

The Road to Socialism and the Worker-Peasant Alliance

I. WE ARE EMERGING FROM POVERTY. WE ARE BUILDING OUR ECONOMY WITHOUT THE LANDLORDS AND WITHOUT THE BIG CAPITALISTS

Since 1924 we, the working class and peasantry of what used to be Tsarist Russia, have begun to raise ourselves rather quickly from a state of terrible disorganization. We have begun to heal our painful wounds and to leave behind the confusion and chaos that prevailed in earlier years. To everyone — friend and foe alike — it is now becoming clear that the economy of our enormous country is beginning to stand on its own feet. No matter what branch of production one examines, revival, expansion, and a forward movement are visible everywhere.

In our country the foundation of the entire economy is agriculture. Our industry is at a comparatively early stage, and its development depends upon agricultural growth. In our conditions, agriculture means the peasant economy, the more than 20 million peasant households.

During the years of imperialist and civil war — years of terrible devastation — this peasant economy was undermined, destroyed, and impoverished. But now it is clear to all that little by little, our countryside is beginning to gather its strength: more land is

N. Bukharin, Put' k sotsializmu i raboche-krest'yanskii soyuz, 4th ed. (Moscow and Leningrad, 1927).

being tilled, production is expanding, new crops are being introduced, the peasants are making the transition from a three-field to a multifield system, in some places new machines and tractors are appearing — in a word, progress is gradually beginning here as well. It is true that a sea of poverty and backwardness still exists. But if one compares the present position with that of the civil war years, there is no doubt that we are lifting ourselves out of poverty.

Just recollect the experience of past years. In the cities most factories and plants lay idle: the best workers were fighting on the fronts; and neither fuel, raw material, nor bread was to be found. Enormous factories and plants were not working. The stores were deserted. And the cities were rapidly melting away as the inhabitants fled to far-off villages in search of a crust of bread, in order to be nearer to the land, to sit things out somehow and to acquire a piece of bread or a sack of potatoes. One could say that the cities, at that time, were all going "to pieces," that they lived by begging and were spreading and spilling out into the entire country.

But now we see that the city is quickly beginning to grow again, that the factories and plants are coming alive, new houses are being built, and city life is in full swing. Exhausted by starvation, the working class is beginning to recover from the terrible years of disaster. By increasing its labor productivity the working class ensures itself an ever-improving standard of living. We are also gradually beginning to construct new factories. The construction of electrical stations is making gradual progress, and the electric lamp is ceasing to be such a rare quest even under the thatched roofs in the villages.

Our transport is likewise advancing quickly. One need only compare the situation in past years with what is happening today. We all remember how infrequently the trains crawled, the cars with their windows smashed out and carrying an endless number of people, like ants, with packs on their backs. At that time the whole country had been broken into virtual fragments, and for long periods of time it was often impossible to move from one place to another. The so-called "locomotive graveyard" (the heaps of old, worn-out, broken, rusted, and defunct locomotives, of smashed, broken up, and mutilated cars) bore witness to the chaos, to the colossal disorder that then prevailed in our transport.

Now we are straightening out our economy in this sphere as well. Both railway and water transport are achieving continually greater successes, beginning now to yield a profit to the state. The

years of disorder have faded into oblivion; the old chaos has vanished forever.

Nor have we forgotten the fate of our Soviet currency. We recall how the value of our Soviet notes fell endlessly, how several pounds of notes had to be carried, and how they became mere scraps of useless paper. The state treasury hung on the thread of these doomed Soviet notes. That was a time when both the economy and the treasury stood on the brink of total collapse.

Yet now we have a "hard currency"; in the cities and villages silver and copper coins have long been circulating, and the chervonets remains stable. The peasant and the worker, the plant, the factory and the mine: all can now keep accounts, prepare plans, and know in advance what they need and can spend and how much they must pay. With proper accounting of revenues and expenditures, the state treasury can prepare a proper plan for its own enormous sphere of economic activity.

Thus, in every respect we are moving toward a better future. Our country is becoming wealthier, and we are beginning to make real gains in the struggle against poverty and deprivation.

The overwhelming majority of everything that is in the country belongs to the working class and the peasantry. True, we have made room for private traders, merchants, and middlemen; in places where we could not manage on our own, we have allowed them to go about their business as private capitalists. In some localities we have also leased certain enterprises, in the form of concessions, to large-scale foreign capitalists. These were enterprises which we could not restore by ourselves and for which foreign capital makes payments to our state. If we survey the economy as a whole, however, the proportion of private, leased, and concession enterprises is very small. The overwhelming majority of economic activity originates with the workers' state, the peasant farms, or the small businesses of the artisans and handicraftsmen.

Just what do these facts mean?

Above all else, they show that the workers and peasants, the common people, by themselves and without the help of capitalists and landowners or the former managers and directors — who were in command of things for decades and centuries — can, on their own, build up their economy.

This is a fact of truly enormous significance. Never before in the world had there been such a great upheaval as occurred in our country in October, 1917. Never before and in no other country

have the laboring masses of the people been able to drive the commandants of the bourgeois order from their cozy nests. Nowhere else have the workers and peasants been in a position to control their own fate. The defenders of the bourgeois order, defenders of the landlords and capitalists, continually buzzed in every ear with the claim that the laboring masses — the workers and peasants — would be unable to guide and manage the economy even if they wished to do so. They said and wrote that the "simple" and "uneducated" people could never accomplish such a complex task. Almost daily, even hourly, after the October revolution they predicted our inevitable destruction. It was only a few days before the October revolution that the wisest representative of the Russian bourgeoisie, the Constitutional Democrat Milyukov, wrote that the Bolsheviks would never manage to take power into their own hands. And when the Bolsheviks, the party of the working class (relying upon the peasantry), "assumed" power, all the enemies of the laboring people malevolently awaited their downfall. Nevertheless, the working class and the peasantry proved capable of doing without the landlords, who have been uprooted and erased for all time from the face of our country. They have also been able to manage without the capitalist bigwigs, who are now whiling away their days in foreign capitals.

The fact that the laboring masses are running things by themselves has enormous significance not just for us but for the toilers throughout the world. This unprecedented and unheard of example will continually summon the toilers of all countries to undertake a great reform and reconstruction of the world. This real, practical example will disprove the yarns and fables put out by the defenders of the capitalist order to the effect that it is impossible to do without the landlords and the capitalists. This example will inspire courage and confidence in the hearts of all revolutionary fighters and builders of the new society.

II. WHY HAVE WE BEEN VICTORIOUS THUS FAR? (THE ALLIANCE OF WORKERS AND PEASANTS)

If we have been able thus far to emerge from all our difficulties and to find a way out of the most terrible situations, this has been possible mainly because in our country the alliance of the landlords and capitalists was offset by another alliance, that of workers and peasants.

In all countries the wealthy groups (the bankers, the factory owners and manufacturers, the great landlords, and those who own the railroads, mines, etc.) sustain themselves by enslaving the will of a large section of the toiling masses. The death-knell sounds for the capitalist and landlord state only when the working class, as a whole, escapes from the influence of the bourgeoisie, tearing the broad layers of the peasantry away from this influence and helping them to free themselves, to find new ways, new, independent paths of development. It is only when an alliance of the laboring classes emerges, an alliance of workers and peasants, ranging themselves against the alliance of the wealthy classes, against the capitalists and the landlords, the classes that do not labor — only then are victory over the old order and strengthening of the new possible. We must always be aware of this truth and never forget it for a single moment. Every conscious worker and every peasant must firmly accept this truth, for it is only in this way that we can hope for further successes.

The main confirmation of this truth is to be found in the course of our own revolution. Consider our October victory and the reason why we were in a position to triumph. It will not be difficult to see that the October victory was possible because the worker, in the course of the struggle, gave his hand to the peasant, and the peasant stretched out his hand to the worker. What was the peasantry's chief demand? It was the demand for land and peace. And what was the chief demand of the working class? The chief demand of the working class was for transfer of the factories and plants from the capitalists, for their conversion into people's property, for peace and for Soviet power. The peasants could not possibly obtain their goal without supporting the workers; and the workers, for their part, could not realize their own demands unless, with all their strength, they supported the demands of the peasants. In this way there emerged and was forged an alliance, or "bloc," between the working class and the peasantry, an alliance that achieved a relatively easy victory in the great days of October. The issue was decided by the joint and unusually harmonious behavior of workers and soldiers: soldiers who were of one bone and one flesh with our peasantry. The soldiers wanted peace — so did the peasants; the peasants wanted land — so did the soldiers; the peasants wanted reprisals against the landlords — so did the soldiers. All these demands were endorsed, circulated, and became fighting slogans in the hands of the working class and its party. The peasants' demands were interwoven with those of the

workers, and the workers' demands were joined to those of the peasants. No force could withstand this joint assault by the enormous, overwhelming majority of our country's population. Herein lies the root of our October victory.

And why did we enjoy a further triumph in the civil war, which dragged out over a number of years? The fact is that after our October victory, foreign capitalists also took up arms against us and rushed to the aid of the Russian bourgeoisie. Our bourgeoisie and its armed forces were supported by every means — both military-political and financial — by a whole series of powerful bourgeois states. On more than one occasion our Soviet state found itself in a ring of fire, surrounded on all four sides by enemy armies. There were moments when the Soviet Republic, under steady pressure by attacking enemy detachments, was reduced to only a few provinces. In fact, there were moments when Petrograd, the leading city of the proletarian revolution, found itself in immediate jeopardy. There was the time when Denikin approached Orel, and in Moscow the white conspirators were already forming their staffs and their officer corps for the forthcoming reprisals against the "communist dogs." More than once we endured months at a time when we were cut off from oil, coal, and grain. We lived for whole years as if in a fortress, besieged from all sides and beset by famine and plague. Nevertheless, we were completely victorious in this civil war between the exploiters and the exploited, between the landlords and the capitalists, on the one hand, and the workers and peasants, on the other — a war that was exceptional for its cruelty and suffering. Where were the roots of this victory?

In the first place, these roots lay in the fact that the laboring masses of the West, sometimes consciously and at other times heeding only the voice of their class instinct, supported us, opposed their own leaders, their governments and their commanders, and in different ways and forms prevented these governments from completing their butcher's task of smothering the victorious revolution in Russia. More than once it happened that units of foreign armies would raise red flags and desert from the fronts.

A second, domestic cause of our victory was once again the strong military alliance between the workers and the peasants of our country. The peasants supported the workers in their struggle against enemies who were pressing hard from all sides. This military alliance between the working class and the peasantry was a continuation and development of the fighting union that emerged

between these classes at the time of the October revolution.

Obviously, this military alliance rested on a bond of fundamental interests and did not simply hang in the air. Struggling with their enemies, the peasantry defended land only recently taken from the landlords. The enemy armies brought in their wake a whole retinue of capitalists, large landowners, princes, barons, and counts who had been driven from their estates and were craving to regain the old nests their noble families had been warming for centuries. And when the sons of the peasantry — soldiers in our Red Army — endured famine and cold, fell sick with typhus and fought in their bare feet; when they defended the frontiers of our Soviet country and drove off the enemy with their bayonets, they were defending the great cause of liberation from the yoke of the landlords. They saw that it was only by joining with the working class, which had sent its own best sons to the fronts, that they could fortify their hold over the land they had seized. They accepted the leadership of the working class because they saw that in revolutionary class battles the sons of the factories and plants heroically defended the revolutionary cause, enduring any sacrifice for victory over the enemy. They saw, too, that Soviet power alone provided reliable support in this unprecedented struggle. For their own part, the workers likewise saw that the arrival of the landlords would also signify the arrival of the capitalists, the return of the old regime as a whole, loss of all the factories and plants won in the battle of October, and the destruction of Soviet power. Thus, the military alliance of the working class and peasantry during the civil war rested upon a community of interests and fundamental goals that confronted both of the toiling classes of our country. It is true that the burdens of this period frequently caused certain strata of the peasantry to waver. This was a time when extraordinary firmness was required in order to assemble all that was needed to feed the Red Army, to support the front, and to sustain those workers who remained in the starving cities. Exhausted by the weight of the struggle and not understanding the need for enormous sacrifices, these strata of the peasantry often went over to the side of the enemy, to the whites, to the supporters of the Constituent Assembly and Kolchak. But the stern lessons of civil war proved to them on every occasion that no salvation could be found in the white camp, for this was the camp of sworn enemies of both the working class and the peasantry. With their ramrods the Denikins and Kolchaks hammered into the peasantry a faith in the justice of the Bolshevik cause and an understanding of the need for

close cooperation with the working class. As a result of the agonizing experience, paid for with blood, the peasantry of our country became more and more convinced of the need to sacrifice for the sake of a great victory over the enemy. Thus was the bond forged between the working class and the peasantry in a struggle against the common foe. And here we find the second root of our victory over all opponents, both our domestic ones and those from abroad. The victory over the alliance of landlords and capitalists is a victory for the alliance of workers and peasants.

When the last units of the bourgeois-landlord armies were driven into the sea and our country was reunited under the Soviet banner, under the red flag of the revolution and on the new foundations of peaceful and voluntary coexistence among the many millions of laboring people, at that point the country entered a new period, and new tasks arose. We had already ceased to be a besieged fortress, repelling an attack. The civil war was over. It was necessary, as quickly as possible, to make the transition to peaceful labor and to begin repairing our shaken economy. For all of these purposes it was imperative to shift to a different economic policy, one that would correspond to the new period and the new tasks so emphatically confronting the laboring classes of our country. Grain requisitions had been needed in order to feed the army and the starving remnants of the working class at all costs. Without these workers the whole revolutionary cause would have collapsed. But grain requisitions and the prohibition of trade were completely unsuitable for a period in which it was necessary to expand productive forces in agriculture and to develop our industry. Thus, the transition occurred to the New Economic Policy. Little by little the effects of the armed struggle, waged against us by the capitalist powers, became less evident, and finally disappeared altogether. Our economy began to recover. We began increasingly to trade with the capitalist states; and they, after some hesitation, one after another reluctantly began to recognize Soviet power as the "legal" power over all the lands of the former tsarist empire. In this context we faced a new form of the question of how we might guarantee our final victory, strengthen the power of the laboring people, ensure economic growth, and construct a new society, a new order and new relations. To this question we must reply: we will finally be victorious, we will triumph fully and completely, we will really build a new society of labor only if we are able once more, in these new, peaceful, postwar conditions, to strengthen anew that alliance between the working class and the peasantry that

was the guarantee of our victory throughout the entire revolution. That is why we must again and again address ourselves to the question of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry. This is not simply a matter of repeating an old question; we are talking of new conditions, more complicated than those we faced earlier. We are growing, and in economic terms we are becoming steadily stronger. But our common enemy is now less obvious than during the former period of civil war. Hence, we must analyze all of the dangers on our route, lest we stumble and let slip away all that we have fought for during so many years.

III. THE WORKING CLASS AND THE PEASANTRY

In the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, an alliance that has enabled us to stand our ground in the struggle against our enemies and to begin restoring the economy of our country, the leading role has gone to the working class. In our country the working class does not comprise a majority of the laboring population. An enormous majority of the toiling people are peasants. Nevertheless, the working class was, and remains, the leading force. In order to understand why this has happened, and why such leadership was necessary for the victory over the landlords and capitalists, one must consider in some detail the position of these classes in capitalist society.

Under capitalism, under the domination of the bourgeoisie, the city has always been a parasite in relation to the village. This has been true of all countries, including our own. All the achievements of science and technology and all the achievements of culture have been concentrated primarily in the city. The countryside and agriculture have always been in a secondary position. In their development they have inevitably lagged far behind the city. The city attracts to itself all the best forces, the most energetic, efficient, and talented people. The countryside is permanently drained of its vital juices for the sake of the city. All the literacy and all the education of contemporary society are concentrated in the city. It is in the city that all the information is gathered on what is occurring in different corners of the globe. Today, as in the past, the city is the hub of the state apparatus, of governmental institutions and all the instruments of the mighty and powerful bourgeois states. The countryside is inevitably condemned to an isolated existence: in terms of knowledge and literacy the countryside lags behind the city by whole centuries.

This fundamental difference has left its mark on both the workers and the peasants. But that is not all. The working class in the factories and plants has no connection whatever with property. In capitalist society the workers sell their working hands to the entrepreneur. Daily and hourly they see that they are working for this entrepreneur. They begin to hate the bourgeoisie, to mistrust them. On the other hand, every worker becomes accustomed to working back to back with other workers in the same position. Concentrated in enormous masses, the workers live and work in gigantic factories and plants, in the mines and the pits. Not only do they learn to hate and mistrust the bourgeoisie, to unmask its every betrayal, but they also learn to strike back in unison. They grow steadily more accustomed to the belief that they can defeat the enemy only through joint action, and that once the enemy has been defeated, only jointly can they reconstruct the entire economy and administer the country they have taken from the bourgeoisie. Urban culture places at their disposal the means with which the workers can build their ranks into a structured army, do battle against the domination of the landlords and the capitalists, and unravel all the guile of the enemy. With the peasant, matters are quite different. The peasant works by himself, on his own farm, with his family and his household. With few exceptions (for instance, mowing, etc.) he is unaccustomed to working in common along with his fellow villagers. He has his own separate, private farm; and he is concerned, first and foremost, with the interests of his own petty undertaking. The conditions of rural life are such that he is seldom beyond the outskirts of the village. Even today there are still peasants who have never been so far as the district capital, and others have never traveled on a railroad.

Of course, this is the peasant's misfortune, not something for which he is to be "blamed." It is, nevertheless, a fact; and the reality of this fact must be taken into account and given due notice.

In addition, the peasantry is far from homogeneous. The well-to-do tavern-keeper, the village moneylender, and the kulak are all referred to as peasants. The large-scale proprietor, who keeps several agricultural workers in harness in order to profit from their labor, is also called a peasant. The toiling proprietor, who works for himself along with his family and does not live at the expense of other people's labor, is similarly a peasant. There are also poor peasants, who do not even own a horse and are scarcely able to make ends meet by taking odd jobs on the side. And finally, there are peasants who are farm laborers for part of the time,

urban workers for the balance, and whose farms are but a secondary source of subsistence.

In the capitalist system the vast majority of the peasants are condemned to a type of existence in which they barely make ends meet. But every peasant, having his own farm — his own property — searches for a way out primarily by expanding his farm and his property so that he may rise to the next higher category of the peasant population and thus elevate himself step by step. Possessing his own property and hoping to expand it (even though such hopes are, in point of fact, usually empty wishes), the peasant has a certain respect for and faith in the large property-owner, and as a result, in the bourgeoisie. For this reason he does not learn to hate the wealthy class with the same hatred as do members of the working class, who confront capital face to face. A section of the peasantry even feels a kind of esteem for the large property-owner. Hence, for the peasant's class enemies to lose esteem in his own eyes, he must experience the class struggle and direct clashes with his antagonist. Accordingly, the capitalists and the landlords find the peasant much easier to mislead than the worker.

On the other hand, the peasant, not being accustomed to continuous joint work and joint struggle, is not in a position to give a systematic and lasting rebuff to his enemies. Scattered throughout the countryside in villages and hamlets, separated and dispersed like sand in a river, the peasantry does not, and cannot, become an orderly and organized army such as the urban workers have managed to put together.

If one also remembers that city life has given, and continues to give, to the worker a more extensive knowledge, literacy, ability to recognize the perfidy of his enemies, etc., then it is not difficult to realize that leadership in the bloc of peasants and workers unavoidably had to fall to the working class. From all that we have seen thus far, it follows that the working class is a much more conscious and organized force, a force that is much more capable of carrying with it broad sections of the laboring population. Time and again we must emphasize that the peasant's less developed consciousness is his misfortune, not his "fault." But it is no less clear that leadership on the part of the working class will be of benefit both to the working class itself and to the peasantry. Without this leadership both the workers and large segments of the peasantry would be lost.

That is how matters stand if we are examining the period when the working class and the peasantry make their assault on the al-

liance of landlords and capitalists. What is the situation, though, once the domination of the landlords and capitalists has been overthrown and it becomes necessary to manage the state and direct the whole economy of the country, which has been seized from the bourgeoisie and the landlords?

This question, too, must be closely scrutinized. When the working class and the peasantry first seize power, they do not fall from the skies: they emerge from the womb of capitalist society. Within capitalist society both the working class and the peasantry were in the position of oppressed classes. Even the working class, within the capitalist system, was unable to rise to the point where it could learn the business of management. All higher education was in the hands of the bourgeoisie; all the commanding heights in government, the army, the economy, science, etc., were in the hands of the ruling classes. Thus, there was no way in which the working class, within the limits of capitalist society, could produce from its own ranks all of the forces needed to put things right, single-handedly, in the whole enormous and complex state and economic apparatus of the country. When the toiling masses overthrow the rule of the landlords and capitalists, burdens that they have never before had to face immediately fall upon their shoulders. The working class and the toiling masses in general must now think decisively of all spheres of the economy and of management. They need technicians and engineers, chemists and agronomists, courts and administrators, teachers and students — in brief, all the forces necessary to guide the country along the path of economic and all other forms of improvement. And since the working class did not, and could not, have at its disposal forces of this type, drawn from its own ranks, it is natural that immediately after the seizure of power by the toiling masses, a question arises concerning the use of many of the personnel who previously served the now overthrown bourgeois regime. In general and on the whole, these people served loyally and conscientiously. The result is that the laboring masses are confronted by the new and complicated task of subordinating all of the above-mentioned forces to their own goals and of reforming them in a spirit suitable for the stabilization and strengthening of the new order.

The working class itself is not in immediate possession of the required skills. Struggling with its enemies and tirelessly eradicating their open and concealed opposition, the working class must make use of forces that initially are hostile or semihostile and only later come over to its side. The peasantry are even less

prepared. We saw earlier that under the conditions of a capitalist regime, the peasantry is inevitably much more backward than the workers and much less able to discern enemy plans or implement a proper policy.

Nevertheless, the working class is able, despite its subjugation under the conditions of capitalist society, to implement either a correct policy or, at least, the general outline of such a policy. Making a number of unavoidable errors, in the final analysis the working class learns to overcome the difficulties it encounters on this new path.

It is obvious that sooner or later the peasantry will also learn to understand economic and political construction through experience. But if the leading role of the proletariat was imperative in the alliance of workers and peasants even when the objective of the toiling classes was merely to overthrow the alliance of landlords and capitalists, then after the conquest of power, this leadership by no means becomes either redundant or any less imperative. On the contrary, one could say that, particularly in the first period and the first phase of strengthening and developing the new order, when enormous numbers of new and extremely complex tasks arise, this leadership must be secured at all costs. It is not a question of the working class necessarily "wanting" to be in the forefront. Rather, this leadership is necessary in the interests of the broad mass of the peasants as well, whatever certain strata of the peasantry might believe. If for some reason or other the working class lost its leadership over the peasantry, then the entire affair would end with an absolutely inevitable victory for the bourgeoisie.

The leadership of the proletariat is therefore an essential condition for the victory of the worker-peasant cause. But the problem is even more complex than it appears at first glance. The point is that the working class itself is not homogeneous. Within its ranks are different component parts. And although these parts are not so sharply defined as the different strata, groups, and classes within the peasantry, they must nevertheless be taken into account. Consider, for example, such a component of the working class as agricultural laborers, or batraks. They are hired workers, and for the most part have no connection with property. But at the same time, the general conditions of their labor — the countryside and rural conditions in general, the resulting cultural and political backwardness, the dispersed nature of their work, the great similarity to conditions of labor in the peasant economy, etc.

— all of these conditions severely impede growth of their consciousness in comparison with the urban workers, who live and work in crowded conditions in the cultural centers of the country. If we consider the working class as a whole, we shall see that it contains recruits from the peasantry, from the handicraftsmen, from the small traders, etc. On the other hand, there are workers who are perhaps already of the second or third generation and who imbibed, with their mother's milk, a proletarian manner of thinking and proletarian habits and views. A whole array of other conditions have diverse influences on the different strata of the working class. It is small wonder, therefore, that in terms of its consciousness, the working class has never been — and still is not — perfectly homogeneous. The most conscious workers, those who see better and understand more clearly the route and the basic interests of the toiling masses, unite in the most advanced organization of the laborers — that is, in the Communist Party. In a most consistent and intelligent manner, the party directs the struggle to eliminate the power of capital and to build the new society of the future. If the most conscious section of the proletariat joins together in the party, it is perfectly obvious that within the proletariat itself, the leading role must, in turn, belong to the party. Here, too, we can say that the most backward strata of the workers are not, of course, to "blame" for their backwardness or for falling short of other strata in terms of their consciousness — this is not their fault, but their "misfortune." On the other hand, it is perfectly understandable and obvious that if the party were to lose its leadership, if this leadership should somehow be destroyed, the results would be extremely harmful to the entire working class as a whole and would signify the end of leadership on the part of the most conscious, most advanced, and most organized section of the working class.

And so what must we conclude? We must conclude that for the victory of the worker-peasant cause, or the cause of the toiling masses, the following basic conditions are necessary: first, it is imperative to have an alliance or a bloc between the workers and the peasants; second, the leading role in this alliance must belong to the working class; and third, within the working class itself, the leading role must in turn belong to the Communist Party. If the leading role of the Communist Party is eliminated within the working class, or if the leading role of the working class over the peasantry is destroyed, then it is quite inevitable that the whole worker-peasant cause will be ruined and that the sworn enemies of both

the working class and the peasantry will triumph.

We can, however, also consider the question of areas in which the interests of the working class and the peasantry do not correspond and sometimes even contradict each other. We can, for instance, point to the fact that the peasant sells grain, and the worker is the buyer. As a seller of grain the peasant is interested in higher prices; as a buyer of grain, the working class is interested in lower prices. This is a genuine contradiction that exists in real life. But we have not said, after all, that the working class and the peasantry are one and the same class. Nowhere have we said that between the working class and the peasantry there are no differences. One must look truth in the eyes and not confuse things with empty chatter. These differences between the working class and the peasantry do exist, but they take second place to interests and questions that have a more fundamental and basic significance for both classes. In the very same way, landlords and capitalists were never one and the same class: there were very important contradictions between their respective interests. The urban bourgeoisie bought grain and raw materials from the landlords, while the landlords sold them this grain and material. In return, the bourgeoisie sold the landlords industrial products, which the landlords purchased. Nevertheless, despite this rather essential contradiction, the alliance of the capitalists and landlords, especially in recent times, was the basic fact of social life. Under the leadership of the bourgeoisie — that is, under the leadership of the capitalists — this bloc was the ruling force against which every level of the working class and peasantry has had to, and still must, wage its struggle. Just as the landlords and capitalists, without being a single class and still differing from each other, have entered into and constitute a bloc, or an alliance, just as they are merging together both in economic life and in the class struggle against the working class and the peasantry, so the proletariat must, even though it does not consist of the same class, enter into a bloc and a close alliance with the peasantry. For its part, the peasantry must, by virtue of its own basic interests, support the proletariat, ally with it, and voluntarily agree to working-class leadership, for it is only in these conditions that the general victory of the worker-peasant cause is possible.

IV. THE STRUGGLE OF THE WORKING CLASS
AGAINST THE BOURGEOISIE AND
FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE PEASANTRY

The fact that the countryside inevitably lags behind the city in its development leads to a very important phenomenon. To be precise, the peasantry usually proves unable to play a completely independent role and inevitably falls under the influence of either the bourgeoisie or the proletariat. Very often the peasantry wavers between these two basic classes of capitalist society. For its own part, the bourgeoisie, using all the advantages of its position, all its financial resources, its political dominance, its monopoly of science, of the schools, newspapers, etc., wages a systematic, stubborn, and never-ending struggle to subordinate the broad strata of the peasantry to its domination — including its ideological domination. The purveyors of this bourgeois influence over the peasantry are normally the more prosperous strata of the peasantry, who are naturally drawn toward the bourgeoisie. The working class, in its turn, struggles to emancipate the peasantry from the influence of the bourgeoisie, to explain to the peasantry the need to struggle against the capitalist order, which conflicts with the basic interests of the broad mass of poor peasants and partly even with the interests of the middle-level peasantry. The question of how stable the bloc of landlords and capitalists becomes, or whether it is really seriously threatened by the bloc of workers and peasants, is decided by the direction in which the peasantry leans and the side toward which it wavers — whether to the side of the proletariat or that of the bourgeoisie. Our revolution provides an excellent example of how the bourgeoisie attempted to utilize the ignorance of the peasantry and its excessive faith in big-property owners in order to use the peasants as cannon fodder against the proletariat. Our revolution and its development also strikingly demonstrate how, with a correct policy on the part of the proletarian party, the peasantry can be removed from the influence of the bourgeoisie and transformed, in its own interest, into an additional, very significant, and powerful force, a spearhead against the exploiting society of capitalism.

Immediately after the February revolution, the bourgeoisie attempted to deceive the peasantry on the question of the war. Playing on peasant ignorance and devotion to the fatherland, the bourgeoisie tried to portray the imperialist war — which it was waging in compliance with the direct orders of English and French im-

perialists, jumping to the whip of these capitalists — as a war of justice, a war not devoted to plunder, but of a purely defensive nature. Playing on the patriotic and property-owning sensitivities of the peasantry, the bourgeoisie tried to portray the most revolutionary party of our revolution, the Bolshevik Party, as a rabble of German spies and German agents whose purpose was to sell out our country to German imperialism. One must acknowledge that there was a time, thanks to rabid persecution on the part of the entire bourgeois press, when they succeeded in achieving certain positive results (from their point of view). Our party and the working class were forced to endure a very trying period when the petit bourgeois party of Socialist-Revolutionaries stood at the head of the peasantry and together with the Mensheviks — the other petit bourgeois party in our country — implemented the policy dictated to them by our bourgeoisie. It was only through our party's most energetic work, combined with the experience of war and revolution, that the masses themselves gradually became convinced of Bolshevik innocence. Only thus were bourgeois deceit and lies concerning the war fully unmasked.

In like manner the bourgeoisie very skillfully attempted to take advantage of certain prejudices among the peasantry concerning the land question. The broad masses of the peasantry wanted to acquire the landlords' holdings (a centuries-old dream in our countryside); they passionately and insistently wanted to take this land from the landlords. But on the other hand, certain elements among the peasantry, particularly the more prosperous strata, who had less need for this land and greater respect and esteem for large-property owners in general, naturally found themselves in a wavering and indecisive position. Through their lackey party of Socialist-Revolutionaries, the bourgeoisie tried to postpone the natural attempt of the peasantry to seize the landlord holdings. In every way they affirmed that the land must not be seized "before the Constituent Assembly," that the landlords must not be smoked out without a special law from the manor houses. They were afraid of the way the land would be carved up and of the chaos of holdings that would result if the peasantry "arbitrarily" took the land, drove out the landlords, and dealt with them as they deserved, without waiting for any instructions from on high. Only one party, the Bolsheviks, the party of the working class, stood for immediate confiscation of landlord holdings and called upon the peasants at every meeting and gathering to seize the land on their own, without waiting and regardless of what anyone said to the contrary. We

remember the period when the bourgeoisie sat in government with representatives from the Socialist-Revolutionary party, and when this government arrested peasant land committees for their less than delicate handling of landlord properties. Our party, in contrast, was working energetically to explain to the peasants the need to root out the landlord and drive him from the land. For it was only by unleashing the revolutionary energy of the peasantry (and this had to be done first and foremost on the land question) that we were able to create a really stable guarantee of revolutionary victory. The joint plan of the bourgeoisie, the SRs, the Mensheviks, and others was to delay any solution of the land question, a plan that in fact represented nothing but support for the old regime in its entirety. This plan failed because, on the land question, the peasantry followed the working class rather than the bourgeoisie. The peasantry did not follow the moderate slogans of the bourgeoisie and the compromising parties, but the consistently revolutionary slogans expounded by the party of the working class.

This extraordinarily bitter struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie for influence over the peasantry went even further. For the bourgeoisie the greatest danger was conquest of power by the proletariat and consolidation of this power. The bourgeoisie understood perfectly well that this would inevitably come about if the peasantry supported the working class at the decisive moment. Our bourgeoisie had an excellent understanding of the experience bequeathed to it by the overthrown tsarist regime; it understood that the landlord tsar succeeded in smashing the forces of the revolutionary people in 1905 precisely because in that case the working class did not receive the support of the peasantry in time. The peasantry went into action much later, when the urban working class, the leading detachment of the revolutionary movement, had already been crushed and defeated. Tsarism was able to put an end to the revolution precisely because it was able to defeat the revolutionary army one part at a time. It was understandable, therefore, that the bourgeoisie should make every effort to separate the workers from the peasants. Both immediately before the October days and afterward, as the Soviet power struggled for its life, the bourgeoisie, helped by its SR and Menshevik agents, tried to deceive the peasantry with the slogan of "democracy": in opposition to the power of the soviets, i.e., to the leadership of the proletariat, they expounded the slogan of so-called "democracy" and the "constituent assembly," a slogan of bourgeois domination and leadership. In part this leadership

was to be direct; in part it was to be through the SRs and Mensheviks. The working class and its party were condemned for being unfaithful to the watchwords "equality," "freedom," etc. That was a time of battles. At all costs it was imperative to smother every counterrevolutionary initiative coming from the bourgeoisie and the landlords, and to do so with a firm hand, courageously and mercilessly. The bourgeoisie and landlords in our country enjoyed enormous support not only in the Menshevik and SR parties but also among enormous sections of officialdom, among office-workers and the so-called intelligentsia (doctors, lawyers, teachers, professors, clergymen, and so forth), not to mention the officer corps of the former tsarist army, the overwhelming majority of whom openly stood for the return of the old order. At a time such as that, when it was imperative to use every means of merciless struggle in order to disarm our enemies, the bourgeoisie, the SRs, and Mensheviks expounded the slogan of "equality" and "freedom," i.e., freedom for conspirators to go about their work, freedom for former landlords to deceive the peasants, freedom for capitalists to use their money bag in order to buy and organize supporters, etc. If the Mensheviks and SRs did not fully understand that under these conditions the demand for "democracy," which was preferred as an alternative to the slogan of Soviet power and proletarian dictatorship, was really nothing but a demand for every kind of freedom for the bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie themselves had an excellent understanding of what was at issue. They were preparing a military dictatorship of bloody generals. More than anything else, however, they needed to trick at least a section of the broad popular masses, tearing the peasantry away from the working class and thereby undermining the fortress of Soviet power with the deceitful slogan of "democracy" and the "constituent assembly." Quite justifiably the bourgeoisie hoped that if it could succeed, through its agents, in overthrowing the Soviet power and eliminating the leadership of the proletariat, then it would be a trivial matter to settle accounts with the SRs and Mensheviks "at one stroke," for these parties were utterly incapable of any decisive leadership whatever.

The experience of real struggle showed that wherever a part of the peasantry subscribed to these deceptive slogans and sided with supporters of the constituent assembly, after a short interval of time the course of events inevitably led to one or another tsarist general's taking over and assuming undivided power. That was the case in the south (Denikin, Wrangel, etc.) and in the east (Kolchak,

etc.). Having learned through their own experiences what the "democracy" of a constituent assembly leads to, the peasants again turned to Soviet power, freeing themselves once more from bourgeois leadership and returning to the side of the proletariat — only this time much more decisively, more wholeheartedly and with less wavering. In the struggle against the joint forces of the landlords, the capitalists, and the foreign bourgeoisie, the newly restored alliance of the working class and peasantry went on to accomplish truly great miracles.

The fact is that this struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie for influence over the peasantry is still continuing. Notwithstanding our economic growth, we still face an enormous number of difficulties. The heritage of previous disorganization weighs like a heavy burden on our backs. The working class and the city's industries cannot immediately provide an adequate volume of commodities at sufficiently low prices. Soviet power and the ruling party are making every effort to increase production as quickly as possible, to reduce cost-prices and to send less expensive commodities to the countryside. But one cannot accomplish the impossible, and our state industry is only gradually developing the capacity to resolve the tasks it has been assigned.

Construction of an enormous state apparatus, provision of the security the country requires, and reform of the whole sphere of management, etc., involve substantial expenditures. In turn, these expenditures create the need for taxation, including taxation of the peasantry. For the ruined and impoverished peasant farms, these taxes represent a heavy burden. And the working class is unable to lower taxes at once, but can improve the taxation system only gradually, learning through experience how to lighten the share of the load falling on the peasantry.

At the time of its birth, the young state was short of skilled and knowledgeable personnel who were loyal to the revolutionary cause; the working class and the peasantry had never before had an opportunity to learn how to manage the state. It was no surprise, therefore, that both the workers and the peasants who became involved in state construction made a number of errors, which in turn had unfavorable consequences for the peasantry. To provide sufficient numbers of the people who are needed to manage a country so enormous as ours is certainly not an easy task. The former ruling classes had hundreds of years and many generations to produce the personnel they required. But Soviet power, the power of the toilers, has existed in our country only a few short years —

hence the inevitable shortcomings in our system of management, together with a number of unfortunate phenomena and so-called "defects in the mechanism."

All of these shortcomings are then used by supporters of the bourgeoisie to drive a wedge between the working class and the peasantry, to split and divide the alliance of workers and peasants, to tear the peasants away from proletarian leadership and bring a considerable number of them under the leadership and ideological influence of those who support the bourgeoisie.

It should be borne in mind that the struggle for influence over the peasantry, the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, is currently being waged in our country, among other forms, in the completely unique and original form of a struggle for an economic link with the peasantry. Our state industry and trade are waging this struggle against private capital, against the private trader and merchant, who are desperately fighting on every side to increase their economic influence over the peasantry and to achieve their own economic link. This struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is being waged with unique weapons; and the proletariat can be victorious only to the extent that it truly succeeds in developing its industry, creating an efficient and inexpensive trade apparatus, and showing the entire peasantry that the state economy is in a better position to satisfy the vital economic demands and needs of the peasant population than the private capitalist, the private trader, the private merchant, and the private middleman.

V. HOW WE MIGHT REVERT TO THE OLD REGIME

All large-scale industry, transport, and large-volume wholesale trade is now in the hands of the working class and under the control of state power. The new bourgeoisie and the remnants of the old bourgeoisie have comparatively little capital; but what they do have is enormous experience, flexibility, aggressiveness, and skill. Using these resources, private capital is waging a systematic, desperate and rabid struggle against us. While this struggle is not taking the form of bloody clashes, it nevertheless has the utmost significance for the entire fate of our country. For this reason it is especially important for the working class and the peasantry to understand which conditions guarantee the success of their alliance and which conditions might lead to a victory for the alliance of landlords and capitalists.

We have already said that the task of the working class and the city's industry is to develop production to the point where it is possible to satisfy in full the needs of the peasant population and to do so with low prices. If this does not happen, and if the private entrepreneur — for instance, the private, small-scale manufacturer — produces better or more cheaply than state plants, then it is obvious that this private entrepreneur will establish the only genuine link with the peasantry, increasing his economic importance and authority in the peasant's eyes. The economic authority of state enterprises and of the entire state as a whole, in contrast, will diminish in the eyes of the peasant. If our state trade and our commercial agents sell commodities more expensively because of their lack of skill, because of the high overhead expenses of their apparatus and their careless business practices, etc., at the same time as the private trader, used to taking advantage of trifles, sells more cheaply, then, in this case, the peasantry will once again value private trade much more highly than state trade. The economic authority of the private trader will exceed that of state institutions. Private capital will acquire real influence and a genuine economic link, and all of this will mean nothing less than the victory of the bourgeoisie over the working class in the struggle for economic influence over the peasantry.

Today the question could be put this way: What kind of link will occur, a link of whom with whom — of the private trader and capitalist with the peasantry, or of proletarian industry with this same peasantry? The outcome of the class struggle depends on the answer to this question. The important fact is not that this struggle is being waged in peaceful forms, without the clang of metallic weapons; the really important fact is its truly gigantic significance. Indeed, this struggle will decide everything.

If the private trader and the capitalist win for themselves a growing role in our economic life, and if these same classes establish their economic link with the peasantry, the result will be a rupture in the very foundation upon which it is currently necessary to build the whole alliance of the working class and the peasantry. If the bourgeoisie really succeeded in economically pushing aside state industry and trade, the inevitable consequence would be the bourgeoisie's growing political influence over the peasantry. It is perfectly understandable at the present time, with the civil war over and the main task being to strengthen the economy, that a growth in the political influence of the working class over the peasantry and of the peasantry's confidence in Soviet

power can be achieved only to the extent that Soviet power proves capable of providing economic leadership for the entire country. If this development did not occur, if the reverse were to happen, then a transfer of political influence over the peasantry from the proletariat to the bourgeoisie would prove to be completely unavoidable.

If the peasantry were to move away from the political leadership of the proletariat and fall under the influence of the bourgeoisie and private capital, the inevitable result would be the collapse of Soviet power and the establishment of a bourgeois regime, i.e., the establishment of political rule by the new bourgeoisie and the remains of the old bourgeoisie, who were beaten at the time of the great revolution. The first move of such a new government would inevitably be to repeal all types of nationalization: the factories and plants would return to the hands of private individuals, to private owners and manufacturers; nationalization of the land would be quickly terminated; permission would be given for complete freedom of trade and speculation in land; and this land would be madly, feverishly bought up, especially that part of it belonging to poor peasants who do not have sufficient equipment. Within a very short time, a huge section of the peasantry would be deprived of land, and large land funds would be concentrated at the disposal of shrewd land speculators, some of whom would themselves become new landlords while another group would resell their lands to other wealthy people, thus permitting a new stratum of landlords to emerge from the latter group. It stands to reason that these new landlords would begin to lease a part of their land to the peasants, forcing them to pay huge sums of money as rent. Thus, we would end up restoring an order fundamentally the same as that which was swept away by our revolution, for whose destruction the working class and the peasantry fought with such heroism.

The new ruling classes would have to pay in full all the debts both of the tsarist government and of Kerensky's government. And in order to be in a position to pay these truly enormous sums, they would inevitably have to extract an unheard-of tribute from the peasantry, multiplying the tax load many times over and putting merciless pressure on the proletariat in an attempt to set private industry in motion in accordance with entrepreneurial principles. It goes without saying that not only the Soviet organs but all intervention in production by the working class would be completely eliminated: all the factory committees would be abolished, the trade unions would be stripped of their rights, and the working

class as a whole would be completely deprived of any commanding role in production. Very soon the peasantry, too, would understand that their cause was lost, that a split in the alliance between the working class and the peasantry entailed enormous losses for the broad peasant masses, leaving them at the sole and exclusive mercy of the upper stratum of kulak exploiters — that is, of the agricultural bourgeoisie. Once again a great movement would begin among the masses; again the peasantry would begin to grind their axes and take up their pitchforks against the new landlords, and the whole history would recommence from the beginning. But it would begin with enormous losses: the working class and the peasantry would have been weakened; and the bourgeoisie would have much greater experience and considerably more support from foreign capital, which would no longer be divided by its own imperialistic brawl, as it was in 1917.

Of course, nothing of the kind will actually happen. As a matter of fact, things will occur quite differently. Our state industry and trade, together with the cooperatives, will grow steadily and increasingly push aside the private trader and the private middleman. On this basis the working class, in the final analysis, will enjoy increasing success in attracting the broad peasant masses under its influence and leadership, involving them in the project of actively building the new regime and the new order. We shall not follow the normal capitalist path. We are already following, and shall continue to follow, a perfectly independent path — our own, special, socialist road. This road becomes possible once the working class, supported by the peasantry, seizes and fortifies its own state power.

VI. THE HIGH ROAD TO SOCIALISM IN OUR COUNTRY

The enemies of the working class and peasantry have demonstrated that any attempt to bring a socialist system into being would in fact mean nothing but universal impoverishment and "equality in poverty." These enemies of the working class, who during the years of our civil war strangled and tormented our country, thus causing its poverty and ruin, have said that this poverty and ruin result from the very essence of socialism and communism. Of course, all of this is utter nonsense. Our party's mission is to increase the wealth of our country and then of the entire world to unprecedented heights — not the wealth of private individuals, not

the wealth of separate groups of millionaires, private capitalists, speculators, bankers, stock-exchange manipulators, etc., but the wealth of the entire people, of all the toilers as a whole, the wealth of one country and then of others as they are taken over from the former ruling classes. We must be the champions of the very best in technology, of the best means for working the soil, of the best methods for organizing labor; in brief, our role and our significance when we seize power from the capitalists and landlords consist primarily of being the bearers of every kind of economic improvement. As far as industry is concerned, these improvements mean construction of new and larger plants, the transition to electrical energy, construction of the preconditions for the electrification of all types of industrial work, and the introduction of better planning in the organization of both industry and labor. We must move ever closer to a point where the whole of industry will be united by a general plan, where nothing will be wasted, where no expenditures are excessive, and where, for these reasons, the cost-price of producing the products in question will steadily decline. But this type of planned economy within industry is unthinkable on its own: the fact is that our industry works in very large measure for the peasant market, the primary consumers of industrial products being our peasant farms. In order to have an accurate plan in industry, it is necessary to know how much the peasant farms will consume. A strict accounting must be made of the volume and type of products these peasant farms will request from state industry. In order for industry to enjoy increasing opportunities for development it is also necessary for the peasant economy itself to develop, to become more and more organized, to become the type of economy in which separate households and small farms move in the direction of growing mutual ties with one another. Very often we hear complaints from the peasants that their standard of living is lower than the workers', that their working day is longer, that they cannot even dream of an eight-hour working day, etc. But it is not difficult to understand that these conditions result from the dreadful backwardness of the peasant economy itself, compared with the factory and large-scale production. The peasant farm is comparable in terms of industrial production to the small operation of a handicraftsman or an artisan; they, too, sit in their tiny establishment, working all day and all night, but nevertheless are not to be compared with a large-scale factory, where one finds the best machinery, the best organization of labor, the best use of fuel, materials, etc. Thus, if

the peasants want to achieve serious, lasting, and important improvements in their way of life, they must move along the path toward their amalgamation. It stands to reason that one cannot and should not even think of persuading the peasantry to amalgamate every last strip of their land at once. The old habits and economic methods are so ingrained in people that they cannot be overcome so suddenly. Nevertheless, motivated by the interests of their own private farm and the tiny individual household, the peasantry will inevitably follow the path of their own amalgamation and in so doing will be joined together all the more harmoniously with proletarian state industry. How will this development occur? It will occur through cooperation. Every peasant is interested in selling his farm products more easily and profitably; and every peasant is interested in buying the urban industrial products he requires on the cheapest and most advantageous terms. This is true both of so-called consumer demand (the purchase of textiles, shoes, and other such products for immediate use) and of productive demand (the purchase of all sorts of means of production, of improved seeds, agricultural implements, and so on). Also, every small, private, peasant farmer is interested in having cheaper credit available in the event of need. These are the factors that push the peasantry along the path of cooperative amalgamation — and they not only avoid contradicting the interests of the private farm but actually result from, and are dictated by, those interests. Everywhere, in all countries of the world, this has proven to be decisively the case. In order to purchase industrial products or the agricultural products of other countries more advantageously (for example, better seeds or better breeds of cattle, etc.), the peasants have organized cooperative purchasing societies. Individual peasants have organized themselves, jointly created a cooperative, selected the cooperative's management, paid dues, and thus made it possible to be much more organized in purchasing the items they need. The individual, acting on his own and at his own risk, has been replaced by an entire organization, which is better able to discover where to buy and what can be bought most profitably. The seller, quite naturally, has more confidence in an organization than in an individual and for this reason is prepared to extend a certain amount of credit. On the other hand, because an organization of this type buys far more than an individual peasant, and because wholesale prices are always lower than retail prices, it is perfectly understandable that with cooperative purchases such as these, the peasant-buyers manage to save a fair amount. If we

also consider the fact that joint shipping and organized distribution yield further considerable economies — compared with the case in which each peasant must individually harness his mare, travel to the city, and bring home the commodities he requires — then we can understand how this sort of expenditure is similarly reduced several times over with cooperative purchases. Thus, the individual peasant, without interrupting his individual farming routine at all, and acting under the influence of his own private, small-entrepreneurial interests, is led to the creation of social organizations, namely, to cooperative purchasing.

Or let us take another case, that of selling the products of the peasant economy, the sale of milk, eggs, meat, grain, etc. It is one thing for the individual peasant (or his wife), to drag himself with his tank and his pail, on his own, to the city market. But if the peasants unite in a joint sales cooperative, they inevitably benefit and at the same time receive a greater income than when they go forth individually and in a disorganized fashion. A cooperative can acquire better knowledge of market conditions, organize deliveries more effectively, and achieve economies in all overhead expenditures on transport, shipping, storage, and the like. In certain branches of production the joint sale of a product leads rather quickly to organization of production itself. Thus, in almost every country, including our own, one notices this example: once the peasants have a cooperative for the sale of milk, they rapidly become interested in joint sales, through their cooperatives, of all kinds of milk products, such as cheese, butter, and so forth. From here it is but a step to the organization of cooperative creameries or cooperative cheese factories. Individual peasant households organize a joint creamery, and together they order and purchase the machines they require — the separators, and so forth. To the creamery they bring the milk they have produced on their separate farms, and they receive a corresponding return through the organized cooperative sale of the butter, cheese, etc. With certain deductions for maintenance and development of the cooperative, the returns find their way into private pockets and are inevitably larger than those received by individual producers who are not organized in cooperatives. Thus, we have here a case in which the peasants make a transition from the organization of trade to the organization of joint production.

Exactly the same thing happens, for example, in potato-producing areas. There the peasants frequently recognize the need to organize their own starch factories in order to process potatoes.

Similar cooperative enterprises are found in other branches: for instance, the drying of fruits and vegetables, cooperative wine production in areas where the peasantry works at grape cultivation, fish canning in those localities where fishing is the main peasant occupation, etc.

Finally, cooperative credit organizations are equally compatible with the interests of the private peasant producer. Like cooperatives in buying and selling or in the organization of individual branches of production, cooperative credit societies inevitably provide benefits for the peasant farms. It is by no means a coincidence, therefore, that in every country peasants follow this pattern.

There is, however, an essential and really gigantic difference between the conditions for developing agricultural cooperation in capitalist countries compared with our Soviet Union. In a capitalist regime all types of peasant cooperation inevitably fall under the influence of the capitalist economy. Enormous and powerful industries are in bourgeois hands; a mighty credit system, headed by extremely powerful banks, belongs to a small circle of the largest capitalists, and transport and the railroads are either in private capitalist hands, or are controlled by the bourgeois state. The fact is that the whole of city life is supervised by the bourgeoisie. And in the countryside, where the upper stratum of landlord-capitalists are in command as the owners of large estates, the influence of the city is decisive. Given this state of affairs, if cooperative organizations develop, they inevitably fall under the economic leadership of the bourgeoisie and the landlords; gradually they grow into the economic organizations of these capitalists and landlords, becoming, to a great extent, a special kind of capitalist organization that relies on the use and exploitation of hired labor. Indeed, let us suppose that the agricultural cooperatives have idle capital, as they inevitably will if they develop rather than wither away. It is self-evident that in a number of cases, as this idle capital grows, it is deposited either directly or indirectly in different kinds of banking institutions (either in private banks or in the state bank, which is controlled by the bourgeois state). In this case we have a "coalescence" between the cooperative organization and a bourgeois bank. The cooperative becomes manifestly dependent on the bank, and through this sort of economic link becomes subordinated to the economic (and consequently also the political) leadership of the bourgeoisie. Consider the case of purchasing cooperatives: they must do business with the bourgeois syndicates

and trusts, i.e., with the organizations of large factory owners and manufacturers. The inevitable result here, too, is therefore an economic link with and economic dependence on the organizations of large-scale capital, which become tied to the cooperatives through a whole network of agreements concerning deliveries, credit obligations, etc.

The situation is identical in the case of credit societies, which are even more closely tied to the bourgeois banks and become directly dependent on them. Thus, the general conditions for the development of cooperatives within the limits of a capitalist system — even when they are created as organizations of nonexploiting and laboring peasants rather than kulaks — are such that they are necessarily converted into organs and components of the enormous economic machine of the capitalist order. This is an inevitable consequence of the general course of events and the general conditions of development by which the cooperatives are compelled to work within limits imposed on them by the prevalence of the capitalist structure. The cooperative organizations grow into the overall capitalist mechanism and become one of its constituent elements; they merge with it and are themselves transformed into a type of capitalist enterprise.

Finally — and this is extremely important — under the conditions of a capitalist order, in which all science, technology, education, schools, and the press are under bourgeois supervision, cooperative personnel (the managers, the leading and directing people, the advisers, agronomists, accountants, etc.) as a rule come from different strata of the bourgeoisie. Within the cooperative they accordingly take a course that is beneficial for the ruling bourgeoisie and disguises in every possible way the contradictory interests of labor and capital, of peasants and landlords. In Western Europe and America one frequently finds that peasant cooperative organizations are even headed by great landlords, priests, and other types of devoted agents.

If any cooperative organization wished to implement a particular policy of an independent and anticapitalist nature, it would thus inevitably be condemned to destruction. The powerful capitalist organizations would subject it to a discriminating economic boycott. Either it would receive no credit or it would be granted worse terms than another cooperative organization, more loyally disposed toward capitalism. Nowhere would it be able to purchase on the same terms as other cooperatives the industrial products it required, etc.

All of these factors determine the course of development taken by peasant cooperation in a capitalist economy.

Completely different conditions prevail under our system, i.e., under the system of proletarian dictatorship. The general bounds of cooperative development in our country are not determined by the fact that the factories, plants, mines, railroads, and banks are in bourgeois hands, but by the fact that the whole of large-scale industry, transport, and the credit system are under the control of the proletarian state. It follows that if a general development of the productive forces occurs in our country, and if the city becomes to an increasing degree the economic leader of the countryside, establishing more and more of an economic link — in short, if our state economy is strengthened — the result will be a growing link between the proletariat and the peasantry. Peasant cooperation will inevitably grow into the system of proletarian economic organs in exactly the same way as it grows into the capitalist system of economic organs under a bourgeois regime. Under a capitalist regime every cooperative organization that wants to follow a path of development antagonistic to capitalism is gradually smothered by the credit and other economic institutions of the bourgeoisie. Under the conditions of a proletarian dictatorship, on the contrary, they are precisely the laboring cooperatives that will receive every form of assistance, that is, cooperatives of the middle and poor peasants will be in a privileged position in comparison with cooperatives of the kulaks and the village rich, or the agricultural bourgeoisie. Finally, under a proletarian dictatorship, cooperative personnel, cooperative employees and leaders of all types, are not drawn from the bourgeoisie. They are specially trained and prepared in the appropriate educational institutions and in practice so that they can more successfully direct the kind of work that is necessary from the point of view of building a new society — not in order to serve big capital. Here the whole enormous difference between the conditions of rural development under capitalist domination and under the proletarian dictatorship is apparent. There is no justification for thinking that development within our structure will be the same as in a capitalist system. The power of the Soviets and the dictatorship of the proletariat is not limited to mere political power. Our state differs from a bourgeois state not only in that it is controlled by a different class but also in that it has all large-scale industry and transport in its own hands and therefore represents an enormous, powerful, economic force, a force that leaves its imprint on the entire develop-

ment of the country as a whole, including the development of rural relations.

If the peasant cooperatives, in general and on the whole, grow into a system of economic organs belonging to the proletarian state, this will imply economic leadership by the proletariat and a strengthening of the alliance between the workers and the peasants. It will mean that we are making great strides on the road to socialism.

Indeed, given a general upsurge in the national economy, state industry will steadily grow and through cooperation will develop increasingly closer links with the peasant economy. Imperceptibly and to its own benefit, the peasant economy itself will slowly and gradually be reformed and assume a new shape. The former dispersed and detached peasant households, which had no economic bonds with one another, will increasingly unite on the basis of buying, selling, and credit, merging in this way with the economic organs of the proletarian state. On the other hand, from joint purchases and sales and from the mutual organization of credit the peasants will gradually turn to organization of their own cooperative creameries and other types of plants and factories for the processing of agricultural and livestock products.

This organizational process will advance and become more extensive as the peasantry becomes more and more convinced, through its own experience, of the advantages of shifting to collective forms of labor. From joint purchase of machines the peasants will proceed to their collective use. Branch after branch of the peasant economy, as in the case of the creameries, will thus be organized in conformity with the new principles. In addition, the development of large-scale industry in the cities and the growing accumulation of material resources by the state economy will make possible more extensive electrification of agriculture. The supply of electrical energy to a large number of peasant farms will in turn give an even greater impetus to the transition to collective methods of working the land itself. The transition to electrical energy will make perfectly clear the advantages inherent in collective forms of its utilization. Each peasant household and each individual peasant farm will bear a much smaller burden of expenses if electrical energy is used by several rather than by single peasant households. Thus, the process of organizing the peasant economy, which begins with the cooperative organization of trade, eventually leads through the organized processing of agricultural products to organized agricultural production in the direct sense of the word. With the

transition to electrification this process achieves its fullest expression. Thus, a system of peasant farms develops that is becoming more and more organized, converting separate and detached units into a single, organized entity. The peasant economy gradually changes its very nature by merging with and developing into an even larger alliance with state industry. An economic chain of this type, which is organized at each of its links, represents the essence of socialism.

By following this sort of road we are moving toward socialism, notwithstanding the economic and technological backwardness that still distinguishes our country. In these conditions of technological and economic backwardness, the road ahead is, of course, a very long one. Nevertheless, it is the correct road, the one that will lead us to socialism, provided we adopt a proper policy with respect to the peasantry.

VII. INDUSTRY AND AGRICULTURE MUST HELP EACH OTHER

General expansion of our national economy, of industry, on the one hand, and agriculture, on the other, represents one of the greatest victories of our revolution. But at the same time, this economic growth is accompanied by certain "growing pains," i.e., it contains within itself certain unique contradictions that could prove to be dangerous if the most conscious section of the toilers, the avant-garde of the working class — our party — does not examine and explain them with sufficient clarity to the broad strata of the laboring masses. The problem is that the time has long passed since the peasant clearly understood and had constantly in mind the fact that the working class and its party gave him the landlords' property and helped to sweep the entire landlord class from the face of our country. With the transition to peaceful economic work and the beginnings of an expansion in agriculture as well as in state industry, the agricultural economy is more and more becoming a commodity economy, i.e., it is producing a growing share of its output for sale on the market. The more the peasant economy climbs out of its poverty, the greater is the share of its production that goes to market and is exchanged for money, which is used, in turn, for the purchase of other commodities needed in the agricultural economy but not produced there. These commodities, for the most part, come from our state industry. Thus, in the marketplace the peasant comes into contact with state

industry, which is in the hands of the working class. If one has in mind agricultural products, the peasant is the seller and the urban population, the working class, in particular, is the buyer. If one thinks of the products of state industry, the working class, organized in the state power, is the seller and the peasant in this case is the buyer. But everyone knows that the interests of buyers and sellers in the market are contradictory: the buyer is interested in purchasing a commodity more cheaply if possible, and the seller is directly interested in selling his commodity at a higher price. The more the economy develops during this period — that is, during the period that precedes establishment of a single, organized economy, embracing both peasant households and state factories — the more critical becomes the question of prices: both prices for agricultural products, on the one hand, and prices for the products of state industry, on the other. Thus, we see that here we have a direct clash of interests between the working class and the peasantry. This contradiction inevitably creates frictions between the two basic laboring classes of our country, frictions that represent a certain threat to the worker-peasant bloc.

But what is the point here? Is the contradiction between the interests of the working class and the peasantry an irreconcilable one? Or does this contradiction not simultaneously obscure certain more fundamental interests, which are common to both the working class and the peasantry? We have already seen that the basic and most general interest of both classes lies in their joint movement toward socialism, something that is impossible without stabilizing the alliance of workers and peasants and without the working class's assuming the leading role. The point is that this basic and most fundamental interest of the working class and peasantry finds expression in the need for mutual help between industry and agriculture, each of which is fundamentally dependent on the other. As we have already mentioned, our industry works primarily for the peasant market. In its previous development, industry also depended on this market; but under the conditions of a proletarian dictatorship, the dependence is inevitably greater than under the old regime. In the first place, we have lost the external market, because we will not adopt a policy of plunder and seizing new territories such as tsarism followed. In the second place, we no longer have orders for the fleet, for naval armaments or for a vast number of military projects in general. We spend incomparably less on our military needs because we are concerned only with the defense of our own country, having absolutely no expansionist

objectives under any circumstances. It follows that we must re-equip many plants and transfer them from the production of military items to peaceful work, to the production of things needed for agricultural labor, agricultural implements, and equipment in particular. In the third place, the political need to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and the influence of the working class over the peasantry further dictates to us the need to devote substantially greater attention to the peasant market.

Thus, the development of our industry depends on the peasant economy. The greater the peasantry's effective demand, the more quickly will our industry develop. The more quickly accumulation occurs in our peasant economy, the more quickly will it occur in our industry. That is, the more quickly the peasant economy emerges from poverty and the more prosperous it becomes, the more it will buy in the way of agricultural equipment and machines. And the more quickly it improves its technology and shifts to a new form of working the land, the greater will be its capacity to make purchases from the city's industry. The development of the peasant economy, in turn, is unthinkable without the development of the city's industry. For its progress agriculture requires products that it does not itself produce and must acquire from the different branches of our industry. If our industry were to come to a halt one fine day, agriculture would be condemned to vegetate miserably, being held back by the most primitive and primeval methods of working the land. At the very best it would be forced to mark time forever, never being in a position to take even the slightest step forward. Conversely, if industry develops (the metal industry for production of agricultural machines and the chemical industry, producing different types of fertilizers, etc.), then agriculture will begin to find in industry a most powerful aid and support that will enable it, in the final analysis, to do away with the old methods of working the soil and to accelerate greatly the development of productive forces of agriculture as a whole. Thus, industry requires successes in agriculture for its own development; and agriculture, in order to succeed, requires the development of industry. This mutual dependence is the most basic fact in determining the proper policy to be followed by the ruling party. The party's chief responsibility is to ensure that private and transient, momentary and temporary, secondary and derivative interests are subordinated to the more permanent, general, fundamental, and basic ones.

At the present time we must remember that our policy must be conceived not for one year, but for several years. Our concern

is no longer to hang onto power by one means or another (for Soviet power is now firm and stable): no, we must think in terms of implementing a political plan calculated over a considerable number of years. If it were merely a question of dividing between the working class and the peasantry the national income resulting from one year's labor in our country, if nothing more were involved, then it would obviously be absurd to say to the working class: "Do not take too much." It would be equally absurd to attempt to convince the peasantry to adopt self-restraint. In this state of affairs each of the classes would inevitably be guided by its own immediate interests and would try to acquire for itself the largest possible share of the aggregate national income produced in the country as a whole.

However, we have every expectation of surviving far longer than a single year; we expect to survive for many long years and to progress all the while along the road toward socialism. And for that reason our task, the task of both classes, is not so simple as in the case mentioned above. If we had only to divide a given national income, once and for all — a fixed income, of constant magnitude, fixed for all time and never changing — then, of course, no rapid development would be possible, and we should permanently mark time. But that is not the case. The fact is that we must constantly raise the national income, increase the quantity and value of the commodities produced in our country each year, and thereby raise the national income of society as a whole.

If the national income grows, so do the shares into which it is divided. If the total national income steadily increases and grows from year to year, then a larger and larger sum of values will each year be allocated to the share of the working class and that of the peasantry, and the material position of both classes will rapidly improve. Hence, from the point of view of both the working class and the peasantry, which are developing their economy under conditions of Soviet power, it is necessary to follow the kind of policy that will guarantee first and foremost a development of the productive forces of state industry and of the peasant economy, thus permitting the national income to grow more rapidly from year to year.

Every question pertaining to our economic policy must be discussed from this standpoint, including the question of price policy. Suppose that a group of workers tells us: "We workers control large-scale industry, and we are free to set high prices. Let us do so in order to acquire the highest possible profits for our industry.

If industry earns high profits, it will be able to pay the worker more, so that a policy of high prices on the products of our industry is in our own interest. Every retreat from such a policy would constitute nothing but a concession to the petite bourgeoisie and a step backward from the purely proletarian line."

Would this sort of view be correct? Of course not; it would be incorrect. And the policy suggested would not be a proletarian policy at all, but a shop policy, an obtuse, limited policy of not seeing beyond one's own nose, i.e., a policy that would be simply stupid. This policy would presuppose lack of any understanding of the basic link between state industry and peasant agriculture.

Within a short time it would cause state industry's development to come to a halt after encountering the weak purchasing power of the peasant market. With this kind of policy it might be possible over the next few years to acquire a reasonably high profit at the cost of undermining the peasant economy; but after a brief interval of time this policy would bring a cruel vengeance in its wake. The market would be condemned to a sharp contraction, and state industry, in these conditions, would inevitably be deprived of sales. Instead of further development and uninterrupted progress on industry's part, a cruel crisis would set in and cause industry a great setback. Were such a policy allowed to continue, we would have chronic industrial stagnation and either a regression or, at the least, a senseless standstill.

Let us suppose, on the other hand, that certain broad segments of the peasantry were able to follow the kind of policy that would cut short the possibility of further industrial development by charging high prices on grain and raw materials. If these conditions were to last much beyond a single economic year, agriculture would soon begin to suffer from an inability to restore its equipment, not to mention the question of further improvements in farm techniques. This policy, too, would therefore be shortsighted and limited, overlooking the link between town and country and leading inevitably to a decline in national income and hence to a deterioration in the material position of the two basic classes of our Soviet society.

It follows that the contradiction between the working class and the peasantry, which we discussed previously, is one of a comparatively secondary order. From the viewpoint of the interests of the working class and the peasantry, when these interests are correctly understood, it is imperative to follow a policy that allows room for fuller development of productive forces. In its own in-

terest the working class must make every effort to set production in order as quickly as possible, to produce state industrial products as cheaply as possible, and to sell these products as inexpensively as possible, thus benefiting from a greater sales volume, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, guaranteeing each year a greater expansion of the entire national economy.

We absolutely must not confuse the position of the working class, once it is in power, with the position of the working class when it is struggling to take power. While the struggle for power is going on, the working class is not concerned with the national economy as a whole, with growth of the national income or with the integrity of society as a whole. On the contrary, its fundamental interest is to pull down, smash, and destroy capitalist society. But when the working class is the class in power, it becomes the leader of the whole society. The responsibility for growth of the national income becomes its own responsibility. Responsibility for developing the productive forces also becomes its own responsibility. And an interest in developing the national economy similarly becomes its own interest. We must understand this fact and make it the starting point in any definition of our policy. Thus, we see that the basic fact is the mutual link between industry and agriculture. The need for mutual assistance between industry and agriculture is the basic condition for the stability of the worker-peasant bloc, without which any movement toward socialism is inconceivable.

VIII. THE GROWTH OF COOPERATION AND THE RURAL CLASS STRUGGLE

When we say that under a dictatorship of the proletariat the growth of cooperation in fact signifies the growth of socialism, we do not at all mean that this entire process will take place perfectly smoothly or without internal frictions. On the contrary, it can be said that the course of development through cooperation to socialism will be accompanied by a class struggle among the different groups and strata of the peasantry, especially during the first phase, or until such time as state industry is in a position to underpin all of agriculture with electrification. At the present time, as we have mentioned previously, we have several strata among the peasantry, occupying diverse social positions. There is no doubt that these different strata will build cooperatives dif-

ferently and will struggle for influence among themselves in the course of cooperative construction. Even the tasks and objectives to which the cooperative organizations are devoted will differ somewhat according to the particular stratum of the peasantry that is involved. If, for instance, we are speaking of poor peasants, who own no horses and cannot cope with their own strips of land, who possess neither equipment nor even the most rudimentary means of production, then these strata of the peasantry will inevitably gravitate toward various types of collective farms, to kolkhozy in the literal sense. It is currently impossible for them to organize societies for the sale of their products because they have, in fact, virtually nothing to sell. They must still pass through that stage of development which will permit them to stand on their own feet and gradually extend production in order then to begin selling a growing portion of their output on the market. Until they reach that stage of their development, until they overcome the phase of desperate need, their most important objective is the joint purchasing of equipment, draft animals, and machines and their joint utilization on collective principles. For this reason kolkhozy are the natural form of organization for poor peasant farms. It must be said, however, that a direct transition to this type of farm demands a major break with long-standing habits that have been inherited from both grandfathers and fathers alike. For this reason one can hardly think that the kolkhoz movement will embrace the entire broad mass of the poor peasants. Middle-level peasant farms, which are already growing and becoming more stable, will, of course, be organized into agricultural cooperatives along all three of the main lines mentioned above: purchases, sales, and credit. The basic mass and nucleus of the peasantry is composed mainly of middle peasants. Hence the basic form of cooperation will likewise be a corresponding type of agricultural cooperative. The well-to-do peasants and those with large holdings will similarly work to create their own cooperative organizations, including credit cooperatives, and will try to make these organizations serve as their strong points. Inasmuch as the class struggle in the countryside will begin to die out only after some considerable interval of time and the near future will bring a process of stratification among the peasantry — that is, emergence of an upper stratum of the well-to-do, on the one hand, a lower stratum of agricultural proletarians and semiproletarians, on the other — it is obvious that a class struggle among the different cells of the overall cooperative movement, and even within individual cooperatives will

also take place: a struggle over the election of management and responsible officials, over members' shares and how big they should be, over the regulations of the cooperative organizations, over the policy management must follow, etc. Each of these individual questions will give rise to separate battles ("peaceful," of course) among the different strata of the peasantry.

The picture will therefore be a mixed one. Within the general network of cooperative organizations we shall have kulak cells (sometimes, perhaps, even purely kulak in composition), cells of poor peasants and middle peasants, and cells of mixed composition. Nevertheless, the picture will have a common background. Despite the process of peasant stratification, we must remember that the basic nucleus, namely, the middle peasant, will be preserved. Comrade Lenin spoke of the middle peasant as "the central figure in our agriculture." If a relatively stable stratum of middle peasants survives even under capitalist conditions, with capitalist cities and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, then under conditions of a workers' dictatorship, the peasantry will be stratified even more slowly — certainly not more rapidly. At the same time, inasmuch as state power will increasingly be able to extend the hand of material assistance to the poor and middle peasant, we shall have a new movement toward equalization — although on completely different bases than in the past. Previously we took from the prosperous peasants and the kulaks in one form or another and gave to the deprived poor, i.e., we made the well-to-do less prosperous and, in this way, as with the poor peasant committees, we achieved a certain equalization. This time things will be different. To be precise, the poor and middle peasants will emerge from poverty more and more rapidly with the help of their own cooperative organizations, and the latter will enjoy special protection, privileges, and support, material and otherwise, from the state power of the working class.

The more the national economy progresses as a whole, and the more quickly our state industry grows, the more forcefully will we support those strata of the peasantry that, in terms of living standard, can overtake the prosperous rural upper stratum, doing so not as a result of exploitation or at the expense of other people's labor, but by virtue of improved methods on their own farms and through the combined efforts of peasant households in a cooperative organization. Consequently, these strata will more and more make the transition to a collective form of farming. Hence, the basic network of our peasant cooperative organizations will consist not

of kulak cells, but of "toiling" cells, and these cells will grow into the general system of our state economic organs and thus become links in the single chain of a socialist economy. On the other hand, the cooperative nuclei of the kulaks will likewise grow into this same system through the banks, etc., although to a certain extent they will remain an alien body similar, for example, to concession enterprises. And what does the future hold for these kulak cooperatives? Let us suppose, for example, that we have a credit cooperative headed by kulaks who exercise complete authority. If this kulak cooperative wishes to prosper it must, like all other cooperatives, inevitably become linked up with the state economic organs. For instance, it will deposit its free cash in our banks in order to receive a specified rate of interest. Even if cooperatives of this type were to create their own banking organizations, they would nonetheless inevitably have to become linked up with the powerful credit institutions of the proletarian state — institutions that have the major credit resources of the country at their disposal. The kulak and his organizations will have no room to move, for the general limits of development in our country are determined in advance by the system of proletarian dictatorship and by the already growing power of the dictatorship's economic organs. If the kulak, like it or not, becomes a depositor in our banks, if he willingly or otherwise finds himself being linked through various relations to our economic organs, then he will inevitably be confined within fixed limits. Of course, one can, generally speaking, imagine a state of affairs in which the kulak farm might grow with frightful speed and accumulation occur more quickly than in the whole of state industry. In that event the kulak would outgrow the rest of the economy; and having joined forces with private commercial capital, he might topple the whole structure, both economic and political, of the proletarian dictatorship. But this sort of assumption is totally improbable. To suppose that the kulak economy will grow more quickly than the whole of state industry is to assume something that directly contradicts reality. In the development of our national economy as a whole, large-scale industry will develop the most rapidly of all, since it is already standing on its own feet. And this industry is entirely in the hands of the proletarian state. Its growth will be the determining factor and will serve as an adequate guarantee that the kulak, or the well-to-do peasant, while hiring a few agricultural workers, will nevertheless be subordinated to our overall system.

It stands to reason that the proletarian state, being interested in

"noncapitalist" or socialist forms of economy, cannot treat laboring cooperatives and kulak cooperatives in an identical manner; it will, as we have suggested earlier, support cooperatives of poor and middle peasants in every possible way. Moreover, it is in this class assistance, extended by the proletariat to the nearest strata of the peasantry as they battle against the kulaks or the agricultural bourgeoisie, that the class struggle will find expression.

IX. THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM AND FORMS OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE

At the present time there are three classes in our country, two of which — the workers and the peasants — are the basic classes of our society and our system, whereas the third class — the bourgeoisie (kulaks, Nepmen, etc.) — exists only to the extent that to a certain degree and on specific terms it is "admitted" into "collaboration" with the working class and the peasantry. We have already seen that the position currently occupied by the working class, as the ruling class, implies several basic conclusions regarding the policy of the workers' state. The basic and main conclusion, as we have suggested, is the following: Whereas the task of the working class under the capitalist system was the destruction of society, under a proletarian dictatorship the goal of the working class is not to destroy the system of proletarian dictatorship and the new society being created, but to support it in every way, to strengthen it and provide it with leadership. A number of other conclusions follow from this one, particularly with respect to the forms of the class struggle in our society. As we know very well, the class struggle does not halt and die out immediately, but will persist for a very long time, until class divisions in general disappear forever. Yet even now we see how the main direction and forms of the class struggle are inevitably changing. In capitalist society, in which the proletariat's main concern is society's destruction, the constant objective is to intensify and ignite the class struggle in every manner until it assumes its cruelest forms, namely, those of civil war and armed struggle on the part of the toiling masses against the ruling capitalist regime. In the course of this struggle the old society is split from top to bottom; and, in the final analysis, the position of the classes changes completely: the so-called "lower" and oppressed classes are elevated, and the exploiters become a class whose opposition is suppressed and who

must, after their defeat, submit to the new power erected by the classes that have come up from below. Thus, in capitalist society the task of the working class is to follow a line of sharpening class struggle and its conversion into civil war. Within the context of the capitalist system, the party of the working class is a party of civil war. The position is completely reversed when the working class takes power into its own hands, supported by the broad strata of the peasantry. As the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is destroyed and replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat, the task of the working class becomes one of strengthening this dictatorship and protecting it against all encroachments. The party of the working class, under these conditions, becomes a party of civil peace, i.e., it demands submission from the former ruling classes, strata, and groups. It demands civil peace from them; and the working class punishes and prosecutes all those who disrupt this civil peace, all conspirators and saboteurs — in a word, all who interfere with the cause of peacefully building a new society.

After the working class has beaten off all the attacks of its enemies and guaranteed peaceful, constructive work within its own state, it no longer advocates civil war within the country. Instead it calls for domestic pacification based on recognition of the new power's plenitude, its laws, and its institutions — a pacification based on submission to these laws and institutions from all strata, including the former opponents of the new power. The very forms of the class struggle undergo a corresponding change. This point can be clarified by a few examples. Let us first consider relations with the bourgeoisie. Within the context of the capitalist system we advocated expanding the class struggle right up to the use of armed force. Of course, if the bourgeoisie were to attempt to move against us now by force of arms, as they did in 1917, 1918, and 1919, we would immediately put our armed forces into action and deal with such an opponent in a fitting manner. But now we have an entirely different position. The strength and stability of the Soviet power are so obvious that the bourgeois strata of our society (the Nepmen) see quite clearly how hopeless any attempt would be to undertake an active and acute political struggle against the new order. Like it or not, these strata are forced to make peace with the existing state of affairs. Within certain limits this bourgeoisie is allowed to engage in economic activity. At present we do not prevent private trade, we admit a number of private enterprises, and we do not even close down private shops; we thus allow these groups a limited opportunity to continue their existence. Does this mean that the class struggle is ending? No, it means no such

thing. But this struggle has changed its form in a most essential manner. The working class continues to wage the struggle; our legislation, which guarantees the workers' interests, secures definite rights for the trade unions, forces private entrepreneurs to pay insurance premiums, deprives these entrepreneurial circles of voting rights for the organs of political power, etc., — this legislation represents a new form of the class struggle. The taxation system, which similarly taxes the incomes and profits of capitalist enterprises, places a burden upon the bourgeoisie such as can be found in no other country. This taxation system, too, is a new form of the class struggle. The same is true of competition from state industry and trade and competition from the cooperatives. When our state grants special privileges and advantages to cooperative enterprises, when it gives them special financing or supports them with its monetary resources, and when its legislation guarantees them unequal rights — all such acts are new forms of class struggle. If state industry, trade, and the cooperatives gradually squeeze out the private entrepreneur in the course of competition in the market, this victory represents a victory in the class struggle — not a victory in a mechanical confrontation or from armed skirmishes, but one achieved in an entirely new environment such as the working class and the peasantry could not even hope for in the past, under the capitalist regime.

In the countryside the form of the class struggle changes in exactly the same way. It is true that here and there the class struggle in the countryside breaks out in its old forms, such an intensification usually being caused by the kulak elements. When, for example, the kulaks, or people who live through exploitation and worm their way into the organs of Soviet power, begin to shoot agricultural press correspondents, then we have a manifestation of the class struggle in the sharpest possible form. Such events, however, usually take place in areas where the local soviet apparatus is still weak. As this apparatus improves, and as all the lower cells of the Soviet power are strengthened, as the local party and Komsomol organizations are improved and reinforced in the villages, such phenomena will obviously become more rare and eventually will disappear without a trace. Several years have already passed since the main form of class struggle in the countryside was direct administrative pressure on the rural upper strata. At first we had constant confiscations and requisitions from the more well-to-do peasantry and the transfer of this confiscated property to the poor (at the time of poor peasant committees). Then we had a system of what were in fact continuous and arbitrary

pressures, which created extraordinary difficulties and sometimes completely prevented any economic progress and corresponding activity on the part of the rural well-to-do strata, particularly the rural bourgeoisie. Whereas we permitted the economic activity of private merchants and entrepreneurs in the city from the very outset of the New Economic Policy, in the countryside, for the rural bourgeoisie, we created such obstacles as to limit similar activity severely or to render it virtually impossible. Now (in the summer of 1925) we are arriving at the point of eliminating such a system in practice by giving greater freedom of movement to bourgeois elements in the villages. But this change does not at all mean that we have ceased to wage the class struggle against the rural bourgeoisie. It does not at all mean that we are refusing to support poor and middle peasants against the exploiting strata. We are merely altering the form of our class struggle against the small rural capitalists. We are making the transition to a new form of the class struggle, one that is more expedient in the present circumstances.

In the cities we by no means close down the private merchant's shop; we allow him to go about his "business." As a result, we achieve a greater revitalization of commodity turnover throughout the country. This merchant is a buyer in relation both to our state industry and state wholesale trade; on the other hand, where our own state and cooperative trading network is very weak, he sells our commodities in every corner of our country. In so doing, of course, he makes a living and acquires the commercial profits, or at least a part of the commercial profits. Nevertheless, he inadvertently promotes, through a general revival of the commodity turnover, both the growth of our state industry and the expansion of our state trade, along with a more rapid turnover of the country's capital as a whole, including capital in our state industry and state trade. The result is that the machinery of production itself turns more quickly, the process of accumulation takes place more quickly, and our state industry — that base and bulwark of socialist society — increases its power more quickly. On the other hand, through our tax levies upon the bourgeois strata, we simultaneously acquire still further resources for our state treasury. It is this growth in material values, coming partly from the more rapid growth of our own enterprises in response to the general revival of the commodity turnover and partly from tax receipts, that we convert into aid for the different types of undertakings that serve the cause of the laboring classes and of socialism. From our position,

a policy of this type is a class policy. As its objective this class policy has the support of the toilers against the remnants of an exploiting world. But the form of this policy and the form of this class struggle, as we see, differs radically from one in which we would simply close up the shops of the private merchants. Thanks to this new form of the class struggle, not only do we lose nothing but we even gain enormously. We become much stronger, and we do so on the basis of a universal growth in prosperity.

True, we were not able to implement such a policy all at once. When we controlled factories and plants that were not working; when we issued masses of currency, amounting to mere pieces of paper with practically no market value; when instead of banks we had only bank buildings; when the railroads did not run; when the most elementary conditions were missing for the work of large-scale enterprises (there was no raw material, fuel, or even bread for starving workers): to permit freedom at such a time for private economic activity or to give private shopkeepers and small private capitalists complete freedom to trade would have been dangerous in the extreme. We would have had nothing with which to compete. We did not possess sufficiently strong and powerful weapons for the struggle. In conditions of ruin it would have been much easier for the small capitalist to maneuver with his insignificant capital; he was distinguished by considerably greater skill and forcefulness than our treasury institutions, in which a vacuum prevailed. And if we had then given complete economic freedom to all of these elements, before having secured our own position — that is, without having any strong points in the economic struggle — there would have been a great, a most extraordinary danger that these thousands of small capitalists would have overwhelmed and defeated us in a competitive economic struggle. For this reason we had to act with a certain caution, securing solid positions for ourselves on the economic battlefield, i.e., on the field of class battles and the class struggle in its new form. In our hands such positions consist of large-scale industry, transport, the banking system (credit), and the state budget and state finances.

In step with our growth and with the strengthening of these "economic commanding heights," as they are called, we were able all the more decisively to release our grip on both the small and the medium-sized private entrepreneurs. At present, for example, we have absolutely nothing to fear from free trade, because on the grounds of free trade, taking advantage ourselves of a free trade foundation, we have fortified our commanding heights and are al-

ready in a position to wage a victorious economic struggle.

Now we can carry over such a policy to the countryside as well, making certain that our rural workers are not practicing a system of simple administrative "pressure" and "suppression" with respect to the more prosperous strata in the villages. But once again, does this mean that we want to abandon the class struggle with this agricultural bourgeoisie? Nothing of the kind has occurred. In exactly the same way as we did not abandon the class struggle with the urban bourgeoisie (the Nepmen) when we let them go about their "business," so a similar policy in the countryside does not signify abandonment of the struggle. We are merely changing its form. We must oppose the shops of the village merchants not with organs of direct compulsion and force, but with our own good cooperative shops. Against the village usurers, who lend money at a scandalous rate of interest or hire out their horse to a horseless peasant on enslaving terms, we must move up our battery of credit societies, with the proper organization of inexpensive cooperative credit and assistance on the part of the state power. Our commodities must be better and cheaper than those of the private trader; our loans must be bigger and much less expensive than those provided by the moneylender; the cooperatives must trade better and adjust more successfully to local rural demand than private traders. These are the weapons we must bring into front-line positions in our struggle with the exploiting elements of the countryside.

But one might inquire: Is it correct to extend to the countryside a policy that was suitable for the city? The fact is that there is one important and extremely essential difference between the conditions of economic struggle in the city and those that obtain in the country. In the city we already possess "commanding heights" that are more or less properly organized and properly functioning; after all, this is our heavy artillery in the struggle with the urban Nepmen. But where are the comparable "commanding heights" in the country? What can we use in the villages to counter the prosperous upper strata? Where are the economic instruments we might use, in the course of an economic struggle, to beat the back of the rural kulak? Might it not happen here that the kulak elements will turn out to be immeasurably stronger in economic terms than the remaining mass of the peasantry? And might they not thus be in a position to prevail over us, making themselves the bosses and masters of the whole of rural life?

To this perfectly natural question we must reply as follows: The

commanding height in relation to the rural bourgeoisie is the proletarian city. One must not think of the matter in terms of a countryside that develops completely on its own, totally independently of the city. We have already said that with the growth of national productive forces, the city's influence on the development of agriculture will become increasingly decisive. And the heart of the city, its proletarian industry, its banking system, its legislation, etc., have all turned their "face to the village," i.e., they all serve as a powerful support for the middle and poor peasant elements in the countryside against the kulak strata.

The mediating link between the proletarian city and the laboring countryside is cooperation, which stands precisely at the junction between town and country. Above all, cooperation incorporates the economic link between the working class and the peasantry that it is the basic task of the working class and of our party to strengthen. Growth of this cooperation, by which the proletarian state supports and finances the poor and middle peasants against the kulaks and small-scale agricultural capitalists, signifies, as we have seen, uninterrupted and systematic growth of the cells of the future socialist society. Step by step state industry and state trade are joining forces with rural cooperation, which in turn is spreading from trade into production itself, and will squeeze out private capital in its industrial, commercial, and usurious forms. Peasant farms will be drawn into and absorbed by the general state-cooperative organization in exactly the same way as the different forms of cooperative organizations (particularly in small-scale manufacturing) will draw in and absorb the small handicraftsmen and artisans. Gradually, as private entrepreneurs and private concerns of every description are squeezed out, and in conjunction with improvements in the organization and balance of the state-cooperative economy, we will steadily move closer to socialism, or to a planned economy in which everything belongs to the toilers and all production is intended to satisfy their needs.

In coming years a partial development of capitalist relations in the countryside will inevitably provoke other forms of class struggle in addition to the purely economic form, i.e., in addition to the struggle of economic forms as such. Farm laborers who hire themselves out to the village bourgeoisie are an example. Unable to retain their own farms, these laborers are involved in a struggle that is different from that between the middle-level peasant and the kulak, or even between a poor peasant farm and a kulak farm. Between the kulak and the farm worker the struggle involves such

questions as the conditions of hired labor (length of the working day, forms of payment, the general conditions of work, etc.). But here, too, the pattern of class struggle adopted by the farm workers is conditioned by the fact that they are a part of the working class, which currently holds power. Thus, the class struggle has forms different from those that were characteristic of a capitalist regime. The change results from the fact that in the kulak's employ the farm laborers are under their master's control, so to speak, yet as part of the ruling class they stand over their masters — even if individual agricultural workers are not conscious of the fact. How does this fact find expression? It is expressed in our country's legislation, the spearhead of which is directed against exploiters, every paragraph defending the interests of the workers. It is expressed in the legally acknowledged rights of both industrial and agricultural trade unions, rights such as no capitalist country provides. It is also expressed in our country's courts, which punish entrepreneurs for violating these laws, etc. In the final analysis, therefore, the class struggle of the agricultural laborer is not aimed at destroying the kulak farm and dividing it up. The time has come when we can no longer go on repeating the same tale about the "little white bull." The farm workers wage their class struggle in other forms, enforcing working conditions through their trade unions and through their state authority, the Soviet power. If it is necessary to restrain the agricultural entrepreneurs, the farm workers have recourse to the courts of their own class. Being a part of the working class, the farm workers not only promote the organization of hired workers in agriculture but also help in every possible manner to organize the poor and middle peasants. Thus, they are the living fabric that unites the industrial workers of the city with the broad strata of the laboring peasantry. This does not mean that our country will see none of the old forms of struggle. For example, the farm workers will often have to resort to strikes in their struggle against the kulaks. But even in the event of such clashes as these, things will proceed differently, since the farm workers are supported by all the organs of power as they exert pressure on the private proprietor.

X. UPON WHOM SHOULD WE PLACE OUR WAGER?

Now we must analyze the same questions we have just been discussing, but from a somewhat different angle. The point is that

certain comrades do not understand the essence of the matter and are puzzled about the political course our party has taken with respect to the village. Certain comrades, for instance, discuss things as follows.

At the time of the civil war, they say, we relied on an alliance of the urban working class and the rural semiproletarians, the farm laborers, the semilaborers, the small peasants, and the rural poor in general. This policy line is said to have expressed a "true" proletarian direction, a genuinely "leftist" and purely "proletarian" course. After a period of time we then shifted the center of gravity in our rural policy. Initially we had placed our wager on the village poor, relying on such rural organizations as the committees of poor peasants; then we announced the slogan of "support for the middle peasant," presenting him as "the central figure of our agriculture." Thus, perhaps without even noticing it, we passed from a wager on the poor peasant to a wager on the middle peasant, i.e., we turned our course to the right, away from a "purely proletarian" line. Still more time passed, and we began to speak of greater economic freedom for the well-to-do peasant and even for the kulak. In other words, we now turned even further "to the right" and apparently placed our wager precisely on the prosperous peasant, seeing that our wagers first on the poor and then on the middle-level peasant had "fallen through." Is it not true that the latest turnabout in our policy is to the right? And does not our entire course, taken as a whole, signify an unwavering and systematic retreat from a proletarian policy? Does it not represent a growing conversion of our party's policy into one of continuous and mounting concessions, first to the middle peasant and then to the middle bourgeoisie and beyond? In other words, is this not a clear line of degeneration on the part of our party's policy? Is it not a surrender of our positions and capitulation in face of the growing capitalist relations in our country?

This type of reasoning and all possible complaints of a similar kind must be scrutinized closely. Certainly they must not be left unanswered. We must speak out frankly, because without an understanding of the essence of our policy — and no understanding is possible if such questions are not answered — without this understanding it will be impossible to give any proper leadership to such an enormous country as ours, a country with so many internal contradictions and such complicated tasks as we are facing.

In reply to these questions and complaints it will be useful, first of all, to raise the general question of the so-called New Economic

Policy. When we made the transition from the system of War Communism to the New Economic Policy, it seemed to some that this New Economic Policy in fact represented capitulation to the bourgeoisie. All the enemies of the Communist Party and the proletarian dictatorship, both "our own" and foreign enemies, tirelessly spoke and wrote of the collapse of communism in Russia, of the fact that the Russian Bolsheviks had failed in their experiment to bring real socialism into being and now were rapidly becoming disenchanted. The experiment had demonstrated the complete impossibility of a socialist system, and now the Bolsheviks were revealing their total impotence by appealing for help to the very same bourgeoisie they had hoped to destroy. At the outset of the New Economic Policy both foreign and Russian conspirators, along with the émigré (white) press, tirelessly affirmed that Russia had taken an enormous step toward restoration of the old order. This step would inevitably be followed by all the others needed to return to capitalism: the factories and plants were to be given back, the former owners being received as if they were the Varangians, saving Rus' and restoring order. Every kind of "nationalization" and "monopolization" was to vanish, and the old capitalist system was to be reinstated with the help of the most "educated" Bolsheviks. Over and over again capitalism was showing its enormous vitality and superiority over any kind of socialism or communism. It was said, too, that the Bolsheviks, having once "placed a wager" on the working class, were now betting on the bourgeoisie, both old and new. The new bourgeoisie had been bred during War Communism and had gone through all kinds of trials and tribulations, learning the ins and outs of the new Soviet system. They would therefore inevitably be much better adjusted to the Bolshevik regime.

But can it really be said that the New Economic Policy represented capitulation to capitalism? Was the cause of the laboring people really lost with the introduction of the New Economic Policy? Can it really be said that the New Economic Policy meant repudiation of socialist construction, the collapse of communism, etc.? Finally, can it really be said that the New Economic Policy was a wager on the bourgeoisie?

At the present time this so-called New Economic Policy has already been in operation for a fair number of years. It has been verified in practice, and we are now able to see its imposing consequences. Clearly, its result has been an enormous growth in the strength of the working class and of the laboring masses in general.

Socialism has been strengthened in its struggle with the private capitalist economy. Thanks to the New Economic Policy we have enjoyed enormous economic successes; moreover, the development of our country's productive forces has followed a direction in which socialist and related forms of economy have achieved, and are achieving, steadily increasing predominance as we move along the road to socialism. In the aggregate, our country's economy shows no evidence that private capital is growing in comparison with the state and cooperative sectors. On the contrary, the state and cooperative sectors are steadily being reinforced on the basis of a general improvement in the country's well-being. If this is the case — and it most certainly is — then how is it possible to speak of some sort of capitulation, of retreat from the proletarian line or a wager on the bourgeoisie? A fine "wager on the bourgeoisie" when the main benefit goes to the socialist proletariat! A fine "collapse" of communism when its result is that the state economy of the proletarian dictatorship, after several years of stagnation and inactivity, is now enjoying a rapid expansion!

Actually, the "collapse of communism" was nothing but the collapse of certain of our own misconceptions and incorrect ideas concerning the course of our development toward socialism, misconceptions linked to the period of so-called "War Communism." But the collapse of a few misconceptions hardly means the collapse of communism. It is perfectly understandable that a young class, having seized state power, should be unable to conceive of all the complexities on the path it must travel. During the civil war, a period of ruthless suppression of the exploiters, of confiscations, requisitions, and the like, we imagined that we could shift almost immediately to a planned organization of the economy as soon as we had completely abolished all free trade and replaced it with organized distribution (ration cards, etc.). Experience taught us, however, that we were not strong enough for such a task — indeed, that it could not be achieved so long as there was a colossal number of small farms that could not possibly be included, all at once, in a single, harmonious plan. It was impossible to cling to the prohibition of free trade for any length of time insofar as the small producer and, particularly, the peasant were concerned. That policy caused such a rupture of all the peasant's established relationships and provoked such hostility among broad segments of the peasantry that it inevitably ended up being doomed to the scrap heap. Under the system of War Communism the peasant and the small producer in general, being accustomed to freely disposing of

their product (selling it if they wished), lost all interest in improving and expanding production. It followed that agricultural production could not develop and progress under such a system. There was no proper combination of the private interests of the small producer with the tasks and goals of proletarian socialist construction. To discover such a combination, or bond, was of the utmost importance. And the New Economic Policy, first and foremost, represented this sort of bond or combination. We have seen above that, by harnessing the private economic interests of the small producer — through cooperation — it is possible to lead him gradually toward socialism. This can be done without suddenly and abruptly violating the established pattern of life and without thus exciting either hostility on the basis of petit bourgeois traditions or superstition on the part of the broad masses of the laboring peasantry. Let us recall that there are approximately 100 million peasants in our country, or more than 20 million peasant households. Let us recall, too, that the peasant farm is the economic basis of our state industry. Then it immediately becomes clear what an immense forward stimulus our country was bound to receive from the transition to the New Economic Policy. Today we see our path to socialism quite clearly, and we see that it is different from, or at least not entirely the same as, what we once expected. We thought that we would be able to destroy market relationships immediately, with a single blow. It has turned out that we are approaching socialism precisely through market relationships. One could say that these market relationships will be destroyed as a result of their own development. And how will this occur?

We know that in a capitalist society, in which the market prevails and different types of private enterprises struggle and compete with each other, large-scale production ultimately drives out small-scale production, and medium-sized capital retreats before large-scale capital. In the final analysis, a mass of competing entrepreneurs, manufacturers, merchants, and bankers is replaced by small coteries of the kings of industry and finance, who concentrate all of industry and trade in their hands. Development of the market struggle causes the number of competitors to decline steadily, and production is concentrated in the hands of the great capitalist organizations. Something similar in appearances will occur in our country, is occurring even now, but with one essential difference: in our case the place of the great kings of industry and the bankers is taken by the working class and the toiling peasantry. In our country there are indeed several different forms of economy and

several types of economic "enterprises": we have state enterprises, cooperative enterprises, and purely capitalist enterprises. Production on a large scale is in the hands of the proletarian state. The private capitalist economy controls much more modest enterprises in the sphere of trade, principally retail trade, and wholesale (or large-volume) trade belongs to the state. In industry large-scale production similarly belongs to the state, and private enterprises are mainly of average or small size. Among these different forms of enterprise an economic struggle is being waged, a struggle in which the last word belongs to the buyer. The buyer makes his purchase where the commodity is better and cheaper. If things are working properly — and we are making increasingly certain that they are — then all the advantages will be on the side of large-scale state production, and it will defeat its private rival in the competitive struggle. Suffering from its "smallness," as we saw earlier, the small peasant farm will compensate for this inadequacy with its cooperative organization. Supported by the proletarian state power, it will similarly win for itself all the advantages of any large-scale association and will use these advantages and benefits, deriving from cooperation, in its struggle against the private farm of the kulak. Through struggle in the market, through market relations, and through competition state enterprises and cooperatives will displace their competitor, i.e., private capital. In the final analysis, developing market relations will bring on their own destruction. On the soil of these market relations, with their purchases and sales, money, credit, bourses, etc., state industry and the cooperatives will gradually prevail over all other forms of economy and squeeze them out entirely. As this happens, the market itself will sooner or later wither away, being replaced by the state-cooperative distribution of everything that is produced.

Thus, our conception of the development toward socialism has changed significantly. But these changes do not in the least imply retreat from a proletarian policy. On the contrary, they represent the summation of a great revolutionary experience. In the New Economic Policy we discovered for the first time the proper combination of the private interests of the small producer with the general cause of socialist construction. The New Economic Policy is not a betrayal of the proletarian line, but the only correct proletarian policy. Today this fact could not be clearer.

Generally speaking, one can best determine whether our policy is a retreat from the correct proletarian line by considering its consequences. If the consequences show that socialist economic

forms are becoming more dominant in the economy of the country, then this fact alone is enough to resolve the entire question. Basically the policy of poor peasants' committees in the countryside solved two tasks that predominated at the time: first, the task of struggling against the kulak opposition; and second, the task of collecting grain by requisitions, without which it would have been impossible to feed the army. But this policy did not, and could not, resolve the task of economic expansion in the countryside. Rural economic expansion, i.e., expansion on the part of an enormous number of small farms, was impossible without including the middle peasants as the basic economic mass among the peasantry. The degree to which this economic expansion occurred would determine the possibility of an expansion of the state economy in the cities. Did this form of expansion mean forgetting the poor? It meant nothing of the kind, for a general expansion of the national economy and of the state sector creates much greater possibilities of providing real, material aid and assistance to the poor — not assistance in words alone, but in fact, not on paper, or in decrees, but in real life. If this assistance has to date fallen short of what would be appropriate, the basic reason is that the accumulation of resources in our state economy has not taken place quickly enough. For this very reason we must make every effort to speed the growth of our material resources, to speed up the "tempo" of accumulation in our state industry, and to accelerate the inflow of additional resources into our state treasury.

In order to realize this task, a further development of commodity circulation in our country is imperative. And this development, in turn, requires a somewhat greater economic freedom for the agricultural bourgeoisie, or the extension of the New Economic Policy into the countryside. Such a policy holds absolutely no danger for us: as we mentioned earlier, we already possess the commanding heights. On the other hand, by accelerating the commodity turnover within the country such a policy will permit us to accumulate more rapidly and to give assistance all the sooner to poor and middle peasant cooperatives, to the kolkhozy, to cooperatives in agricultural production, and to consumer societies. Our real wager is a wager on ourselves, on the working class and the toiling peasantry. It is a wager on the growth of socialist economic forms, on the growth of state industry, first, and of agricultural cooperation, second. A link between these two basic forms is the necessary precondition for our victory.

XI. THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT AND ITS DIFFERING SIGNIFICANCE FOR DIFFERENT CLASSES

The development of present-day society in the direction of socialism is guaranteed by the fact that the working class holds power and that we have a revolutionary dictatorship, or undivided rule. The general significance of the proletarian dictatorship, is, first, that it is a weapon for suppressing the exploiters and any attempt they might make to regain power and, second, that it serves as a basic lever for the economic transformation of society. The working class uses its control over the machinery of state power in order continuously to reform the economic relations of society in a socialist manner. Immediately after the seizure of power, when only the foundation of the new state structure had been laid, this power was used by the working class to "expropriate the expropriators," i.e., to take the factories and plants from the owners and to make them the property of the state. In the same way the working class, definitively and for all time, secured the confiscation of all landlord properties and made them the property of the whole people (nationalization of the land). As the Soviet power becomes stronger, it implements a policy of continuously and systematically consolidating every sprouting socialist form, both social and economic, and thus serves as an instrument of social transformation. In light of everything that we have said in previous chapters, we can conclude that as the stability of the Soviet order grows, the center of gravity will shift more and more from the work of directly and mechanically suppressing the exploiters and the remains of social groups hostile to the working class to that of economically remaking society — that is, to peaceful organizational work, to an economic struggle with private enterprises, and to the work of constructing socialist economic forms (state enterprises, cooperatives, etc.).

The dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., of the working class, organized as the state power, cannot help but behave differently toward the different strata of society and different class groups. It would be very odd if the working class did not differentiate among these strata and did not see the enormous differences among different social classes and groups, but instead followed only a single policy, i.e., took exactly the same approach to these diverse classes, strata, and groups.

With respect to the bourgeois strata who oppose the regime, the role of the proletarian dictatorship is one of suppression. If, for

example, Russian counterrevolutionary agents come here from abroad to establish secret organizations and circles aimed at struggle against the Soviet power and its overthrow, then in relation to this kind of bourgeois-landlord strata the proletarian dictatorship acts as a swift sword and mercilessly deals with all conspirators who wish to undermine the possibility for a social reform along socialist lines. The situation is entirely different, as is the role of the proletarian dictatorship, with respect to those bourgeois strata that, in Comrade Lenin's words, "are admitted into collaboration" with the working class and the peasantry. Indeed, we recognize that there is an entire stratum of bourgeois entrepreneurs, mainly merchants, who go about their business, so to speak, on a legal basis: our Soviet laws allow their kinds of activity. What is the role of the proletarian dictatorship in relation to this stratum of the bourgeoisie? In the first place, it consists of limiting this activity through a whole series of conditions (legislation dealing with labor and the workers, the rights of trade unions, different kinds of taxation, etc.); second, the role of the proletarian dictatorship consists of using these elements for the purpose of socialist construction (a general revival of the commodity turnover and the use of taxes collected from these strata to support socialist economic forms, etc.); third, the role of the proletarian dictatorship lies in economic struggle against these strata by way of competing with them in the market (state enterprises and support for cooperatives that are competing with private capital, etc.). If we now ask ourselves what the main task of the proletarian dictatorship with respect to the new bourgeoisie is, we can give a brief answer to the question thus: the task is to use them and to force them out. Consequently, what we have here is the kind of relationship that, in the final analysis, leads to the destruction of private capitalist forms by supplanting them. Now let us consider the question of the role and importance of the proletarian dictatorship with respect to the toiling peasantry, or the poor and middle peasants. Is there any element of struggle here? No doubt there is such an element, but it is incomparably less significant than in the case of the new bourgeoisie. Where does this element of struggle find expression? It is expressed in the need to struggle against the waverings among certain elements of the peasantry toward the side of the bourgeoisie. We have already seen that because of the private nature of their farms, because of their backwardness and age-old subordination, and because the peasantry is not familiar with collective forms and is only now

beginning to turn in this direction, under certain conditions, and especially in critical moments of stress, they are inclined to waver in a bourgeois direction. The proletarian dictatorship must wage a decisive struggle — in a suitable form, of course — against these waverings and deviations, which result from the dual nature of the peasant himself (on the one hand, he is a laborer, on the other, his farm has a private character). The basic task of the proletarian dictatorship with respect to the laboring peasantry, however, is one of help and reform in reconstructing the peasantry's economic character. With the help of the proletarian dictatorship, the peasant economy will be converted, chiefly through cooperation, into a new, higher form, operating on a much larger scale, in a more cultured manner, and developing toward socialism. This process will take place not by means of "ousting," "devouring," or "destroying" the peasant farm, but through its gradual reconstruction. Whereas private capitalist enterprises, as a result of the proletarian dictatorship and its policies, will be squeezed out and destroyed, retreating in the face of competition from state enterprises and the cooperatives, the peasant farm will not perish, but will make a transition to new, higher forms. State enterprises compete with private enterprises, ultimately driving them down. But state enterprises do not compete with the peasant farm; they help it to rise to a higher level. They do not drive it down in a competitive struggle, but organize it through competition.

Thus, the proletarian dictatorship has the kind of bond with the peasantry that can be described by the word alliance. In this alliance, as we have already noted, leadership belongs to the working class, organized as the state power.

In order to understand clearly and precisely how matters stand, a strict differentiation must be made between collaboration in society, on the one hand, and collaboration in power, i.e., the division of power among classes, on the other. Collaboration and even an alliance, however strong and indestructible, is not yet a division of power. The working class and the peasantry enjoy complete collaboration within society in the relationship of an alliance. This relationship means that state industry and the peasant economy must help each other; it means that the working class and the peasantry jointly battle against the landlords and capitalists should they march against the Soviet republics; on the economic front it means that the working class and the peasantry struggle together against private capital. But this still does not mean that we have a division of power, or a dictatorship of two classes, i.e., the work-

ing class and the peasantry, rather than a dictatorship of the working class. Who are the partners in the alliance? It is an alliance between the working class, organized as the state power, and the peasantry. The peasantry is not a co-participant in the state power itself; but the latter, as a workers' power, is allied with the peasant class. Why is this the case? Why is it necessary in our conditions, i.e., in the conditions of society's transition to socialism, to have a dictatorship of one class, i.e., of the proletariat? It is necessary because the proletariat alone represents the kind of social force that consciously and firmly can lead the whole of society to socialism. We have seen above that leadership on this road, leadership in the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, must belong to the proletariat, and that only with such leadership is a victorious advance toward socialism possible. But the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., the organization of the proletariat into the state power, is also an organization of leadership with respect to the broad masses of the peasantry. Yet the working class has no interest in becoming a new "tsar"; it has no interest at all in making the proletarian dictatorship eternal or in playing the part of a ruling class forever.

The real task of the working class is to reform the broad popular strata, the peasantry in particular. Unwaveringly approaching this objective, and drawing the rest of society in its wake, the proletariat must reeducate the peasantry in a socialist manner, constantly elevating it and pulling it upward to the same material, economic, and cultural-political level as that of the leading strata of the proletarian population. As broad strata of the peasantry are reformed and reeducated, they will increasingly become comparable with the proletariat, merge with it, and be transformed into equal members of socialist society. The difference between the two classes will steadily disappear. In this way the broad masses of the peasantry, "changing their own nature," will blend with the workers of the city; and the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the dictatorship of a particular class, will increasingly wither away.

Within capitalist society it could also be said of the bourgeoisie, to some extent, that it was the leader of society as a whole, its most advanced and educated class. But leadership by the bourgeoisie and leadership by the proletariat differ from each other sharply, profoundly, and in the most fundamental manner. The development of capitalist society, headed by the bourgeoisie, has led to a situation in which the difference between the ruling classes and the oppressed classes, between the bourgeoisie, on the one hand, the

working class and the peasantry, on the other, has increased and become more and more acute. It is inconceivable that within the confines of the capitalist order the working class and the peasantry might acquire a position comparable with that of the bourgeoisie either materially, educationally, socially, or in terms of their standard of living. Such a development would contradict the very foundations of bourgeois society, the essence of which is its ever sharper division into classes. The very essence of bourgeois policy is to help the bourgeoisie secure for itself — exclusively for itself — all the advantages of material position and all the advantages of education. In the countries it rules the bourgeoisie possesses a monopoly (or exclusive control) of the means of production, of the factories, plants, railroads, etc.; it has a monopoly not simply of the state power, to which no one else is admitted, but also a complete, factual monopoly of higher education, of the press (newspapers, journals), of science, etc. The new scholars, administrators, engineers, officers, and generals — in short, all the leading cadres of society — are continually drawn not from the lower strata of the population, not from the workers and the peasants, but from the same bourgeoisie and bourgeois intelligentsia who through inheritance perpetuate and enjoy the advantages of their position. The bourgeoisie have never accepted, and cannot accept, the goal of systematically and persistently elevating ever newer strata of the population to a cultured way of life; to do so would be to cause the collapse of bourgeois power.

The policy followed by the working class is completely different and directly opposite. Its purpose is not to reproduce one and the same relationship among classes, but to overcome class distinctions, eliminating them through reeducation of the broad popular masses. To achieve this objective the working class uses every resource at its disposal and the entire might of its state apparatus. The basis of change is reform of society's economic relations and its development along the road to socialism. Moreover, the working class makes every effort to reform the broad popular strata, particularly its most reliable ally in the struggle against the landlords and capitalists — the peasantry. This policy finds expression, among other things, in an effort to attract the peasantry into soviet construction. By involving a growing number of nonparty peasants in soviet work; by helping them, through this work, to reeducate themselves, to grow, to change their nature and acquire the skills necessary for governmental management; by helping them to understand general as well as local governmental

tasks, etc., the working class begins to erase the division between itself and the leading strata of the peasantry. Other strata and new groups of the peasantry will pass through these leading ranks, making the ascent to a new, active, and conscious life. Gradually, on the basis of proletarian leadership, the peasantry will come closer and closer to coalescing with the working class in terms of its habits, skills, thoughts, goals, and objectives. Through cooperation the peasant economy will coalesce with the state economy of the proletariat, ultimately reforming itself and entering into a single, planned, socialist economy. Similarly, in every aspect of life the peasantry will coalesce with the working class, changing its own nature in the process and finally merging with the working class in a single, socialist society of laborers. At the start of this process there was a wide split between the working class and the peasantry; the worker, as a natural supporter of collective forms (social forms) of labor and struggle, was separated from the peasant, who supported the small private farm. With the growth of cooperation and of their political and cultural education, the peasantry will increasingly be converted into something resembling an extensive, but still retarded and lagging, stratum of the working class. The process of rapprochement will continue until the split between the two classes is filled in at last, and both classes merge once and for all as identical toiling members of a socialist society. Then we shall see the destruction (withering away) of the proletarian dictatorship, which will have become "superfluous." But in order to reach this goal, it is imperative to have a persistent and firm policy, a policy that, keeping the goal in view, forcefully directs the course of social development. This is why it is necessary, at the present stage of development, to preserve fully the sole genuine guarantee of a correct policy. That guarantee is the proletarian dictatorship, relying upon and allying itself with the peasantry.

XII. THE FORMS OF PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP

The general form of the proletarian dictatorship is the Soviet power and the Soviet state, as distinct from so-called bourgeois democracy. The special uniqueness of this form of state power lies in the following distinctive features. First, representatives of the bourgeoisie are not allowed to participate in elections for state organs. The franchise is limited, as in a bourgeois state, but for

the opposite purpose. Bourgeois states, in one way or another, directly or indirectly, secretly or openly, either deny the franchise or restrict its use by representatives of the toiling people. Second, Soviet power curtails a number of "freedoms," sometimes abolishing them entirely for representatives of the bourgeoisie. For example, it forbids bourgeois political organizations. The bourgeoisie is denied any political weapons, including press organs, etc. Third, to an unprecedented extent Soviet power grants real freedom to workers' organizations, to their press, their meetings, etc. Thus, it encourages an unprecedented flourishing of all possible organizations of the working class and the laboring masses in general. Soviet power makes a broad democracy of the toilers a reality, as distinct from, and in opposition to, democracy for the rich, or democracy for the bourgeoisie, as it is practiced in capitalist countries. In the latter countries the working class and the peasantry often have diverse kinds of rights, but in a majority of cases these are merely formal in character (i.e., they exist on paper, but not in real life). For instance, freedom of a workers' press might be recognized on paper. But when all the typographic equipment, paper, and buildings are in the hands of the large, capitalist property-owners, a revolutionary workers' paper cannot, in fact, exist: it is prevented from publishing even if it can meet the material expenses. The right of assembly exists on paper, but workers' organizations cannot assemble "for want of space," etc. In our country, under Soviet power, these rights are increasingly being guaranteed in fact and are being made a part of real life. Soviet power gives guarantees to this effect: it materially supports the workers' press; it gives the best locations in the city to workers' organizations; it helps the leading peasants to establish clubs, giving them the best sites in the village, etc. The mail service distributes the workers' publications, and the militia protects workers' meetings. In short, all the organizations of state power make a reality of the rights that are necessary for genuine participation of the working class in active construction of the new society.

In the fourth place, Soviet power is not detached from the organizations of workers and peasants; on the contrary, its most essential feature is the fact that it is directly linked with and dependent on an enormous network of different organizations of the laboring people — the workers' trade unions, peasant cooperatives and committees, poor peasant committees in the Ukraine, organizations of workers' and peasants' press correspondents, all kinds of voluntary

societies and associations, etc. Soviet power raises up ever newer strata even among the most backward elements of the laboring population. For instance, it organizes and gives every form of support to different types of associations among women workers, among women peasants, and among women of the most backward nationalities, who were formerly oppressed by imperialism. It does everything possible to awaken in them a consciousness of the need to go forward to a new life and to take part themselves in building this new life. The numerous and diverse organizational cells of all these associations of laboring people, above all of the working class, are directly or indirectly connected by close ties to the organs of Soviet power. Together with that power they in fact form a single system, which embraces, organizes, enlightens, and reforms the broad strata of the toilers.

Under a capitalist regime, state power relies on exclusive organizations of small groups of the leading capitalists. If it is involved with organizations of laborers, its purpose is just to corrupt and deceive them. In these cases the state's goal is not to draw the laborers into establishing the new order, but to distract the working class and the peasantry from achieving their own independent class objectives and goals. The capitalist state hopes to make the laboring people work better for the bourgeoisie and be more subservient to the state power of this same bourgeoisie.

Under the conditions of a Soviet regime, Soviet power itself is essentially an expression of the will of the laboring masses; it is the widest and most comprehensive form of organization created by the masses. Our state is a state of the working class, and our dictatorship is a dictatorship of the proletariat. But our state apparatus is linked with peasant organizations, not merely with the workers. And these links are the preconditions of the state, creating a bridge that enables the peasantry gradually to make the transition to "a proletarian point of view."

In the fifth place, Soviet power is built in such a way that participation in political life, for instance, in election campaigns for the soviets and in soviet work, differs fundamentally from election campaigns and participation in so-called parliamentary work. In bourgeois republics, once every three or four years, or at some other interval, the citizens elect deputies to parliament. Then their political life virtually comes to an end. On the other hand, the parliamentary deputies, not being subject to recall by their electors, without exception become parliamentary chatterboxes. Under our conditions, election campaigns for the soviets and work in the so-

viets means involvement both of the electors and, even more, of the deputies in the real, genuine work of managing the state. Even in the very lowest electoral units, in the factories and plants, the electors take part in constructive work, and their representatives on the soviet organs are likewise obliged, in one manner or another, to play a leading role in managing the state or some part of the state economy.

A number of further indications could be cited to show the profound differences between the Soviet form of state and any other form. It is not difficult to see that the purposes, goals, and tasks of Soviet power are fundamentally opposed to the character, goals, and tasks of the bourgeois states. This is so because Soviet power is the power of the lowest class, which is overturning the old order and the old world completely.

But this same Soviet form of power, for its own part, undergoes a number of changes, depending on the circumstances in which the laborers must struggle to achieve their end.

During the epoch of so-called War Communism, when the whole country was converted into a besieged fortress, when the main purpose of power was to organize an armed rebuff to our enemies, when it was necessary above all to defend ourselves, speedily and decisively — not to discuss but to lead, to give orders in a military fashion — in those circumstances it was perfectly natural that proletarian dictatorship should take the form of a military-proletarian dictatorship. In fact, broadly based organs of Soviet power and plenums of soviets came virtually to an end. Leadership was transferred, without exception, to the presidiums of executive committees, i.e., to narrow collegiates, to troikas, groups of five, etc. Very often, particularly in localities either threatened by the enemy or close to enemy territory, so-called "revolutionary committees" were created in place of the "normal" organs of Soviet power. Unlike the regular organs, which were elected by all the laboring population, the committees acted with complete autonomy, without waiting for mass discussion and preliminary decisions from the broad strata of toilers. This form of Soviet power was no less an expression of the laborer's interests: it was simply imperative for that period and expedient at a time when it was necessary to minimize all chatter and discussion, when time could not be spared even for the task of educating the masses. The need was to act, act, and act again on the field of armed struggle against the enemies of the toiling people. This system of military-proletarian dictatorship was also characterized by absence of precisely defined and strictly

enforced laws: for the most part, laws were replaced by orders and instructions, which changed according to military circumstances.

During that period methods of confiscation and requisition were perfectly normal. All of these things resulted from the unbelievably cruel civil war and agonizingly difficult conditions that were imposed upon the working class and peasantry.

With the coming of peace, especially when our country began to experience comprehensive economic expansion, the need quite naturally emerged once again to alter the form of Soviet power in the sense of outgrowing and eliminating the remnants of the War Communist period.

All of these remnants of administrative arbitrariness, however revolutionary, had to be replaced by revolutionary legality. During a period of peaceful construction, when economic activity has first priority, any nonsystematic, arbitrary, spontaneous, and unpredictable interference in the course of economic life can have an extraordinarily unfavorable economic result. Consider the peasantry as a prime example. In writings and speeches addressed to the peasantry we refer to the need for improvement in the peasant economy; we suggest a transition from a three-field to the multifield system, we recommend a number of new and improved methods for working the land and raising stock, we talk about the need for better farm accounting and less waste. Our propaganda is replete with suggestions such as these. And the peasantry, particularly its most conscious and cultured elements, the so-called "leading peasants," follow our advice willingly. But if we tell the peasant to keep better farm accounts and make better use of what he has, it goes without saying that any arbitrariness and unpredictable behavior on the part of Soviet power will contradict and sharply conflict with our own propaganda and our demand for normalcy in economic affairs. Indeed, how can the peasant reckon what he must do and what expenditures to undertake when he really has no clear idea, for example, what his taxes will be or when they must be paid?

How can he manage his farm properly when completely unforeseeable decrees can rain down upon him and when there is no fixed system of laws, known in advance and strictly and unconditionally enforced? This new situation, which differs fundamentally from the military conditions during the civil war, forcefully demands that the whole system of management be set right. It demands the kind of management that is based on legislative resolutions, known in advance and able to be read and taken into account beforehand.

The transition to revolutionary legality, to strict fulfillment of decrees issued by the Soviet power, to the decisive and unconditional abolition of all remnants of administrative arbitrariness, will be one of the basic features characterizing the new period in our revolution's development.

Involvement of the masses is similarly becoming a much more important task at the present time than in the preceding period. A general cultural upsurge and growth in the political activity of all the main strata of the toilers, including the peasantry; much greater amounts of free time than earlier, during the agonizing years of the civil war; and an improved material position together with economic growth — all these factors are forcing Soviet power to direct considerably more attention to the enormous and gratifying task of more decisively attracting the broad elements of the laboring population into the affairs of state. It must be remembered that at the present time, more than ever before, it is important for the working class to direct the swelling political energy of the peasantry into a channel that will strengthen the alliance of the peasantry and the working class. And it is precisely in order to strengthen the leadership of the working class that it is necessary at present, i.e., during a "peaceful-organizational" period, to make every effort and do everything possible to reform the peasantry in the proper spirit. The most important way to give the peasantry this kind of education is to involve them, in the person of their nonparty representatives, in the work of our Soviet organs. It is precisely here, learning in their work to understand the tasks of the national government, that the peasantry will undergo such a reform. On the other hand, it is only in this way, by involving the broad masses of town and country, that we can wage a more successful struggle against bureaucratism, that ulcer which even up to the present is eating away at our state organism.

Finally, for the most active nucleus among the personnel of our Soviet organs, namely, for the members of our party, who are the leaders of these Soviet organs, it is now necessary to outgrow the methods of issuing commands or orders. What we need is a decisive, total, and unconditional switch to methods of persuasion.

This entire system of measures will serve the cause of stabilizing and developing the Soviet system as a special form of state structure and will guarantee continuing growth (material, political, and cultural) for the broad strata of toiling masses.

Generally speaking, one can say that a political system represents a greater improvement and a greater step forward in com-

parison with the historical past the greater the number of people to whom it gives an opportunity to grow. The capitalist system limits this opportunity to select strata: the bourgeoisie, the bourgeois intelligentsia, the landlords, etc. The enormous masses of laboring people are excluded. For the laboring masses, i.e., for the basic mass of humanity, under a capitalist regime there is no opportunity to raise oneself, to make a continual movement upward. If we appraise Soviet power from this point of view, then we shall readily see that it is the very best of all forms of state power that have existed up to now. The point is not that we have already achieved everything we wish (we are taking only the first steps toward socialism and an extraordinary cultural upsurge by the lower classes of the people): the point is that the rudder of social development is turned in this direction. And this rudder, which makes it possible to turn in the direction of such an unprecedented cultural upsurge, is Soviet power.

XIII. ECONOMIC INEQUALITY AND HOW IT IS OVERCOME

The communist system is the highest stage in the development of human society, permitting the social forces of production and man's control over nature to exceed by far even that degree of technological development that distinguished the capitalist order when it was flourishing. At the same time, a communist society is an economic organization in which complete equality prevails among people, in which there is no exploitation of man by man and neither commands nor coercion will be used by one group of people against another. One has only to compare this condition of human society with the conditions we inherited from the capitalist system in order to understand how truly tremendous is the work to be done over the next several decades so that human development may be raised to its highest level. It is perfectly understandable, therefore, that within just a few short years of the conquest of power by the working class one cannot even think of immediately eliminating all inequality and all poverty. But at the same time, it is necessary to accelerate the transition to communism in every way, and to do this we must have a perfectly clear concept of how the inequality that still exists among people will gradually be overcome.

Let us consider in turn the main forms of economic inequality we currently have in our country. Above all, one is struck by the unequal conditions of material life between town and country. In

earlier chapters we have already described the way in which the capitalist mode of production inevitably produces rural backwardness, delays the development of agriculture in relation to industry, and converts the city into an exclusive focus of all life's basic material comforts. When the working class and their peasant supporters seized power, they inherited this relationship between town and country.

The small peasant farm lagged far behind the modern factory, with its technological improvements. Similarly, the small peasant farm lagged behind the factory in terms of its internal structure and the organization of labor. As a result, labor productivity on the peasant farm is exceptionally low, and enormous amounts of labor must be expended in order to achieve a comparatively insignificant result. How can this sort of inequality between town and country be overcome? It would be quite unthinkable to adopt a mechanical approach, relying on a single blow or a single measure of one kind or another. One could, of course, entertain the outrageous idea of dismantling all the large cities, brick by brick, together with all their large enterprises, machines, electrical installations, etc. But the fact is that this would not move us one bit closer to correcting the situation, primarily because it would undermine and destroy large-scale industry, which, as we have already seen, plays the major part in fertilizing the agricultural economy, providing machines, hand tools, and a variety of other articles needed to improve agricultural production. Science, too, would be undermined, and science is becoming the decisive force in the realm of agricultural production. An idea of this kind would be utter madness, and anyone with a sound mind and a good memory would reject it at once. It is perfectly natural, on the other hand, to conclude that the countryside can be raised up only with the assistance of the city's industry, which is controlled by the proletariat, the true helper of the peasantry. Not by destroying the cities, but by bringing industry and the countryside closer together, by means of economic and technical assistance to the countryside — that is how we will gradually fill in the abyss between town and country that has been created by the whole previous historical development of human society. The task of the workers' party and of Soviet power is precisely to eliminate this contradiction between town and country. Gradually we must build new plants, electrical stations, and other such large-scale industrial production units not just in the urban centers but also in the hamlets and villages. We must scatter these enterprises throughout the entire country, mak-

ing them seedbeds and levers of culture, literacy, economic improvements, and political consciousness among the peasant population.

Technical assistance from the city, particularly electrification, together with the organization of peasant farms into cooperatives, which, as we have already seen, constitute the high road to socialism in our countryside: these measures represent a powerful lever for rural growth and progress. Little by little the material conditions of life in town and country will be equalized, with really great benefits for both sides. The city dweller, shut up within the stone confines of modern cities, not seeing nature, and condemned in these conditions to degeneration, notwithstanding his relative material comfort, will benefit from a closer association with nature. The rural dweller, in contrast, will enjoy exceptional benefits from the fact that he will increase his labor productivity and will finally enjoy all the blessings of culture and civilization that have previously been available only to our enemies. It is self-evident that to achieve such a social system, enormous changes are needed, which can take place only over many long years. Nevertheless, we see that we have already embarked upon this road.

Within the city, too, we can now observe acute and striking inequalities. One has only to compare the Nepmen and their living standards with those of homeless and starving children, or even with the crowds of unemployed, in order to see how far we still are from the ideal conditions for which we are aiming. If we consider the different standards of living in descending order, we get a whole range of ranks, each fairly sharply differentiated from the other. If we consider only the major subdivisions, these ranks can be characterized as follows:

1. The new bourgeoisie (the Nepmen). These are the people who receive profit from exploiting the labor of others, whether the profit comes from an industrial enterprise, whether it is commercial profit or the gain of a supplier, whether it is speculative gain or some other kind of so-called "nonlabor income." Very often the standard of living of people in this category approaches the level that was characteristic of the not-so-large capitalists before the war.

2. The higher Soviet employees. These people are mainly the employees of economic institutions and organs (directors of trusts, managers of syndicates, important specialists, etc.).

3. So-called responsible workers in general.

4. Skilled workers.

5. Unskilled workers.

6. The unemployed and the Lumpenproletariat, people who have gone off the rails, the chronically unemployed, beggars, etc.

This whole picture readily shows us once again how far we still are from achieving equality even within the cities, which are the center of our work and in which the predominance of the proletariat is most clearly expressed. Yet we already see clearly that the development of our society, given a correct policy on the part of our party and Soviet power, inevitably leads to easing of these contradictions, to their being overcome and abolished. Indeed, let us begin with the clearest manifestation of inequality, the inequality that exists between the bourgeoisie (the Nepmen) and the position of the working class as a whole. How will we outgrow this inequality? After all that we have said up to now, that is not a difficult question.

The point is that the growth of our state economy along with cooperation will be accompanied by displacement of private-entrepreneurial forms of economy. Long before these forms completely perish and die out, making way for the victory procession of developing socialist economic relations, the expansion of state industry will cause wages of the working class to rise. On the other hand, the taxation system will curtail any further rise in the living standard of the new bourgeoisie. Ultimate elimination of private capitalism, the final victory, will bring the matter to a close: this fundamental contradiction, this fundamental inequality within the cities, will thus be abolished. The question of inequality between the higher cadres of Soviet employees and directors, on the one hand, and the average worker, on the other, is rather complex. Among these higher and responsible employees of Soviet power are included all kinds of specialists and former workers with real talent and culture — "worker-leaders" (for example, red directors, etc.). It is perfectly obvious that this inequality, traced to its roots, results from the cultural backwardness of the working masses, who in capitalist society were an exploited class, politically and culturally oppressed. In order to undertake the complex task of managing the economy or performing a number of other such jobs in different spheres of managing the country, a great fund of knowledge, experience, and skill is required. The number of people from the working class who met these qualifications, acquired them during the revolution, or received some experience of leading the masses in political struggle even before the victory of the working class is in itself relatively small. It is perfectly understandable that not every worker — in fact, far from every worker

— has been able to rise to such a level. On the other hand, different types of specialists, who held their posts under the capitalist regime and thus accumulated considerable scientific, managerial, economic, and other experience, are also vitally necessary in order to manage people in the present circumstances. To some extent they are irreplaceable; for the entire working mass as a whole, in all of its parts, will not be able to acquire such a high cultural level very quickly. A rather substantial payment is required in order to ensure that these jobs are done, and that fact guarantees a corresponding way of life. Meanwhile, to give the exact same payment to every section of the working class, with the present degree of development of the productive forces, would be impossible and impracticable. If every worker were of the same high cultural level, leading responsibilities could be accepted in turn or only for a certain interval of time. Thus, new workers would always hold the so-called "responsible positions," and any post could be taken over at any time by someone else. But here the uneven cultural levels and the considerable and persistent backwardness of the masses makes itself felt. Again we must mention that this is not the fault of the masses, but their misfortune, caused by decades of capitalist rule. Nevertheless, the task of members of the working class — who during the revolutionary years learned very quickly, in the course of the struggle itself, to take a greater part in the active construction of socialism, and who are studying increasingly in special institutions (different types of workers' organizations, clubs, party and soviet schools, workers' faculties, and even secondary schools) — the task of this working class is to overcome such backwardness within its own ranks. It is understandable that the entire mass of the working class, in all of its strata, does not move perfectly simultaneously. Just as it is impossible under present circumstances for all workers to hold commanding posts and occupy completely identical positions in the system of management, so it will be impossible, for obvious reasons, for every worker, to a man, to be admitted to middle-level and secondary schools.

Today there are pockets of the working class, if one can put it that way, or comparatively small detachments of workers, who are reaching a more or less advanced level in modern science and technology. Year by year more "pockets" and more detachments will be added, until the development of the productive forces in our country creates a sufficient economic foundation to allow every child of workers to pass through middle and upper schools as a

matter of course, and then to put their learning into practice. Entering life this way, they will overcome all the cultural inequalities created in the past among the laboring people.

What we have just said concerning the differences between the more cultured leading workers and the former specialists, on the one hand, and the working mass in general, on the other, applies also to the question of inequality among different strata of the working class, different in the sense of possessing different work skills (for instance, metal workers compared with navvies and construction workers). The mechanics of Soviet power and the Soviet regime as a whole, together with the whole policy of the proletarian dictatorship, lead to elevation of the cultural level of the broad working masses, so that the leading strata of the working class will no longer be "irreplaceable," and differences in levels of culture and material circumstances will be abolished. Of course, we shall never achieve complete equality among people in the sense that they will all be perfectly identical as far as their minds, talents, color of their hair, and shapes of their noses are concerned, and we have no need to do so. That would be the same kind of equality that exists between two drops of water, and it would be a miserable bore. The purpose of our endeavors is not to be found here. Our efforts are intended to achieve equality in the material conditions of life, so that all can be assured normal conditions for development and the whole mass, in consequence, can be given an opportunity for advancement. The most talented and gifted will emerge not from a narrow circle of "educated people," separated by a partition from the more backward, but from the whole mass of toiling mankind.

At this point it is obvious that this sort of inequality, resulting from such profound causes, cannot possibly be eliminated at a single blow. Of course, a decree could be published one fine day, declaring that all higher Soviet employees, all engineers, professors, directors of trusts, etc., should receive the same income as a simple workman. But in that state of affairs we would soon discover that the working class as a whole would lose, not gain; it would lose because under these conditions, work in the responsible positions would deteriorate greatly, things would become completely disorganized, and overall achievements would give way to a state of stagnation or decline. It is much more beneficial for the working class to support its own upper stratum, along with such people as so-called specialists, who come from the bourgeois world, for in this way a general expansion of the productive forces can be

achieved much more quickly, and given this expansion, the working class will in turn be able to improve its own position much more rapidly. After a certain interval of time, taking advantage of this growth in productive forces, the working class will be able to commence a more vigorous training of "educated people" from among steadily wider masses of its own class and the toilers in general. It does not follow, of course, that we should go to extremes in paying high salaries; on the contrary, the party must wage a stubborn struggle against all such "extremes."

Within the villages, finally, we have different strata and sharply differentiated living standards among the peasantry. One has only to compare the kulak with a farm laborer or a poor peasant. But this fundamental contradiction, which is characteristic of today's countryside, will also slowly be eliminated, along with the growth of the productive forces and expansion of the state and cooperative sectors. We have seen earlier that we will increasingly be in a position to assist middle and poor peasants, who will then cease to be poor. On the other hand, by a variety of measures we will pare down and economically squeeze out the entrepreneurial strata of the peasantry, i.e., the agricultural bourgeoisie. Thus, the basic direction of our development for a considerable period of time, while the socialist forms of our economy begin to grow more quickly, will be toward eliminating and overcoming the economic inequality that currently exists.

One must see the profound poverty, ignorance, cultural backwardness, and inequality bequeathed us by the capitalist system in order to understand just how much time is needed to remake the human material and surmount this accursed legacy. But even now we are witnessing an expansion of socialist forms in the economy, and this expansion is the main guarantee of a genuine policy whose goal is to achieve economic equality. On the other hand, we can see even now how the next generation of workers and peasants, in a much wider context, will rise as an entire mass to a new, cultural life. This change will be facilitated by the work of our party and by the activity and the entire policy of Soviet power. In the past only individual workers and peasants were admitted to secondary schools; now, each year greater numbers and whole sections of the coming generation of toilers are already passing through workers' faculties and entering our secondary schools — and this is happening on a systematic basis, as part of the "normal order of things," so to speak. In the past it was usually only at a ripe age that a working man took up an active political life,

whereas today we have about one and one-half million individual members in the Komsomol. These are the sons of workers and peasants, who are more or less equally accustomed from a young age to participate actively in political and cultural work. A still younger generation — the Young Pioneers — is beginning to include enormous numbers of people, who from their very earliest years are educated, grow, and learn to work on a different cultural basis from that of previous generations.

The conquest of power by the proletariat cannot effect a historical miracle. The mere fact of victory over the bourgeoisie in the civil war does not guarantee immediate and instant equality among people. But the seizure of power and strengthening of the workers' dictatorship in our country do ultimately create the conditions under which our movement in the direction of economic equality becomes discernible.

XIV. POLITICAL INEQUALITY, HOW IT IS OVERCOME, AND THE END OF POLITICS IN GENERAL

Let us now examine the inequality we experience in the political sphere, or in the sphere of political rights. Here it is necessary to begin by listing the ways in which political inequality is expressed:

1. According to our legislation, people who live on a nonlabor income have no voting rights (including Nepmen, kulaks, and all who exploit labor power in one manner or another for obtaining profit). The "suffering people" in this instance are therefore those strata of the population who, in terms of material well-being and standards of living, stand on the very highest rung. In our system they are the fragments of capitalist society and of the former ruling classes, who now have fallen under the iron hand of proletarian dictatorship.

2. Nor does the laboring peasantry have exactly the same rights as the proletariat, since in elections to the soviet organs of power a much larger number of peasant voters elects the same number of delegates as a small number of the workers in the cities and factory settlements. Here, then, we have unequal political rights between the working class, on the one hand, and the toiling peasantry, on the other, an inequality that quite obviously includes greater rights for the working class.

3. The proletariat enjoys political advantages (privileges) and

occupies the foremost position in all of our legislation.

The reasons for such legislation, reinforcing political inequality among the different classes of our society, are clear enough and easy to understand. We have three classes: the working class, the broad mass of peasants, and, finally, the bourgeoisie, whom we have admitted into social collaboration. We know that if we wish to guarantee the fundamental interests of the toilers it is necessary to secure leadership by the proletariat and its alliance with the peasantry against the bourgeoisie. We also know that the peasantry, because of its social position and particular difficulties of the moment, is inclined to begin wavering from time to time to the side of the bourgeoisie. Finally, we know that if the new bourgeoisie were to grow, become stronger, spread its wings, and overpower the working class in the struggle for the peasantry, the inevitable result would be a danger that the whole revolutionary cause would be undermined. Although the working class is the most conscious force in our country, in numerical terms it is equal to only one-tenth of the peasantry. To see that the rudder is not wrested from working-class hands it is necessary, at the given stage of development, above all else to neutralize the bourgeoisie in political terms and to deprive them of the opportunity to extend their political influence either to the peasantry or to the intermediate petit bourgeois strata in the cities — hence the general denial of political rights to private entrepreneurs, merchants, shopkeepers, traders, kulaks, and Nepmen in general.

Because the peasants lean toward such extensive waverings, and because of the lack of enlightenment and culture inherent in their social position, there is a danger that they may occasionally be induced — despite their own basic interests — to follow the bourgeoisie. Our legislation therefore contains certain advantages and political privileges for the working class. These advantages and privileges provide additional insurance, making certain that the leading role in our country goes to the working class.

As for the restriction or deprivation of voting rights for the bourgeoisie, there are scarcely any toilers who would complain of this provision; the only people who might complain are either open or secret adherents of the bourgeoisie, such as the Mensheviks or the Socialist Revolutionaries (SRs), who do not genuinely believe for a moment in the possibility of making socialism a reality, however much they babble about it in words. Until now it has seemed to them that Russia has been undergoing some kind of historical accident, that the development of our society will inevitably follow

the capitalist road, and that the sooner Soviet power collapses, the sooner will the nightmare (as the bourgeoisie sees it) come to an end, allowing things to improve. For any man who seriously believes in talk of socialism, and for whom, in consequence, words cannot be separated from deeds, for any man who believes in the opportunity and need to build a socialist society, and who rejects any return to the capitalist order — for such a man the restriction and deprivation of the political rights of bourgeois elements in our country will be more than understandable.

The question of political inequality between the working class and the peasantry is immeasurably more complex. Here people often substitute moral observations for sober discussion, and morality has nothing to do with politics. They ask, for example: Doesn't the peasant sometimes work harder than the worker? Where is justice, then, when you give him fewer political rights than the urban worker? Doesn't the peasantry constitute the overwhelming majority of our country's population? Why, then, if most of the laborers are peasants, must the proletarian minority artificially impose its will on the enormous majority of the working people? The peasant is not a drone or a parasite; he is not a bourgeois, but a toiler. Where, then, to repeat, is the most elementary (simple) justice? Is this not, in fact, a retreat from the precept of equality among the toilers, which alone constitutes the basis upon which a real bridge to socialism can be constructed?

Although arguments like these sometimes appear convincing, they suffer from a basic flaw: in place of a sober appraisal of forces and a sober discussion of the matter, they deal in poor, wretched words alone. But if we are going to speak of justice, the question must be phrased as follows.

Would it be just or unjust if the cause of socialism were lost? Would it be just or unjust if we let the bourgeoisie dupe us and restore the old order of things? One has only to ask the question in this way for a negative answer to follow. Of course, it would be "unjust" in the extreme. To put the matter simply, it would be quite stupid if we really were to let the cause of socialism be lost. The point is that we know there is no contradiction between the socialist cause and the fundamental interests of all the toilers; not only this, but we are also aware that, in the final analysis, both the working class and the broad peasant masses benefit from the achievement of socialism. Consequently, from the point of view of both the working class and the fundamental interests of the peasantry, the failure of socialism would be a political crime on our

part if we were at fault for letting things go to ruin.

But we know and are firmly convinced that there is only one way to arrive at socialism, and that is exclusively through the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. We know that the only way to victory is exclusively through leadership of this alliance by the working class. We know, too, that anything that undermines the proletarian dictatorship, i.e., anything that undermines this leadership, undermines the whole cause of socialism. That is why we must take every measure to ensure this leadership. At the present time there is still a danger of certain waverings on the part of the peasantry or some of its sections, even though these waverings in fact run contrary to the fundamental interests of the peasants themselves. That is why there must be a certain political inequality between the proletariat and the peasantry, providing the proletariat with an additional guarantee of its leading role.

It is not hard to see that, in the final analysis, this kind of policy not only does not contradict but in fact expresses the fundamental interests of the peasantry. Because of the backwardness and ignorance of the peasant population, these basic interests are very often hidden from sight by a shroud of temporary or apparent, secondary or fanciful interests. The latter interests, being less important and less essential to the peasantry, must be sacrificed for the sake of more basic and fundamental interests.

The working class and its party speak quite freely and openly of this political inequality between the proletariat and the peasantry, acknowledging its existence before all; but with equal candor we declare that these working-class privileges are only temporary, and will disappear as the consciousness of our peasant masses grows and as they are reformed. The further socialist construction advances, the less significant will the remaining bourgeois forces become, and the more quickly and impressively will socialist forms be strengthened in our economy. The more this happens, the stronger will the foundation of the economic link between the working class and the peasantry become; and, in consequence, the greater will the proletariat's political influence be over the peasantry. The need for working-class privileges will then decline. Gradually these privileges will be diminished until they finally become totally redundant. With a further strengthening of proletarian influence, and with the broad masses of the toilers reformed in a socialist spirit, an opposing influence from the bourgeois elements that persist will not be dangerous. Thus, we will make the transition, in the final analysis, to a system of universal and equal suf-

frage in our soviet organs.

And if we look even further into our future, we see a time when all the barriers among classes will disappear, when the division between town and country workers will be eliminated, when the need for all state organs of compulsion will vanish (assuming that capitalist states in other countries of the world will have been overthrown), and when all politics will completely die out. Then politics will be replaced by scientific leadership and scientific management of the social economy.

XV. THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE GUARANTEE OF A PROPER POLICY OF LEADERSHIP

We have already seen that a proper policy is guaranteed by proper leadership, and proper leadership is guaranteed by a certain combination of different social classes and their organizations. In order to guarantee this kind of leadership in reality, it is imperative for the peasantry to follow the working class, for the working class to follow its trade unions, and for the trade unions, in turn, to follow the leading detachment of the working class — the party, which must be the basic leading force in the entire worker-peasant bloc.

As we know, our experience of life offers an endless number of possible contradictions: among classes, between the working class and the peasantry, within the working class itself, and among the different nationality groups of our enormous country. Within the bosom of the working class there must exist the kind of force that will clearly see all of these contradictions, stand guard in the watchtower, and take timely notice of any dangers, have the wisdom at each stage of development to subordinate what is secondary to what is basic, and demonstrate unprecedented unity of will and a capacity for leadership.

The Communist Party is just such a working-class organization. It is the most advanced detachment of the proletariat, including the most decisive, most conscious, most advanced, and most daring elements from the working class of our country.

It is precisely because the Communist Party represents the leading detachment of the working class and the basic leading force in the country that all the enemies of the working class concentrate their fire here. Among these enemies are the avowed White Guards and supporters of a return to a landlord-bourgeois or bourgeois

regime, people such as the Russian white monarchists, the Cadets, and other disguised supporters of the landlord and bourgeois system; and then there are also the hidden enemies of socialism and the disguised supporters of the capitalist system such as the Mensheviks, the so-called Socialist Revolutionaries, and others. They all take it as their political objective to cut down the pillars of the party, hoping that the whole structure of the workers' dictatorship and Soviet power will in turn collapse and that the road followed by the working class since the first days of its October victory will come to an abrupt end.

A strengthening of the party's influence is the first and most essential condition for the proletarian dictatorship. Unless the party plays the leading role with respect to both the working class and the peasantry, there is no dictatorship of the working class; if there is no link between the party and the nonparty workers and peasants, Soviet power cannot survive and be strong.

We noticed above that if we examine the relations formed within the working class, we shall find the Communist Party at the head, securing its influence over a number of other working-class organizations that are broader in composition. Such organizations include, above all, the trade unions, an exceptionally broad form of proletarian organization, and the soviets of workers' deputies, representing the state form of proletarian organization and relying on broad strata of the peasantry. It is through these organizations, which in turn merge directly with the nonparty workers, that the party guarantees correct leadership of this whole aggregate and all the constituent elements of the proletarian masses.

One might ask, however: Just what sort of organization does the peasantry have to correspond to the proletariat's trade union?

If we have in mind the sort of workers who resemble those in industry but work on the land, then, of course, we are speaking of agricultural laborers, of hired agricultural workers, for whom it is expedient to have a trade union just like those of workers in other trades. Such a trade union of workers on the land already exists, and is called Vserabotzemles. However, if we ask ourselves what are the special interests (or the "professional interests") of the peasant, we shall see quite clearly that the peasant cannot be compared with a worker. The peasant works on his own farm; and his private economic interest, which results from his position as a small, independent producer, consists of selling the products of his farm more profitably and buying more advantageously the products that come to him from state industry and are necessary to him

both as a consumer and as the proprietor of his small farm. Finally, it is of benefit to the peasant to have less expensive access to the credit he finds necessary in his economic activities. His fundamental and common interest, together with the working class, is to prevent a return of the old order, to prevent the emergence of new landlords, and gradually to improve his farm on the basis of a further growth in the cooperative associations of peasant households. All of these tasks are resolved precisely through agricultural cooperatives, along with such subordinate organizations as peasant committees, etc.

We must not, however, conceal the fact that until recently the peasants had no particular confidence in the cooperative movement. This was true, to a large extent, because our cooperatives suffered from numerous defects and because the peasant was unable to find in them the things he needed.

These shortcomings, inherited from the time of War Communism, must now be decisively overcome. Above all, we must have cooperatives that are completely voluntary, with internal democracy, i.e., the election of management and all responsible officials. The peasant will not pay his dues and will not entrust his money to people appointed completely from above. He wants people whom he knows and trusts. Only then will he energetically build up cooperation; only then will it capture his vital interest.

In order for cooperatives to play the role that we have assigned to them, two tasks must be resolved.

First there is the task of strengthening cooperation economically, i.e., the task of accumulating cooperative "capital," expanding the volume of cooperative turnover, and so forth.

And second is the task of attracting the masses into cooperative construction. Without mass involvement, the cooperatives will be deprived of one of their most essential features.

These tasks, however, cannot be resolved without introducing voluntary membership in the cooperatives along with elections for the leadership of the cooperative organizations. Naturally, the party must fight the elections by means of persuasion, relying upon the poor and middle peasants. But the peasants themselves must do the choosing. Then the self-initiative of the peasant masses and a growth in their activity will inevitably lead to rapid expansion of our agricultural cooperation.

It is also necessary to see that the cooperatives are spared having unwarranted tasks imposed upon them that are now subject to direct decisions of state organs. Of course, cooperatives must

be linked with the organs of Soviet power; but they also have their own, unique tasks, in addition to those they share. If, for instance, the cooperatives began to collect taxes, that would be improper, just as it would be improper in the cities to have the workers' trade unions assume the state's function of directly managing the factories and plants. If the cooperatives become burdened with responsibilities that involve substantial sacrifices from the peasantry, they will obviously not accept these tasks willingly, and this approach will fail. For the peasant the cooperative must become the agent of his economic advancement. Then, with elective and voluntary principles secured, cooperation will become an object of the peasantry's affection. Given their links with industry and with the organs of the Soviet state in general, the cooperatives will in fact perform the role that is currently assigned to them by our party.

A revitalization of the soviets and an expansion of the cooperative movement — these are our party's basic tasks in the villages. If the party — and with it, and through it, the working class — stabilizes its influence over the peasant masses, then the cause of socialism will become for us a guaranteed certainty.

We have already mentioned the fact that even the toiling peasant has, as they say, "two souls": on the one hand, he is a laborer, struggling against the landlord-capitalist; yet on the other, he is a property owner. If he grows rich he does not hesitate to hire a worker for himself, and for this reason he has a certain respect for the large-property owner, i.e., the bourgeois. This is the first point to be considered. The second is that among the peasantry there are different strata, beginning with the exploited and ending with the exploiters (the poor and the kulak; the semiworkers, who earn additional income by selling their labor power part of the time; and their employers, the prosperous, wealthy, so-called "mir-eaters"*). When the peasant organizes and is influenced by the Communist Party (directly or indirectly, through immediate inclusion in the party or through the party's indirect influence by way of cooperatives, peasant committees, and a number of other organizations), the Communist Party in that case organizes his toiling soul and gradually shifts him onto the rails of socialized work

*Historically, the mir, or village community, owned peasant land in common and periodically redistributed it on an egalitarian basis. In the years before World War I, the Russian government promoted individual ownership, hoping to win political support from a class of independent farmers. — R.B.D.

through cooperation. He is trained for this work through the soviets, drawing him into the work of socialist government, and through the party, reforming him directly in a spirit that corresponds to the tasks and goals of socialist construction. If another party grew up among the peasantry, a party opposed to the Communist Party (whatever it might be called), it could, and inevitably would, have only one meaning and significance: in every way it would strengthen and organize the "nonlaboring soul" of the peasant and his wavering toward the bourgeoisie. It would cherish and foster, rear and nurture those very traits that express such peasant waverings, traits that are harmful to the cause of socialist construction. In the nature of things, such a party would inevitably incite, so to speak, the temporary and derivative interests of the peasantry against their basic interests, their petit bourgeois prejudices against a socialist pattern of development, kulak ways as opposed to proletarian solidarity. Instead of smoothing over frictions between the working class and the peasantry, this party would sharpen them. It would not follow a line leading to the worker-peasant alliance and voluntary acceptance of proletarian leadership; on the contrary, it would work for a so-called "emancipation" from proletarian leadership, which in fact means nothing other than influence over the peasantry and leadership of the peasantry from the side of the bourgeoisie and its ideological agents (the SRs, Mensheviks, Trudoviks, and other such compromising parties).

Thus, the victory of the worker-peasant cause presupposes leadership from the Communist Party. But this leadership, in turn, requires the soviets and cooperatives to be strengthened in every way and depends on the expansion of industry. When these tasks are resolved properly, the peasantry will then renew their conviction that the worker-peasant alliance and proletarian leadership are as necessary as breath itself from the point of view of fundamental peasant interests.

XVI. THE INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTION AND THE USSR

Up to this point we have considered every question exclusively from our domestic point of view. But we are not alone in the world: we are surrounded by capitalist states that fear our growth and are, in fact, our implacable enemies. Until now the proletariat has not been able to overthrow its bourgeoisie and take power into its own hands in a single country other than our own. Thus, the

question naturally confronts us: Can we build socialism in one country without direct support from the victorious proletariat in other countries?

We were able to seize power in one country; we were able to repulse our enemies, who were closing in on us from all sides; we were able to begin the expansion of our economy; and we were able to strengthen and stabilize the system of proletarian dictatorship. But do we have any guarantee that foreign plunderers will not attack us again, that they will not undertake any new "interventions"? The only guarantee of that sort would be a victory of the proletariat in several other capitalist countries. That is why our interests are firmly and for all time tied to the interests of the international working class and the oppressed colonial peasantry, who in their rebellions against the yoke of imperialism undermine the strength of our most bitter opponents and enemies. That is why our party would be treacherous and disloyal to the interests of our own working class and peasantry were it to cease being a party of international revolution. We must never forget for a single moment the fact that our peaceful construction could suddenly be disrupted by a strike against us on the part of our closest neighbors. We must never be lulled to sleep by the dream that we have once and for all been left in peace. And that is why our fraternal bond with the laboring masses of other countries, with people who are our most dependable allies and powerful supporters within the enemy camp, must be unbreakable and indestructible.

From the experience of the civil war, from the experience of past intervention by the capitalist powers, who supported all the mutinous counterrevolutionary generals, we know what enormous help was extended to us by the international proletariat, who all the while held back their own bourgeoisie by the coattails and prevented them from successfully carrying out their butcherous affair in our country. Everyone knows of the mutinies by the French sailors in Odessa; everyone knows how English units deserted from the Archangel front; and everyone knows that more than once the working masses of Europe have prevented the shipment of troops, shells, and weapons intended by our enemies to be used in reprisal against the young Soviet republics. That experience has shown us that international proletarian solidarity, the solidarity of the toilers in general, is not merely a nice phrase with which to soothe oneself or make merry on holidays. No, this is something real and has an enormous practical bearing on our fate, on our entire future, and on the road to be followed in our development.

Thus, the only final guarantee against a restoration of the old order, brought about by the bayonets of foreign armies, is an international revolution, of which our party must be an adherent, supporter, and vehicle.

But perhaps we are condemned to perish not from the attack of a foreign enemy, but from our own backwardness. Without technical and economic assistance from the victorious proletariat of other countries, and deprived of this aid over a considerable length of time, will we inevitably become the victim of our own backwardness, of our economic weakness? Is it possible that the petit bourgeois character of our country, with its overwhelming peasant majority and insignificant working class, depleted by the long years of imperialist and civil war, will bring all of our construction, of "iron necessity," to the point of collapse?

Such assertions as these, expressing a profound lack of faith in the resources of our revolution, are utterly incorrect and baseless. True, the absence of technical and economic assistance from other countries in which the working class, unfortunately, has not yet come to power will severely retard our economic growth and the whole tempo of socialist construction in our country. If we were to receive such additional help, of course, we would proceed at an incomparably faster rate along the road of economic expansion. Our entire construction would proceed comparatively quickly: not only in the economic realm but also in politics, in the cultural aspect of living conditions, in all the sciences and in so-called "spiritual culture." Without this assistance, of course, we shall proceed with our development more slowly. All the same, we will go forward without hesitation, a fact that has been clearly demonstrated by our first years free from civil war and direct involvements on the battlefield.

Indeed, throughout this brochure we have more than once spoken of the fact that while expanding the productive forces of the national economy as a whole, we have also noticed the increasing growth of socialist forms together with other forms that are developing more and more along the socialist road. There is no basis for saying that in the economic struggle between private-entrepreneurial capital, on the one hand, in all its forms and variations, and state enterprises and cooperatives, on the other, private capital is emerging as the victor. On the contrary, we know that in relative terms it is retreating to a secondary position, that the economic commanding heights are becoming stronger and more powerful, and that the cause of socialism is thus advancing. If socialism has already ad-

vanced during the first peaceful years, what basis is there for asserting that in the future we shall regress? Where is there even a shadow of evidence — or even the shadow of a hint of evidence — that in future years conditions will be less favorable for development of the state economy and the cooperatives than during the initial years of our economic expansion? Since no such evidence exists, one can, on the contrary, point to a number of conditions that suggest the likelihood of far greater successes in the future. The advantages of large-scale production will become more and more apparent; steadily greater economies and benefits will accrue to the state economy from the growth of planning, i.e., from a more thoroughly planned and expedient use of all the material resources and labor power at the economy's disposal; and ever greater sums will be available to the state power, which will be in a position to provide a broader range of assistance in the matter of organizing the peasantry through the construction of cooperatives, etc.

As a matter of fact, we have already demonstrated that we can build socialism even without any direct technical-economic aid from other countries. It is true that the forms of our socialism in the coming period of construction will inevitably be those of a backward socialism. But that does not matter, because even these forms guarantee a continuing movement toward other forms of socialism, which are more full and complete.

We must remember that even the capitalist system, after several centuries of development and despite its venerable age, still had different forms and different, so to speak, "national features" — and this was true at the very sunset of its development, in the imperialist epoch. Even now American capitalism differs quite markedly from the French, as does the German from the English, and so on. American capitalism has sharply defined features of monopoly capitalism under the domination of the banks, which have merged with the most powerful domestic industrial organizations (the trusts). French capitalism is mainly usurer capitalism, with a weakly developed domestic industry, a capitalism that lends money to other states, feeds off them, and is distinguished by exceptionally little productive activity within the country. In the lap of French capitalism there is shelter even for small peasant farms, whereas English capitalism, for example, is one that has already devoured the free peasant farm and combined the attributes of a world looter with energetic activity in the development of its own domestic industry. Similarly, Russian capitalism had its own features. These were determined mainly by the fact that with us the capitalist sys-

tem was, on the whole, weakly developed, if one thinks in terms of the overall national economy. The result was the enormous importance in the system of Russian capitalism of the small-scale peasant farm and the gentleman-landlord (in place of the capitalist-landlord, who uses hired labor). Small-scale industry (handicraftsmen and artisans) also had enormous significance, and large-scale capital still had a long way to go before gobbling them up in its victory procession. All the same, if we consider large-scale production alone, in this sphere we had a very high percentage of so-called "giant enterprises" (with more than 10,000 workers, such as the Morozovsky mills, the south Russian steel plants, and other such industrial giants). This fact was explained mainly by the influence of foreign capital, which established enormous enterprises in our country and often equipped them with the last word in Western European technology.

It was this terrible fusion of semiserfdom and barbarism, of economic backwardness in general with the most advanced forms achieved by Western European capitalism, that constituted the distinctive feature of Russian capitalism — its "national character," as it is called.

But the point is that the movement toward socialism does not begin in a vacuum; it begins after the working class takes power into its own hands, along with the inheritance bequeathed it by the capitalist order. After what has been said, it will be perfectly clear that in different capitalist countries this inheritance will look quite different. And if capitalism had its peculiarities in the different countries, it is quite understandable that socialism, too, in the first stage of its development, before all the countries of the world merge into a single entity, will inevitably be differentiated in a similar fashion by its own peculiarities, resulting from those of previous development. The fact that we had a combination of the most advanced, large-scale, capitalist enterprises with extremely backward economic forms, leaves its inevitable imprint on the forms of socialism as it is being built in our country. From the presence of petty merchants and small-scale entrepreneurs it follows that they will continue to exist for a certain period of time under our regime as well. From the presence of enormous strata of peasants and from their immeasurable economic significance for our country, there follows, first, a comparatively long road to the achievement of full socialism and, second, the enormous significance of agricultural cooperation as the high road for the peasant economy's development toward socialism. And from the presence

of large-scale industries, uniting within their walls many thousands of proletarians, there follows the possibility of proletarian leadership in our country.

In other countries (leaving the colonies aside), in England, for instance, where the peasant farm plays a very minor role, the forms of organizing the national economy will inevitably be different, and the course of development will be distinguished by a much faster tempo than our own. In contrast, if we look at the tasks that will confront the West European proletariat in the former colonies, where a massive peasant population lives, here we shall see many tasks and economic forms reminiscent of the tasks and questions we are resolving and of the organizational forms of economic life that distinguish our own construction. There is no cause for us to be ashamed of the fact that the socialism we are building is inevitably a backward type of socialist construction. That is not our fault. We can, however, be fully confident that we have the potential for endless progress, for perfecting these forms, for overcoming our backwardness and accelerating our transition to a really comprehensive type of socialist society.

For now our country is still at the stage where it is just beginning to emerge from the most dreadful poverty, and it would be madness even to mention the possibility of resting on our laurels or stopping for a rest. We still have terrible poverty to surmount, along with the remnants of famine, dirt, ignorance, barbarism, and stagnation. But we already have before us a clear vision of a wide and true road, along which we shall attain our final victory.