

Lenin and Stalin: The Great Organizers of the Soviet State

Foreign Languages Publishing House
Moscow 1949

Contents

Introduction.....	1
1. Lenin on the State	5
2. The Proletarian Revolution and the Peasantry.....	11
3. Soviet Socialist Ideology.....	26
4. The Multinational Soviet State—A Family of Nations	38
5. The Soviet State—A New Type of State Federation	42
6. Foundations of the Economy of the Soviet State.....	49
7. Stalin—The Great Continuer of Lenin’s Work	54

Introduction.

The Soviet state recently celebrated its thirtieth anniversary. This momentous and historic date—anniversary of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which ushered in a new era in the history of mankind—was marked by a new upsurge of enthusiasm of the whole Soviet people. And once again, in these festive days, millions and millions of Soviet men and women, workers, peasants, intellectuals, turn their thoughts, in deepest gratitude, to the great leaders and organizers of the socialist state—to Lenin and Stalin, whose brilliant discoveries in the realm of state construction, whose indefatigable activities in the organization and consolidation of the Soviet state made possible the transformation of our country from the backward, semi-colonial land of the tsars into a mighty and invincible socialist state of workers and peasants.

The great advance and victory of scientific Socialism—that militant theory of the proletariat, that revolutionary theory without which, as Lenin declared, there can be no revolutionary movement—are inseparably bound up with the names of Lenin and of his great comrade-in-arms, the continuer of his work, Stalin. Lenin not only preserved the great teachings of Marx and Engels, not only saved these teachings from perversion and vulgarization and cleansed them of the opportunist distortions and falsifications introduced by pseudo-Marxists of the type of Kautsky, Bernstein, David and their ilk, not only restored Marx's original ideas in all their integrity—Lenin further elaborated them, he advanced the theory of scientific Socialism and formulated new principles in conformity with the experience of the proletarian revolution of the twentieth century.

Stalin has defined Leninism as Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. He has demonstrated that Leninism is the direct continuation and development of Marxism, a development organically linked with the

specific features of the time in which Lenin, true follower of Marx and Engels, lived and worker.

Coming as the further development of the ideas of Marxism, Leninism enriched the theory of scientific Socialism with new conclusions and new laws of social development. These conclusions and laws were placed at the basis of the strategy and tactics of the proletarian revolution in the face of the new tasks arising from the specific features of the new era. Lenin was a brilliant innovator in the revolutionary theory of Marxism.. He demonstrated in practice his loyalty to that basic principle of genuinely scientific theory: the necessity of constantly developing and advancing science, never marking time—of treating science, not as a dogma, but as a guide to action.

Lenin's article "Our Program," written in 1898, points out with remarkable clarity the importance of innovation in science. Writing of Marx's theory, Lenin stated emphatically in this article that "...this theory was the first to transform Socialism from a utopia into a science, to lay down a firm foundation for this science and to indicate the path that must be followed in further developing this science and elaborating it in all its parts." Further, he stressed the service rendered by Marxist theory in that "it taught us how, beneath the surface of rooted customs, political intrigues, abstruse and intricate doctrines, to discern the *class struggle*."*

Lenin indignantly condemned those "theoreticians" who "have not taught the proletariat any new methods of struggle" and who "have not advanced one single step the science which Marx and Engels enjoined us to develop."†

Of such theoreticians, whom he ironically dubbed "renewers," Lenin wrote that "they only moved backward, picking up fragments of obsolete theories and preaching the

* Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 111.

† *Ibid.*, p. 112.

theory of compliance instead of the theory of struggle to the proletariat.”

“We,” Lenin continued, “do not regard Marx’s theory as something final and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the cornerstones of the science which Socialists *must* advance in all directions if they do not want to lag behind the march of life.”*

We must also mention here Lenin’s notable idea that “an *independent* elaboration of Marx’s theory is especially necessary for Russian Socialists, since this theory provides only general *guiding* principles which, in *particular*, are to be applied differently to England than to France, differently to France than to Germany, differently to Germany than to Russia.”†

Lenin followed the path he himself had indicated in the elaboration of Marxist theory; and he inaugurated a new era in the development of Marxist theoretical thought. Lenin developed and further advanced the Marxist teaching on the proletarian revolution, on dictatorship and democracy, on the state, and, in particular, on the socialist state.

Lenin’s theory of socialist revolution, further developed by Stalin, armed our people with a clear prospect in their struggle: the prospect of the victory of Socialism. Sternly combating those enemies of the people, the Trotskyite and Bukharinite conspirators, Lenin and Stalin proved that Socialism can be built in a single country. With this inscribed on their banner Lenin and Stalin led the Soviet people forward in the heroic effort which achieved the organization of a new, socialist society, the reorganization of economic and social relationships in the U.S.S.R. on socialist foundations. Advancing along the lines which Lenin had mapped out, the Soviet people under Stalin’s guidance, launched and completed the construction of a socialist society and a

* *Ibid.*, pp. 112-13.

† *Ibid.*, p. 113

socialist state.

The Soviet system and the Soviet state grew and strengthened with every passing year. The Soviet state became a mighty socialist power—the bulwark, the defence and hope of the people of the Soviet Union—an invincible socialist state of workers and peasants.

1. Lenin on the State.

Leninism teaches that the cardinal question of revolution is the question of state power. The capture of the power of state, and the direction of all action by the state—that potent mechanism for the accomplishment of political aims—to serve the interests of the class which dominates in the given society, is the prime and decisive object of revolution.. One of Lenin’s greatest contributions to Marxist teaching lies in his discovery of the Soviets as the new form of state organization, the new type of state, required to effect the political and social emancipation of the working people.

The importance and significance of the state for the emancipation of the working people, for the promotion of socialist construction, were demonstrated by the very course of events, by the practical experience of the struggle for Socialism. At the outset of the October Revolution, however, this was still a debated question, and object of passionate disagreement. That was quite natural. For one thing, state authority is by its very nature an instrument of considerable intricacy and sensitivity; for another, the concepts of state authority and state apparatus were linked up in the minds of the masses with prejudices arising from the adverse role played in history by the state as an instrument for the oppression of the people. Lenin devoted no little effort to explaining the bias, the harmfulness to the proletarian revolution, of the conceptions of the state preached by various opportunist groupings.

In December 1917 Lenin was again obliged to come out against the opportunists, explaining the importance and significance of the state for the proletarian revolution and setting forth the essence of the proletarian state, which carries out the will of the people the will of the workers and peasants.

“The anarchists,” Lenin said, “want to carry through the

whole tremendous economic job required by the proletariat, workers and soldiers, and the peasants, without control. Simply go ahead—take, dispossess. We, on the contrary, say: there must be proper distribution, proper control. For this there must be a state, as a means of compulsion.*

At the first All-Russian Congress of the Navy Lenin returned to this question once more, subjecting the anarchists to annihilating criticism and demonstrating the necessity of building a new state, a socialist state, in which the will of the majority must prevail. “This will of the majority,” said Lenin, “will be enforced by the alliance of the working people, by the honest coalition of workers and peasants, based on common interests. Parties change and perish, but the working people remain.”†

The newspaper report of this speech notes that Lenin stressed the necessity of making the stability of this alliance the first object of care.

The report further quotes Lenin as saying:

“Let the Navy devote all its energies to the end that this alliance remain the foundation of state life; if this alliance is strong, nothing can stop the transition to Socialism.”‡

Here we have a formulation of the fundamental distinguishing feature of the new, proletarian, Soviet state: it is based on a firm alliance of workers and peasants, and derives its might and grandeur from the inviolability of this alliance.

When, in the early days of the October Revolution, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries hysterically prophesied the instability of the Soviet power, and declared that the Soviets would inevitably period, Lenin replied:

“I say that cannot be. I am firmly convinced that the Soviets will never perish; that has been proved by the revo-

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXII, p. 87.

† *Ibid.*, p. 100.

‡ *Ibid.*

lution of November (October 25). The Soviets will never perish, for they were formed even in the first revolution of 1905, they were formed after the February Revolution, and were formed not upon anybody's personal initiative, but by the will of the masses of the people, from below.”*

The Soviet system, as a new type of state, was called into being by the very course of historical development.

“The Soviets were not invented by any party,” Lenin pointed out at a congress of railway workers in 1918. “You know perfectly well that there was no party that could have invented them. They were called into being by the revolution in 1905.”

“The Revolution of 1917,” he continued, “not only revived the Soviets, but covered the whole country with a network of them. They taught the workers, soldiers, and peasants that they could and must take all power in the state into their own hands.”†

To the insolent threats flung at the workers and peasants by the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and Constitutional Democrats in the hope of intimidating the Bolshevik members of the Soviets, Lenin replied:

“When they tell me, and shout from the hostile press, that bayonets may be directed against the Soviets, I simply laugh. The bayonets are in the hands of the workers, the soldiers and the peasants, and while in their hands they will never be directed against the Soviets. Let the counter-revolution turn the bayonets on the Soviets—they bear no terrors for them.”‡

Here we have clearly indicated the distinctive nature of the Soviet state as a state of a new type, a consistently democratic state created by the proletarian revolution. The distinction lies in the fact that the armed forces of this state

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1935, Vol. VI, p. 428.

† Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXII, p. 233.

‡ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1935, Vol. VI, p. 429.

are in the hands of the workers and peasants, in the hands of the people themselves.

In his pamphlet “The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution,” written in April 1917, Lenin treated of the new type of state developing in our revolution. He pointed out that since the end of the nineteenth century revolutionary periods have been bringing forward a higher type of democratic state—a state of the type of the Paris Commune, which Marx, it will be remembered, called “the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical emancipation of labour.”*

Further, Lenin explained the distinctive features of this new type of state which the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917 had begun to create and which was “*being realized* in our country now, at this juncture, but the initiative of millions of people who, of their own accord, are creating a democracy *in their own way*, without waiting until the Cadet professors draft their legislative bills for a parliamentary bourgeois republic, or until the pedants and routine-worshippers of petty-bourgeois ‘Social Democracy,’ like Mr. Plekhanov or Kautsky, renounce their distortions of the Marxist doctrine of the state.”†

In the same pamphlet Lenin goes on to say:

“If we organize, and conduct our propaganda skilfully, not only the proletarians, but nine-tenths of the peasantry will be opposed to the restoration of the police, will be opposed to an irremovable and privileged bureaucracy and to an army separated from the people. And that alone comprises the new type of state.”‡

The fact that in the Soviet state the power belongs to the workers and peasants, that the whole state apparatus,

* Marx, *The Civil War in France*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1948, p. 83.

† Lenin, *Selected Works*, Two-Volume Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, Vol II, p. 34.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

and first and foremost the army and all the armed forces of this state, are made up of workers and peasants, that the leading and directing force within the system of the Soviet state is the Party of Lenin and Stalin—it is this fact which distinguishes the Soviet state as a state of a new type, as the highest form of democracy, as the instrument used by the working people to achieve liberation. Lenin castigated “Messieurs the Socialists” who forgot the most essential point of Marx’s doctrine of the state and failed to see “that the power of state is simply an *instrument* which *different* classes can use, and must use (and know how to use) in *their own class interests*.”*

Lenin wrote in this connection that the proletariat (having assembled sufficiently powerful political and military “striking forces” must overthrow the bourgeoisie, take from it the power of state, create its own, Soviet state, and use this *instrument* for its *own* class aims. As the basic tasks of the proletariat in the accomplishment of this aim, he pointed to the neutralization of the middle peasantry during the period of preparation for and accomplishment of the socialist revolution—that is to say, “turning the middle peasantry into a social stratum which, if it did not actively aid the revolution of the proletariat, at least would not hinder it, would remain neutral and would not take the side of our enemies”†; and, for the succeeding period, winning the peasantry, so far as possible—in any case, the majority of the labouring section of the peasantry—to the side of the proletariat; the organization of large-scale machine production, and the building of Socialism on the ruins of capitalism.

The accomplishment of these tasks requires a new state apparatus, specially adapted to them. This apparatus is not invented by any individual, but grows up out of the class

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1935, Vol. VI, p. 472.

† Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXIV, p. 114.

struggle of the proletariat, as that struggle grows in breadth and depth. "This new apparatus of state power, this new *type* of state power, is the *Soviet power*."*

It should be noted that Lenin saw it as a tremendous advantage of the Soviets that they are in a position, immediately after the seizure of state power by the proletariat, to win the great mass of the peasantry to the side of the proletariat, away from the petty-bourgeois, pseudo-socialist parties. That is exactly what happened when the Russian proletariat, on seizing power, promulgated the decree on the land, and won away from the Socialist-Revolutionaries that part of the labouring peasantry which was still following them.

No other state, however democratic it may be, is capable of *such* solution of fundamental problems, involving the vital interests of the masses, as the Soviet state. That is so because the Soviet state was created by the masses themselves, as a means of protecting the interests of the people, as a means of protecting the interests of the people, as a means of fighting for these interests. In his article "A Great Beginning," Lenin wrote: "As a toiler, the peasant, the vast mass of the peasants, supports the state 'machine' which is headed by a Communist, proletarian vanguard a hundred or two hundred thousand strong, and which consists of millions of organized proletarians."†

A little thought upon this formulation of Lenin's leads at once to a clear understanding of the fundamental distinction of the Soviet state as a state of a new type, an understanding of the secret of the invincibility and indestructibility of the Soviet system, which has proven its ability to withstand any storm, any tempest—to emerge victorious from the bitterest and most difficult struggle with its enemies.

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1935, Vol. VI, p. 473.

† Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 421.

2. The Proletarian Revolution and the Peasantry.

A most important question in any revolution, and especially in the proletarian revolution, is the question of the peasantry, *i.e.*, the question of what place the peasant masses are to occupy in the revolution, what part they are to play in the development and the attainments of the revolution; the question of the attitude to be adopted towards the peasantry by that advanced class in the given society which heads the revolutionary movement and determines the policy of the leadership of the revolution.

In speaking of the principal tasks of the proletarian revolution, Lenin pointed out the urgent necessity for the precise definition of the attitude of the proletariat towards the middle peasantry, which, as we know, together with the poorer strata, comprises the bulk of the peasantry. Lenin pointed out that *theoretically* this question had already been settled, and a definite line adopted. But, he said, “we know from our own experience that there is a difference between solving a problem theoretically and putting that solution into practical effect. We are now directly confronted with that difference, which was so characteristic of the Great French Revolution, when the French Convention launched into sweeping measures but did not possess the necessary base of support in order to put them into effect, and did not even know on what class to rely in order to put any particular measure into effect.”*

The Soviet state possesses all the conditions necessary for putting into effect measures of a scope inconceivable before the establishment of Soviet rule, measures feasible only to a state which enjoys sufficient popular support and knows in what class it must seek support.

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Two-Volume Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, Vol. II, p. 459.

At the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Lenin formulated the policy of the proletarian revolution on the peasant question as follows: “The aim here” (in reference to economic relations with the middle peasantry—A.V.) “is not the expropriate the middle

peasant, but to bear in mind the specific conditions in which the peasant lives, to learn from the peasant methods of transition to a better system, *and not to dare to domineer!* That is the rule we have set ourselves.”*

Lenin stressed that “the millions cannot immediately understand a change of course,” that “the new conditions and the new tasks in relation to this class demand a new psychology.”†

Fundamentally, this psychology lay in a new understanding of the position and role of the middle peasantry in the proletarian revolution. The main thing was a proper approach to the task which Lenin termed adjusting the life of the middle peasant.

“We must live in peace with him,” Lenin taught. “In a Communist society the middle peasant will be on our side only when we mitigate and ameliorate his economic conditions. If tomorrow we could supply one hundred thousand first-class tractors, provide them with fuel, provide them with drivers—you know very well that this at present is fantasy—the middle peasant would say: ‘I am for the Commune’ (i.e., for Communism).”‡

Lenin clearly saw and clearly stated the conditions necessary for the realization of such a plan. These conditions, first and foremost among them being the development of the country’s productive forces and the rise of labour productivity, were brought about within the next ten years. The problem was solved as Lenin, the great genius of the

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXIV, p. 168.

† *Ibid.*, p. 169.

‡ Lenin, *Collected Works*. 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXIV, p. 170.

proletarian revolution, had foreseen. “Fantasy” became actual fact.

On the soil worked and cultivated by the mighty plough of Bolshevik agrarian policy, there grew up and strengthened an alliance of workers and peasants—the foundation of Soviet power. Lenin’s injunction “not to dare to domineer” promoted the establishment of stable, comradely cooperation between the two great classes, of an alliance of workers and peasants (consolidated on the basis of leadership by the working class) directed towards the complete abolition of classes.

Lenin and Stalin teach us to regard the labouring masses of the peasantry as a reserve of the proletariat, as a source of firm support in the realization of sweeping and fundamental measures aimed at the organization of socialist relationships.

Stalin reminds us of the words of Engels, who in the 1890’s in his book *The Peasant Question in France and Germany*, wrote that to achieve political power the Socialist Party “must first go out from the towns into the countryside, must become a force in the countryside.”* But what does it mean to “go out from the towns into the countryside”? How is a party to “become a force in the countryside”?

To these questions Engels replied that everything possible must be done to improve the peasant’s life, and to facilitate his transition to the co-operative, if he decides to take this step; while if he cannot bring himself to this decision, he must be given plenty of time to consider it on his own holding. The peasants must be accorded material aid out of public funds; very liberal aid, for such expenditure will be many times repaid in the general reorganization of society.

Commenting on these remarks in 1924, Stalin stressed

* Neue Zeit, 1894-95, Jahrgang 13, Band I, No. 10.

that it is precisely in the land of the dictatorship of the proletariat that the ideas outlined by Engels can be most easily and completely realized. Indeed, such measures were already being carried out in the U.S.S.R. at the time.

“How can it be denied,” Stalin said, “that this circumstance, in its turn, must facilitate and advance the work of economic construction in the Land of the Soviets?”*

The entire subsequent course of events has fully confirmed this statement, demonstrating that the success of economic construction, and of state construction generally, is organically bound up with the participation in this construction of the labouring peasantry, the prime and faithful assistant of the working class in the struggle for Socialism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat brought the labouring peasantry out onto the highroad of economic and political development and success. At the same time, the dictatorship of the proletariat constituted a firm basis for fraternal collaboration between the working class and the great mass of the peasantry. The experience of Soviet rule completely and graphically refutes the Trotskyite-Bukharinite “thesis” alleging the existence of fundamental antagonisms between the working class and the labouring peasantry.

Fraternal collaboration between the working class and the peasantry is a direct consequence of the Soviet system, which is based on the alliance of workers and peasants, and every quality and distinctive feature of which works to bring the workers and peasants closer together, to unite, not disunite, them.

Defining the essence of Soviet government, Lenin wrote of six distinctive features of the Soviets, Lenin wrote of six distinctive features of the Soviets. As one of these features, he pointed to the fact that the new state apparatus represented by the Soviets “provides a form of organization of the vanguard, *i.e.*, of the most class-conscious, most en-

* Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 57.

ergetic and progressive section of the *oppressed* classes, the workers and peasants, and thus constitutes an apparatus with the help of which the vanguard of the oppressed classes can elevate, educate and lead *the gigantic masses* of these classes, which hitherto have stood completely outside of political life, outside of history.”*

A distinctive feature of the proletarian revolution lies in the fact that it is able, that it is bound, to join the millions of the working people into a lasting alliance with the proletariat. And the same distinctive feature characterizes the Soviet state, as a special form of alliance of workers and peasants.

In this connection Stalin wrote, in his work *On the Problems of Leninism*: “This special form of alliance consists in that the guiding force of this alliance is the proletariat. This special form of alliance consists in that the leader in the state, the leader in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat is *one* party, the party of the proletariat, the party of the Communists, which *does not and cannot share* that leadership with other parties.”†

The Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites distorted the idea expressed by Stalin in the passage just cited: the idea of the proletarian dictatorship as a class alliance of the proletariat and the labouring masses of the peasantry aimed at the final victory of Socialism, with the provision that the guiding force in this alliance is the proletariat. The traitor Zinoviev, camouflaging his treachery with intricate little “theories” concerning the dictatorship of the proletariat, plainly affirmed that dictatorship is not an alliance of one class with another. This was a crude and mechanical application to the proletarian dictatorship of the features and peculiarities characterizing bourgeois dictatorship. But there are different kinds of dictatorships, as we know; and they

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXI, p. 258.

† Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 133.

can be confused only by political ignoramuses and simpletons, or by such inveterate falsifiers of Marxism and enemies of the working class as Zinoviev and his accomplices proved to be.

The basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a higher type of social organization of labour than that obtaining under capitalism.

“This is the essence. This is the source of the strength and the guarantee of the inevitable complete triumph of Communism.”*

To achieve the victory of Communism “an enormous step forward must be taken in developing the productive forces; it is necessary to overcome the resistance (frequently passive, which is particularly stubborn and particularly difficult to overcome) of the numerous survivals of small production; it is necessary to overcome the enormous force of habit and conservatism which are connected with these survivals.”†

But only the proletariat possess the ability to overcome this enormous force of the survivals of capitalism in economic life and in human psychology, notwithstanding the fact that the proletariat itself is not yet free of such survivals.

Lenin’s article “A Great Beginning” pointed out this ability of the proletariat, due to which it becomes the leader of the other toiling classes. The proletariat is capable of leadership because historical development has produced in it this ability which grows up “*only* out of the material conditions of large-scale capitalist production.”‡ It is this circumstance that gives the proletariat the historical right of leadership.

To admit of equality between the proletariat and the

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXIV, p. 336.

† *Ibid.*, p. 337.

‡ Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXIV, p. 337.

other toiling classes in this matter, to admit of equal rights to leadership, would be Manilovism,* unctuous liberalism, having nothing in common with the requirements of genuine proletarian revolutionism. No, the point here is precisely the hegemony of the proletariat, the leadership of the proletariat, the proletariat as leader. On this question, Lenin wrote the following:

“The proletariat *alone* possess this ability” (the ability to take “an enormous step forward”—A.V.) “at the beginning of the road leading from capitalism to Socialism. It is capable of fulfilling the gigantic task that falls to it, first, because it is the strongest and most advanced class in civilized society; second, because in the most developed countries it constitutes the majority of the population; and third, because in backward capitalist countries, like Russia, the majority of the population consists of semi-proletarians, *i.e.*, of people who regularly live in a proletarian way part of the year, who regularly eke out their livelihood in part as wagers in capitalist enterprises.

“Those who try to solve the problem of the transition from capitalism to Socialism on the basis of general phrases about liberty, equality, democracy in general, the equality of labour democracy, etc. (as Kautsky, Martov and other heroes of the Berne yellow International do), thereby only reveal their petty-bourgeois, philistine natures and slavishly follow in the ideological wake of the bourgeoisie. The correct solution of this problem can be found only by concretely studying the specific relations between the specific class which has captured political power, namely, the proletariat, and the whole of the non-proletarian and also semi-proletarian mass of the toiling population—relations which are not established in fantastically-harmonious ‘ideal’ conditions, but in the real conditions of the furious and

* Manilovism—smug complacency, inactivity, daydreaming. From the name of Manilov, a character of Gogol’s *Dead Souls*.—Ed.

many-sided resistance of the bourgeoisie.”*

The leading role of the proletariat in reshaping the old social relationships arises from the very nature of these relationships. It results from the social status of the proletariat in production; and that is the dominating factor in social relationships. In the period of transition from capitalism to Socialism the proletariat inevitably retains its status as the leading class in society, with all the consequences arising therefrom. This is one of the most important laws of the proletarian revolution.

The very concept of dictatorship of the proletariat implies the exercise of leadership by the proletariat in relation to the non-proletarian toiling masses. That is exactly how Lenin and Stalin have defined this concept.

Leninism teaches that only the proletariat is capable of leading the masses of the working people in the struggle for emancipation, in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the victory gained.

Lenin’s “A Great Beginning” stressed this feature of the proletarian dictatorship in the following words: “In order to achieve victory, in order to create and consolidate Socialism, the proletariat must fulfil a twofold or dual task: first, by its devoted heroism in the revolutionary struggle against capital, to win over the whole mass of the toilers and exploited, to win them over, organize them and lead them in the struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie and to utterly suppress its resistance. Second, it must lead the whole mass of the toilers and exploited as well as all the petty-bourgeois strata on the road of new economic construction, on the road to the creation of new social ties, a new labour discipline, a new organization of labour, which will combine the last word of science and capitalist technique with the mass association of class-conscious workers engaged in large-scale socialist production.

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXIV, pp. 337-38.

“The second task is more difficult than the first, for it cannot possibly be fulfilled by single acts of heroism; it requires the most prolonged, most persistent and most difficult heroism of *everyday* mass work. But this task is more important than the first, because, in the last analysis, a new and higher mode of social production, the substitution of large-scale socialist production for capitalist and petty-bourgeois production, can alone serve as the deepest source of strength for victory over the bourgeoisie and the sole guarantee of the durability and permanence of this victory.”*

The alliance of workers and peasants under the leadership of the working class, and the leading status of the Communist Party in the U.S.S.R.—such is the foundation of the Soviet state, of the new form of state power: Soviet power. This form of power—the Republic of Soviets—was, as Stalin put it, “the political form, so long sought and finally discovered, within the framework of which the economic emancipation of the proletariat, the complete victory of Socialism, is to be accomplished.”†

The experience of the revolution has demonstrated that this form of government is a much higher type of democracy than any other form of government as yet known to history. This the Soviet people realize and understand; for every step in economic and cultural construction in the U.S.S.R. brings home to them the great advantages of Soviet government as compared with other forms of government.

Speaking of the Kerensky period, with its incessant ministerial changes, its false promises of peace, its deception of the people, Lenin pointed out: “On the basis of this experience, their own experience, not the influence of propaganda, the people compared the socialist Soviet sys-

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXIV, p. 339.

† Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 48.

tem with the bourgeois republic and arrived at the conviction that the old reforms and the old institutions of bourgeois imperialism did not satisfy the interests of the toilers and the exploited; that these interests could be satisfied only by the power of the Soviets, to which people—workers, soldiers, peasants, railwaymen, all the working people—are free to elect their representatives, and from which they may freely recall those of their deputies who do not satisfy the demands and desires of the people.”*

Thus did the great Lenin define the very essence of Soviet government and Soviet democracy—the most vital feature of the new type of state, which makes it possible for the working people to participate actively and systematically in the building of the new society.

The Soviet state, as a state of a new type, is new in its democracy—consistent socialist democracy. Soviet democracy ensures the domination in society of the will of the majority of the workers and peasants, the majority of the working people, as participants in the administration of the state. The Soviet form of democracy arouses millions of people to activity in life, to socialist creative effort; it brings to the fore thousands upon thousands of leaders and organizers from among the masses of the people. Lenin noted as one of the most important distinctive features of Soviet government the circumstance that it is precisely Soviet government, the forms and methods of work of Soviet state bodies, that effectively solve the problem of advancing and training new leaders and organizers from among the people.

The truth of the words of Lenin and Stalin describing Soviet democracy as the highest form of democracy, ensuring in practice to the vast masses of the people participation in the administration of the state and in the building of Socialism, has been proved thousands of times.

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXII, p. 234.

How many tens and hundreds of thousands of men and women, splendid representatives of our great and gifted, our wise and energetic people, have come forward as leaders and organizers of the new society!

The creation of a new form of state, and the subsequent development of this form in the direction of an ever-increasing consolidation and extension of democratic principles, an ever-increasing extension of the rights and duties in the state of the millions of people, could not, of course, be accomplished without struggle, and bitter struggle.

Not a single question bound up with class interests, Leninism teaches, is solved in history otherwise than by force, than by compulsion. Force and suppression, naturally, served the workers and peasants who had commenced the building of their own state as an important instrument for overcoming resistance on the part of all the outlived and decaying forces of the old society. Nor could it have been otherwise. Force and compulsion on the part of the state are indispensable in class struggle, and there is no state that does not resort to the use of force against those who violate public law and order, against those who violate the laws and injunctions of the ruling authorities.

Soviet government is the expression of the most complete and most fully developed democracy. At the same time, it is the expression of the dictatorship of the working class, which secures the very possibility of democracy for the people. Soviet democracy and the proletarian dictatorship are two aspects of one and the same phenomenon.

Enemies of the Soviets depict the proletarian dictatorship as stark force, violence, lawlessness. We need waste no effort on refuting this laboured slander of the enemies of the Soviet state. It is precisely in the land of the Soviets that we see the reign of law and justice, of political equality and public order, of firm discipline and mutual respect among the people, of fraternal cooperation both in peaceful labour and on the field of battle.

There are still no few dunderheads who like to deliberate, with solemn mien, on Socialism. For decades, people of this type have been doing their utmost to discredit Socialism, depicting it, in filthy lampoons and caricatures, as a sort of barrack system, fatal to personal initiative, to the gift of creation. Of these dunderheads Lenin wrote: "The hangers-on and spongers on the bourgeoisie described Socialism as a uniform, routine, monotonous and drab barrack system."*

The Soviet state is mighty in the strength of the masses; it derives its strength from the initiative of its people, from their creative effort, their supreme devotion to the cause of emancipation, to the cause of freedom, to the cause of the glory and exaltation of their socialist motherland. Such is the root of that vital patriotism which has led to the historic victories and achievements of the Soviet people.

In the first days of the Soviet system, Lenin taught that the most variegated means and methods must be employed in the organization of new social relationships in the Republic of Soviets. In reference to the problem of transition "to large-scale economy based on machine industry," to Socialism, Lenin wrote that "the concrete conditions and forms of this transition will inevitably vary, and should vary, in conformity with the conditions in which the movement directed towards the establishment of Socialism begins. Local peculiarities, distinctive features of economic life, manners and customs, the degree of preparedness of the population, attempts to accomplish one or another definite plan—all these must affect the specific features of the road to Socialism followed in any particular labour commune of the state."†

Again: "The greater this variety—provided, of course,

* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Two-Volume Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, Vol. II, p. 256.

† Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXII, p. 416.

that it does not develop into attempts at artificial originality—the more surely and the more rapidly will we be assured both the achievement of the democratic centralism and the realization of socialist economy. It now remains only to organize competition, *i.e.*, to ensure publicity which would enable all the communities of the state to show just what turn economic development has taken in the different localities; to ensure, secondly, the possibility of comparison between the results achieved in progress towards Socialism by one or another commune of the state; to ensure, thirdly, the practical possibility of repetition of experience gained in one commune, by other communes; to ensure the possibility of interchanging material—and human—forces which have shown themselves to best advantage in any given branch of the national economy or the state administration. After the crushing restraint of the capitalist system, we cannot at present have any accurate conception of the tremendous forces lying latent in the masses of the working people, in all the varied labour communes of a big state, in the intellectuals who until our time functioned as lifeless, voiceless executors of the plans of the capitalists—the forces, not latent, which may be brought into action under the socialist organization of society. Our task is only to clear the road for all these forces. And if we make the organization of competition our task of state, then—given the operation of Soviet principles of state, given the abolition of private ownership of the land, the factories, mills, etc.—results will inevitably be attained, and will suggest to us the forms for further construction.”*

None more than Lenin and Stalin has attacked and exposed the harm and danger arising from bureaucracy, inertia, routine, immobility, fear of the initiative and create spirit of the masses. None more than Lenin and Stalin has taught that initiative and innovation must be fostered, that

* *Ibid.*, pp. 416-17.

all the varied manifestations of life, of struggle, of creation must be seized upon to further the interests of Socialism.

In his article “How to Organize Competition” Lenin wrote that under capitalism the initiative of the masses is stifled, for under capitalism competition “means the incredibly brutal suppression of the enterprise, energy and bold initiative of the *masses* of the population, of the overwhelming majority, of ninety-nine out of every hundred toilers; it also means that competition is superseded by financial fraud, despotism, servility on the upper rungs of the social ladder.”* “Socialism,” Lenin went on, “does not extinguish competition; on the contrary; it for the first time creates the opportunity for employing it on a really *wide* and on a really *mass* scale, for actually drawing the majority of the working people into an arena of labour in which they can display their abilities, develop their capacities, reveal their talents, which are an untapped spring among the people, and which capitalism crushed, suppressed and strangled in thousands and millions.”†

Lenin called upon the masses of the people to display their creative ability and initiative. He pointed out that in the process of competition “*organizing talent* should be singled out *in practice* and promoted in the work of administering the state.”‡

“There is a great deal of this talent among the people,” Lenin declared. Since the establishment of Soviet power thousands upon thousands of talented organizers and leaders have come to the fore, from the very heart of the people, in every sphere of state construction: engineers, administrators, leaders and builders of the Red Army, scientists, outstanding statesmen, physicians, lawyers, actors, writers, artists—masters in the most diverse fields of endeavour.

* *Ibid.*, p. 158.

† *Ibid.*

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 167.

Thousands and tens of thousands of heroes and heroines of labour and battle have been fostered by our motherland. Never, before the Soviet system, was our country so rich in remarkable men and women, creators and builders of a new life.

Truly, none by hangers-on and spongers on the money-bags could try to make Socialism a bogey to the people, depicting it as a barrack system. Socialism, and only Socialism, has brought about in the U.S.S.R. and unprecedented growth in the national economy, science and culture—the result of the creative activities of millions of gifted men and women of the new, Soviet epoch.

3. Soviet Socialist Ideology.

Soviet ideology, the ideology of the party of Lenin and Stalin, based on Marxist philosophical materialism, which was raised to new heights by Lenin and Stalin, has been a great constructive force in the U.S.S.R.

The greatness of Marxist philosophical materialism lies in that it converted Socialism into a science; in that it discovered, and formulated with scientific precision, the laws governing social development, and pointed out, on scientific basis, the road to victory for the vanguard class which has mastered advanced theory and is guided by advanced ideas.

Pre-Marxist methodology proved incapable of distinguishing the lines of social development, of determining the conditions and interconnections of phenomena in the course of this development—of elucidating the laws that govern the development of society. Instead of scientific analysis it resorted to abstract guesswork of no scientific worth, substituting the desirable for the essential, and taking no account of the actual state of social and, in particular, economic forces in the given country. Sociology in the pre-Marxist period was dominated by metaphysics, which sees no interconnection of phenomena, no system in their development, either in nature or in society. Marxist dialectical philosophy, Marxist philosophical materialism take as their starting point recognition of the interconnection and interdependence of the phenomena of social life, the principle that social development is governed by definite laws.

This being so, it remained to determine and demonstrate the laws of social development. Marxist philosophical materialism revealed these laws, demonstrating the dependence of the ideological, political life of society upon that society's material foundation. Marxism proceeds from the recognition of the existence of objective laws, the data concerning which has the validity of objective truths.

Objectivity, Marxism-Leninism teaches, is not based on any such concepts as “universality,” or “collective experience.” Affirming the existence of objective reality, which we designate by the philosophical category of matter, and exposing the gibberish of Mach and Avenarius, Bogdanov and Yushkevich, which boils down to the negation of objective truth, to the assertion that sensation and thought, rather than matter, are primary, Lenin wrote caustically, in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*: “The waters rest on the earth, the earth rests on a whale, and the whale rests on the waters.”* Indeed, the treatment of the laws governing the development of life as a product of consciousness amounts to treading a vicious circle; for the very concept of consciousness calls for an explanation of the origin of consciousness, calls for an explanation of why, at any definite period, the consciousness of one class should differ from that of another.

Marxist philosophical materialism accepts as its basis and cornerstone the proposition that matter is primary. Marxist philosophical materialism proceeds from the principle that “the standpoint of life, of practice, should be first and fundamental in the theory of knowledge.”†

The correct construction of the theory of knowledge, the correct perception of the world are impossible, Lenin taught, otherwise than on the basis of their verification in practice, in the experience of life.

Marxist theory recognizes experience which takes as its point of departure the fact of the existence of objective truth, which is knowable, and which can and should be verified in the experience of life. Only on this basis, *i.e.*, on the basis of the standpoint of life, to use Lenin’s words, is it possible to attain a scientific approach to reality, is it possi-

* Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 89.

† *Ibid.*, p. 142.

ble to attain a correct perception of the paths of development of social life and social relationships, is it possible to determine whether the policy being followed at any given time in the organization and direction of social relationships is correct or incorrect. A policy is a form of organization of social relationships, a form of the organization of classes, of the whole of society, of the people of which this society consists. And without a correct understanding of how, why, whither, and by what paths social development should and can proceed, there cannot, of course, be any question of correct leadership, of the conduct of a correct policy.

The application of the method of dialectical materialism ensures the correct direction both of proletarian policy and of the proletarian state. This policy is determined, not by abstract “principles of human reason,” or by the good intentions of “great men,” but by the concrete requirements of the development of the material life of society.

When scholars began to master Marxist philosophical materialism, and learned to apply it in their special fields as a method of cognition of phenomena, there followed a complete exposure of the reactionary essence of the subjective idealistic trend in methodology, which is based on the conception that consciousness determines the content of the material environment, that “opinions rule the world,” that “absolute” or “eternal” truths determine the course of things throughout the universe.

Treating of the importance of Marxist philosophical materialism in the development of the social sciences, Stalin points out that affirmation of one of the basic principles of Marxist philosophical materialism—the principle that social phenomena and the laws governing them are knowable—leads to the admission that “the party of the proletariat should not guide itself in its practical activity by casual motives, but by the laws of development of society, and by

practical deductions from these laws.”*

Stalin concludes: “Hence, Socialism is converted from a dream of a better future for humanity into a science.

“Hence, the bond between science and practical activity, between theory and practice, their unity, should be the guiding star of the party of the proletariat.”†

The cognition of social phenomena, Stalin teaches, becomes truly scientific only when it proceeds from the material foundations of the life and activities of society. Hence the tremendous progressive role of science, when it is really genuine science, based on a correctly constructed scientific methodology and proceeding from the requirements of the development of the material life of society. In other words, it is the purpose of science to perceive these requirements, to distinguish between the casual and the real, the seeming and the essential. We know of the attempts to divert our party to an erroneous policy, which would have been fatal to the Soviet state, made by such renegades as Bukharin and Trotsky and their followers, who even then, in the first years of the Revolution, already constituted a potential “fifth column”—destroyed in good time, however, thanks to Stalin’s far-seeing genius. At a time when it was our greatest need to develop heavy industry, to produce the very maximum of iron, steel, pig iron, coal, machinery, in order to become an industrial country, economically independent—at such a time these traitors insisted that the most important thing was to produce more cotton goods and haberdashery, that our entire economic policy must be reduced to “shoeing and clothing.” True enough, light industry must be advanced; but there can be no subordinating our entire policy to requirements which, though important, are not decisive. Perceiving the tasks arising out of the vital needs of our people and our state, and proceeding from a

* Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 578.

† Ibid.

scientific basis, our Party directed its economic policy towards the task of sinking mines, of exploiting copper, iron and other mineral deposits, of building enterprises which would secure us a firm industrial and economic base; for only on such a foundation, equipped with powerful modern technique, could we proceed to build a socialist economy and a socialist state, could we “clothe and shoe” the population.

Guided by the Marxist-Leninist science of the development of society, our Party took the path of socialist industrialization, the path demanded by the vital interests of the Soviet land. The economic development of the U.S.S.R. proceeded along this path—and Socialism triumphed. The victory of Socialism in our country proved the strength and vitality of Marxism- Leninism.

“The strength and vitality of Marxism -Leninism, “ Stalin declares, “lies in the fact that it does base its practical activity on the needs of the development of the material life of society and never divorces itself from the real life of society.”* Nor does this detract from the role an significance of theory, of social ideas and political views.

Marx wrote: “Theory becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses.” Citing these words, Stalin explains that they refer to the influence of ideas, of theory, on the material life of society, on the creation of the conditions necessary for completely carrying out the urgent tasks of the material life of society and for rendering possible its further development.

The bond between theory and practice, their interdependence and unity, without which there can be no correct theory and no correct practice—such is one of the prime distinctive features of Marxist materialism, which by this discovery achieved a gigantic forward stride in the theory of knowledge. And precisely this bond between theory and

* *Ibid.*, p. 579.

practice, their interdependence and unity, as Lenin and Stalin have always stressed, comprises one of the prime distinctive features of the activities of our Party, which grounds its policy and practice on Marxist philosophical materialism.

In his momentous speech at the conference of Marxist students of the agrarian question in 1929, Stalin said:

“You know that theory, if it is genuine theory, gives practical workers the power of orientation, clarity of perspective, confidence in their work, faith in the victory of our cause. All this is, and cannot but be, of vast importance in our work of socialist construction. The unfortunate thing is that we are beginning to limp precisely in this sphere, in the sphere of the theoretical elaboration of the problems of our economy.”*

Again:

“The new practice is giving rise to a new approach to the problems of the economy of the transition period. The problems of the New Economic Policy, of classes, of the rate of construction, of the bond with the peasantry, of Party policy, are now presented in a new way. If we are not to lag behind practice we must immediately proceed to elaborate all these problems in the light of the new situation.”†

No progress is possible without unity of theory and practice. But what does unity of theory and practice mean? A historic example of the Marxist understanding of this unity is presented in the thoughts expressed by Stalin in 1929, at the conference of Marxist students of the agrarian question, concerning the class changes in the country and the turn in the Party’s policy. At that time we had performed one of the greatest turns our policy has known, namely, the turn from the policy of *restricting* the exploiting proclivities of the kulaks to the policy of *eliminating*

* Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 301.

† *Ibid.*, p. 302.

the kulaks as a class.

Stalin said the following:

“In 1926-27, the Zinoviev-Trotsky opposition did their utmost to impose upon the Party the policy of an immediate offensive against the kulaks. The Party refused to embark on this dangerous adventure, for it knew that serious people cannot afford to play at offensives. An offensive against the kulaks is a serious matter. It must not be confused with declamations against the kulaks. Nor can it be confused with a policy of bickering with the kulaks, which the Zinoviev-Trotsky opposition did their utmost to impose upon the Party. To launch an offensive against the kulaks means that we must smash the kulaks, eliminate them as a class. Unless we set ourselves these aims, an offensive would be mere declamation, bickering, empty noise, anything but a real Bolshevick offensive. To launch an offensive against the kulaks means that we must properly prepare for it and then strike at the kulaks, *strike so hard as to prevent them from rising to their feet again. This is what we Bolsheviks call a real offensive.* Could we have undertaken such an offensive five years or three years ago with any prospect of success? No, we could not.”*

Further, Stalin declared:

“At that time the policy of not permitting the expropriation of the kulaks was necessary and correct. But now? Now the situation is different. Now we are able to carry on a determined offensive against the kulaks, to break their resistance, to eliminate them as a class and substitute for their output the output of the collective farms and state farms.”†

That is what is meant by the application of theory to practice; that is what is meant by the organization of practical measures from the standpoint of a correct scientific

* *Ibid.*, pp. 317-18. Italics mine.—A.V.

† *Ibid.*, p. 319.

analysis of the situation—of its economic, production and other features.

In 1926-27 the conditions necessary for a determined offensive against the kulaks, whom Lenin described as the most brutal and barbaric of all exploiting classes, did not exist. A correct, sober, scientific analysis of the situation shows that at that time such a so-called offensive would have led only to a lot of noise and scuffling that could have yielded only negative results. The Party therefore could not embark on this path, could not undertake such a measure. It was obliged to fight all those who tried to impose this path on it. And, conversely, in 1929, when the correlation of class forces in the country had changed, and when a material base had been set up from which to launch and successfully carry out a determined offensive against the kulaks, the Party undertook this offensive and carried it to completion.

There can be no successful advance in socialist construction without a foundation of scientific knowledge. The practical measures of general and economic policy must be proportioned and planned in strict accordance with the requirements of a science based on the theory of Marxist philosophical materialism.

To ensure success in the reorganization of agriculture on the basis of collectivization, it was necessary not only to break kulak resistance, but to shatter Groman's and Bukharin's kulak "theory of equilibrium" of sectors, or theory of two compartments,* which served as a weapon for those

* Criticizing the bourgeois theory of "equilibrium," Stalin said: "According to this theory we have a socialist sector—which is one compartment, as it were—and a non-socialist or, if you like, a capitalist sector—which is another compartment. These two compartments move on different rails and glide peacefully forward, without touching one another. Geometry teaches that parallel lines do not meet. But the authors of this remarkable theory believe that these parallel lines will meet eventually, and when they meet we will have Socialism. This the-

who resisted the building of collective farms.

To this “theory,” so-called, Stalin opposed the truly scientific, Marxist theory of reproduction. He demonstrated the impossibility of basing Soviet rule and socialist construction, for any length of time, on two different foundations—on the foundation of large-scale socialist industry and on the foundation of scattered and backward small-commodity peasant farming.

The solution lies in the socialist path of development of agriculture, by way of collective farms, equipped with machinery and scientific knowledge. This is a realistic path, pointed by genuine science, and not be utopian, anti-Marxist, reactionary “theories” such as Bukharin’s “theory of equilibrium.”

Such is the influence of the scientific theory of socialist construction on the practice of the socialist state.

Concerning this influence of the science of Marxism-Leninism on state measures pertaining to the reconstruction of the Soviet national economy, Stalin said:

“When we nationalized the land we proceeded, *inter alia*, from the theoretical premises laid down in the third volume of *Capital*, in Marx’s well-known book, *Theories of Surplus Value*, and in Lenin’s works on the agrarian problem, which represent an extremely rich treasury of theoretical thought. I am referring to the theory of ground rent in general, and the theory of absolute ground rent in particular. It is now clear to everyone that the theoretical principles laid down in these works have been brilliantly confirmed by practice in our work of socialist construction in

ory loses sight of the fact that behind these so-called ‘compartments’ there are classes, and that these compartments move as a result of a fierce class struggle, a life and death struggle, a struggle on the principle of ‘who will win?’ It is not difficult to see that this theory has nothing in common with Leninism.” (Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, pp. 302-03.)

town and country.”*

Never before in the history of human society has there been a state in which practical measures have harmonized so fully and consistently as in our country with the theoretical interpretation of those laws which, on the one hand, evoke the necessity for such measures, and, on the other hand, immediately after their appearance, begin to govern the further progress and development of these measures. This is because our state is a state of a new type, a socialist state, in which science occupies a special place, a place of honour—though that is too weak a term; in which science has become a fundamental component element of the entire structure of society, of the entire structure of state administration and leadership.

It was on the basis of theoretical premises and practical experience that Lenin and Stalin formulated the laws of socialist construction. In illustration we may cite the “law of offensive” formulated by Stalin in 1930 in his “Reply to Collective Farm Comrades.”

This law consists in that an offensive undertaken without consolidation of the positions captured is an offensive that is doomed to failure.

“When can an offensive be successful, in the military sphere, let us say?” Stalin asked, and replied: “When the people concerned do not confine themselves to a headlong advance along the whole line, but try at the same time to *consolidate* the positions captured, to *regroup* their forces in accordance with the changed circumstances, to *bring up* the rear and to *move up* reserves. Why is all this necessary? In order to be protected against surprises, in order to close up breaches in the line which may be caused in every offensive, and thus to prepare for the complete rout of the enemy. The mistake the Polish army made in 1920, if we take

* Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, pp. 307-08.

only the military side of the matter, was that it neglected this rule. This, among other reasons, is why, after advancing with a rush to Kiev, it was obliged to retreat as precipitously back to Warsaw. The mistake the Soviet forces made in 1920, again if we take only the military side of the matter, was that in their advance on Warsaw they repeated the mistake of the Poles.

“The same must be said about the laws of an offensive on the front of the class struggle. It is impossible to conduct a successful offensive with the object of liquidating the class enemies *unless we consolidate* the positions already captured, *unless we regroup* our forces, supply the front with *reserves*, bring up the *rear*, etc.

“The whole point is that the blockheads do not understand the laws of an offensive. The whole point is that the Party does understand them and applies them in practice.”*

We saw this law of offensive applied with consummate mastery under the leadership of Stalin—brilliant Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet armies—in the Great Patriotic War against the German fascist invaders.

Is it possible to plan a correct policy without a scientific analysis of the development of social relations? Is a Bolshevik offensive possible without the proper Bolshevik preparation, *i.e.*, without determining the direction of the necessary measures, their prospects of realization, and the conditions, forms, method and time for their realization, on the basis of the Marxist- Leninist-Stalinist theory of social development, proletarian revolution, and the building of Socialism? Of course not. Without these prerequisites there could be no more than empty project-mongering, adventurism. Marxist- Leninist theory plays a part of tremendous importance in the struggle for Socialism under the conditions of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R.

Lenin and Stalin condemn the tendency of some practi-

* *Ibid.*, p. 341.

cal workers to brush theory aside. Stalin points out that this “runs counter to the whole spirit of Leninism and is fraught with serious dangers to the cause.” * We might cite here Stalin’s well-known definition of theory: “Theory is the experience of the working-class movement in all countries taken in its general aspect.” †

Again, there is Lenin’s formula, “Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement,” ‡ indited forty-five years ago as his reply to one of the “accursed questions” of that day, the question: “What is to be done?” And, supplementing this formula, the prophetic words: “*the role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory.*” §

But theory, to this end, must indeed be advanced. Ideas, theories must truly reflect the needs of society, and must be capable of bringing the broad masses into action, of mobilizing and organizing them into a force that can smash the forces of reaction and clear the way for the forces of social progress.

Lenin and Stalin spoke always, not simply of theory, but of advanced theory, of a science which does not divorce itself from the people, but marches in step with the people, serves the people, raises life to a higher level. Thus, Stalin points out the “tremendous organizing, mobilizing and transforming value of new ideas, new theories, new political views and new political institutions.” **

* Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 26.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Lenin, *Selected Works*, Two-Volume Eng. ed., Moscow 1946, Vol. I, p. 165.

§ *Ibid.*

** Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 580.

4. The Multinational Soviet State— A Family of Nations

The population of our country comprises many nationalities. This caused additional difficulties in the organization of the Soviet state. There have been various attempts, as we know, to solve the national question within the framework of capitalism—for example, in Austria-Hungary. These attempts, as we also know, have proved always fruitless, for the petty-bourgeois Socialists have evaded the fundamental problems involved, amusing themselves, as Lenin put it, with sour-sweet resolutions comprised of blatant, but purely formal legalistic, declarations.

Again, there have been those who simply brushed aside the national question: various phrase-mongering “heroes” such as the Proudhonists and other representatives of petty-bourgeois Socialism, who denied the national question in the name, you see, of social revolution. Other “heroes,” the Cunows, Parvuses, Vanderveldes, Renaudels from the camp of the Second International, the Trotskyites and Bukharinites, in varying degree, but essentially in concert, denied the right of nations to self-determination, not to speak of the right of nations to secession, without which correct solution of the national question is unthinkable.

Marx and Engels in the nineteenth century, and Lenin and Stalin in our time, demonstrated the fallacy, the impossibility of any solution of the national question other than that propounded by Marxism-Leninism.

In the U.S.S.R. the national question has been brilliantly and radically solved on the basis of Soviet power, on the basis of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy, proclaimed and consistently put into practice.

The most important thing in the solution of this question was, “establishing proper relations between the proletariat of the former sovereign nation, which is the most cultured section of the proletariat in our entire federation, and

the peasantry, mainly the peasantry of the formerly oppressed nationalities.”* Such proper relations can be established and have actually been established in the land of the Soviets. They are founded on the principles of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy, namely: recognition of the people’s sovereignty, of equality in law, of voluntary choice and fraternal co-operation; recognition of the right of nations to self-determination, up to and including secession, and unqualified rejection of all and any forms of coercion, or of racial or national exclusiveness or superiority.

The realization of these great principles of national policy brought into being those integral features of Soviet state policy which distinguish our state from all other states in the world.

The triumph of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy endued the Soviet state with entirely new qualities with new features native only to the state of the new type. Thus:

1. Complete equality of the Soviet peoples in law;
2. Tremendous economic progress in the national republics, on the basis of socialist industrialization and collectivization;
3. A vigorous growth and advance of cultures national in form and socialist in content;
4. Moral and political unity of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., solidarity, and ardent Soviet patriotism, as demonstrated in thousands of heroic exploits performed by men and women of various nationalities on the production front and on the fronts of the Patriotic War;
5. The absence of all national division or antagonisms; mutual support and complete solidarity of interests among all the peoples of the U.S.S.R.

These are altogether new qualities, unknown to any state in the world before the rise of the Soviet state.

There is no need to enlarge upon the tremendous inter-

* Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. V, p. 240.

national significance of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy. Its domestic significance is greater still. As early as 1923, Stalin noted the tremendous, decisive importance of the correct solution of the national question from the point of view of our country's defence capacity.

At that time, in 1923, Stalin reminded us that "the formerly oppressed nationalities inhabit regions most essential from the point of view of economic development and most important from the point of view of military strategy."*

The colossal significance of this circumstance was brought home to us with particular force during the Patriotic War, inspiring undying reverence for Stalin's brilliant foresight.

Twenty-odd years ago Stalin wrote:

"And in order that Soviet government should become dear also to the peasantry of other nationalities, it must be comprehensible to this peasantry; it must function in their own language; the schools and government bodies must be recruited from among the local people who know the language, manners, customs and traditions of the non-Russian nationalities. Only when the institutions and government bodies in the republics of these countries speak and function in the native language, only then, and only to that extent will the Soviet government, which until very recently [this, I repeat, was written in 1923.—A.V.] was a Russian government, become a government that is not only Russian but international, a government that will be near and dear to the peasants of the formerly oppressed nationalities.

"That is one of the fundamentals of the national problem in general, and of the national problem under Soviet conditions in particular."†

Soviet government was to become their own govern-

* *Ibid.*, p. 238.

† Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. V, pp. 240-41.

ment to all the peoples of the Soviet Union—such was the task set by the Great October Socialist Revolution. Under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, this task was brilliantly carried out. As evidence, we may cite the entire history of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the entire history of the non-Russian Soviet republics, which Soviet government has guided to flourishing prosperity, to material wealth and the heights of culture. We may cite the heroic struggle against the German fascist invaders waged by the peoples of these republics, their valour in defence of Moscow, Leningrad and other cities: Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, for which they fought as they would have fought for their native towns and villages: Uzbek, Armenian, Tatar, Georgian; Turkmenian, Kirghiz, Kazakh, etc. We may cite the inviolable unity that binds all the nationalities inhabiting the Soviet Union, their indissoluble bonds of love for the motherland, their brotherly friendship, their passionate hatred for slavery and for all would-be enslavers of their native land.

5. The Soviet State—A New Type of State Federation

The Socialist system, embodying the immortal ideas of Leninism, has endowed the Soviet people with great and unconquerable power. The Soviet ideology is our people's guiding star in the building of the new life and in the fight against their enemies.

The Leninist-Stalinist ideology has cemented the friendship of the peoples of our country; it has guaranteed the indestructibility of the alliance of workers, peasants, and intellectuals and the equality of all races and nations. The Leninist-Stalinist ideology which has established itself in our country, the ideology of equality for all races and nations, of friendship among the peoples, has gained full victory over the Hitlerite ideology of bestial nationalism and race hatred.

Lenin and Stalin, the great founders of Bolshevism, realized the weight of national oppression in tsarist Russia; they realized how greatly nationalism, chauvinism, and international feuds injured the struggle of the working people for emancipation.

Lenin and Stalin taught the masses to hate bestial misanthropy, which by its barbarity drags man downward, and prevents him from raising his eyes to the sun of Socialism. They spared no effort in the struggle against nationalism and chauvinism, in the elaboration of a consistent, revolutionary national policy. The success of the October Revolution and the successful establishment and development of the Soviet state were due, in great measure, precisely to this Bolshevik policy. The oppressed peoples saw the Party of Lenin and Stalin as their liberator.

Indeed, one of the earliest acts of the Soviet state was to abolish at a single stroke all political inequality among the peoples. The historic "Declaration of Rights of the Nations of Russia," signed by Lenin and Stalin, will go down in his-

tory as a document of world significance.

The great principles of the Leninist-Stalinist ideology of equality of all races and nations, of friendship among the peoples, were the foundation for the Leninist-Stalinist policy, which has brought about a colossal cultural development in the non-Russian Soviet republics, drawn by the Soviet system into the great work of building a new, socialist society. These principles formed the foundation upon which the Soviet Union—the Soviet Socialist Federation—was organized.

At the Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets (January 1918), Lenin said: “Here in Russia, in the sphere of internal policy, a new state system has now been finally recognized: the Socialist Soviet Republic, as a federation of free republics of the various nations inhabiting Russia.”*

Lenin had in mind the resolution adopted by this Congress on Stalin’s report on the national question. “The Russian Socialist Soviet Republic,” this resolution declared, “is constituted on the basis of the voluntary union of the peoples of Russia, as a federation of the Soviet Republics of these peoples.”†

This was a new principle in the organization of federations—the Soviet, Leninist-Stalinist principle, which became the guiding principle in the building of the Soviet state. Further elucidating the essence of this principle, Lenin declared, in his concluding remarks at the Congress: “We rule, not by dividing, as was the brutal law of ancient Rome, but by uniting all the working people in the indissoluble bonds of vital interests and class consciousness.”‡ The federation which our young republic was then about to form, he said, would grow “on an absolutely voluntary basis, knowing neither falsehood nor the sword”; it would be

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXII, p. 223.

† *Ibid.*, p. 602 (explanatory notes).

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

indestructible, and “the best guarantee of its indestructibility are the laws and the state system which we are setting up in our country.”*

Lenin’s genius saw ahead into the nascent world of socialist federation, foresaw its progress along a path “swept clear of the rubbish of history.” We all remember these inspiring words: “Our path swept clear of the rubbish of history, we shall now build the mighty and radiant edifice of socialist society. A new type of state authority is being created, a type without historical precedent, called upon by the will of the Revolution to cleanse the earth of all exploitation, violence and slavery.”†

Thus did the great spirit of the leader of the proletarian revolution rise above all the difficulties of the period, giving expression to the firm confidence of the people, risen in struggle for social and political emancipation, in the final victory of their cause. This was the spirit of a new epoch, signalized, as Lenin said, by the victory of the Revolution and the uniting “of the victors into one mighty revolutionary federation.”‡

The entire development of the Soviet state—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—is a testimony to Lenin’s genius, a demonstration of the great truth and power of his foresight.

The peoples of the Soviet Union look upon Soviet power as their own power. United by common interests, inspired by common ideals, the peoples of the Soviet Union gave new proof of their devotion and love for their motherland during the Patriotic War.

Stalin wrote, in one of his article on the national question—“The Policy of Soviet Government on the National Question in Russia” (1920): “Soviet power

* *Ibid.*

† *Ibid.*, p. 223.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

cannot be regarded as a power divorced from the people; on the contrary, it is a power, the only one of its kind, arisen out of the Russian masses, their own, and near to their hearts.” It is this, essentially, he pointed out, that “explains the unparalleled strength and resilience customarily evinced by the Soviet power at critical moments.”

“Soviet government,” Stalin continued, “must become no less near and dear to the masses of the border regions of Russia. But to do so the Soviet government must first be comprehensible to them. It is therefore necessary that all Soviet organs in the border regions—the courts, the administration, the economic bodies, the direct organs of government (as also the organs of the Party)—should as far as possible be recruited from among local people who know the customs, life, habits, and language of the native population ... that the masses may see that Soviet government and its organs are the products of their own efforts, the embodiment of their aspirations. Only in this way can an unbreakable spiritual contact be established between the masses and the government, and only in this way can the Soviet government become comprehensible and dear to the toiling masses of the border regions”^{*}—border regions which have since become Autonomous and Union Soviet Republics.

Stalin’s part in the creation of the Soviet Federation, the Soviet Union, is generally known. Lenin and Stalin established the basic principles of the Soviet Federation called into being by historical development in the Soviet state and throughout the world.

At the Tenth All-Russian Congress of Soviets (1922), Stalin indicated three groups of circumstances which rendered inevitable the union of the Soviet republics into a

^{*} Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. IV, p. 358.

single, federal state. The first group of circumstances related to the domestic situation of the Soviet state at that time: the paucity of economic resources, which called for a pooling of resources to ensure the most rational conduct of economic activity; the natural division of labour historically evolved between the various regions and republics of the Soviet state; and “the fact that the principal means of communication in the federation, which are the nerve and backbone of any possible union, constitute a single system.”*

The second group of circumstances related to the international position of the Soviet state. Speaking of the international position of the Soviet state at that time, Stalin had in mind the military situation, Soviet Russia’s relations with foreign capital through the Commissariat of Foreign Trade, and diplomatic relations with the bourgeois states. He warned against the danger of foreign attack, the danger of economic isolation of our federation, and the danger of organized diplomatic boycott.

The third group of facts necessitating the organization of the Soviet as a federation was associated with the class nature of the Soviet system. “The Soviet system is so constructed that, being international in its very essence, it systematically fosters the idea of unity among the masses, itself impels them towards unification.”†

Such were the three groups of circumstances giving rise to the Soviet federation, which, as we know, was constituted in 1922, comprising the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, the Transcaucasian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, and the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics

In concluding his report to the Tenth All-Russian Congress of Soviets on the union of the Soviet republics, Stalin

* *The Tenth All-Russian Congress of Soviets—Stenographic Report*, Russ. ed., p. 185.

† *Ibid.*, p. 186.

declared:

“Five years ago the Soviet system of government succeeded in laying the foundation for peaceful co-existence and fraternal collaboration of the peoples. Now, in deciding here on the desirability and necessity of unity, we have to erect on this foundation a new edifice, to found a new and mighty federated power of the toilers. The will of the peoples of our republics, who recently assembled at their congresses and unanimously resolved to form a Union of Republics, is incontestable proof that the work of unification is proceeding along the right lines and that it is based on the great principle of voluntary consent and equality of the peoples.”*

These words were fully confirmed by the years of peaceful socialist construction. They stood the grim test of history in the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against the German barbarians.

Today, it should be clear to all what constitutes the real foundation of the might of the Soviet state—from what profound and inexhaustible sources the Soviet land derives its wealth of vital creative effort and unexampled heroism. These sources lie in the Stalinist friendship of the peoples; in the unity of the Soviet people, their lofty moral and political qualities, their supreme devotion and love for the socialist motherland; in the power of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, which inspire the Soviet people to fight for the victory of the socialist motherland; in the very organization of Soviet society, which is based on public, socialist property—the foundation of the whole Soviet system. They lie in the mighty leading and directing force, the tremendous power of organization and transformation, exerted by the Bolshevik Party within the system of the Soviet state. The Party of Lenin and Stalin has trained up the millions in the

* *The Tenth All-Russian Congress of Soviets—Stenographic Report*, Russ. ed., p. 189.

principles of free labour, proletarian, conscious discipline, self-sacrifice; it has taught them to comprehend the community of interests of all Soviet people, regardless of nationality. The Party has steeled the masses in struggle against their numerous enemies. It leads the peoples of the Soviet Union from victory to victory.

Such are the wellsprings of the indomitable energy and efficiency, firmness and resolution, organization and discipline displayed by the Soviet people in every sphere of state, economic and cultural development in the Soviet Union, overcoming our country's former backwardness and the short space of the historic Stalin five-year plans making up for what had been left undone for many decades.

6. Foundations of the Economy of the Soviet State.

The Soviet system has wrought a fundamental change in the face of our land. The very first years of Soviet development, under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, laid the foundations of the new, Soviet economy — socialist economy. For the complete victory of Socialism, however, it was necessary, Lenin taught, that the whole of our national economy be based on advanced technology; it was necessary that individual peasant farming be transformed, by co-operation, into large-scale socialist agriculture.

Such was the task which confronted the young Soviet republic at its very inception: to “place Russia on the real economic foundation essential for Communism,” to “shift the economic base from small-peasant to large-scale industrial economy.”* Unless this was done, there could be no question of victory for the socialist revolution.

“As long as we live in a small-peasant country,” said Lenin, “there is a more solid economic basis for capitalism in Russia than for Communism. This must be borne in mind. Anyone who has carefully observed life in the countryside, as compared with life in the towns, knows that we have not torn up the roots of capitalism and have not undermined the foundation, the basis of the internal enemy. The latter depends on small-scale production, and there is only one way of undermining it, namely, to place the economy of the country, including agriculture, on a new technical basis, the technical basis of modern large-scale production. And it is only in electricity that we have such a basis.”†

Lenin demanded the electrification of the whole coun-

* Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXVI, pp. 46, 47.

† *Ibid.*, p. 46.

try, the establishment of a modern technical basis for industry, agriculture, and transport; for only on such a basis could Socialism be victorious. We know Lenin's definition of Communism: "Communism is the Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country." We know, too, that Lenin spoke of the program for the transformation of the national economy on the technical basis of electrification as the Party's second program.

"Our Party program," he said, "must not remain merely a program of the Party. It must be converted into the program of our economic development, otherwise it will be valueless as a program of the Party. It must be supplemented by a second Party program, a plan of work for restoring our entire national economy and for raising it to the level of modern technical development. Without a plan of electrification, we cannot undertake any real constructive work."^{*}

Lenin attached decisive importance to the plan for the electrification of the entire national economy. In one of his letters to Krzhizhanovsky (November 1920), he wrote: "...of what worth are all 'plans' (and all 'planning commissions' and 'planning programs') *without a plan of electrification?* They are worth nothing."[†]

In an earlier letter, Lenin suggested that Krzhizhanovsky "order a short article calculated to prove, or at least illustrate, a) the tremendous advantage, b) the *necessity* of electrification."[‡]

With amazing brevity and precision, Lenin outlined the method to be followed in such an article:

Approximately:

I. Transport, To restore it by the old methods requires α millions (prewar prices), or α fuel + β working days.

While restoration on the basis of electrification re-

^{*} *Ibid.*, p. 45.

[†] *Ibid.*, Vol. XXIX, p. 393.

[‡] Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXIX, p. 434.

quires:

$\alpha - x$ mill. rubles.

$\alpha - y$ fuel + $(\beta - z)$ working days.

Or the *same* $\alpha/(\alpha + \beta)$, but with an effect so and so many times the former.

II. Steam power. To restore industry by the old methods requires *greater* expenditure than restoration on the basis of electrification.

III. Agriculture.

Restoration, say, of +5 mill. ploughs and teams of horses. The cost of this by the old methods and under electrification?

This is *approximate*. I think a competent specialist could do this work in two days (if he wants to do it conscientiously), using either pre-war statistics (only a few, a very few totals), or a *roughly approximate* calculation ('by way of a first approximation' *to the first approximation*).*

Similarly, in explaining his thoughts on the necessity for the electrification of the whole country, Lenin added precise and concrete advice concerning the structure of the actual plan of work for the electrification of the country. This plan, he said, should not merely be a technical, but a state plan. "The time to present it is now," he wrote, "in graphic and popular manner, for the masses, in order to win them by a clear and vivid prospect (absolutely *scientific* in its foundation). Let us get to work, and in 10-20 years we shall make all Russia, industrial and agricultural, *electrical*. We shall work up to *so many* (thousands or millions h.p. or k—t?? the devil can tell) machine slaves, and so forth.

"Say we add an *approximate* map of Russia denoting centres and circles? or is this still impossible?

"I repeat, we must win the *mass* of workers and po-

* *Ibid.*

litically-conscious peasants to enthusiasm for a *great* program for 10-20 years.”*

Lenin regarded this state plan as “a task for the proletariat.” He formulated its essence in a few words, as follows: “Approximately: in 10 (5?) years we will build 20-30 (30-50?) power stations, in order to dot the whole country with centres covering radii of 400 (or 200, if we cannot manage more) versts; using peat, water, shale, coal, oil (*about* all of Russia to be covered, approximating *roughly*). Then let us begin at once to buy the necessary machines and models. In 10 (20?) years we shall make Russian ‘electrical’”†

There was not the slightest element of abstraction about Lenin’s plan for reorganizing the national economy. It was concrete and precise, realistic and practical, for it was based on a sober calculation of real factors, of the resources and funds we then disposed of, or could dispose of.

As we can see from the letters cited above, Lenin thought of the realization of this plan in terms of the active participation of the masses in its fulfilment. That is why he wrote of the necessity of winning the mass of workers and politically-conscious peasants to enthusiasm for the achievement of this program in ten to twenty years. That is why, working tirelessly on this plan, he severely criticized all soap-bubble projects of the type being concocted at that period by Kritzman, Larin, or Milyutin. Lenin called such plans tedious scholasticism, “sometimes literary and sometimes bureaucratic”; they signified, he declared, “a haughty bureaucratic indifference to the real work which has already been done and which must be continued,” a “most banal ‘production of theses,’ or a pure fabrication of slogans and projects, instead of a careful and attentive study of our own practical experience.”‡

* *Ibid.*, p. 432.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Lenin, *Collected Works*, 3rd Russ. ed., Vol. XXVI, p. 168.

Of Milyutin's 1921 project for a "whole, integral, genuine plan," Lenin wrote: "A bureaucratic utopia.... Do not chase after it. Immediately, without a day's or an hour's delay, we must *single out*, piece by piece, *the most important*, the minimum of enterprises, and *get them going*."*

Enough has been said to show the tremendous importance Lenin attached to the establishment of a state plan for the reorganization of the national economy on the technical basis of large-scale industry, and the tremendous effort he devoted to advancing this most important task of state, without— to use his own words—a day's or an hour's delay.

* *Ibid.*, Vol. XXIX, p. 444.

7. Stalin—the Great Continuer of Lenin’s Work.

Following Lenin’s plan, the Soviet people, led by the Party of Lenin and Stalin, performed their great feats in the socialist transformation of our entire national economy.

Proceeding from Lenin’s plan for the creation of a modern technical basis—large-scale socialist industry—and from Lenin’s co-operative plan, Stalin elaborated the principles of the socialist industrialization of the country and collectivization of agriculture. The accomplishment of these principles ensured the victory of Socialism, and was our country’s salvation in the Great Patriotic War.

Under the leadership of our Bolshevik Party, the Soviet people manifested unexampled heroism in the struggle to fulfill the Stalin plan for the industrialization of the country and the collectivization of agriculture. Our country changed with remarkable speed, becoming a mighty industrial and collective-farm power.

“We are advancing,” Stalin wrote in 1929, “full steam ahead along the path of industrialization—to Socialism, leaving behind the age-long ‘Russian’ backwardness. We are becoming a country of metal, a country of automobiles, a country of tractors. And when we have put the U.S.S.R. on an automobile, and the muzhik on a tractor, let the esteemed capitalists, who boast so much of their ‘civilization,’ try to overtake us! We shall see which countries may then be ‘classified’ as backward and which as advanced.”*

It was not long before life showed clearly which countries could really be classified as “advanced,” and which as “backward.” By 1938 socialist industry could register enormous progress—the direct result of the socialist system of organization of our national economy. Stalin had every

* Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 300.

ground for declaring, at the Eighteenth Congress of the Party (1939), that “from the standpoint of the technique of production and from the standpoint of the degree of saturation of industry with modern machinery, our industry holds first place in the world.”*

That is one of the most telling indices of a country’s advancement.

Another such index is the rate of growth of industry in our country as compared with the principal capitalist countries. In this respect, too, the U.S.S.R. stands first. By 1938 industry in the U.S.S.R. had grown more than ninefold as compared with the pre-war (1913) level, while industry in such important capitalist countries as the U.S.A., Great Britain, and Germany continued, as Stalin put it, “to mark time round about the pre-war level.”† Great Britain exceeded this level only by 13 per cent. Thus, as regards technique of production and rate of industrial development, the U.S.S.R. has outstripped the principal capitalist countries. But the U.S.S.R. still lags as regards the volume of industrial output per head of the population (in the production of pig iron, steel, rolled steel, machine building, etc.). This is a task still facing us today; but we shall cope with it. We must outstrip the principal capitalist countries economically as well.

In agriculture, too, by 1938, the U.S.S.R. had scored tremendous successes, contributing to our advance into the ranks of the leading countries. As a result, our agriculture, equipped with over half a million tractors and harvester combines, to say nothing of scores of thousands of other agricultural machines, became more productive. Larger quantities of collective-farm and state-farm produce became available for the market, ensuring the solution of the grain problem, *i.e.*, the problem of supply our country with

* *Ibid.*, p. 608.

† *Ibid.*, p. 609.

sufficient marketable grain.

The Stalin five-year plans have done their great work. The Soviet Union has been put on an automobile and the peasant—the collective farmer—on a tractor; we have become a country of metal, a country of automobiles and tractors. New industries have been created: new branches in iron and steel and non-ferrous metallurgy; machine building, aircraft, chemicals, tractor building, etc. Huge columns of figures could be cited in illustration of the tremendous growth of our national economy under the Soviet system, in vivid demonstration of the transformation of the Soviet land into a mighty industrial power equipped with modern machinery.

Cultural development has attained tremendous heights in the Soviet Union, keeping pace with the powerful new industry and advanced and mechanized socialist agriculture. In their great majority, the Soviet people—new people, of the Leninist-Stalinist breed—are bearers of knowledge and progress, confident in their power to achieve, and supremely devoted to their motherland, for which they are prepared to lay down their lives. It is these new people, the people of the socialist epoch, of free labour, who make up our Red Army—the strongest and most efficient army in the world.

Socialist industry has given our army powerful weapons. The ideology of the Party of Lenin and Stalin has trained up our army in the spirit of Bolshevik principles, has armed it with a knowledge of the laws of struggle and victory. It inspires the millions of the Soviet people to great and heroic deeds in labour and upon the field of battle for the freedom, independence, and prosperity of the Soviet state who organizer was the great Lenin.

Under Stalin's leadership, in the twenty years and more that have passed since Lenin died, the Soviet state created by the genius of Lenin has strengthened and matured, has increased its might and consolidated its very foundations,

growing into a force formidable indeed to enemies of the Soviet land and of the Soviet people.

Stalin has carried on the great work Lenin began. He has upheld and further developed Lenin's teaching of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one country taken singly; he has concretized this teaching, and arrived at the conclusion that it is possible to build Communism in our country even if the capitalist encirclement remains. Stalin has evolved and perfected an integral and comprehensive teaching concerning the socialist state in the period of transition from Socialism to Communism, and under Communism during capitalism encirclement. He has demonstrated the organic ties linking socialist construction and its achievements in our country with the Soviet state, with its economic, military and cultural might, with the strength of such of its important instruments as the Red Army, the Navy, the Soviet intelligence department, the judicial system, and the organs of the Soviet state apparatus.

One of Stalin's greatest services in the elaboration of the Marxist theory of the state consists in his demonstration of the importance of the mechanism of state, of the mechanics, the methods and means, of state activity—the importance of the driving belts, levers, and springs that bring this mechanism into action. At the same time, Stalin has given us a clear understanding of the mechanism and mechanics of the diabolic work of the imperialist states, without a knowledge of which it would be impossible to expose the insidious methods of their subversive, interventionist activities.

Forgetfulness of the Marxist-Leninist truth that the state means armed people and “material appendages,” institutions, organizations, organs, a mechanism functioning in accordance with all the rules of state tactics and strategy and governed, so to speak, by the inherent laws of development determined by the class structure of the given society—forgetfulness of this material, technical aspect, and

the substitution for this most important question of a question of an abstract ideological nature, was one of the causes giving rise to distortions of the teaching on the state.

The Trotskyites and Bukharinites attempted to divert our minds, our consciousness from these questions, the consideration and study of which would enrich the experience gained in practical work and facilitate our struggle against our enemies, against all the forces hostile to us. All these gentry made every effort, not only in theory, but in practice, to disorganize the machinery of the Soviet state, to deprive it of the authority essential and inherent to state power. They suggested and prophesied the speedy “withering away” of the state, and preached the necessity of relegating it to the museum of antiquities as unwanted rubbish.

This led to an underestimation of the Soviet state and its role, against which Stalin came out vigorously on several occasions. Stalin spoke on this subject with particular force at the Eighteenth Congress of the Party, at which he expounded his ordered and integral theory of the socialist state.

Proceeding from the Marxist-Leninist methodology, Stalin raised to new heights the teaching on the state evolved and expounded by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, illuminating and solving a number of problems which until that time had been awaiting solution.

One of these was the important problem of the functions of the state authority at various stages of the historical development of the state.

“Two basic functions characterize the activity of the state: at home (the main function), to keep in restraint the exploited majority; abroad (not the main function), to extend the territory of its class, the ruling class, at the expense of the territory of other states, or to defend the territory of its own state from attack by other states. Such was the case in slave society and under feudalism.

Such is the case under capitalism.”*

Thus did Stalin treat of the functions of an exploiting state. An understanding of these functions throws a revealing light upon the entire home and foreign policy of exploiting states. It indicates the sources of their every state undertaking and facilitates our perception of the real motive forces behind the most outstanding events of history.

Of great importance, likewise, is that part of Stalin’s teaching on the state which deals with the historical connection between the functions of the new, proletarian state and the functions of the old states, on the one hand; and with the inevitability of changes in the original functions of the proletarian state, in line with changing historical conditions and the new requirements of this state, on the other.

As the socialist state grows and develops, changes take place in its forms, in its methods of activity, and in its functions.

“As a matter of fact,” Stalin declared, “the forms of our state are changing and will continue to change in line with the development of our country and with the changes in the international situation.”†

Under civil war conditions the forms of the proletarian dictatorship, as also the methods of its work, were not the same as during the peaceful period of socialist construction. The difference lies, Stalin explains, in the fact that in the period of socialist construction “the peaceful, organizational and cultural work of the dictatorship, revolutionary law, etc., are most conspicuous.”‡

Stalin warns us, however, against a mechanical understand of these distinctive features. The forcible aspect of the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot fall away even in

* Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, pp. 635-36.

† *Ibid.*, p. 636.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

the period of comparatively peaceful socialist construction.

“The organs of suppression, the army and other organizations, are as necessary now, in the period of construction, as they were during the period of civil war. Without these organs, constructive work by the dictatorship with any degree of security would be impossible.”*

Stalin distinguishes two main phases in the development of the socialist state: the first, from the October Revolution to the elimination of the exploiting classes; and the second, from the elimination of the capitalist elements in town and countryside to the complete victory of the socialist economic system and the adoption of the new Constitution.

Analysing these two phases through which our country has already passed, Stalin demonstrated the inevitability of changes in the forms, methods and function of the Soviet state, and the laws governing these changes, which are caused by the very process of economic, political and cultural development of the U.S.S.R., on the one hand, and by the international situation, which also changes and affects the development of the various states, on the other.

Stalin’s brilliant analysis of the development of the U.S.S.R. as a state shows that changes in the forms and functions of the Soviet state are inevitable in the future as well.

“But the development,” he says, “cannot stop there. We are going ahead, towards Communism.”†

Consequently, in the future as well, the forms and functions of our state will undergo change, until the state finally withers away.

But the state cannot wither away before the danger of military attack from without has been eliminated.

* *Ibid.*, p. 136.

† *Ibid.*, p. 637.

Stalin's greatest service to science and mankind lies in the fact that he further developed the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state, and demonstrated the necessity for the further consolidation of the socialist state as long as the capitalist encirclement exists.

The new Constitution of the U.S.S.R. adopted by the Extraordinary Eighth Congress of the Soviets was an expression of the further consolidation of the Soviet state, an expression of the incontestable fact that our state is truly a people's state.

The Stalin Constitution, as a legislative act of victorious Socialism constitutes the most powerful and striking expression of the triumph of the principles of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy. It gives legislative embodiment to the full equality of the peoples, to their sovereignty, to the unreserved recognition for all the peoples of the U.S.S.R. of equal rights and of equal duties to their country and their state.

The Stalin Constitution came as the legislative embodiment of the Soviet state system, based on the Soviets of Working People's Deputies, at the highest point then reached in its development.

The elections to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and, later, to the higher and local organs of state power in the Union and Autonomous Soviet republics, held on the basis of the Stalin Constitution and of the new electoral system it introduced, the most democratic electoral system in the world, demonstrated the great moral and political unity of the Soviet people. These were truly elections by the whole people. They showed the world again, with incontrovertible power conviction, that our state is a state of all the people.

Under the banner of the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, under the banner of Stalin's teaching on the socialist state, the U.S.S.R. has entered a new phase, the third phase of its history.

In his theory of the socialist state Stalin presented an exhaustive reply to the question of whether the state would remain in the future, in the period of Communism. He replied to this question in the affirmative: until the danger of military attack from without has been eliminated. This reply put an end to all confusion and differences on the highly important question of the role of the Soviet state and the prospects for its development. It taught us to estimate correctly the place of the Soviet state in history and its importance in the struggle for Socialism, in the further development and growth of socialist relationships.

Stalin's teaching on the socialist state was formulated on the eve of the second world war unleashed by the German fascist aggressors. More than one state was consumed and destroyed in the flames of this war, more than one country plundered and devastated, more than one people crushed and enslaved. But the Soviet state and the entire Soviet people, who bore the main brunt of the enemy's blows, emerged from the struggle stronger in every respect—materially, morally, politically, spiritually. The Soviet people and the Soviet state brought their banner through this struggle intact and victorious, pointing the road to new achievements in the further development of socialist society, in the further progress of human culture and civilization.

The recent war strikingly confirmed the extraordinary role of the Soviet state in the destinies of our country and in the destinies of the world. In the face of the great events that marked our four years of struggle against the detested enemy, events unparalleled in human history, it would be quite superfluous to cite arguments in proof of the role and significance of the Soviet state in this war. Our state stood every grim test of war, surmounting the numerous difficulties in its way, rallying all the forces of the people, and organizing them to meet the new and exceedingly heightened needs of defence of the Soviet land against an enemy not

only equipped with up-to-date technique, but assisted by the vast human and material resources of the lands already conquered—almost the whole of Europe.

In the decisive days of the second world war the Soviet state was not found wanting. With ever new force, it demonstrated the invincibility of the Soviet system, its vitality, its tremendous creative capacities. In this war the Soviet system, created by the October Socialist Revolution and consolidated with every year and every five-year period of its existence, evinced a staunchness, an unshakeable firmness, possible only in view of the deep and powerful root this system has taken in the Soviet land. The Soviet state showed itself, in these years, as the embodiment of the entire Soviet people, as a gigantic condenser, so to speak, rallying all the vital forces of the people, all their talents and abilities; as the embodiment of the people's genius, advancing confidently along its broad historical road. When the war came to an end, and our people were relieved of the trials and privations of the four years of bitter struggle against the German fascist hordes—whose earliest and most decisive defeats, be it remembered, were suffered on the plains of Russia, and at the walls of Moscow, Stalin-grad, Leningrad, Sevastopol and many another glorious Soviet city—the strength of the Soviet state, which had borne the main brunt of the trials of this war, was manifest in all its grandeur.

During the Patriotic War the Soviet state brought into action all its creative power, the power of the Soviet people, and took its stand, an indestructible barrier, in the path of the fascist German bandit hordes.

The victorious Soviet armies hurled the insolent foe from our territory. They broke the resistance of Germany's allies—Rumania, Finland, Hungary, Bulgaria—and compelled their surrender. In a short period of time the Soviet troops liberated Poland, Hungary, a large part of Czechoslovakia, and a considerable part of Austria, including the

capital, Vienna. In four months of 1945 the Red Army conquered the German territories of East Prussia, Pomerania, Silesia, and the larger part of Brandenburg, and unfurled the banner of victory over Berlin, the German capital and the centre of German imperialism.

Fascist Germany was forced to its knees and, admitting itself conquered, unconditionally capitulated to our Red Army and the armies of our allies.

A decisive victory was also won in the war against Japanese imperialism. The Japanese aggressors capitulated to the combined forces of the U.S.S.R., the United States, and England.

The Anglo-Soviet-American coalition accomplished its great work. Uniting the efforts of the peace-loving peoples in the struggle against Hitlerite Germany, the Anglo-Soviet-American fighting alliance won a historic victory.

The modern Minotaur, German and Japanese robber imperialism, which had devoured millions of human lives, was beheaded and reduced to dust.

The war in Europe and in the Far East terminated in a great victory for the peace-loving peoples. A period of peaceful development, of constructive labour, set in. Looking back at the difficult road traversed in the four years of war, remembering the past years of bloody battles, the suffering and havoc brought to the world by the insane fury of the German fascist brigands, one realizes the true majesty of the heroic victory won by our people together with the other freedom-loving peoples. And in this victory the Soviet state, the great federation of Soviet Socialist Republics, which bore the main brunt of the war, the main burden of the struggle against the bloodthirsty fascist monster, rendered immortal service.

Whence does the Soviet state derive its strength? From life-giving Soviet patriotism, which is based on the harmonious conjunction of the national traditions of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and the vital interests of all the working

people of the Soviet Union. From the indestructible Stalinist friendship of the peoples, based on the Soviet ideology of friendship among peoples, on the consistent fulfillment of the Leninist-Stalinist program on the national question. From the leading role of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, which organized and inspired the struggle of the whole people against the German fascist invaders. From the advantages of the Soviet socialist system. As Stalin has said, “the Soviet system is not only the best system for organizing the economic and cultural development of a country in the period of peaceful construction, but also the best system for mobilizing all the forces of the people to resist and enemy in wartime.”*

The socialist system, realizing in practice the immortal ideas of Leninism, has given our people and the armed forces of the Soviet Union great and unconquerable strength.

Surmounting the tremendous difficulties of war, it took the Soviet state but a very short time to organize a smoothly functioning and rapidly growing war economy. During the Patriotic War our industry steadily increased production of armaments, munitions and all types of war materiel.

The war did not halt the process of extended socialist reproduction in our country; in many branches of our economy, indeed, the process of reproduction assumed still broader dimensions during the war. The restoration of the national economy in the areas liberated from German occupation, begun while the war was still in progress, is advancing with remarkable rapidity.

Having victoriously terminated the war, the peoples of the Soviet Union, confident in their strength, entered upon the fulfilment of their fourth Stalin five-year plan—the five-year plan for the restoration and further development

* Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1946, p. 123.

of the national economy of our country.

The results of the first two years of effort towards the post-war development of the national economy serve as eloquent testimony that the pledges which millions of Soviet people in field and factory are sending in to Stalin will be splendidly fulfilled. The new wave of labour enthusiasm, overriding the difficulties of the post-war period at a pace unparalleled in history, comes as a further expression of the mighty and unconquerable power of our Soviet socialist system, which rests on the devoted support of the millions of the people, on the great patriotism and heroism of the whole Soviet people.

Born of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, born of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Soviet state lives, triumphs, and advances under the glorious leadership of the great Stalin, advances confidently, victoriously, to new and still more splendid accomplishments.