

Chapter 5

Socialism in One Country

Trotsky's Position

Trotsky, stubbornly adhering to his 'theory of permanent revolution' was of the view that socialism could not be built in backward Russia without the help of a successful proletarian revolution in the advanced capitalist countries.

"The antagonisms", said Trotsky in his Preface to his book on the 1905 revolution, "which appear under a workers' government in a backward land where the vast majority of the population is made up of peasants can only be solved in the international arena of the proletarian world revolution.

"In the absence of direct state support on the part of the European proletariat, the Russian working class will not be able to keep itself in power and transform its temporary rule into a stable socialist dictatorship. No doubt as to the truth of this is possible." (Trotsky, *Our Revolution*, 1906).

"The assertion repeated several times in the Programme of Peace that the proletarian revolution cannot be carried through to a victorious end within the national framework will perhaps appear to many readers to have been refuted by the experience of our Soviet Republic for almost five years. Any such conclusion would be utterly without foundation ... a steady rise in socialist economy in Russia will not be possible until after the victory of the proletariat in the leading countries of Europe" (Trotsky, *Postscript to Programme of Peace*, 1922).

This is the stand taken by Trotsky consistently over a long period of time and as a matter of fact he never departed from this stand even when he gave the appearance of having done so. With this theoretical standpoint, which under-estimated the ability of the broad masses of Russian people to build socialism and over-estimated the dark forces of reaction, Trotsky could not but oppose the policy of building socialism in the USSR. Thus the position of Trotsky was nothing but a new variant of Menshevism. The Russian Mensheviks said: 'Russia is a backward country, and therefore the sole

possibility is a bourgeois revolution which will give an impetus to the development of capitalism in Russia'. Trotsky says 'No, a proletarian revolution is possible, but unless this is speedily followed by a proletarian revolution in Europe, it is doomed to collapse'. Thus it can be seen that there is no basic disagreement between the Menshevik and the Trotskyite views. Both of them ardently believed that it was impossible for Russia to build socialism on her own owing to her backwardness.

Failure of the European revolution and the alternatives open to the Soviet working class.

Now, it is perfectly true that the Bolsheviks thought and expected that the revolution in Russia would be followed by revolution in many European countries. Their expectation was based on the objective revolutionary situation then prevailing in Europe. But the hopes and expectations of the Bolsheviks failed to be realised, thanks, *inter alia*, to the treachery and opportunism of official social-democracy. By 1922 the European bourgeoisie had achieved conditions of relative stability and it was clear that the chances of successful proletarian revolution in Europe had faded for a good many years to come. So, in this situation - *viz.*, the Russian proletariat being in state power but no proletarian revolution in Europe - what was the Russian proletariat to do? What were the alternatives open to it?

There were two avenues open to the Russian proletariat:-

(1) It could either take the advice of Trotsky and declare that "*in the absence of direct state support on the part of the European proletariat*" the Russian proletariat could not stay in power, let alone build socialism, and should make its peace with the international and national bourgeoisie and hand over state power to the very same class that had been deprived of it in October 1917, and thus demonstrate that the working class was incapable of ruling and building socialism; or

(2) Alternatively it could resolve, despite immense difficulties, to build socialism in the USSR and thus demonstrate to the proletarians and broad masses not only of the USSR but of the whole world "*the conviction that the working class can get along without the bourgeoisie*".

This is how Comrade Stalin brilliantly outlined the significance of building socialism in the USSR:

"What do the proletarians of the West need in order to win their way to vic-

tory? Above all, they need faith in their own powers; a conviction that the working class can get along without the bourgeoisie; the conviction that the working class is competent, not only to destroy the old, but likewise to build up the new, to build up socialism. The main endeavour of the social-democrats, the reformists, is to instil scepticism into the workers' minds, to make the workers doubt their own powers, doubt their capacity for winning by force a victory over the bourgeoisie. The significance of all our work, of all our constructive work, is that it serves as a demonstration to the working class in the capitalist countries that they too will be able to get along without the bourgeoisie, and will be able unaided to build a new society once the workers in capitalist countries have acquired faith in their own powers, you may be certain that this is the beginning of the end of capitalism, and a sure sign that the victory of the proletarian revolution is at hand." (Speech at the 14th Party Congress).

This was the revolutionary alternative policy put forward by Stalin and the Bolshevik Party. Consequently the 14th Congress of the CPSU(B) rejected the capitulatory plans of Trotsky and his henchmen and recorded in its now famous resolution:-

"In the sphere of economic development, the Congress holds that in our land, the land of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there is 'every requisite for the building of a complete socialist society' (Lenin). The Congress considers that the main task of our party is to fight for the victory of socialist construction in the USSR."

Summing up the results of the 14th Party Congress, and outlining its historical significance, Comrade Stalin wrote:

"The historical significance of the 14th Congress of the CPSU(B) lies in the fact that it was able to expose the very roots of the mistakes of the New Opposition [i.e., Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky], that it spurned their scepticism and snivelling, that it clearly and distinctly indicated the path of the further struggle for socialism, opened before the party the prospect of victory and thus armed the proletariat with an invincible faith in the victory of socialist construction" (Problems of Leninism).

The Russian working class and the broad masses of Russian people rallied in support of this revolutionary alternative and decisively rejected Trotsky's petty-bourgeois despondence and despair disguised in 'revolutionary' phrasemongering. They did this because the policy that was being projected by the Bolshevik Party and Stalin was revolutionary and it made sense; whereas the one projected by Trotsky was a counter-revolutionary

jumble that made no sense at all.

Was Stalin against world revolution?

The most ignorant of the Trotskyites often assert that Stalin was a narrow nationalist, whereas Trotsky was an internationalist because Stalin wanted socialism in the USSR whereas Trotsky wanted socialism everywhere, a world revolution. If it were true that Stalin wanted a revolution in the USSR only, and nowhere else, then this Trotskyite accusation would have substance in it. The fact of the matter is that this accusation is a monstrous lie and only one of the many examples which demonstrate the depths to which Trotskyism has sunk in order to belittle one of the great leaders of the Bolshevik Party, Comrade Stalin. Anyone who has any respect for historical accuracy and cares to look at the documents concerning the controversy under discussion would find that there were no differences of opinion at all within the Party regarding the desirability and necessity of following a proletarian internationalist policy - the policy of rendering fraternal help to the proletarians of other countries engaged in decisive struggles. The Bolshevik party under the leadership of Stalin fully realised the importance of following, and did follow, a proletarian internationalist policy because it fully recognised that the true consolidation of socialism in the USSR could only take place after the victory of the proletariat in other countries. All revolutions and revolutionary struggles mutually support each other. Let us quote for the benefit of ignorant Trotskyites the well-known pronouncement on this subject by Comrade Stalin (the same Stalin whose name only has to be mentioned for Trotskyites and other reactionaries to foam at the mouth - though foaming at the mouth and showing signs of delirium are no answer to harsh facts):

"After consolidating its power and leading the peasantry after it, the proletariat of the victorious country can and must build socialist society. But does that mean that in this way the proletariat will secure a complete and final victory for socialism, i.e., does it mean that with the forces of a single country it can finally consolidate socialism and fully guarantee that country against intervention, which means against restoration? No, it does not. For this victory of the revolution in at least several countries is needed. Therefore, the development and support of revolution in other countries is an essential task of the victorious revolution. Therefore the revolution which has been victorious in one country must regard itself not as a self-sufficient entity, but as an aid, as a

means for hastening the victory of the proletariat in other countries." (Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, emphasis added).¹

So it is clear that there were no differences in principle in the CPSU(B) as to the need to follow an internationalist policy. There were, however, differences as to the content of this internationalist policy. Basing himself on his notorious theory of 'permanent revolution', according to which socialism could not be built in Russia without aid from a successful proletarian revolution in Europe, Trotsky did from time to time advocate adventurist policies in order to export socialist revolution into Europe. These policies of adventurism prompted by a lack of faith in the ability of the Russian working class and peasantry to build socialism unaided from abroad, were naturally and rightly rejected by the Party.

Therefore, there was no controversy as to whether the proletariat of the USSR should give fraternal assistance to the revolutionary struggles of the proletarians abroad. The controversy was: could the USSR build socialism without the assistance of a victorious proletariat of Europe. Stalin and the overwhelming majority of the Bolshevik party answered this world-historic question in the affirmative.² History has fully vindicated Comrade Stalin and the Bolshevik party, but of this we shall have more to say later on.

Did Stalin raise the question of 'socialism in one country' for the first time?

Another myth spread by the Trotskyites is that Stalin was in 1924 the first person to raise the question of 'socialism in one country' and that before this no one had ever seriously considered the possibility of building 'socialism in a single country'. That this is a lie can be seen from the fact that as early as 1915 Lenin had this to say:

"Uneven economic development³ is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even in a single capitalist country. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and organised its own socialist production, would confront the rest of the capitalist world, attract to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raise revolts among them, and in the event of necessity come out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states" (Lenin, *The United States of Europe Slogan*).

And again in 1916 Lenin formulated the same conclusion in his article *Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution*:

"The development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly in the various countries. It cannot be otherwise under the commodity production system. From this it follows irrefutably that socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously in all countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois for some time. This must not only create friction, but a direct striving on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the victorious proletariat of the socialist state. In such cases a war on our part would be a legitimate and just war. It would be a war for socialism, for the liberation of other nations from the bourgeoisie." (Lenin, *Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution*).

Lenin arrived at this conclusion from his study of imperialism, which he described as the 'monopoly stage of capitalism'. Lenin then went on to give a definition of imperialism which includes the following five basic features:

"(1) The concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life; (2) the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this 'finance capital,' of a financial oligarchy; (3) the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance; (4) the formation of international monopolist capitalist combines which share the world among themselves, and (5) the territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed."

Imperialism, said Lenin, intensifies all contradictions, both internal and external, to an acute degree. The growth of monopoly made the yoke of capitalist trusts and syndicates more and more burdensome and unbearable. This intensified the contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the working class in imperialist countries, which brings the masses to proletarian revolution as their only salvation. The financial enslavement and exploitation and colonial oppression of the peoples inhabiting the vast majority of the countries of the world by a handful of 'advanced' countries intensifies the contradiction between imperialism and the huge majority consisting of colonial and dependent countries which are compelled to wage a struggle for liberation from the yoke of imperialism. The uneven development of capitalism leads to a frenzied struggle for the re-division of the world between those countries which have already seized vast territories and those who are new entrants into the field demanding their 'fair share' of the plunder. German imperialism, for example, owing to the uneven development of capitalism, was more or less left out of the colonial plunder, whereas the

Anglo-French capitalists dominated the whole world. German capitalism, however, having caught up with the Anglo-French capitalists, now demanded its 'fair share'; it demanded a redivision based on the present strength of the parties. It wanted to have set aside the division of the world based on the capitalist development and hence on the strength of the parties at the time of the existing division. The Anglo-French capitalists, of course, turned down this demand as 'grossly unfair'. So German imperialism went to war against Anglo-French imperialism. Thus the uneven development of capitalism leads to the intensification of inter-imperialist contradiction. Hence as long as imperialism exists, war is unavoidable, and a coalition between the proletarian revolution and the national liberation movement "*in a united world front of revolution against the world front of imperialism is inevitable*" (Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*).

Lenin sums up all these conclusions into one general conclusion that "*imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution*".

Lenin therefore came to the following conclusions:

(1) Because the growth of imperialism had created a world economy and the national economies of individual countries were like a link in this chain of world economy, the question of proletarian revolution could no longer be considered in the old fashion, i.e., from the point of view of the capitalist development of a given country, nor from the standpoint of the working class constituting a 'majority' of the population, etc. The imperialist system as a whole was ripe for revolution and the chain of the imperialist world front would break at its weakest link, thus providing an outlet for proletarian revolution. The weakest link might be an advanced capitalist country or a country where capitalist advancement had not proceeded very far.

(2) The uneven growth of capitalism within the conditions of imperialism and the intensification within imperialism of catastrophic contradictions, resulting in imperialist wars and the growth of revolutionary movements in all countries, lead not only to the possibility, but also to the necessity, of the victory of the proletariat in individual countries. Socialism can be victorious in individual countries because the victorious proletariat can take advantage of the intensification of all contradictions - inter-imperialist contradictions, the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the working class in imperialist countries as well as between imperialism and oppressed nations - to ward off intervention by imperialism and build so-

cialism.

Just before his death Lenin returned to the question of building socialism in the USSR:

"As a matter of fact, the power of the Soviet state over all large-scale means of production, the power of the state in the hands of the proletariat, the alliance of this proletariat with the many millions of small and very small peasants, the assured leadership of the peasantry by the proletariat, etc., ... , is not this all that is necessary in order from the co-operatives - from the co-operatives alone, which we formerly treated as huckstering, and which, from a certain aspect, we have the right to treat as such now, under the New Economic Policy - is not this all that is necessary in order to build complete socialist society? This is not yet the building of socialist society but it is all that is necessary and sufficient for this building." (Lenin, On Co-operation,).

We hope that it is by now clear that the question concerning the possibility of successfully building socialism in a single country was not first raised by Stalin. It was raised by Lenin as early as 1915 and once again as late as just before his death. So the Trotskyite attacks on Stalin on the question of building socialism in a single country are in fact attacks on Lenin and Leninism.⁴ This must be understood by every revolutionary worker.

Proceeding from the theory of 'permanent revolution' Trotskyism cannot but attack Leninism. Leninism says that the proletariat in a single country can build socialism, whereas Trotskyism says that it cannot. Leninism holds that the peasantry is a reliable and firm ally of the proletariat, while Trotskyism says it is not. Leninism says that under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leadership of the working class it is possible to mobilise the poor and middle peasantry in the task of building socialism, whereas according to Trotskyism this is an impossibility. What we have here are not just differences of opinion of a casual nature, or differences in matters of detail. What we have here are two fundamentally different and mutually irreconcilable trends: (i) revolutionary Leninism, and (ii) counter-revolutionary Trotskyism.

Trotskyism is incapable of understanding the Leninist theory of proletarian revolution and of building socialism, not only because its political outlook is hemmed in by the acceptance of the wretched theory of 'permanent revolution', but also because it has never accepted (accepted in PRACTICE as opposed to acceptance in words) Lenin's thesis on imperialism. These twin evils - the acceptance of the theory of 'permanent revolution' and the

non-acceptance of Lenin's thesis on imperialism - constitute the theoretical basis of Trotskyism and explain in large measure why Trotskyism degenerated to the point of becoming an ally of fascism, as will be explained later on.

Was socialism built in the USSR? Trotsky says it was.

The answer we give is that socialism was built in the Soviet Union and in support of this affirmative answer of ours we quote an authority which can in no way be described as biased either in favour of Stalin and the Bolshevik Party or indeed in favour of building socialism in the USSR. This authority is none other than that master phrase-monger, Trotsky himself:

"Socialism has demonstrated its right to victory," says Trotsky, "not in the pages of Das Kapital, but in an industrial arena comprising one-sixth of the earth's surface, not in the language of dialectics, but in the language of steel, cement and electricity. Even if the Soviet Union, as a result of difficulties, external blows, and the mistakes of its leadership, were to collapse - which we firmly hope will not happen [the real nature of Trotsky's hopes, however, were disclosed by the Moscow Trials] there would remain as an earnest of the future this indestructible fact that thanks solely to a proletarian revolution a backward country has achieved in less than ten years successes unexampled in history." (Trotsky, The Revolution Betrayed).

And again: *"The vast scope of industrialisation in the Soviet Union, as against the background of stagnation and decline in almost the whole capitalist world appears unanswerably in the following gross indices ...*

"Gigantic achievements in industry, enormously promising beginnings in agriculture, an extraordinary growth of old industrial cities and a building of new ones, a rapid increase in the number of workers, a rise in cultural level and cultural demands - such are the indubitable results of the October Revolution ... " (Trotsky, The Revolution Betrayed).

One could not have asked for a better refutation of Trotskyism than the one advanced by Trotsky himself in the above-quoted remarks. We are highly grateful and indebted to Trotsky for these candid admissions. Trotsky was right when he admitted that *"socialism has demonstrated its right to victory, not in the pages of Das Kapital, but in an industrial arena comprising one-sixth of the earth's surface"*; that there had been *"gigantic achievement"* in industry; that *"enormously promising"* had been the results in the sphere of agriculture; that there had been a rise in the *"cultural level and demands"* of

the Soviet people. He was absolutely correct. Such indeed were the *"indubitable results"* of the fight for the victory of socialist construction in the USSR - the fight launched by the Party in consequence of the decision of the 14th Congress of the Party - a decision which had met with the most vicious opposition from Trotsky and the New Opposition, i.e., Zinoviev and Co.

The role of correct policy and leadership

Under the banner of Marxism-Leninism and the correct leadership of the Bolshevik Party led by the great Leninist and the most resolute defender of Leninism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, Comrade Stalin, the Soviet people, surmounting all difficulties, smashing the enemies of socialism - both internal and external - marched from victory to victory. They literally achieved miracles and did so **not only because of the conditions of social ownership of the means of production** created by the October Revolution (to which conditions alone Trotsky attributes all the successes and achievements of the fight for the building of socialism in the USSR), **but also because of the revolutionary policies of the Bolshevik Party and the quality of its leadership.** The role of the Party and the quality of leadership are very important factors without which nothing can be achieved.

"Conditions of socialised property" cannot of themselves build socialism

"Conditions of socialised property" cannot of themselves build socialism. Can anyone who has not yet parted company with his senses or - what is the same thing - accepted the theory of 'permanent revolution' seriously suggest that if during the period of building socialism the leadership of the USSR had been vested in people like Trotsky the Soviet people would have achieved exactly the same results in socialist construction as they actually did? Would not such a suggestion amount to the absurd assertion that people who say that *"in the absence of direct state support on the part of the European proletariat, the Russian proletariat will not be able to keep itself in power and transform its temporary rule into a stable socialist dictatorship"* are just as fitted (or better fitted, as the Trotskyite ignoramuses usually assert) to lead the struggle for the building of socialism as those who believe - and believe on the basis of objective reality - that it is not only possible to build socialism but also that it is a necessity and that it is the only revolutionary

way forward for the proletariat? Yes, in our view such a suggestion would indeed be the height of absurdity and stupidity.

As a matter of historical truth *"socialised property"* did not triumph, and could not have triumphed, automatically over capitalist elements. It could, and did, triumph by reason of the correct and planned leadership of the Party having a definite policy. But before the policy of the Party could succeed and be put into effect, erroneous and counter-revolutionary policies had to be defeated, and were defeated. But despite what we have said here, the Trotskyites continue to repeat the formula learnt by rote that *"conditions of socialised property created by the revolution"*, and not the quality of the leadership, were responsible for the building of socialism. Yet they blame the leadership for every mistake, real and imaginary, minor and major. Well, you cannot have it both ways, worthy Trotskyists!! You cannot keep saying that socialism cannot be built in a single country and yet assert that *"conditions of socialised property created by the revolution"* can on their own, automatically, build socialism! You cannot assert that the leadership has no role to play in the building of socialism, and yet blame the *"Stalin group"* for all the misfortunes, real and imaginary! There is a glaring contradiction in what you say! Have you really become incapable of perceiving this discrepancy? Has your sense of perception and your political outlook really become distorted to such a degree by your blind acceptance of the wretched theory of 'permanent revolution'?

Trotsky's theory of 'permanent revolution' has been proved by history to be quite useless and erroneous. Trotsky could, in the event, have taken up the only correct stand for anyone claiming to be a Marxist, i.e., renounce the theory that had proved to be wrong in practice and frankly admit that it was wrong. Trotsky did not do that. The intellectualist arrogance of the petty-bourgeois individual (and in the case of Trotsky this arrogance was to be found in its highest stage of development) made it impossible for Trotsky to stomach what in the eyes of the petty-bourgeois intellectual is nothing but a downright humiliation. So Trotsky took the position that his theory was right and that history was wrong. This was a typical idealist position amounting to saying: if reality does not conform to my conception of it then there is something wrong with reality for reality ought to fit into my conception of it. This idealist position, worthy of Bishop Berkley himself, took Trotsky deeper and deeper down the road of degeneration. What could have been a casual mistake became a monstrosity when justified, persisted in and elevated to the level of a system - a theory. Wrong theory led to

wrong practice, and, failing rectification in the light of practice, each subsequent mistake became a bigger one. Quantity transformed itself into quality. Mistakes transformed themselves into crimes. This process alone explains why Trotsky degenerated to the point of becoming an ally and an agent of fascism, determined at all costs to overthrow the Soviet state. Those people who are following Trotskyism are slipping down the same road of degeneration as Trotsky himself did. We appeal to those ordinary workers who have been won over by the fashionable and seductive phrasemongering of the Trotskyites to consider seriously what we have said, discard Trotskyism, accept Marxism-Leninism and make a worthy contribution to the fight for the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the building of socialism.

Achievements in socialist industrialisation

At the beginning of 1926 Soviet industry, though restored more or less to pre-war level as a result of the measures of restoration taken by the Soviet government under the New Economic Policy, suffered from three defects: (i) most factories were old and equipped with worn out and antiquated machinery; (ii) there were no machine-building plants; and (iii) there was no heavy industry worth speaking about. All this was to be rectified by the adoption of the policy of socialist industrialisation. In addition a new munitions industry had to be created for the defence of the first state of the working class. It was also necessary to build factories for the production of agricultural machinery, and to provide agriculture with this machinery in order to enable millions of tiny individual farms to pass to large-scale collective farming, and thus ensure the victory of socialism in the countryside. In short, many industries which never existed in Russia had to be created.

It must be said to the great credit and glory of the Soviet masses, the Bolshevik Party and its tried and tested leader, Comrade Stalin, that overcoming all difficulties, technical and financial, and defeating the schemes of imperialist intervention as well as smashing the plans and plots of internal reactionaries - both within the Party and outside of it - and displaying exemplary labour heroism - they went on successfully to build socialism in the Soviet Union. All this was possible owing to the enthusiasm of the masses, their involvement in the task of building socialism, and, most important, their changing attitude to labour. From the involuntary and penal servitude that it had been under capitalism, labour was becoming, as Stalin put it, "a

matter of honour, a matter of glory, a matter of valour and heroism".

Already by the end of 1930 industrial construction on a gigantic scale was in progress all over the country:

"The Dnieper hydroelectric scheme was in full swing. Construction work on the Kramatorsk and Gorlovskaya Iron and Steel Works and the reconstruction of the Lugansk Locomotive works had begun in the Donetz Basin. New collieries and blast furnaces came into being. The Urals Machine Building Works and the Berezniki and Solikamsk Chemical Works were under construction in the Urals. Work was begun on the construction of the Iron and Steel Mills of Magnitogorsk. The erection of big automobile plants in Moscow and Gorky was well under way, as was the construction of giant tractor plants, harvester combine plants, and a mammoth agricultural machinery plant in Rostov-on-Don. The Kuznetsk Collieries, the Soviet Union's second coal base, were being extended. An immense Tractor Works sprang up in the Steppe near Stalingrad in the space of eleven months. In the erection of the Dnieper Hydroelectric Station and the Stalingrad Tractor Works, the workers beat world records in productivity of labour.

"History had never known industrial construction on such a gigantic scale, such enthusiasm for new development, such labour heroism on the part of the working-class millions.

"It was a veritable upsurge of labour enthusiasm, produced and stimulated by socialist emulation" (History of the CPSU(B)).

Let us now turn from industry to agriculture.

By 1938, compared with the year 1913, Soviet industry had grown 9-fold. Here is a table showing the growth of Soviet industry, expressed in percentages of the pre-first world war level. This table also reveals the rate of growth of industry by comparison with the growth of industry in the principal capitalist countries during the same period. It is reproduced from Stalin's *Report to the 18th Congress of the CPSU*, March 1939, as reproduced in *Problems of Leninism*, (p 762).

GROWTH OF INDUSTRY IN THE USSR AND THE PRINCIPAL CAPITALIST COUNTRIES (IN 1913-38)

	1919	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938
U.S.S.R.	100.0	380.5	457.0	562.6	732.7	816.4	908.8
U.S.A.	100.0	108.7	112.9	128.6	149.8	156.9	120.0
Britain	100.0	87.0	97.1	104.0	114.2	121.9	113.3
Germany	100.0	75.4	90.4	105.9	118.1	129.3	131.6
France	100.0	107.0	99.0	94.0	98.0	101.0	93.2

Stalin's claims in this regard are fully confirmed by bourgeois experts. In his book *Stalin's Industrial Revolution*, Hiroaki Kuromiya, a Professor at Indiana University, makes, *inter alia*, the following observations:

"The breakthrough wrought by the revolution of 1928-31 laid the foundations of the remarkable industrial expansion in the 1930s that would sustain the country in the Second World War. By the end of 1932, when the Five-Year Plan was declared to have been completed in four years, the gross industrial output, according to the official report, had more than doubled since 1928. This official report is usually regarded in the West as vastly exaggerated, but as the capital projects of the First Five-Year Plan were brought into operation one after another in the mid-30s, industrial production expanded enormously. During 1934-36, ... the official index showed a rise of 88% for total gross industrial production, with the output of industries 'A' [capital goods industries] rising by 107 per cent and that of industries 'B' [consumer goods industries] by 66 per cent. In the decade from 1927-28 to 1937, according to Soviet data, gross industrial production leapt from 18,300 million roubles to 95,500 million; pig iron output rose from 3.3 million tons to 14.5; coal from 35.4 million metric tons to 128; electric power from 5.1 billion kw hours to 36.2; machine tools from 2,098 units to 36,120. Even discounting the exaggeration, it may be safely said that the achievements were dazzling." (Kuromiya p. 287).

According to *40 Years of Soviet Power*, a statistical digest published in 1958 in Moscow, during the 11 years from 1930-1940 the USSR registered an average annual growth of 165% in industrial production.

As to the growth of fixed capital, which is a correct reflection of the remarkable industrial feats performed by the Soviet people, taking 100 as the index for the year 1913, we find this figure had reached 136 in 1928 - the year of the launch of the First Five-Year Plan.

Twelve years later, in 1940, on the eve of the Second World War, the index had climbed to 1,085 - an unprecedented 8-fold increase. The figures for the increase in agricultural fixed capital for the same period are 100 (in 1931), 141 (1928), and 333 (in 1940), (see pages 26 and 30).

What capitalist country, backward or advanced, can boast such gigantic successes in the field of industrialisation!

Notwithstanding the sacrifices involved, the Soviet people cheerfully accepted the challenge with purposeful determination to build a bright social-

ist future for themselves and their children, taking great pride in the enterprise, displaying genuine labour heroism in the process. Hiroaki Kuromiya correctly observes:

"Paradoxical as it may appear, the forced accumulation was a source not only of privation and unrest, but also of Soviet heroism ... Soviet youth in the 1930s found heroism in working in factories and on construction sites like Magnitogorsk and the Kuznetsk..." (p. 305-6).

"... [T]he rapid industrialization drive of the Five-Year Plan symbolized the grandiose and dramatic goal of building a new society. Promoted against the background of the Depression and mass unemployment in the West, the Soviet industrialization drive did evoke heroic, romantic, and enthusiastic 'superhuman' efforts. 'The word enthusiasm, like many others, has been devalued by inflation', Ilya Ehrenburg has written, 'yet there is no other word to fit the days of the First Five-Year Plan; it was enthusiasm pure and simple that inspired the young people to daily and unspectacular feats.' According to another contemporary, those days were 'a really romantic, intoxicating time ... People were creating with their own hands what had appeared a mere dream before and were convinced in practice that these dreamlike plans were an entirely realistic thing." (p.316).

Expressing his conviction of the ability of Soviet people to build socialism, even if the Soviet Union was not joined by victorious proletarian revolutions in Europe or America, Lenin had declared: *"Communist is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country."* Approaching the problem from this perspective, Lenin had advanced in 1920 a plan for the electrification of Russia, which envisaged the construction of 30 power stations, with a capacity of 1.75 million kw, during the course of 15 years. Actually, by the year 1935, the USSR was producing 4.07 million kw of electricity, thus realising Lenin's daring dream by an overfulfilment of 233% - an incredible tribute to the self-sacrificing heroism of the Soviet people and the determination and wisdom of the Leninist leadership of the CPSU headed by Stalin (See *40 Years of Soviet Power*).

Such gigantic achievements could only be made possible through unprecedented internal accumulation and, to a certain extent, at the expense of immediate consumption. 1928 saw the accumulation funds reach 3.6 billion roubles, representing 14% of national income. These rose to 17.7 billion roubles (44% of national income!) in 1932.

All this took place not because of the insensitivity of the Soviet regime to

the terrible hardship suffered by the working class; it took place to ensure the survival of the USSR and of socialism in the USSR. No doubt, the Soviet Union could have easily improved the standard of living of the Soviet people to a far higher degree than was actually the case by putting great emphasis on the development of light industry, by producing more consumer goods, building more houses, and so on. Would that have ensured its survival in the then impending war? No one should be allowed to forget that the Nazi beasts ransacked, set fire to, and destroyed 1,710 towns and more than 70,000 villages and hamlets, rendering 25 million Soviet citizens homeless and bereft of shelter (see *40 Years of Soviet Power*). Only the furious industrialisation of the years between 1928 and 1940, with its emphasis on heavy, metallurgical and machine building industry, and the development of a modern armaments industry, could have (and did) save the USSR in the face of this Nazi onslaught. Only such industrialisation, along with collectivisation, could have propelled the Soviet people into the modern world of machinery, by tearing millions of illiterate peasants away from their medieval integuments.

But let no one conclude from this that the living conditions of the working class and peasantry remained as miserable as under the Czarist regime. Far from it. The industrialisation and collectivisation laid the basis for the prosperity of the Soviet working class and peasantry. By 1934, while there was deep depression and mass unemployment in the capitalist world, the USSR had abolished unemployment.

Already by 1934, the face of the town and the countryside alike had changed beyond recognition as a result of the successes of industrialisation and collectivisation. In his report to the 17th Party Congress, held in January 1934, these are the graphical terms in which Stalin describes the changes wrought in the wake of industrialisation and collectivisation:

"It goes without saying that this historic victory over the exploiters could not but lead to a radical improvement in the material standard of the working people and in their conditions of life generally.

"The elimination of the parasitic classes has led to the disappearance of the exploitation of man by man. The labour of the worker and the peasant is freed from exploitation. The incomes which the exploiters used to squeeze out of the labour of the people now remain in the hands of the working people and are used partly for the expansion of production and the enlistment of new detachments of working people in production, and partly for the purpose of directly

increasing the incomes of the workers and peasants.

"Unemployment, that scourge of the working class, has disappeared. In the bourgeois countries millions of unemployed suffer want and privation owing to lack of work; but in our country there are no longer any workers who have no work and no earnings.

"With the disappearance of kulak bondage, poverty in the countryside has disappeared. Every peasant, whether a collective farmer or an individual farmer, now has the opportunity of enjoying a human existence, if only he wants to work conscientiously and not to be a loafer, a tramp, or a despoiler of collective-farm property.

"The abolition of exploitation, the abolition of unemployment in the towns, and the abolition of poverty in the countryside are such historic achievements in the material condition of the working people as are beyond even the dreams of the workers and peasants in bourgeois countries, even in the most 'democratic' ones.

"The very appearance of our large towns and industrial centres has changed. An inevitable feature of the big towns in bourgeois countries are the slums, the so-called working-class districts on the outskirts of the towns - a heap of dark, damp, and dilapidated dwellings, mostly of the basement type, where usually the poor live in filth and curse their fate. The revolution in the USSR has swept the slums out of our towns. They have been replaced by blocks of bright and well-built workers' houses; in many cases the working-class districts of our towns present a better appearance than the central districts.

"The appearance of our rural districts has changed even more. The old type of village, with the church in the most prominent place, with the best houses - those of the police officer, the priest, and the kulaks - in the foreground, and the dilapidated huts of the peasants in the background, is beginning to disappear. Its place is being taken by the new type of village, with its public farm buildings, with its clubs, radio, cinemas, schools, libraries, and creches; with its tractors, harvester combines, threshing machines, and automobiles. The former important personages of the village, the kulak-exploiter, the blood-sucking usurer, the profiteering merchant, the 'little father' police officer, have disappeared. Now, the prominent personages of the village are the leading workers in the collective farms and state farms, in the schools and clubs; the senior tractor and combine drivers, the team leaders in field work and livestock raising, and the best men and women shock workers on the col-

lective-farm fields." (*Problems of Leninism*, pp. 612-619).

"... [B]y the end of 1932, the industrial labor force doubled from 1928 to more than 6 million." (Kuromiya, p. 290).

Over the same 4-year period, says Kuromiya, over all sectors, 12.5 million people had found a new job in the town; 8.5 million of them were former peasants: (p. 306).

The thrust of Kuromiya's book can be summed up in the following sentence: Stalin succeeded in mobilising the industrial and other workers for rapid industrialisation by presenting the issue as one of a war of the class of the oppressed against the saboteurs who had arisen in their own ranks. Commenting on this, Ludo Martens, Chairman of the Belgian Party of Labour (PTB), in his recently published book *Un Nouveau Regard sur Staline*, makes the following apt observation:

"This idea is correct. Nevertheless, by means of literary and historical works we are constantly being pushed to identify with those who were repressed in these class wars which went under the name of industrialisation and collectivisation. They teach us that repression is 'always inhuman' and that it is not permissible in a civilised country to harm any particular social group, whether actually exploiters or classed as such.

"How can one object to this allegedly humanist argument?

"But how was industrialisation achieved in the civilised world? How did our bankers and captains of industry from London and Paris create their industrial base? Would their industrialisation have been possible without the looting of the gold and silver of the Indian kings - looting that was accompanied by the extermination of 60 million American Indians? Would it have been possible without that monstrous bloodbath carried out in Africa, i.e., the slave trade? UNESCO experts estimate African losses at 210 million people, including those killed in raids, those dying en route, and those sold into slavery. Would our industrialisation have been possible without the colonisation that turned whole peoples into prisoners in their own country?

"Those who industrialised that little corner of the earth called Europe on the basis of millions of 'native' deaths are now telling us that the Bolshevik repression against the proprietor classes was an abomination! Those who industrialised their country on the basis of driving peasants off their land at gunpoint, who murdered women and children through subjecting them to 14-hour working days, who forced people to work under threat of unemployment

and starvation - these people dare fulminate in their literature against 'forced' industrialisation in the Soviet Union!

"If Soviet industrialisation did have to be effected by means of the repression of the 5% who happened to be rich and/or reactionary, it is also true that capitalist industrialisation was born of the terror exerted by that same well-heeled 5% against the whole of the working masses of their own countries and the oppressed countries." (op. cit., Brussels, 1993).

While the USSR was thus transforming herself and advancing with seven-league strides through the creative activity and boundless enthusiasm of the tens of millions of its people, who rallied round the CPSU and responded as one to its slogans, that notorious *"information bureau of the capitalist press on matters concerning the CPSU(B)"* (Stalin, CW Vol 12 p.52), namely Trotskyism, was busy shouting about the alleged degeneration and bureaucratisation of the Party. As a matter of fact, the breathtakingly daring enterprise that was the rapid industrialisation and collectivisation of the USSR could not have been achieved without the Party digging its roots deep among the masses and without the active and enthusiastic involvement of the latter in their tens of millions. Even an ordinary bourgeois intellectual such as Kuromiya has little difficulty in admitting that which Trotskyite petty-bourgeois intellectuals find so difficult to come to terms with. According to Kuromiya, the membership of the Party increased from 1.3 million in 1928 to 1.6 million in 1930. During the same period the percentage of industrial workers went up from 57% to 65% - 80% of new recruits being shock-brigade workers. For the most part these were relatively young people who had technical education, Komsomol activists who had distinguished themselves as model workers, who were helping rationalise production and were obtaining high productivity figures. (See pages 319 and 115).

Between 1930 and 1933, Soviet national income went up from 35 billion to 50 billion roubles. During the same period the Soviet population increased from 160 million to 168 million, the industrial workforce by nearly 8 million (from 14.5 million to 21.8 million). The total payroll of workers and other employees went from 13.5 million roubles to 34.2 million roubles. Average annual wages went up from 991 roubles to 1,591. The social insurance fund for workers and other employees increased from 1.81 billion roubles to 4.61 billion roubles.

The same period saw the introduction of a seven-hour day in all surface industries; the introduction of compulsory elementary education throughout

the USSR - thus causing an increase in literacy among the population from 67% in 1930 to 90% at the end of 1933. The number of pupils attending schools of all grades went up from 14 million in 1929 to 26.4 million in 1933. The number of children receiving pre-school education went from 838,000 to 5,917,000. The number of higher education institutes increased from 91 in 1914 to 600 in 1933. (All figures above are taken from Stalin's Report to the 17th Congress of the CPSU, *Problems of Leninism*, pp.620-621).

We challenge any bourgeois country to match these all-round tempestuous developments in the USSR of those days.

Let us turn now from industry to agriculture.

NOTES

1. Elsewhere, analysing the external and internal contradictions, the external and internal obstacles to the victory of socialism in one country, Stalin correctly maintained that while the internal contradictions could be overcome and socialism built in a single country (the USSR at that time), this in itself did not mean the final victory of socialism. This did not guarantee the USSR against imperialist intervention and restoration of capitalism. For such a final victory revolution in several countries is required. Here is what Stalin says:

"While the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country means the possibility of resolving internal contradictions, which can be completely overcome by one country (meaning by that, of course, our country), the possibility of the final victory of socialism implies the possibility of resolving the external contradictions between the country of socialism and the capitalist countries, contradictions which can be overcome only as a result of a proletarian revolution in several countries.

"Anyone who confuses these two categories of contradictions is either a hopeless muddlehead or an incorrigible opportunist." (*Social-Democratic Deviation in our Party*, Report delivered at the 15th All-Union Conference of the CPSU(B), 1 November 1926, Stalin CW Vol 8 p. 278).

Precisely such hopeless muddleheads and incorrigible opportunists are the Trotskyites.

2. In view of the failure of the European proletariat to seize power, which was due, inter alia, to the treachery of official social democracy, the CPSU's stance regarding the successful building of socialism in the USSR was the only revolutionary way out. It was the only way of developing and bringing nearer the world revolution. While the Soviet people under the banner of Marxism-Leninism and under the correct leadership of the CPSU(B) headed by Comrade Stalin busily got on with the job of building socialism, and thus helping to develop world revolution, the Trotskyite muddleheads and incorrigible opportunists started their long and hopeless wait for world revolution. In this regard, it must be said, that the position of Trotskyism is identical with that of Kautskyism, the brand of opportunism peddled by the very same Kautsky whose treachery to the proletariat played such a considerable role in the defeat of the Euro-

pean proletariat and whose ideology put itself at the service of the European bourgeoisie in opposing Bolshevism, the Great October Socialist Revolution and the building of socialism in the USSR. It would be worth while to acquaint the reader with a sample of Kautskyism on the subject under discussion. Here is what Kautsky said by way of an attack on the Bolsheviks in 1918:

"The Bolshevik revolution was based on the supposition that it would be the starting point of a general European revolution ... According to this theory, the European revolution ... which would bring about socialism in Europe would also be the means of removing the obstacles to the carrying through of socialism in Russia which were created by the economic backwardness of that country. This was all very logically thought out, and quite well founded, provided that the supposition was granted, that the Russian revolution must inevitably unchain the European revolution. But what if this does not happen? ... Our Bolshevik comrades have staked all on the card of the general European revolution. As this card has not turned up they were forced into a course which brought them up against insoluble problems." (Kautsky, *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*).

A cursory comparison of the above quotation with Trotsky's theory of 'permanent revolution' is sufficient to bring home the truth that Trotskyism is a variety of Kautskyism.

3. Trotskyism does not accept Lenin's thesis that uneven economic development is an absolute law of capitalism. According to Trotsky, imperialism abolishes all unevenness in the economic development of the various countries. Imperialist exploitation, maintained Trotsky, led to the obliteration of any unevenness in the economic conditions of the exploiting and exploited countries. In 1928, for example, Trotsky wrote about **"the diminishing gap between India and Great Britain"**! From this position of rejection of the law of uneven development of capitalism, Trotsky proceeds, in direct opposition to Leninism, to the erroneous - nay, counter-revolutionary - conclusion that a national revolution is not possible because, says Trotskyism, imperialism has abolished the national economy and created a single world economy. Just as there can be no socialist revolution in a part of a country (i.e., part of an integrated national economy), so, says Trotskyism, there cannot be a national revolution because the national economy is part of a single integrated world economy. So, according to Trotskyism, the world revolution - a revolution in all the countries of the world - must take place simultaneously or not at all. Country after country must accomplish the socialist revolution in rapid succession, just as would different parts of a country in a national revolution. If Trotsky's view of reality had been correct, there would have been no building of socialism in the USSR. But the successful building of socialism in the USSR provided living proof of the great chasm that lay between reality and Trotskyism, of the thoroughly and incorrigibly opportunist nature of Trotskyism, of its inner counter-revolutionary content.

4. On the question of socialism, as indeed on other questions, the attacks on Stalin and 'Stalinism' are almost always attacks on Lenin and Leninism. In order to show the correctness of this statement it would be useful to look at a book called *Let History Judge* written by a Soviet bourgeois intellectual by the name of Roy Medvedev. Medvedev attacks Stalin but 'praises' Lenin. Medvedev's attack on Stalin is not based on any facts or documentation, but on mere gossip and the fertile imagination of a bourgeois brain whose output in terms of fabrication is unlimited. Even the reactionary anti-communist columnist Edward Crankshaw, one of the reviewers of this book in the *Observer* of 26 March 1972 had to admit that Medvedev was **"denied access to all official archives"**. This, however, does not prevent Crankshaw from agreeing with, and admiring, Medvedev's attack on Stalin, the reason for this being that **"this book is high drama of a gifted individual wrestling for the truth, guided only by his inner**

light." This is how 'truth' is established by the bourgeois mind, i.e., by completely ignoring the facts and relying on one's "inner light".

Crankshaw goes on to say: "But besides being the history of an epoch and an act of homage to innumerable victims and to the sufferings of the Soviet people as a whole, his narrative is above all directed towards establishing the necessary ground not only for the author's absolute rejection of Stalin's claims to greatness but also, more deeply, for the opening of an intelligent discussion of the nature of Lenin's revolution and its perversion.

"This is where Laocoon comes in. As Professor Joravsky (whose editing deserves all praise) points out in his introduction, a great deal of the extraordinary impact of the book as a whole derives from the constant tension created by the inherent contradictions in the central thesis. How to diagnose the Stalinist 'disease' without condemning the Soviet system and its progenitor, Lenin? We walk with the author on a knife-edge."

How right is Professor Joravsky in detecting this inherent contradiction. He is quite right in implying that the "Stalinist 'disease'" cannot be diagnosed "without condemning the Soviet system and its progenitor, Lenin". All such attempts will fail and all those who condemn 'Stalinism' are bound to end up by condemning Leninism. It is not for nothing that Crankshaw ends his review by expressing the hope that Medvedev "may yet one day correct the weaknesses [Medvedev's inability to diagnose the "Stalinist 'disease'" by condemning Lenin] in a very remarkable achievement.

Mervyn Jones, in like fashion, in his review of the same book (*New Statesman*, 14 April 1972) complains that "even his analytical chapters answer the question 'How?' rather than the question 'Why?' He adopts without cavil the doctrine of 'Leninist norms', assumes that Lenin was always right, and tells us that Stalin 'almost completely liquidated the socialist democracy that was one of the main achievements of the October revolution' - without asking how far that democracy had been eroded in Lenin's lifetime, still less whether it ever really existed. He even draws a contrast between the Stalinist secret police and the humane, scrupulous, Cheka, which after all shot 6,000 people without trial in 1918 and was authorised by Lenin to embark on 'massive Red terror'. We are told that Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution was 'wrong' and Preobrazhensky's theory of primitive socialist accumulation was 'incorrect', a summary dismissal indeed of highly complex matters. The worst lapse comes when Medvedev asserts solemnly that Beria was an anti-Bolshevik agent in 1919 and that this was 'established' by his trial in 1953 - a trial that was certainly secret and probably non-existent. Hard it is, alas, for even the most honest product of the Soviet regime to free himself mentally from the straitjacket".

In other words, Mervyn Jones says that one cannot condemn Stalin without condemning the Soviet system and Leninism. And he is right. Of course, it goes without saying, Mr Jones would like to see condemned, not only 'Stalinism' but also Leninism and the Soviet system. The revolutionaries, however, should draw the opposite lesson and must not condemn Stalin, for such a condemnation leads directly to the condemnation of Leninism and the Soviet system. Stalin did no more and no less than apply Leninism to the conditions of the USSR in the building of socialism. It can thus be seen that when the Trotskyites, revisionists and others condemn Stalin they are in fact condemning Leninism, despite any subjective wishes to the contrary that some of this gentry might have.

We may also add that even before the October revolution, the Bolshevik Party, not just Lenin as an individual, were committed to the building of socialism in Russia in the event of the Bolshevik Party being in power. At the 6th Congress of the Bolshevik Party in August 1917, a

motion was put forward that the Russian workers should "bend every effort to take state power ... and, in alliance with the revolutionary proletariat of the advanced countries, direct it towards peace and socialist reconstruction of society." Preobrazhensky, who later became a member of the Trotskyist opposition, proposed that the motion be amended to read: "direct it towards peace and, in the event of a proletarian revolution in the west, towards socialism."

At the Congress, Stalin, representing Lenin who had to stay in hiding at the time, opposed Preobrazhensky's amendment and said:

"I am against such an amendment. The possibility is not excluded that Russia will be the country that will lay the road to socialism. No country hitherto has enjoyed such freedom in time of war as Russia does, or has attempted to introduce workers' control of production. In our country the workers are supported by the poorer strata of the peasantry. Lastly, in Germany the state apparatus is incomparably more efficient than the imperfect apparatus of our bourgeoisie ... We must discard the antiquated idea that only Europe can show us the way."

Preobrazhensky's amendment was defeated.

Thus it is clear that even before the October revolution, the Bolshevik Party was committed to the building of socialism in Russia. Only the incorrigible opportunists want to hide this fact from the workers.