

Letter to the Editor of *Pravda* Concerning V. Latsis' Novel *The New Shores*

J.V. Stalin

*The following letter of Stalin which appeared on the 25th February, 1952 in 'Pravda' was published under the signature of 'A Group of Writers' and defended the author V. Latsis from criticism of his novel on the collectivisation movement in post-war Latvia. It is not clear why Stalin published his views in this manner but it may be supposed that he did not wish to intervene in a literary debate with the full weight of his authority which might foreclose any further discussion. The files relating to the works of Stalin which are located in the former CPSU Archives reveal that this letter was to be published in volume 15 of his 'Works'. This, and the other volumes after the thirteenth which had been planned, never saw the light of day. The dummy of volume 14 had been printed and the forthcoming publication of the completed book received passing mention in the **Literaturnaya Gazeta** of January 12, 1956. The anti-communist turn in the following month at the 20th Congress of the CPSU killed off the continuation of this project. Consequently huge gaps have existed in the available Stalin oeuvre in the last half-century for the not inconsiderable period between January 1934 and the death of the leader in March 1953 notwithstanding the publication under Khrushchev and Brezhnev of important diplomatic interventions by Stalin related to the Second World War.*

Vijay Singh

Some time back an article entitled 'Discussion of V. Latsis' novel *The New Shores*' by M. Zorin from Riga appeared in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (15 December 1951).

As is well known, this novel was published in Russian translation in three numbers of the magazine *Zvezda* in 1951.

In this article M. Zorin informs us about the discussion held in Riga by the Artists' Council of the Latvian Gosizdat, where the novel was subjected to severe criticism. The correspondent describes the negative remarks by the participants of the discussion, but himself refrains from any interference in the discussion. This is an act of slyness by the author. In actuality, judging by the selection of the facts and the emphasis on certain aspects of the discussion, the correspondent is expounding his own negative opinion of the novel. The discussion is only an excuse for this and this petty cunningness was necessary for M. Zorin only so he would be able to absolve himself of the responsibility.

M. Zorin contends that the main hero of the novel is Aivar, the adopted son of the kulak Taurin, who breaks ties with the family of Taurin and goes over to the side of the people. M. Zorin maintains that the axis of the novel is Aivar. This is incorrect.

However we may approach the novel, either from the point of view of the number of pages dedicated to Aivar, or from the role assigned to him in the novel, in no way can Aivar be the main hero. If we do have to talk of a main hero, then one can consider Jan

Lidum, the old Bolshevik from amongst the farm labourers, who is superior to Aivar in his understanding of social responsibilities and his standing amongst the people as well as party circles. The organisation's faith in Aivar is not complete. He is entrusted with some jobs but is under the watchful eye of the organization. Only after Aivar successfully fulfils the assignment of the drainage of the swamp and deals with his former step-father the kulak Taurin in a befitting manner does the question of his induction into the party get discussed.

The main merit of Latsis' novel, however, is not in its depiction of individual heroes, but in the assertion that the main and real heroes are the Latvian people, the simple hardworking people who were till yesterday scared and beaten and today take heart and create a new life. Latsis' novel is the epos of the Latvian people, who have broken with the old bourgeois order and are building the new, socialist order.

M. Zorin further claims that the discord in the family of Taurin and the break up of Aivar with Taurin is incidental and an unimportant episode, that this episode should not be taken as the basis of the novel. This is also incorrect.

Firstly, as has been stated earlier, the break up of Aivar with Taurin is neither the basis nor the vital incident of the novel. It is only one of the incidents. The basis of the novel is the movement of the Latvian peasantry for constructing the kolkhoz in the village.

Secondly, it is absolutely incorrect that the discord in Taurin's family and Aivar's break with this family is coincidental and is an unimportant episode. In his novel V. Latsis depicts the transitional period from the bourgeois-nationalistic power in Latvia towards the Soviet order, from individual land ownership to the kolkhoz structures in the village. The distinctive feature of this period is that the old order, old foundations, old customs and rituals are breaking up, brothers are rising against brothers, children against their fathers, families are breaking up, including the kulak families. Therefore it is not coincidental that the storm of the new people's movement burst itself into the family of the kulak Taurin and decomposed it. Not only the family of Taurin, but it also engulfed the family of the middle peasant-cum-subkulak – Patseplis, snatching away her son Jan and daughter Anna and drawing them into the people's movement. Only those people who do not know life and believe in the superiority of the kulaks can think that the kulak families and the subkulaks can withstand the blows of the people's movement, that in this period of break up the kulak families and the subkulaks can as though remain preserved. No, the break-up of the family life of the kulaks and the subkulaks in this period of the kolkhoz movement is not incidental or an isolated episode but the natural law of life. That is why, therefore, V. Latsis, as an expert on life and a great writer could not disregard this and depicts the process of the break-up of the kulak and subkulak family life.

After having said this, it is clear that all that M. Zorin puts forward about the 'ideological vices' and 'ideological derangement' of the novel *The New Shores* are empty words. In order to convince the public about the validity of such charges, it is necessary to have a more serious arsenal than a shallow, ambiguous report from Riga. Such leftist attacks on

V. Latsis cannot be accepted as arguments. On the contrary, such attacks show an absence of any solid arguments.

We are of the opinion that V. Latsis' novel *The New Shores* is a great achievement of Soviet fictional literature; it stands out, both ideologically as well as politically from the beginning to the end. We would like that *Pravda* should voice its opinion about this novel.

Pravda,

25th February, 1952.

RGASPI (delo No. 135, F. 71, O. 10).

L.K. Grigoriev, 'Stalin, sobytiya I dokumenty', opyt istoriko-arkhivnogo, kontrpropagandistskogo issledovaniya, Electronic publication, Moscow, 2002, pp. 47-49.

Translated from the Russian by Neelakshi Suryanarayan.

Click [here](#) to return to the April 2004 index.

On the 50th Death Anniversary of J.V. Stalin

Discussion in the Meeting with the Creative Intellectuals (1946)

J.V. Stalin

Stalin: What do you want to tell me comrade Fadeyev?

Fadeyev: (A.A. was Secretary-General of Writer's Union from 1946 to 1954 – ed.). Comrade Stalin we have come to you for advice. Many think that our literature and art have reached a dead end and we don't know how to develop it further. Today in every cinema hall films are being run, where the hero is endlessly fighting with the enemy and where human blood is flowing like river. Everywhere scarcity and difficulties are being shown. People are tired of struggle and blood. We want your advice how to project a different life in our works: the future life, where there will be no blood and force, where all the innumerable difficulties which our country is facing is absent. In one word, the time has come to narrate about a happy, cloudless future.

Stalin: The main thing is missing from your reasoning. The Marxist-Leninist analysis of the task is missing. And this is what life is bringing before the literary workers and artists. Once Peter I opened window to Europe. But after 1917, the imperialists boarded it up for a long time out of the fear of socialism spreading in their countries. Before the Great Patriotic War through radio, films, newspapers and journals, we were presented before the world as northern barbarians with a blood dripping knife in our teeth. This is how they painted the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Our people were shown dressed in threadbare shirts, drinking vodka from the samovar. All of a sudden this backward Russia, these primitive cave dwellers as represented by the world bourgeoisie defeated two great world powers – the fascists in Germany and the imperialists in Japan – before whom the whole world was trembling in fear. Today the world wants to know, who are these people who accomplished such a heroic deed and saved mankind. Mankind was saved by simple Soviet people, who without any fuss under the most difficult situation achieved industrialization and collectivization. They fortified the defence system and at the cost of their own lives, under the leadership of the communists, destroyed the enemy. Only in the first six months of the war more than 500 hundred thousand communists died in the front-line and overall more than three million. They were the best of us – noble, pure dedicated and selfless fighters of socialism, for happiness of their people. Now we miss them. If they were alive a lot of our problems would have been solved. The main task of our creative Soviet intellectuals today is to reflect in their works, all the aspects of this simple Soviet man, to reveal and to show the best traits of his character. Today this is the general line for the development of literature and art.

Why is the literary hero Pavel Korchagin in Nikolai Ostrovski's 'How the Steel was Tempered' dear to us?"

This is so because of his limitless dedication to revolution, to the people, to socialism and his selflessness.

The artistic image of the great pilot of our time Valeri Chkalova in the film had greatly contributed to the training of thousands of fearless Soviet falcons – fighters with undying fame during the Great Patriotic War. Sergei Lukonim Colonel tankist from the film ‘Young man from our city’ – is the distinctive hero of thousands of tankists.

It is necessary to continue with this tradition. Create such literary hero fighters of communism with whom Soviet people would equate and whom they would imitate. I have a list of questions, which I think would be interesting for the Soviet creative intellectuals. If there is no objection I will answer them.

Shouts from the hall: We request you to answer them please.

Question: What, according to you, are the main shortcomings in the work of modern Soviet writers, dramatist and film directors.

Stalin: Unfortunately, extremely substantial. In recent times a dangerous tendency is apparently discerned in a number of literary works emanating under the pernicious influence of the west in decay and brought into life by the subversive activity of foreign intelligence. Frequently in the pages of Soviet literary journals works are found where the Soviet people, builders of communism are shown in a pathetic and ludicrous form. The positive hero is derided and inferiority before all things foreign and cosmopolitanism, so characteristic of the political leftovers, is applauded. In the theatre repertoire Soviet plays are being pushed aside by disgraceful plays of foreign bourgeois authors.

In the films petty themes dominate and they distort the heroic history of the valiant Russian people.

Question: How dangerous ideologically are the *avantgarde* tendencies in music and the *abstract school* in art and sculpture.

Stalin: Today under the guise of innovation formalism is being induced in Soviet music and abstraction in painting. Once in a while a question can be heard ‘is it necessary for such great people as Bolsheviki and Leninists to be engaged in such petty things and spend time criticizing abstract painting and formalism. Let the psychiatrists deal with it’.

In these types of questions misunderstanding of the role of ideological sabotage against our country and especially against our youth is clearly discernible. It is with their help that attempts are being made against socialist realism in art and literature. It is impossible to do so openly. In these so-called abstract painting there is no real face of those people, whom people would have liked to imitate in the fight for their peoples’ happiness, for communism and for the path on which they want progress. This portrayal is substituted by the abstract mysticism clouding the issue of socialist class struggle against capitalism. During the war how many people came to the statue of Minin and Pozharsky in Red

Square to instill in us the feelings of victory? To what can a bust of twisted iron representing 'innovation' as an art inspire us? To what can an abstract painting inspire?

This is the reason why modern American financial magnates are propagating modernism, paying for this type of work huge royalties which the great masters of realism may not ever see.

There is an underlying idea of class struggle in the so-called western popular music, in the so-called formalist tendencies. This music, if one can call it such, is created from the sect of 'shakers' – dance that induces people to ecstasy, trance and makes them into wild animals ready for any wild action. This type of music is created with the help of psychiatrists so as to influence the brain and psychology of the people. This is one type of musical narcotics under whose influence a person cannot think of fresh ideas and are turned into a herd. It is useless to invite such people for revolution, for building communism. As you see music can also fight.

In 1944, I had an opportunity to read the instruction written by an officer of British intelligence, with the title: how to use formalist music for corrupting the enemy army.

Question: What concretely are the subversive activities of the agents of foreign intelligence in the sphere of art and literature?

Stalin: While talking about the future development of Soviet art and literature it must be taken into consideration that it is developing in a condition of an unprecedented secret war, a war that has been unleashed on us and our art and literature by the world imperialist circles. The job of foreign agents in our country is to penetrate Soviet organizations dealing with culture, to capture the editorships of major newspapers and journals, to influence decisively the repertoire of theatres and movies and in the publication of fiction and poetry. To stop by any means the publication of revolutionary works which awaken patriotism and lead the Soviet people towards creating communism. They support and publish works where the failure of communism is preached. They are ecstatic in their support and propaganda of the capitalist method of production and the bourgeois life style.

At the same time foreign agents are asked to popularise in art and literature the feelings of pessimism, decadence and demoralisation.

One popular American senator said, 'If we were able to show Bolshevik Russia our horror films it most probably will be able to destroy communist construction'. Not for nothing did Lev Tolstoi say that art and literature is a strong form of indoctrination.

We must seriously ponder over who and what is inspiring us today with the help of literature and art so that we can put an end to ideological subversion. We must understand and accept that culture is one of the integral parts of social ideology, of class and is used for safeguarding the interest of the ruling class. For us it is to safeguard the interest of the working class, of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

There is no art for art's sake. There are no, and cannot be, 'free' artists, writers, poets, dramatists, directors, and journalists, standing above the society. Nobody needs them. Such people don't and can't exist.

For those who don't want to serve the Soviet people as a result of old traditions of the counter revolutionary bourgeoisie, or are antagonistic towards the power of the working class dedicated to serving the Soviet people we give the permission to leave the country and stay abroad. Let them be convinced of the meaning of 'free creativity' in the notorious bourgeois society, where everything can be brought and sold, and the creative intelligentsia is completely dependent on the monetary support of the financial magnates in their creative endeavours.

Unfortunately, friends, because of lack of time we must finish our discussion.

I hope that to some extent I have answered all your questions. I think that the position of the CC AUCP(b) and that of the Soviet government on the question of further development of Soviet literature is clear to all.

Zhukhrai V. 'Stalin: pravda i lozh', Moscow, 1996, pp. 245-251; I.V. Stalin, 'Sochineniya', Vol. 16, 1946-1952, Izdatelstvo 'Picatel', Moscow, 1997, pp. 49-53.

Translated from the Russian by Sumana Jha

Click [here](#) to return to the April 2003 index.

The Forgotten Poet: Joseph Dzhugashvili

Lev Kotyukov

In the canonical biography of J.V. Stalin published by the Institute of Marx-Engels-Lenin during his lifetime and, as some maintain, written and edited by him, there is not even half a word about the poetic creativity of the leader.

In their youth many people dream of becoming poets, but running out of wind in their race to be published and attain fame, they reconcile with their failure and in their mature age muse over their homespun doggerel with a smile. Therefore the leader did not consider it necessary to talk about his passion for poetry in his monumental life-story. This is the most apparent conclusion. But it would be a wrong one. Joseph Dzhugashvili, in contrast with the failed artist Adolf Schickelgruber, did not dream just about poetic recognition: he was a poet, was recognized and distinguished as a poet in the very early years of hazy youth. Georgian journals and papers readily gave him space on their pages and his verses were fondly learned by heart. Especially noteworthy is the fact that, not anybody else but the living classic of Georgian literature Iliya Chavchavadze marked Joseph Dzhugashvili out as a 'young man with burning eyes' and included his verses in the reading book for schools. Who among the present young and not so young poets can boast of such early recognition?

Then why did the proud ambitious young Dzhugashvili did not follow his passion? Why, being born a poet and like Arthur Rimbaud, having attained fame in the very beginning, he goes into the revolution and forgets himself as a poet? Lets' try, as much as it is possible, to answer this question.

The end of the XIX Century in Russia was marked by the tumultuous development of capitalism. The 1880-1890 years were indeed very anti-poetic. Forgetting about eternity people were turning Time into Money; with contempt for poetry they were engaging in business. The fact speaks for itself that the brilliant work 'Evening lights' of Afanasii Fet, published by the poet from his own pocket, remained practically unsold. It would not be out of place to remember the contemptuous words of Lev Tolstoi that were so popular at the time: 'Writing poetry is like dancing around a plough'.

The young, much too mature for his years, Joseph Dzhugashvili knew well that a poet's career promises not only fame, but also humiliation, and he did not want to reconcile with such a fate as, from childhood, remaining under the weight of the secrecy of his background, he knew well what awaits him. He moves away from poetry ... moves away in order to struggle against universal oppression. The result of this struggle is known.

What we do not know is whether Joseph Dzhugashvili forgot the poet in himself forever after coming out in the world under the name of Stalin. Poets jealously hide their secrets for eternity. But who knows... But we know that during the Soviet period his verses where never published and, moreover, were never included in any reading book, though, visibly, to do so must have been just so easy.

It is true that in 1949, on the initiative of L.P. Beria, an attempt was made, secretly from Stalin, to publish his verses in Russian as a gift edition on his 70th birth anniversary. For this purpose, under strict secrecy, the best translators were involved including B. Pasternak and A. Tarkovskyi.

Having acquainted themselves with the anonymous verses, not being able to guess the name of the author, one of the master translators exclaimed: 'this work is worth the Stalin Award of the first order'.

But in the middle of the work on the translation a stern order was received to immediately stop the work. I think, there is no need to guess where the order came from – the poet Joseph Dzhugashvili did not become a laureate of the Stalin Award by the will of Stalin.

The end of the present century (XX century – trans.), as the previous one is renowned by a precipitous decline in interest for poetry among our public educated on Mexican tele-serials. On the minds and the lips of every one there is only money, money and money...and the delusion that the wind blows not through the green leaves of the Russian birch tree but through these satanic 'greenbacks', and everywhere – humiliation, humiliation and humiliation ...it comes to ones mind with sadness and apprehension that maybe at this very moment a young boy with the Divine gift in his heart, having experienced a thousand humiliations in his search for a so called 'sponsor' for the publication of his brilliant book gazes with a devastated look thorough a dark dead space and crumples a sheet of paper with unfinished verses and reaches out for a new sheet and writes the application for joining a newly formed party of 'fighters for peoples' happiness and justice'.

And the young boy is sad at heart, and grief be upon the people, when true poets and prophets turn to revolution and politics, and the run of the mill politicians and presidents vainly yearn for the recognition fit only for prophets and artists.

The poetic interest of Joseph Dzhugashvili lasted only four years from 1893 to 1896. The manuscripts of his verses have been irrevocably lost and the search for those published during his lifetime is very limited due to well- known reasons. At present we are publishing some of his verses that have been unjustifiably forgotten by us and the poet himself.

'Zavtra' No. 41 (46), 1994

Translated from the Russian by Tahir Asghar

Poems

Joseph Dzhugashvili

To The Moon (1)

Swim untiring, as before
Over storm hidden earth
Blow away the thick storm of gloom
With your silver radiance.

To the earth unfolded sleepily
You bend with a tender smile
Sing to Kazbek* a lullaby
Whose blanket of ice rises to embrace you.

But know it well, one who was once
Banished and plunged to ashes,
Will rise to the height of Mtatsminda
With his inspiration having taken wings.

Sitting in the dark heart of the sky
Playing with its pale rays
Illuminated my land to the brim for me
With your even light.

I will open my heart to you
Stretch my hand in meeting
Once again, with a thumping heart
I look at the bright moon.

** A reference to the Caucasian mountain known in Georgian as Mkinvari. According to tradition this was the mountain to which Prometheus was bound.*

Oh Bard! Since you were moved to tears
By the peasants' bitter fate
From then on, it has been your fate
To feel the intense burning pain.

When you triumphed, deeply moved
By the grandeur of your homeland
Songs called out to you, as if
Flowing from the divine heights.

When, inspired by the fatherland
You touched your most intimate strings
It was as if a young man in love,
Was dedicating to it his dreams.

From that moment onwards,
You are bound to the people with ties of love
And you built a monument for yourself
In the heart of every Georgian.

To the immortal song of my land's singer
An award must be conferred,
Already the seed has taken root
Reap the harvest now!

Not for nothing people glorify you
You shall live unto eternity
And many like Eristavi*
Let my country raise her sons.

** Eristavi, Rafael Davidovich (1824-1901). Georgian poet, ethnographer and folklorist.
The most prominent theme of his work was the hard life of the peasantry.*

Morning

A rose bud opened
Clinging to the blue violet
Awakened by a light breeze
Bends the lily upon the grass.

The lark sang in the blue sky
Flying higher than the clouds
And the sweet sounding nightingale
For children sang her song from the bush.

Blossom my Georgia!
Let peace reign all over my homeland!
And you my friends through knowledge
Bring glory to your homeland.

Our friend Nininka is getting older
Weighed down under his grey hair
His strong shoulders have drooped
Our hero is becoming feeble.

What a stroke of bad luck
He once with his furious sickle
Crossed the squalling field
One step falling heavily after another.

He walked straight on the stubble field
Wiping the sweat from his face
And then the flames of merriment
Illuminated the young man.

But now his legs do not move
Evil old age does not spare anyone
And the old man lay crippled
Telling stories to his children.

When the songs of free labour
Are heard from the corn fields
The heart as always
Beats faster filled with wonder.

Bending over his crutches
The old man stands up
With a smile for the children
His face lights up.

As he walks from house to house
Knocking on strangers' doors
With his oak mandolin
Playing his simple song.

And in his song, in his song
Pure as the radiance of the sun
Grand Truth can be heard
Of lofty sublime dreams.

The hearts that turned into stone
Are forced to beat once more
For many he ignited Reason
That once slumbered on in Darkness.

But instead of bestowing on him glory
The people of his land
Brought the outcast
Poison in a cup.

They told him "Damn you!
Drink! Drain it to the bottom
Your song is strange to us
Your truth we do not need."

When the moon with her radiance
Suddenly illuminates the earthly world
Her pale blue sparkle
Plays on the farthest corners.

Upon the azure grove
The nightingale sings her song
Her tender voice can be heard
Not waning but free.

Silenced for a moment
The stream shall sing again in the mountains
The dark forest in the night is
Awakened by wind's gentle wings.

When haunted by hellish Darkness
You return to your homeland
Haunted by hellish Darkness
You fortuitously glimpse sunlight.

Then the clouds tormenting the soul
Shall clear the dark veil
And Hope awakens my heart
With its deafening sound.

The poet's spirit rises high
And the heart beats for Reason
I know that this Hope
Is blessed and pure.

*I.V. Stalin, Izbrannye sochineniya v 3-kh tomakh, Tom I, Izdatelstvo gazety 'Patriot',
Moscow, 1999, pp. 1-4.*

Translated from the Russian by Shubhra Nagalia

Click [here](#) to return to the April 2003 index.

Five Conversations with Soviet Economists, 1941-1952

J.V. Stalin

Record of Comrade J.V. Stalin's Discussion with Economists^{*}

Dated 29th January 1941

On Issues of Political Economy

On The Object of Political Economy

There are several definitions of the object of political economy: Engels' definition which views political economy as a science about production, exchange and distribution; there is the definition given by Marx in his preparatory notes to *Capital*; there is Lenin's point of view which accepts the definition given by Bogdanov in 1889. We have a lot of bookworms and they would attempt to counterpose one definition to another. We are very fond of quotations. And quotations are a sign of our ignorance. That is why we must rigorously think over the correct definition of the object of political economy and then standing inside of it introduce it.

If we write that 'political economy is the science about historically developing modes of social production, then people would not immediately understand that we are talking about the economy and relations between people. It is better to say that political economy is the science of the development of the relations of social production, i.e. the economic relations between people. This definition explains the laws governing the production and distribution of the necessary means of consumption for both individual and production purposes'. When I speak of distribution, I have in view not the common notion of distribution in the narrow sense of the word, i.e. distribution of the means of individual consumption. We are talking about distribution in the sense in which it has been used by Engels in *Anti-Duhring*, where he analyses distribution as a form of ownership of the means of production and means of individual consumption.

On the next page, after completing the second paragraph, we must make an addition in the following words: 'i.e. how the means of production are distributed between the members of the society as, subsequently, also the material goods necessary for peoples' lives.'

You certainly know about the preparatory notes of Marx for the fourth volume of *Capital*. There you have the definition of the object of political economy. When Marx speaks of production, he includes transport (independently of whether we are talking of long distance or short distance transport, about transportation of cotton from Turkestan or a factory's internal transport). With Marx all the problems of distribution are included in

the concept of production. What do those present here think: is the definition being outlined here the correct one?

Remark: Unconditionally, the outlined changes bring about a fundamental improvement.

Question: Is it correct to use the words relations of 'social production' in the definition? Is the word 'social' not irrelevant here. After all, production is also social. Will we not have a tautology?

Answer: No, we must write 'social-production' with a hyphen, as, after all, there can be technical relations in production, here we must speak specifically of the relations of social production.

Question: Will it not be more appropriate to talk of consumption as 'individual and productive' instead of the words 'individual and production'?

After a short exchange of opinions 'individual and production' was written.

If we accept the proposed formulation of the object, then the general conclusion must be made that the question of distribution in all the formations must be accorded much more attention. Otherwise, here, very little is said about banks, stock exchanges and markets. This will not do. In particular the section on socialism also suffers because of this.

There are stylistic irregularities on page 5. These must be removed. It is written 'it is a historical science, examining and explaining different modes of production and explaining the traits that distinguish each of them.' It should be written in proper Russian as not 'examining' and 'explaining', but the science that examines and explains.

On the Law of Value

I am coming to the section on socialism. A few things have been improved. But a lot has been spoilt in comparison to what was there earlier in this section.

It is written here that the law of value has been overcome. Then it becomes incomprehensible from where the category of cost arises, without which we cannot calculate, cannot distribute according to labour and cannot set prices. The law of value has not been overcome yet. It is not true that we are commanding with the help of prices; we want to command, but cannot. In order to command with the help of prices, there must be huge reserves, an abundance of commodities. Only then can we dictate our prices. As long as there is an illegal market and a collective farm market, market prices would exist. If there is no value, then there is nothing by which to measure incomes. Incomes are not measured by labour. When we begin to distribute according to needs, then it will be an altogether different matter. But for the present the law of value has not been overcome. We want to consciously use it. We are compelled to set prices within the framework of this law. In 1940 the harvest was lower (in Russia – *ed.*) than in Estonia and Latvia. There was not enough bread and the prices jumped upwards. We threw in

about 200,000 *poods* of bread and the prices came down immediately. But can we do this with all the commodities all over the country? No, we are far from dictating prices for all commodities. For this we have a great deal more to produce. Much more than presently. But at present we are unable to command with the help of prices. And also the income from the sales in the collective farm market goes to the collective farm peasantry. Obviously with us the means of production cannot be bought with this income, and this income goes towards increasing the individual consumption.

Poster propaganda finds its way into the textbook. This will not do. An economist should study facts, and here all of a sudden: 'Trotskyite-Bukharinite traitors' what is the need to mention that the courts have established this thing and that? What is economic about it? Throw the propaganda out. Political economy is a serious matter.

Voice: It was written long ago when the trial was underway.

Answer: When it was written is irrelevant. Now the new edition has been presented and it is there too. And it is out of place here. In science we appeal to Reason. And here we are appealing to something like the belly and a bit to something else. This spoils the job.

On Planning

Regarding the plan for the economy a lot of terrible words have been piled up. What all has not been written. 'Directly social character of labour in the socialist society. Overcoming the law of value and elimination of anarchy in production. Planned conducting of the economy as a means of bringing the production relations of socialism in conformity with the nature of the productive forces'. Some kind of a flawless planned economy is painted. Whereas one can say simply: -- under capitalism it is not possible to carry on production on the scale of the whole of the society, there you have competition, there you have private property, which separates. Whereas in our system the enterprises are united on the basis of socialist property. Planned economy is not something we want, it is an *inevitability*, otherwise everything would collapse. We have destroyed such bourgeois barometers as the markets and the stock exchanges, with the help of which the bourgeoisie corrects the disproportions. We have taken everything up on ourselves. Planned economy in our system is as much inevitable as is the consumption of bread. And it is so not because we are all 'good boys', not because we are capable of doing everything, and they cannot, but because in our system the enterprises are integrated. In their system integration is possible only within trusts and cartels, i.e. within narrow limits, but they are incapable of organising an All peoples' economy. (It is in place here to remind ourselves of Lenin's critique of Kautsky's theory of super capitalism). The capitalist cannot run industry and agriculture and transport according to a plan. Under capitalism the town must devour the countryside. Private property there is an obstacle. So say simply: there is integration in our system, and in their system there is division. Here (page 369) it is written: 'planned functioning of the economy as a means of bringing the production relations of socialism in conformity with the character of the productive

forces'. It is all rubbish, schoolboys' chatter. (Marx and Engels spoke long ago, and they had to talk about contradictions). But why in hell are you treating us to such generalisations? Say simply: in their system there is division in the economy, the form of property brings divisions; in our system there is integration. You are at the helm, and the power is yours. Speak simply.

We must properly define the objectives of the planning centre. Not only must it establish the proportions. Proportions are not of central importance, they are essential, but still secondary.

What are the main objectives of planning?

The first objective consists in planning in a way that ensures the independence of the socialist economy from capitalist encirclement. This is obligatory, and is most important. It is a form of the struggles against world capitalism. We must ensure that we have metal and machines in our hands so as not to become an appendage to the capitalist system. This is the basis of planning. This is central. GOELRO and subsequent plans were drawn up on this basis.

How to organise planning? In their system capital gets spontaneously distributed over the branches of the economy depending upon the profits. If we were to develop various sectors according to their profitability we would have a developed flour-grinding sector, toy production (they are expensive and give high profits), textiles, but we would not have had any heavy industry. It demands large investments and is loss-making in the beginning. Abandoning the development of heavy industry is the same as that which the Rykovites had proposed. We have turned the laws of development of the capitalist economy upside down, have put them on their head, or more precisely on their feet. We have begun with the development of heavy industry and machine building. Without planning of the economy nothing would work out.

How do things happen in their system? Some states rob others, loot the colonies, and extract forced loans. It is otherwise with us. The basic thing about planning is that we have not become an appendage to the world capitalist system.

The second objective of planning consists in strengthening the absolute hegemony of the socialist economic system and closing all the sources and loopholes from which capitalism arises. Rykov and Trotsky had once proposed to close down advanced and leading enterprises (The Putilov Factory and others) as unprofitable. Going by this would have meant 'closing down' socialism. Investments would have then gone into flour-grinding and toy production because they yield profit. We could not have followed this path.

The third objective of planning is to avoid disproportions. But as the economy is huge, ruptures can always take place. Therefore, we need to have large reserves. Not only of funds, but also of labour power.

We should provide something new to the reader, and not endlessly keep repeating about the correlation between the relations of production and the productive forces. It does not produce any results. There is no need to go overboard in praising our own system and ascribe to it those achievements which are not there. Value exists and differential rent exists, but they are used differently. I was thinking about the category of Profit -- should we leave it out or to keep it?

Remark: Maybe it is better to use the word 'income'?

Molotov: Income is of different kinds.

Remark (N.A. Voznesensky--*ed.*): May be socialist accumulation?

Answer: As long as profit has not been extracted it is not accumulation. Profit is a result of production.

Question: Should we have in the textbook that there is surplus product in the socialist society? There were differences of opinion on this matter in the Commission.

Molotov: We have to educate the workers so that they know that they work for the whole of the society and not only for their families.

Answer: Without surplus product you cannot build the new system. It is necessary that the workers understand that under capitalism they are interested in what it is that they are getting. But under socialism they take care of their own society and this is what educates the worker. Income remains but it acquires another character. The surplus product is there, but it does not go to the exploiter, but towards increasing the welfare of the people, strengthening defence etc. The surplus product gets transformed.

In our country distribution takes place according to labour. We have qualified and unqualified labour. How should we define an engineer's work? It is multiplied simple labour. With us incomes are distributed according to labour. It cannot be that this distribution happens independently of the law of value. We think that the entire economy is run according to the plan, but it does not always happen this way. There is a lot of spontaneity with us also. We knowingly, and not spontaneously, make calculations according to the law of value. In their system the law of value operates spontaneously, bringing in its wake destruction, and demands huge sacrifices. In our system the character of the law of value undergoes a change, it acquires a new content, a new form. We knowingly, and not spontaneously, set prices. Engels speaks of leaps. It is a risky formula, but it can be accepted, if we correctly understand the leap from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom. We must understand freedom of will as necessity recognised, where the leap means a transition from spontaneous inevitability to the recognition of necessity. In their system the law of value operates spontaneously and it leads to large-scale destruction. But we should conduct things in such a way that there are fewer sacrifices. The necessity resulting from the operation of the law of value must be used by us consciously.

Question: In the Commission there were misunderstandings and discussions regarding whether there are commodities in the Soviet economy. The author, against the opinion of the majority in the Commission, speaks not about commodities but about products.

Answer: Once we have a monetarised economy, we also have commodities. All the categories remain, but have acquired a new character. Money, in their system, serves as a tool for exploitation, but in our system it has a different content.

Question: Until now the law of value was interpreted as a law operating in a spontaneous market which determines the spontaneous distribution of labour power.

Answer: This is not correct. One should not narrow down the scope of the formulation of the question. Trotsky repeatedly limited money to its being an instrument for calculation. He insisted on this both before and after the transition to NEP. This is wrong. Our answer to him was: when a worker buys something, is he calculating with the help of money, or is he doing something else? Lenin repeatedly would point out in the Politbureau that such a formulation of the question is wrong, that one should not limit the role of money to it being an instrument of calculation.

Remark: Surplus product in a socialist society -- the term is embarrassing.

Answer: On the contrary, we have to educate the worker that the surplus product is needed by us, there is more responsibility. The worker must understand that he produces not only for himself and his family, but also for creating reserves and strengthening defence etc.

Remark: In the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* Marx did not write about surplus product.

Answer: If you want to seek answers for everything in Marx you will get nowhere. You have in front of you a laboratory such as the USSR which has existed now for more than 20 years but you think that Marx ought to be knowing more than you about socialism. Do you not understand that in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* Marx was not in a position to foresee! It is necessary to use one's head and not string citations together. New facts are there, there is a new combination of forces -- and if you don't mind -- one has to use one's brains.

On Wages and Workdays

A few words about wages, work-days and incomes of the workers, the collective farmers and the intelligentsia. In the textbook it has not been taken into account, that people go to work not only because Marxists are in power and there is a planned economy, but also because that it is in their interest, and that we have grasped this interest. The workers are neither idealists nor ideal people. Some people think that it is possible to run the economy on the basis of equalisation. We have had such theories: collective wages, communes in production. You will not move production forward by all this. The worker fulfils and

over-achieves the plan because we have piece-work for the workers, a bonus system for the supervisory staff and bonus payments for farmers who work better. Recently we have enacted the law for the Ukraine.

I will tell you of two cases. In the coal industry a few years ago a situation was created when the people working overground received more than the people working in the mines. The engineer sitting in the office received one and a half times more than those who worked in the mines. The top leadership, the administration want to attract the best engineers to their departments so that they sit by their side. But for the work to move ahead, it is necessary that people have an interest. When we increased the wages for the underground worker, only then did the work move forward. The question of wages is of central importance.

Take another example: cotton production. For four years now that it is moving uphill only because the procedure of paying the bonuses has been revised. The more they produce from a unit of land the more they get. They now have an interest.

The law on bonuses for collective farmers in the Ukraine has exceptional importance. If you go by peoples' interests they would move forward, would upgrade their qualification, work better and will clearly see that this gives them more. There was a time when an intellectual or a qualified worker was considered fit only to be social outcasts. This was our foolishness, there was no serious organisation of production then.

People speak of the six conditions of Stalin. Come to think of it -- what news! What is said there is that which is known all over the world but has only been forgotten with us. Piece-work for the worker, a bonus system for the engineering and technical staff and bonuses for the collective farmers -- these are the levers of industrial and agricultural development. Make use of these levers and there would be no limit to growth in production and without them nothing is going to work out. Engels has created a lot of confusion here. There was a time when we used to boast that the technical staff and the engineers would receive not more than what the qualified workers get. Engels did not understand a thing about production and he confounded us too. It is as ridiculous as the other opinion that the higher administrative staff must be changed every so often. If we had gone along with this everything would have been lost. You want to leap directly into communism. Marx and Engels wrote keeping full communism in view. The transition from socialism to communism is a terribly complicated matter. Socialism has yet not entered our flesh and blood, we still have to organise things properly in socialism, we still have to properly set up distribution according to work.

We have filth in our factories, but we want to go straight to communism. But who will let you in there? We are sinking in garbage and we want communism. In one large enterprise about two years ago they started breeding fowl -- chicken and geese. Where does all this lead you to? Dirty people would not be allowed entry into communism. Stop being swine. And only then talk about entering communism. Engels wanted to go straight to communism. He got carried away.

Molotov: On page 333 it is written: 'the determining advantage of the *artel* consists in that it *correctly* combines the individual interest of the collective farmers with their social interests, that it *successfully* harmonises the individual interests of the collective farmers, with the interests of society'. Such a formulation of this question is avoiding the question. What is 'correctly combining the individual interest of the collective farmers with society's interests'? It is a hollow sentence which has very little of concrete substance in it. You get something like 'all that exists is rational'. In fact it is far from being so. In principle we have come to a correct solution of these questions, but in practice there are a lot of things that are wrong and out of place. This needs to be explained. The social economy has to be placed first.

It is necessary also to pose the question of piece-work wages. There was a time that when this question was very complicated, the piece-work system was not understood. Visiting workers' delegations, for example, of French syndicalists, would ask why do we support piece-work and the bonus system, after all under capitalist conditions workers are fighting against it. Now everyone understands, that without a progressive system of payment and without the piece-work system there would have been no Stakhanovites and front-rank workers. In principle this question is clear. But in practice a lot of disgraceful things are happening with us. In 1949 [*sic.--ed.*] we are forced to go back and repeat the decisions of 1933. Spontaneity is pulling us to the opposite side. The top echelons want the best engineers to be by their side. We have not yet grown up to become as neat and tidy as we would like to be. There is a lot of colouring up of our reality, and we have not at all become as clean and tidy as we want to be. We must criticise our practice.

On Fascism

A few more observations on fascist philosophy. They write as if they have socialism. This needs to be exposed in economic terms. This is what Hitler says: 'The State, The People! our capitalists receive only 8%. That is enough for them!' The formulation of this question needs to be accompanied by throwing light on the question of competition and the anarchy of production, with the attempts of the capitalists to get rid of competition with the help of the theory of ultra-imperialism. It must be demonstrated that they are doomed. They are propagating a corporatist system, as if it is above the class of workers and the capitalists and the State cares and looks after the workers. They are even arresting individual capitalists (it is true that Thyssen could escape). One should say that in all of this there is more of demagogy, that this is just the pressure of the bourgeois State on individual capitalists who do not want to subject themselves to class discipline. It should be mentioned once in the section on cartelisation and their unsuccessful attempts at planning. Mention it again in the section on Socialism. In your system, gentlemen fascists, to whom do the means of production belong? To individual capitalists and to groups of capitalists and, therefore, you cannot have genuine planning, except for bits, as the economy is divided among groups of owners.

Question: Should we use the term 'fascists'?

Answer : Name them the way they call themselves: the Italians -- as fascists, the Germans -- as national-socialists.

In this cabinet I met [H.G.] Wells, and he said to me that he is neither for the workers to be in power nor for the capitalists to be in power. He is for the leadership of engineers. He said that he supports Roosevelt whom he knows well and says that he is an honourable person and a person loyal to the working class. Petty ideas about a reconciliation of classes among the petty bourgeois do exist and are widespread. These ideas have acquired a special meaning with the fascists.

About the place where you talk about the Utopians. Here one should also critically mention the idea of reconciliation among classes. There, obviously, is a difference between the way the question is put by the utopians and the fascists, a variance in favour of the Utopians, but one must not circumvent this issue. Owen would feel very bad if he is put in the same rank as the fascists, but Owen must also be criticized.

The abusive style should be removed from the whole book. You do not convince anyone by abusing. You may sooner get the opposite results, the reader would become wary: 'since the author is being abusive, it means that not everything is clean'.

One should write in a way that we do not get the impression that everything in their system is bad, and everything in our system is good, one should not beautify things.

Remark: It is written here that the State formulates the plan for almost everybody.

Answer: It is nonsense. In general there is a lot of philosophizing in the section on socialism. One should write more simply.

Question: Is the heading of the chapter 'Preparation of the capitalist mode of production' correct? Do we not we get a slight impression that it was consciously prepared?

Answer: This is a terminological issue. One may certainly use the word 'prepared'. The issue actually is about the birth and the creating of the preconditions.

In fact there is another question regarding the preparation of the Socialist mode of production. It is mentioned here that socialism does not arise within capitalism. It needs to be explained that the material preconditions are created within capitalism, that the objective and subjective preconditions are created within capitalism. It should not be forgotten that we have emerged from capitalism.

Composed according to the notes of Com[rades]
[L.A.] Leontyev, [K.V.] Ostrovityanov, [A.I.] Pashkov.

Record of the Discussion of 22 February 1950

at 23 hours and 15 minutes

There are two variants of the model of the textbook on Political Economy. However, there are no differences in principle between the two variants in the approach to the questions of Political Economy and the interpretations of these questions. Thus there is no basis for having two variants. There is the variant by Leontyev and this variant must be taken as the basis.

In the textbook we must give a concrete critique of the contemporary theories of American imperialism. On this question articles have been published in *Bolshevik* and in *Voprosi ekonomiki*.

People illiterate in terms of economics do not distinguish between the People's Republic of China and the People's Democracies of the countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe, let us say the People's Democratic Republic of Poland. These are different things.

What is People's Democracy? It contains at least such features as: 1) Political power being in the hands of the proletariat; 2) nationalisation of the industry; 3) the guiding role of the Communist and Working Peoples' Parties; 4) the construction of Socialism not only in the towns but also in the countryside. In China we cannot even talk about the building of Socialism either in the towns or in the countryside. Some enterprises have been nationalised but this is a drop in the ocean. The main mass of industrial commodities for the population is produced by artisans. There are about 30 million artisans in China. There are important dissimilarities between the countries of Peoples' Democracy and the Peoples' Republic of China: 1) In China there exists a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry something akin to what the Bolsheviks talked about in 1904-05. 2) There was oppression by a foreign bourgeoisie in China, therefore the national bourgeoisie of China is partially revolutionary; in view of this a coalition with the national bourgeoisie is permissible, in China the communists and the bourgeoisie comprise a bloc.

This is not unnatural. Marx in 1848 also had a coalition with the bourgeoisie, when he was editing the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, but it was not for long. 3) In China they still face the task of the liquidation of feudal relationships, and in this sense the Chinese revolution reminds one of the French bourgeois revolution of 1789. 4) The special feature of the Chinese revolution is that the Communist Party stands at the head of the state.

Therefore, one can say that in China there is a Peoples' Democratic Republic but only at its first stage of development.

The confusion on this question occurs because our cadres do not have any deep economic education.

A decision is taken to recommend to the Commission, comprising of Comrades Malenkov, Leontyev, Ostrovityanov and Yudin, to complete the modification of the model of the textbook within a period of one month.

Drafted according to the notes of Com [rades]:
[L.A.] Leontyev, K.V. Ostrovityanov and [P.F.] Yudin.

Record of the Discussion of 24th April 1950

at 23.30 hours

I wanted to make a few critical observations about the new model of the textbook on political economy.

I have read about a 100 pages relating to pre-capitalist formations and to capitalism. I also looked at a little of the section on socialism. About socialism I will talk another time. Today I want to talk about the shortcomings relating to the section on capitalist and pre-capitalist formations. The Commission's work has proceeded along the wrong track. I have said that the first variant of the textbook model should be accepted as the basis. And this, evidently, was understood to mean that the textbook does not need any particular corrections. This is wrong. Substantial corrections are needed.

First and the main shortcoming of the textbook, which shows a complete ignorance of Marxism, is regarding the periods of manufacture and machine production under capitalism. The section on the period of manufacture capitalism is bloated, it has been allotted 10 pages and is more prominent than the period of machine production. In fact, the period of capitalist machine production is absent. It has simply vanished. The period of machine production has not been given a separate chapter, it has been allotted a few pages in the chapter on 'Capital and Surplus Value'. Take Marx's *Capital*. In *Capital*, the manufacture period of capitalism occupies 28 pages, and the period of machine production -- 110 pages. Also, in other chapters, Marx talks a lot about the period of machine production. Such a Marxist as Lenin in the work *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* paid especial attention to the machine period. Without machines there is no capitalism. Machines are the main revolutionising force which have transformed society. It has not been demonstrated in the textbook what actually comprises a system of machines. About the system of machines, literally only one word has been said. Therefore, the whole picture of the development of capitalism has been distorted.

Manufacture is based on the hand labour of artisans. The machine sweeps aside hand labour. Machine production is large-scale production and is based on the machine system.

We have to take into account that our cadres, our youth -- our people have had 7-10 years of education. They are interested in everything. They can look up Marx's *Capital*, and Lenin's works. They can ask: why is it that the exposition of the question has not been

done in the manner of Marx and Lenin? This is the main shortcoming. We must elaborate the history of capitalism according to Marx and Lenin. In the textbook a special chapter on the period of machine production is needed, and the one on manufacture needs to be shortened.

The second serious shortcoming of the textbook is that there is no analysis of wages. The main problem has not been elucidated. Wages are considered in the section on pre-monopoly capitalism as Marx has done. There is nothing about wages under conditions of monopoly capitalism. A lot of time has passed after Marx.

What are wages? Wages are a minimum for livelihood plus some savings. It is necessary to show what is the livelihood minimum, nominal and real wages, and to demonstrate it vividly and convincingly. We are fighting capitalism on the grounds of wages. Take the vivid facts of contemporary life. In France, where you have a falling currency, one receives millions, but you cannot buy anything. The English shout that they have the highest level of wages and cheap commodities. And they all the time hide the fact that though nominal wages may be high, they are still not enough to provide the livelihood minimum, not to talk about savings. In England the prices for certain products, bread and meat, are low, but the workers get them on ration in small quantities. Other products are bought in the market at inflated prices. They have a multiplicity of prices. And the Americans are very bumptious about their high living standards, but according to their own data two-thirds of their workers are not provided with the minimum livelihood. All these tricks of the capitalists have to be exposed. We have to show, on the basis of concrete facts, to these English workers, who have been for long living off the super-profits and the colonies, that the fall in real wages under capitalism is an axiom.

We could tell them that during the civil war with us everybody was a millionaire. During this war the prices were at their lowest, bread was sold for one ruble per kilogramme but the products were rationed.

With us the calculations of wages are done differently. It is necessary to show on the basis of concrete facts the situation regarding the real wages in the country. This has a great revolutionary and propaganda importance.

It would be correct to deal with the question of wages in the section on monopoly capitalism and to return to it in contemporary terms.

In the model of the textbook a large chapter is devoted to primary accumulation. You may talk about it in a few words in two pages. It is mentioned here how a certain duchess drove peasants away from their lands. Who are you going to impress today by all this? And more important things have been left out. The epoch of imperialism provides much more vivid examples.

Regarding the plan of the structure of the textbook. The section on capitalism must be divided into two parts.: under A -- pre-monopoly capitalism and under B -- monopoly capitalism.

Now about the object of political economy. In the textbook what you get is not establishing the object of political economy but rather an introduction to it. There is a distinction between determining the object of political economy and its introduction. In this context the second variant is closer to the topic, though, here too, you end up with an introduction. Some economic terms used by Marx are explained here. This helps the reader to move towards an understanding of the economic works of Marx and Lenin.

It is written that political economy analyses the relations of production. But this is not comprehensible for every one. You say that political economy examines relations of production and exchange. This is wrong. Take exchange. There was no exchange in primitive society. It was not developed in slave society either. The term circulation will not do either. All this is not very useful for socialism too. It should be stated: Political economy examines the production and distribution of material goods. This is applicable to all periods. Production constitutes man's relation to nature, and distribution shows where the goods produced go. This is the purely economic side.

In the textbook there is no transition from the object of political economy to primitive society. Marx begins *Capital* with the commodity and why is it that you begin with primitive society? This needs to be explained.

There are two methods of exposition: one is the analytical and abstract method. This method begins with expounding the general and abstract concepts along with the usage of historical material. Such a method of exposition (it was used by Marx in *Capital*) is meant for people who are more prepared. The other method is historical. This method gives an exposition of the historical development of different economic systems and reveals the general concepts on the basis of historical material. If you want people to understand the theory of surplus value -- expound the problem from the moment surplus value arises. The historical method is meant for people who are less prepared. It is more accessible because it subtly leads the reader to an understanding of the laws of economic development. (He reads out the definition of the analytical and historical method).

In the textbook Engels' model of savagery and barbarism is used. This does not lead anywhere. It is rubbish. Engels in his work did not want to have any differences with Morgan, who at that time was moving towards materialism. That was Engels' business. But how does it concern us? People would say that we are bad Marxists once we do not adhere to the exposition according to Engels. Nothing of the sort. What we get here is a huge heap: stone age, bronze age, kinship system, matriarchy, patriarchy and to top it all savagery and barbarism. All this only confuses the reader. Savagery and barbarism were contemptuous expressions used by 'civilised' people.

There is a lot of gibberish in the textbook, unnecessary words and a lot of historical excursions. I have read 100 pages and have crossed out 10 and could have crossed out more. In a textbook there should not be even a single superfluous word, the exposition must be sculpted exactly. And here at the end of the section you have these antics: you imperialists are scoundrels, you have slavery, bonded labour, etc. All these are like

Komsomol antics and posters. This wastes time and creates confusion. We need to influence people's minds.

About Thomas More and Campanella you say that they were isolated and that they had no relations with the masses. This only evokes laughter. Is this relevant? So what? Even if they had been close to the masses, what would that closeness have given us? That level of development of productive forces demanded inequality which arose out of the property relations. It was absolutely impossible to overcome this inequality. The utopians did not know the laws of social development. Here we have an idealist interpretation.

It is necessary that our cadres have a thorough knowledge of Marxist economic theory.

The first, old generation of Bolsheviks were very solid theoretically. We learnt *Capital* by heart, made conspectuses, held discussions and tested each others' understanding. This was our strength and it helped us a lot.

The second generation was less prepared. They were busy with practical matters and construction. They studied Marxism from booklets.

The third generation is being brought up on satirical and newspaper articles. They do not have any deep understanding. They need to be provided with food that is easily digestible. The majority has been brought up not by studying Marx and Lenin but on quotations.

If matters continue further in this way people would soon degenerate. In America people argue: We need dollars, why do we need theory? Why do we need science? With us people may think similarly: 'when we are building socialism why do we need *Capital*?' This is a threat for us -- it is degradation, it is death. In order not to have such a situation even partially we have to improve the level of economic understanding.

The present number of pages are not needed – it has been bloated to 766 pages. It is necessary to have no more than 500 pages, and half of these must be devoted to pre-socialist systems and half to socialism.

The authors of the first variant have shown no concern about explaining Marx's terminology which is used in *Capital*. The most frequently used terms by Marx and Lenin must be introduced from the very beginning so as to enable the reader to understand *Capital* and other works of Marx and Lenin.

It is bad that there are no arguments and no fights in the commission over theoretical questions. Remember that your work is of historical importance. Everybody will be reading the textbook. It is now 33 years that Soviet power exists yet we do not have a book on political economy. Everyone is waiting for it.

In literary terms the textbook suffers from bad editing. There is a lot of gibberish, and excursions into civil and cultural history. It is not a textbook on cultural history. It needs

fewer historical excursions. They need be there only when necessary for the illustration of theoretical propositions.

Get hold of Marx's *Capital* and *Development of Capitalism* by Lenin and use them as a guide for your work.

When the textbook is ready we will put it before the court of public opinion.

One more observation. In the textbook capitalism is examined only in the industrial sector. It is necessary that the whole of the economy must be taken into account. In *Capital* Marx is also predominantly dealing with industry. But his objective was different. He had to expose capitalism and its ills. Marx understood the importance of the economy as a whole. This is evident from the importance he accorded to the *Tableau Économique* of Quesnay. We must not limit ourselves only to elucidating the problems of agriculture in the chapter on land rent.

We have not only exposed capitalism, we have overthrown it and now we are in power. We know what is the share and importance of agriculture for the national economy.

As with Marx, in our programme too, insufficient attention is paid to agriculture. This must be corrected.

We must study the economic laws in their entirety. We must not neglect agrarian relations under capitalism and socialism.

According to the notes of:

[L.A.] Leontyev, [K.V.] Ostrovityanov, [D.T.] Shepilov, [P.F.] Yudin.

Record of the Discussion of 30th May 1950

Began at 19 hours and ended at 20 hours

How do you think that the text on pre-monopoly capitalism should be submitted? By chapters?

Nothing would work out in separate chapters. We need an overall picture. That is why I asked for all the chapters to be submitted together. You cannot examine it in separate chapters. It is necessary to depict pre-monopoly capitalism as a whole, immediately give a review of the corresponding economic views, and give the criticism that Marx made of regarding the preceding political economy.

Regarding the plan of the section on pre-monopoly capitalism, how do you intend to submit the portion on primary accumulation – in a separate chapter?

(*Answer:* No, this would go into the chapter on the emergence of capitalism.)

In the plan it is proposed to elucidate the question of 'Trading capital and trading profit' only in the XIIIth chapter, after having given the characteristics of industrial capital. Historically this is wrong. The analysis of trading capital should be given earlier. I would put the topic of trading capital before the emergence of the capitalist mode of production. Trading capital precedes industrial capital. Trading capital stimulated the emergence of manufacture.

(**Note:** We propose here to examine trading capital in the framework of the distribution of the surplus value under capitalism, and in the chapter on feudalism we talk about the role of trading capital of that period).

In that case the heading is ineffectual, then give the chapter-heading as 'Trading profit', otherwise people may understand you as saying that the trading capital emerges only during the period of machine production, and this is historically incorrect.

In general you are avoiding the historical method in the textbook. In the introduction you say that the description would be conducted using the historical method, and yet you avoid it. The historical method is necessary in this textbook, it is not possible to do without it. Nobody with us would understand why trading capital is placed after the examination of the period of machine production under capitalism.

The tone used in the chapter on feudalism is also wrong, it is the popular bazaar tone of a grandfather explaining things to children. Everybody turns up in here -- the feudal turns up, the trader turns up, the buyers-up appear, like puppets on the stage.

You should picture the readership for whom you are writing. You should have in view not stereotypes but people who have finished 8-10 classes. And you are explaining here a word such as regulation and you think that without an explanation they would not understand. You have adopted a wrong tone. You speak as if you are narrating fairy tales.

In the chapter on feudalism you write that the town again separates from the countryside. The first time the town separated from the countryside was during the slave society, and, then again it got separated under feudalism. This is nonsense. As if along with the slave society, the towns also were destroyed. The towns emerged during slave society. During the period of feudalism the towns remained. It is true that in the first period they developed feebly but subsequently the towns grew strong. The separation of the town from the villages remained. With the discovery of America and the expansion of the markets, trade was developed in the towns and huge riches were accumulated.

In the chapter on feudalism nothing is said about the discovery of America. Very little is said about Russia. You will have to say more about Russia, beginning with feudalism. In the chapter on feudalism you must throw light on feudalism in Russia until the Emancipation Act.

During feudalism there existed extremely large towns for the period: Genoa, Venice and Florence. During feudalism trade reached huge volumes. Florence could leave ancient Rome far behind.

Under slave society large towns and large scale production came into existence. As long as there was slave labour, and cheap labour was available there could be large scale production, and big latifundia. Immediately as the slave labour became less available the latifundia started to be divided up. The earlier vivacity is already missing. But the towns remained, they stayed alive. Trade also was conducted, there were ships of 150 oars.

Some of the historians create an impression that the Middle ages were a time of degradation in comparison to the slave society, that there was no movement ahead. But this is incorrect.

In the chapter on feudalism you have not even mentioned what kind of labour was the basis of the feudal society. But you have to show that in the world of antiquity slave labour was the basis, and under feudalism it was peasant labour.

When the large latifundia in slave society fell apart, the system of slavery fell too, the slave was no more, but the peasant remained. And even under the slave system there were peasants, but they were few and always under threat of becoming slaves. The Roman empire was conquered by the so-called 'barbarian' tribes. Feudalism arose when two societies confronted each other: on the one hand -- the Roman empire and, on the other -- the barbarian tribes, which fought against Rome. This question has been sidestepped, the 'barbarian' tribes have not even been named. Which tribes were these? These were the Germans, Slavs, Gallic tribes and others. These tribes at the time of the conquest of Rome had a commune system. It was particularly strong among the Germans where it was represented by the Mark. The agricultural commune began to coalesce with the remnants of the slave system of Rome and the Roman Empire. The Roman Empire exhibited remarkable endurance. First it broke into two parts: the western and the eastern Empires. Even long after the western Empire was destroyed the Eastern Roman Empire continued to exist for a long time.

It is necessary to clearly and precisely state that peasant labour was the main basis of the existence of the feudal society.

We always say that capitalism has its origins in the feudal system. This is true and unquestionable and it must be demonstrated historically how did this happen. One does not feel that capitalism was born within the feudal society. We do not have here the discovery of America. But, after all, the discovery of America happened during the middle ages prior to the bourgeois revolutions. They were looking for the sea route to India and hit upon a new continent. But this is not essential. What is important is that there occurred a huge degree of growth in trade and a big expansion of the market. Thus were created the conditions wherein the first capitalist manufacturers were able to break apart the guild system. Thus was created a huge demand for commodities and the manufacture system emerged in order to satisfy this demand. That is how capitalism

emerged. All this is missing in the chapter on the feudal system. To write a textbook is no simple task. One has to deeply consider history. You have done a hack-work of writing the chapter on feudalism. That is how you have gotten used to delivering your lectures, all wishy-washy. And every one listens to you there and nobody criticises you.

The textbook is written for millions of people, it would be read and studied not only with us but in the whole world. The Americans and the Chinese would be reading it and it would be studied in all the countries. You must have a more qualified readership in view.

Slave society – is the first class society. It is the most engaging society before capitalism. The ills of class society have been taken to their limits in it. Now, when capitalism is facing trouble, it is reverting to the methods of the slave owners. In antiquity wars were conducted so as to acquire slaves. And Hitler in our time started a war to enslave other nations, especially the nations of the Soviet Union. This was also a manhunt. Hitler obtained slaves from everywhere. Hitler had transported millions of foreign workers into Germany, there were Italians and Bulgars and the inhabitants of other countries. He wanted to revive slavery. But he failed. Therefore, when capitalism is in trouble it reverts to the old and most savage methods of slavery.

The bourgeois textbooks talk a lot about the democratic movement in Antiquity and praise the 'Golden Age of Pericles'. It must be shown that democracy in the world of antiquity was a democracy for the slave owners.

I really request you to relate more seriously to the textbook. If you do not know the material study it from books and other sources or ask competent people. The textbook is going to be read by everybody. It will be an example for everybody. You must redo the chapter on the feudal system. It is necessary to show the source of feudalism. The slave owning elite was eliminated and slavery fell apart. But the land remained, the handicrafts remained, the *coloni* remained and the peasant labour remained. The town remained and they prospered towards the end of the Middle ages.

It is necessary to begin the age of capitalism with the bourgeois revolutions -- in England, in France, and the peasant reforms in Russia. By this time capitalism has already acquired its own foundation within feudalism.

It is better to bring a part of materials relating to the emergence of capitalism into the chapter on feudalism.

It is necessary to show the role and significance of state power in the period of feudalism. When the Roman Empire ended, the decentralisation of power and the economy began to take place. The feudals waged war against each other. Small kingdoms were created. State power became fictitious. Every landlord put up his own customs barriers. Centralised power became necessary. Later it acquired real force when nation states began to be organised on the basis of emergence of the national markets. The growth of trade demanded national markets. And here not a word is said about the national markets.

The feudals obstructed trade. They fenced themselves off by means of various tariffs and taxes. It is necessary to mention this even if only in a couple of words.

The feudal system is more near to us -- it was there only yesterday. In this chapter one must speak about Russia and the peasant reforms, how the peasants were emancipated -- with land or without land. The landlords were afraid that the emancipation of the peasants would take place from below, therefore the State conducted the reforms from above. With us the system of serf labour was ended when the peasant reform took place, and in France -- it happened at the time of the bourgeois revolution.

In the chapter the propositions being discussed are correct. But all this is spread about, it is not concentrated and it is not done consistently. And the main thing is not mentioned. Which labour formed the central basis of the feudal society?

A quotation from Ilyich is cited to establish that the serf system was based on the stick. This quotation has been taken out of context. Lenin had paid a lot of attention to the economic aspect of the question. It is impossible to keep people under the stick for 600-700 years. The main thing is not the stick, but that the land belonged to the landlords. The land was the basis and the stick was the supplement. You take quotations from Marx and Lenin without thinking in what connection a particular thought was expressed.

Do not be stingy about economic ideas. By acquainting oneself with these ideas the reader gets a more concrete elucidation of the epoch. You must mention mercantilism and Colbert. Within the country Colbert brought down the tariffs but fenced off the State with high tariffs in order to stimulate the development of manufacture and capital in the country. Mercantilism existed prior to the bourgeois revolution.

I make some observations about the democratic movement in ancient Rome and Greece and have written about a page for you. In the chapter on slavery you had not given any criticism of the bourgeois theories of the democratic movement in ancient Rome and Greece. This movement is praised not only in the bourgeois literature but in some of the books with us. The French revolutionaries would swear by the name of the Gracchi.

It is necessary to elucidate by using the historical method once you have taken the job up.

One should not be carried away by the style of bazaar propaganda or popular language because then it would appear like a grandfather is telling stories.

It turns out with you that the town got separated from the countryside a second time. The separation was there and it remained, no reason for it to separate again. The old town under the slave system was not severed from the countryside. The separation of the town was further developed during the end of the Middle Ages. Its enough to recall such towns as Venice and Florence. Recall the hanses. What trade they had, what ships! The trading capital played a major role. The kings remained dependent on the large traders.

Venice conquered Constantinople. It hired soldiers and conquered it. The bounds of trade greatly expanded. Within feudalism a powerful trading class emerged. It was pocketing high dividends. In antiquity two of the biggest traders were -- one Hittite, whose name I do not remember, and one Phoenician by the name of Hiram. They had a lot of money and they would lend money even to the state. But in comparison to the Fuggers they were nothing.

(Question: In relation to your suggestion it is not clear whether the question of the commodity is to be partly included in the section on feudalism, as it was in the model?)

Of course it is better to speak of the commodity in the chapter on feudalism. But the full question of the commodity in its entirety needs to be given in the section on capitalism. We agreed, did we not, on following the historical method.

Marx went according to another method. He began with the commodity as the economic cell of capitalism, investigated and turned it over from all sides. But you give the question of the commodity in parts and sum up in the chapter on capitalism. This makes it easier to master. It is necessary to give the theory of commodity in separate elements, as corresponding relations emerge.

(Question: As we are going to jot down the economic thought of the period of pre-monopoly capital, what do we do with the explication of Lenin's works. Where do we put them?)

In the chapter on pre-monopoly capitalism one must explain the works of Lenin right up to the publication of his work on Imperialism, or, to be precise, the publication of his article against Trotsky *On the Slogan of the United States of Europe*. Here the works of the period of so-called free capitalism must be explained, when different countries were steadily coming up to the level of the others and occupying lands yet unoccupied by anybody else. Then a new period began -- a period of monopoly capital. Thus, the elucidation of Lenin's works must be done in two parts.

The ideology of capitalism in the pre-monopoly period is altogether different from the monopoly period. At that time the bourgeoisie would by all means run feudalism down, would talk of freedom, praised liberalism. It is altogether different under Imperialism, when the ideologues of capitalism throw away all the remnants of liberalism and glean the most reactionary views of the preceding epochs. Now there is an altogether different ideology.

(Question: We have faced a similar question: in the section on pre-monopoly capitalism we explain a number of themes to which we never come back in the section on Imperialism, for example, rent from land. Can we give here concrete factual data relating to contemporary capitalism?)

Obviously, you may. After all Imperialism is also capitalism.

(Question: In the chapter about the period of machine production do we limit ourselves, as Marx did, only to steam-powered machines, or, do we show the further development -- of the internal combustion and electrical engines, without which there is no system of machines?)

Certainly, one must speak about the system of machines too. Marx, after all, wrote in the [18]60's and since then technology has progressed way ahead.

You will have to expand the chapter on feudalism by another 15-20 pages.

(Question: Should we not make two chapters -- 1) the main features of the feudal mode of production and 2) decline of the feudal mode of production?)

You decide this yourself as you find necessary. The chapter on feudalism has to be modified almost on the same pattern which was used for writing the chapter on slavery.

In the chapter on feudalism it is necessary to indicate the economic system of the 'barbarian' tribes. One must show what happened when the so-called barbarian tribes and slave-owning Rome met.

In the beginning there was no serfdom, it took place later. It is necessary to show how the relations of serfdom were created. Maybe it is necessary to divide feudalism in two periods: the early and the later.

About manufacture do not speak a lot, it is not the most interesting period of capitalism. Under manufacture the technology is old, in fact it is nothing more than bloated handicrafts. A new quality is imparted by machines. Manufacture can be cut down, do not get carried away. The machine period changed everything.

A period of one month is insufficient to write the chapter on pre-monopoly capitalism. I think the writing of the textbook will take the whole of this year. And some of it might even take up part of the next year. It is a very serious matter.

We think that in the textbook we must print the names of all the members of the Commission and also print 'approved by the CC AUCP(b)'.

Drafted according to the notes of:

[I.D.] Laptev, [L.A.] Leontyev, [K.V.] Ostrovityanov, [A.I.] Pashkov, [D.T.] Shepilov and [P.F.] Yudin.

The words in brackets belong to the members of the Commission.

Discussion on the Issues of Political Economy

(15 February 1952, the discussion started at 22.00 and ended at 23.10)

Question: May the *Remarks on Economic Questions* be published in the press? Can we use your *Remarks* in scientific, research, pedagogical and literary works?

Answer: We should not publish the *Remarks* in the press. The discussions on the questions of political economy were held *in camera* and the people do not know about them. The speeches of the participants of the discussions were not published. It would not be understood if I come out in the press with my *Remarks*.

The publication of the *Remarks* in the press is not in your interest. It would be interpreted as if everything in the textbook has been defined beforehand by Stalin. I care about the authority of the textbook. The textbook must have an immaculate reputation. It would be appropriate if the contents of the *Remarks* come to be known by the people from the textbook.

One should not refer to the *Remarks* in the press. How can you refer to a document which has not been published? If you like my *Remarks* then use it in the textbook.

You may use it in your lectures, the faculty and political circles but without any reference to the author.

If an insufficient number of copies have been printed then we can make some more, but it should not be published in the press. The textbook gets published, a year or two passes then the *Remarks* may be published. It may then be included in one of the volumes of the works.

Question: [K.V. Ostrovityanov] In your *Remarks on Economic Questions* consumer commodities are mentioned, but are the means of production also commodities in our system? If not, then how do we explain the use of cost accounting (*khozrashyot -- tr.*) in the sectors producing means of production?

Answer: Commodities are everything that are freely sold and bought, for example bread and meat etc. Our means of production cannot in essence be judged to be commodities. These are not consumer items that go into the market and which are bought by anyone who wants them. The means of production we allocate ourselves. They are not a commodity in the generally accepted sense, not that commodity which exists under capitalist conditions. There the means of production are commodities. Here the means of production cannot be called commodities.

Our cost accounting is not the same cost accounting which operates in the capitalist enterprises. Cost accounting under capitalism operates in a way that unprofitable (*nerentabel'niye--tr.*) enterprises are closed down. Our enterprises may be very unprofitable, they may be altogether unprofitable. But the latter are not closed down in our system. They receive subsidies from the State budget. Cost accounting in our system exists for the purposes of accounting, for calculation and for the balance. Cost accounting

is used as a check for the enterprises' executives. The means of production only formally figure as commodities in our system. Only the items of consumption fall in the sphere of commodity circulation with us and not the means of production.

Question: [K.V. Ostrovityanov] Would it be correct to call the means of production as 'commodities of a special kind'?

Answer: No. If there is a commodity, it must be sold to everyone who wants to buy it. Expressions like 'commodities of a special kind' are no good. The law of value impinges on production of the means of production through the realisation of the consumer commodities. The law of value is needed here for calculations, for the balance and for checking the feasibility of the activities.

Question: [K.V. Ostrovityanov] How ought one to understand the terms -- general crisis of capitalism and crises of the world capitalist system, are they one and the same thing?

Answer: They are one and the same thing. I underline that one should speak about the crisis of the world capitalist system on the whole. With us often only a particular country is taken up, which is not correct. Earlier people would study the capitalist system only on the basis of the conditions in a single country -- England. Now for the evaluation of capitalism one should not take up a particular country but the capitalist system as a whole. The economy of all the capitalist countries is intricately interwoven. Certain countries are moving ahead at the cost of other countries. The limitations of the contemporary capitalist market must be taken into account. An example -- the USA find themselves in a good situation having eliminated competition from their main competitors -- Germany and Japan. The USA hoped to increase their production twofold on the strength of their monopoly. But nothing came of their plans of doubling production. The calculations fell through. One country -- the USA -- moved ahead and the others fell behind. But the situation is unstable, the situation would change in the future. A single country cannot be typical for evaluating the condition of capitalism. It is not correct to take up a single country, one should take up capitalism as a whole. I underline: one must study the world system as a whole, and with us we have got used to taking up a single country.

Question>: [D.T. Shepilov] Can we consider the outline of the section 'Socialist mode of production' that is given in the *Proposals* on the draft of the textbook to be correct?

Answer: I agree with the outline contained in the *Proposals*.

Question: [A. Arakelyan] How do we call those parts of the National Income of the USSR which were given the name: 'the necessary product' and 'the surplus product'?

Answer: The concepts of 'necessary and surplus labour' and 'necessary and surplus product' are not suited for our economy. Does all that which goes towards welfare and defence not constitute necessary labour? Is the worker not interested in it? In a socialist economy we should be making the distinctions in approximately the following manner:

Labour for ones own self and labour for society. That which in relation to a socialist economy was earlier termed as necessary labour coincides with labour for oneself, and that which earlier was called surplus labour is labour for society.

Question: [A. Arakelyan] Is it correct in place of the concept of the 'transformation' of the law of value in the USSR to apply the concept 'limiting the operation' of the law of value?

Answer: The laws of science cannot be created, destroyed, abrogated, changed or transformed. The laws must be taken into consideration. If we violate them, we suffer. An opinion is widespread with us that the time of the (operation of the -- *tr.*) laws is past. This point of view is frequently found not only among economists but also those engaged in practical work and politicians. This does not correspond with the concept of law. The proposition about the transformation of laws is a digression from science, this comes from philistinism. It is not possible to transform the laws of nature and society. If it is possible to transform a law then it is also possible to abolish it. If it is possible to transform and abolish laws then it means that 'everything is possible for us'. Laws must be taken into consideration, grasped and utilised. It is possible to limit their sphere of impact. This is so in physics and chemistry. This is so for all science. One should speak not of transforming the laws but of limiting their sphere of operation. This would be more precise and scientific. No imprecision must be allowed in the textbook. We are coming out with a textbook on political economy before the whole world. It would be used at home and abroad.

We do not limit the laws, but the material objective conditions. When the sphere of operation of the law is limited the law looks different. The sphere of operation of the law of value with us is limited. The law of value is not exactly what it was under capitalism. It is not transformed with us, but limited by the force of objective conditions. The main thing is that here private property has been eliminated and labour power is not a commodity. These are the objective conditions that determine the limiting of the sphere of operation of the law of value. This limiting of the law of value occurs not because we wanted it but because such is the necessity, such are the favourable conditions for such a limitation. These objective conditions impel us to limit the sphere of the operation of the law of value.

Law is a reflection of the objective process. The law reflects the correlation between objective forces. The law shows the correlation between the causes and the result. If a certain balance of forces and certain objective conditions are given then inevitably certain results follow. One has to take account of these objective conditions. If some of the objective conditions are missing then the corresponding results will be different. With us the objective conditions have changed as compared to capitalism (there is no private property and labour power is not a commodity), therefore, the results are also different. The law of value has not been transformed with us, but the sphere of operation is limited by virtue of the objective conditions.

Question: How should one understand the category of profit in the USSR?

ANSWER: A certain amount of profit is needed by us. Without profit we cannot create reserves, have accumulation, support fulfillment of defence tasks and satisfy social needs. Here we can see that there is labour for one self and labour for society. The word profit itself has become very dirty. It would be good to have some other concept? But what? Perhaps net income? Under the category profit we have hidden an altogether different content. We do not have a spontaneous capital flow and no law of competition. We do not have the capitalist law of maximum profit nor the law of average profit. But without profit it is not possible to develop our economy. For our enterprises even minimal profits are adequate and, sometimes, they can work without profits on account of profits of other enterprises. We ourselves distribute our resources. Under capitalism only profitable enterprises can exist. In our system we have very profitable (*rentabel'niye -- tr.*), somewhat profitable and totally unprofitable enterprises. During the first years our heavy industry did not produce any profit but started to do so later on. In general the enterprises of the heavy industry during the initial period are themselves in need of means.

Question: [A.I. Pashkov] Is the position of the majority of the participants in the economic discussions on the issue of the linkage of the Soviet money and gold correct? Some of the followers of the minority, which rejects this linkage, state that in the *Remarks on Economic Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion* there is no answer to this question.

Answer: Have you read the *Proposals*? In my observations it is mentioned that on other issues I do not have any remarks regarding the *Proposals*. That means that I agree with the *Proposals* on the issue of the linkage of our money with gold.

Question: [A.I. Pashkov] Is it correct that differential rent in the USSR must be fully extricated by the state, as it was asserted by certain participants of the discussions?

Answer: On the question of the differential rent I am in agreement with the opinion of the majority.

Question: [A.D. Gusakov] Does the linkage between Soviet money and gold means that gold is a monetary commodity in the USSR?

Answer: Gold is a monetary commodity. Earlier with us the shape of things with the cost of production of extraction of gold was not good. Later we took steps to bring down the cost of production and things got better. We made a transition to the gold standard. We take the position that gold becomes a commodity and we will achieve it. There is, obviously, no necessity to exchange money for gold. It is not prevalent even in the capitalist countries.

Question: [I.D. Laptev] Do the Soviet state finances belong to the sphere of the basis or to the state-political superstructure?

Answer: Whether it is the superstructure or the base? (laughs). In general lot has been said on the issue of the base and the superstructure. There are people who even relegate Soviet power to the basis.

If you leave aside generalisations about basis and superstructure on this issue, then we have to proceed from socialist property. Our budget is fundamentally different from a capitalist one. Under capitalism every enterprise has its own budget, and the state budget encompasses a more narrow sphere than our state budget. Our budget covers all the income and expenditure of the peoples' economy. It reflects the status of the whole of the peoples' economy and not simply expenditure on management. It is a budget of the whole of the peoples' economy. Therefore, in our finances the elements of the basis predominate. But there are also elements of the superstructure present in it, for example, the expenditures on management belongs to the superstructure. Our state oversees the people's economy, our budget includes not only expenditure on the managing apparatus but on the whole of the people's economy. The budget has elements of the superstructure, but the elements of the economy predominate.

Question: [A.V. Bolgov] Is it correct that the agricultural *artel* would exist during the whole period of uninterrupted transition from socialism to communism whereas the agricultural commune is related only to the second phase of communism?

Answer: The question is meaningless. The *artel* is moving towards the commune, it is evident. The commune will be created when the functions of the peasant household of servicing their personal requirements will vanish. There is no need to hurry with the agricultural commune. The transition to the commune requires the solution of a mass of questions, construction of good canteens, laundries, etc. The agricultural communes will be created when peasants will be convinced of the feasibility of a transition to the communes. The *artel* does not correspond to the second phase of communism, more likely the commune corresponds to communism. The *artel* requires commodity circulation and, at least, for the time being does not allow for products-exchange, and more so does not allow for direct distribution. Products-exchange is after all still exchange, and direct distribution is distribution according to needs. As long as commodity production, sale and purchase exist, we must take these into account. The *artel* is linked with sale and purchase while direct distribution will develop only in the second phase of communism. When the agricultural *artel* will grow into a commune is difficult to say. It is not possible to say that the second phase of communism would already be in existence when the commune would be created. But to say that without the commune it is not possible to make the transition to the second phase of communism is also risky.

One should not imagine the transition to the second phase of communism in a layman's terms. There would be no particular 'admittance' into communism. Steadily, without knowing ourselves we will enter communism. Its not like an 'entry into the city', the 'gates are open -- enter'. In many of the collective farms the women members (*kolkhoznitsi* -- tr.) still do not want to be released from the bondage of household work, or hand over the cattle to the *kolkhoz*, so as to receive meat and milk products from it. But

as for now they do not refuse to do so in the case of fowl. These are only the first green shoots of the future. At present the agricultural *artel* is not an impediment to the development of the economy. During the first phase of communism the *artel* will gradually grow into a commune. One cannot draw a sharp line here.

It is necessary to bring the production in the *kolkhoz* to the level of whole of the society. There are a mass of complex questions here. The *kolkhozniki* need to be taught to have more consideration for the affairs of the society. At present the *kolkhozes* do not want to know about anything except their own economy. At present there is no integration of the *kolkhozes* at the district and provincial level. Should we not make a move from above in this case for creating an All-Union economic organ consisting of representatives of industry and the collective farms that would account for the produce of both the industry and the collective farms. One needs to begin with the accounting of the produce of the state enterprises as also of the *kolkhozes* and then turn to the distribution first only of the surplus produce. We must set up funds which are not to be distributed, and funds that are earmarked for distribution. It is necessary to steadfastly teach the *kolkhozniki* to have consideration for the interests of the whole of the people. But it is a long course and one need not to hurry. There is nowhere to hurry to. Things are moving fine with us. The aim is right. The path is clear, and all the orientations are set up.

QUESTION: [Z.V. Atlas] Why is it that in the *Remarks on Economic Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion* the term 'monetary economy' is placed in quotations marks?

Answer: Once there is commodity circulation, there must be money. In the capitalist countries the monetary economy, including the banks, leads to the ruination of the workers, the impoverishment of the population and increase in the wealth of the exploiters. Money and the banks serve as means of exploitation under capitalism. Our monetary economy is not the usual one and is distinct from the capitalist monetary economy. With us money and the money economy serve to strengthen the socialist economy. With us the monetary economy is an instrument that we are using in the interests of socialism. The quotation marks are there so as not to confuse our money economy with the money economy under capitalism. The words 'value' and 'forms of value' are used by me without quotation marks. Money is also included here. A lot of factors determine the law of value with us, it indirectly affects the production and directly affects circulation. But the sphere of its operation with us is limited. The law of value does not lead to ruination. The biggest difficulty for the capitalists is the realisation of the social product, the transformation of commodity to money. With us realisation takes place easily, it moves smoothly.

Question: [G.A. Kozlov] What is the content of the law of planned and proportional development of the national economy?

Answer: There is a difference between the law of planned development of the national economy and planning. The plans may not take into account all that, which would be necessary to have been taken account of according to this law, according to its

requirements. If, for example, a certain number of automobiles are being planned, but if along with this the corresponding amount of thin metal sheet is not planned, then in the middle of the year the automobile plants would come to a standstill. If a certain number of automobiles is planned, and a corresponding amount of petrol is not planned for then it would also mean a breach of linkages between the given branches. In these cases the law of planned and proportional development of the national economy makes itself felt in a serious manner. When it is not transgressed it sits calmly and its address remains unknown -- it is everywhere and it is nowhere. In general all laws are felt when they are transgressed, and this does not go unpunished. The law of planned development of the national economy shows the lack of correspondence between the branches. It requires that all the elements of the national economy correspond mutually and develop in correspondence with each other, proportionally. The mistakes of planning are corrected by the law of planned development of the national economy.

Question: [M.I. Rubinshtein] How is the basic task of the USSR to be understood in the current period. In determining this task do we need to take as the starting point the figures per head of capitalist production according to the population of 1929 or do we need to take for comparative purposes the updated level of capitalist production which, for example, in the case of the USA due to the militarisation of the economy is higher than that of 1929? Is it correct to consider, as is frequently done in publications and lectures, that the achievement of the quantity of production, indicated in your speech of 9th February, 1946, signifies the decisive economic task of the USSR for the entry into the second phase of communism.

Answer: The method of calculation which proceeds from production per capita retains its force. Production per capita is the basic yardstick of the strength of countries. There is no other measurement which replaces this. It is necessary, to proceed not from the level of 1929 but from contemporary production. We require new calculations. It is necessary to compare our per capita production in terms of the current figures of the capitalist countries.

The figures I put forward in 1946 did not signify the decisive economic task for the transition towards the second phase. By achieving these figures we become more strong. This safeguards us from the peril of the enemy assault, from the attack of capitalism. But the decisive task which is indicated in the speech of 1946 does not as yet signify the second phase of communism. Some comrades are too much of a hurry to effect the transition to the second phase of communism. One should not be in excessive haste in this transition as one cannot create the laws. Yet others are thinking of a third phase of communism. The yardstick is old. For the purposes of comparison with those countries which are richer we need to use up to date facts. This means advancing forward.

Drafted according to the notes of Com[rades]

[L.M.] Gatovsky, [I.I.] Kuzminov, [I.D.] Lapytev, [L.A.] Leontyev, [K.V.] Ostrovityanov, [V.I.] Pereslegin, [A.I.] Pashkov, [D.T.] Shepilov and [P.F.] Yudin.

Taken into account are the notes of Com[rades]
Atlas, Arakelyan, Bolgov, Vasilieva, Gusakov, Kozlov, Lyubimov, Rubinstein.

ARAN Fond 1705, Opis 1, No. 166, LL 14-66.

Translated from the Russian by Tahir Asghar.

* Copyright © Revolutionary Democracy, 1998

Click [here](#) to return to the September 1998 index.

Speech at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

October 16, 1952

J.V. Stalin

Yes, we did hold the Congress of our party. It went very well, and many of you might now think that, amongst us there exists full harmony and unity. But we have not this harmony and unity of thought. Some of you are even opposed to and do not like our decision.

They say, why do we need an enlarged Central Committee. But isn't it self-evident that we need to get new blood and new strength into the CC of the CPSU? We are getting older and shall sooner or later die, but we must think into whose hands we shall give this torch of our great undertaking, who will carry it onward and reach the goal of communism? For this we need younger people with more energy, dedicated comrades and political leaders. And what does it mean to bring up a dedicated, devoted political leader of the State? It needs ten, no fifteen years so that we would be able to bring up a state leader, able to carry on this torch.

But just to wish for this to happen is not enough. To bring up such new cadres needs time and involvement in the day-to-day governing of the state, learning in practical matters which encompass the whole gamut of the state apparatus, plans and ideological concepts to carry on to a higher plateau the building of a Socialist society, and that comrades must be able to recognize and struggle against all sorts of opportunist tendencies. He must be a Leninist worker, taught by our party its history, tactics, plans and future of the Soviet Union as envisaged by Lenin.

Is it not self evident that we must lift up the importance and the role of our party and its party committees? Can we afford not to follow the desire of Lenin to improve the work of the party constantly? All this needs a flow of younger blood into the leadership, especially in the CC of the CPSU. And this we followed as Lenin always suggested. In this way even the membership of our party has grown.

The question is asked as to why we relieved some well-known comrades from their posts in the party and state apparatus? What can be said about this? We replaced comrades Molotov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov and others and they were elected to new, less demanding posts. The work of a Minister is extremely hard work, demanding strength, stamina and new thinking to new problems. Why did we put in their place younger and more qualified, energetic comrades? They are younger comrades, have more energy plus strength. We are old Bolsheviki and shall not be here forever. We must support and help them.

The replaced comrades, the old Bolsheviks are in very important new positions, where their expertise, dedication and respect is beyond question. They are all now our Deputy Chairpersons of the Council of Ministers of the USSR. Thus, even I do not know how many Deputy Ministers we have.

We must, as Communists be self-critical and also critical of others.

There has been criticism of comrades Molotov and Mikoyan by the Central Committee.

Comrade Molotov – the most dedicated to our cause. He shall give his life for the cause of the party. But we cannot overlook his weakness in certain aspects of his work. Comrade Molotov is our Minister of Foreign Affairs, finding himself at a ‘slippery’ diplomatic reception, he gave an assurance to a British diplomat that the capitalists can start to publish bourgeois newspapers in our country. Why? Was that the place to give such an assurance, without the knowledge of the CC CPSU? Is it not self-evident that the bourgeoisie is our class enemy and that to promote bourgeois newspapers amongst our party people besides doing harm, shall not bring us any benefit. If this was allowed to transpire, we can foresee circumstances where the attacks against Socialism and the CPSU would be started, first very subtly then overtly. This is the first political mistake of comrade V.M. Molotov.

What about the incorrect suggestion by Molotov to give the Crimea to the Soviet Jews? This is a flagrant mistake of comrade Molotov. Why was this even proposed? On what grounds did comrade Molotov make this proposal? We have a Jewish Autonomous Republic. What else is yet needed? There are many other minority nations that have now their own Autonomous Regions and also Autonomous Republics... is this not enough now? Or is this meant not to trust the Constitution of the USSR and its policy on nationalities? Comrade Molotov is not appointed by anyone to be a lawyer for pursuing territorial pretensions on the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics! This is the second mistake of our esteemed comrade V.I. Molotov! Thus, in this respect comrade Molotov is not correct in his proclamations as a member of the Politburo. The CC of the CPSU has categorically defeated his suggestion.

Comrade Molotov has such deep respect for his wife, that no sooner have the CC or the Politburo made very many decisions on this or that question, that this decision immediately is conveyed to Molotov’s wife Zhemtchuzhina and all of her friends. Her friends, as is well known to all of you here, are not to be trusted, as former situations have shown. It is of course not the way that a member of the CPSU-CC-Politburo should behave.

Now regarding comrade Mikoyan. He is categorically against and thus he agitates against any taxes for the Soviet peasants. What is it that is not clear to our esteemed comrade A.I. Mikoyan?

Farmer Deputy – We have good relations with the collective farmers. Our Collective Farmers are forever dedicated to collectivization. Our crops are abundant and all our

Collective Farmers should give taxes to the state as the workers do. Therefore we do not agree with the suggestion – put forward by comrade Mikoyan.

Mikoyan – coming to the speaker's tribune started to defend his collective farm policies.

Stalin – Well comrade Mikoyan, you are lost in your own policies and you are now trying to get the members of the CC to be lost with you. Are you still unclear?

Molotov – Coming to the speaker's tribune completely admits his mistakes before the CC, but he stated that he is and will always be a faithful disciple of Stalin.

Stalin – (interrupting Molotov) This is nonsense. I have no students at all. We are all students of the great Lenin.

Stalin suggested that they continue the agenda point by point and elect comrades into different committees of state.

With no Politburo, there is now elected a Presidium of the CC of the CPSU in the enlarged CC and in the Secretariat of the CC of the CPSU – altogether 36 members.

In the new list of those elected are all members of the old Politburo – except that of comrade A.A. Andreev, who, as everyone knows now is unfortunately completely deaf and thus cannot function.

Voice From the Floor – We need to elect comrade Stalin as the General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

Stalin – No! I am asking that you relieve me of the two posts!

Malenkov – Coming to the tribune: Comrades! We should all unanimously ask comrade Stalin, our leader and our teacher, to be again the General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU.

This document was published for the first time in the newspaper 'Glasnost', the central organ of the Union of Communist Parties – CPSU. It was translated from Russian and published in 'Northstar Compass' in its issue of April 2000, pp. 22-24.

Click [here](#) to return to the April 2002 index.

Two Documents on Electoral Questions

J.V. Stalin

Published below are documents relating to the electoral question in Nazi Germany in 1933 and in India just prior to the general elections of 1952. The first two documents relate to the Reichstag elections after the Nazis came to power and the Referendum to be held after Germany departed from the League of Nations and the Disarmament Conference. Stalin opposed the suggestion that the Communist Party of Germany should recommend to the voters that they boycott the elections. He argued that this would simply constitute electoral absenteeism and said that the voters should score out the fascist list. In the Referendum the Communist Party of Germany should suggest that the voters vote 'no' on the question of approval of Nazi government policy on the departure from the League of Nations and the Disarmament Conference.

The second document of J.V. Stalin relates to the publication in the Cominform journal of the Pre-Election Manifesto of the Communist Party of India for the first general election. It shows the keen interest shown by the CPSU(b) in this political event. It also reveals in a clear fashion that Stalin and the CPSU(b) did not adhere to the sectarian position upheld by a section of the revolutionary communists in India that it is impermissible in principle for communists in a colonial or semi-colonial country to participate in the electoral process.

V.S.

No. 1

Letter from the Political Secretariat of ECCI to Stalin on the Tactics of the Communist Party of Germany

25 October, 1933
Moscow
Top Secret

In Germany, where the campaign is going on for the elections which are scheduled for 12th November for the Reichstag and the Referendum which is to be held after the exit from the League of Nations and the Disarmament Conference, the situation is such that the chances of affecting the elections in any significant manner do not exist. [There will be a list of national-socialists for the Reichstag and a voting slip for the referendum bearing an option 'yes' (signifying approval of the government's policy) and 'no' (against this policy)]. No other option of expressing an opinion of dissatisfaction with the fascist regime exists for a voter participating in the elections. A call given by the Communist Party, for instance, to inscribe 'Down with Fascism', 'Long Live the Communist Party of Germany', and so on would attract only an insignificant number of voters.

The Cominternists propose to:

- (1) Appeal to the voters to boycott the elections.
- (2) At the places where the fascists will force voters to participate in the elections, appeal to the voters to cross out the list bearing the names of the national-socialists and the referendum voting slip.
- (3) The Communist Party of Germany must conduct its electoral campaign under slogans such as (a) Against the Treaty of Versailles. In the battle against bankers, factory owners, landlords and their defenders – the national socialists; the working class of Germany along with the revolutionary workers of France, England and the whole world will liberate Germany from the yoke of the Treaty of Versailles. (b) Against fascism and war. (c) Against hunger and terror. (d) Down with the fascist dictatorship. Long live the Worker-Peasant Soviet Republic.

The local leadership of the Communist Party of Germany agrees with the proposals of the Cominternists but the Foreign Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany proposes participating in the elections, crossing out the national-socialist list and voting for the option 'no' in the referendum. The foreign leadership of the Social Democratic Party of Germany is also proposing participation in the elections and using the same method of voting as that suggested by the Foreign Bureau of the CC of the CPG.

We concur with the opinion of the Cominternists. It is an urgent question – please communicate your opinion.

RGASPI F. 508. Op. 1. D. 128. L. 27-28.

No. 2

**Reply of Stalin to the Letter of the Political Secretariat
of ECCI dated 25th October, 1933.**

26 October, 1933
Moscow
Top Secret

The Cominternists are not correct. The boycott proposed by them is not an active boycott in the Bolshevik spirit. It is a simple abstention from elections: simply absenteeism. The Bolsheviks have never observed such a boycott. They observe only active boycott accompanied by revolutionary activities, their aim is to undermine or even to foil the elections. But this, the solely acceptable boycott, is now not possible in Germany. Therefore the Cominternists are wrong and the Foreign Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPG is correct. You must participate in the elections, cross out the fascist list and vote for the option 'no' in the referendum. On such a basis you must form an anti-fascist

front with the social-democratic workers and lead them so that such an initiative can be undertaken on a communist platform and under their leadership. Any other politics will serve only the interests of the fascists and social-democrats.

Signed: Stalin

RGASPI F. 508. Op.1. D.128. L.30.

The above documents have been taken from: (Editors) V.V. Dam'ye, N.P. Komolova, M.B. Korchagina, K.K. Shirinya 'Komintern protiv fashizma. Dokumenty'. Moscow, Nauka, 1999, pp. 305-307. They have been translated from the Russian by Shubhra Nagalia.

No. 3

From Protokol No. 83

Decision of the Politburo of the CC A-UCP(b) for 31st July - 7th October 1951.
Decision of the Politburo of the CC of the A-UCP(b) of 29.VIII.51.

**294 - On the Publication of the
'Pre-Election Manifesto of the Communist Party of India'.**

Adopted the proposal of the Foreign-Policy Commission of the CC A-UCP(b) on the publication in the next issue of the newspaper 'For an Everlasting Peace for People's Democracy' of 31st August (this year) the 'Pre-Election Manifesto of the Communist Party of India'.

Secretary of the CC J. Stalin.

Rgaspi, F. 17 Op. 3. D. 1090. L. 58. Typewritten text. Facsimile of the signature of J.V. Stalin, authenticating seal of the CC A-UCP(b).

True typewritten extract from the Protocol:
Deputy Director of the Russian State
Archive of Social-Political History

(RGASPI Seal) s / d
V. Shepelev
19.05.2000

Translated from the Russian by Vijay Singh.

Click [here](#) to return to the September 2001 index.

On The Film 'The Great Life'

J.V. Stalin

Speech by Comrade Stalin at the Meeting of the Organising Bureau of the Central Committee, All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks).

9. VIII-1946.

We have seen this film, seen also its first part. The first part is better, even though it calls for criticism. I am now, through associations, collating this film with the film 'Ivan Grozni' by Eisenstein, the second part, and with Pudovkin's film 'Admiral Nakhimov'. One gets a general impression that the Producers and Directors worked little over the subject matter, they want to demonstrate that they relate light-heartedly towards their duties. I would even say that sometimes this light-heartedness can be a crime. People do not study the subject, they write scripts and do not comprehend the matter, they do not study it. This is not an honest attitude.

Let's take some good Producers, Directors, let us take that same American Charlie Chaplin. For two, three years he is silent, works hard, conscientiously studies technique and other details of his art, because no work without details can be studied in depth and one cannot make a good film without details. One has to study the details. And good Producers, Directors, work for years – 2, 3, 4 years because they relate to their work very punctiliously and conscientiously. And we have here poets, who can finish two poems in a month. And let's take Goethe, he worked for thirty years on 'Faust'; how sincere and conscientious he was about his work. This casual attitude of authors of certain works becomes a flaw which forces the Directors and Producers to make such films. Take for example the film 'Admiral Nakhimov'. Pudovkin is a talented Director and Producer, knows his work, but this time he did not get around, as is required, to study his subject. He decided: I am Pudovkin, everyone knows me, I will write and the public will swallow any film, they will see my films, and read any story. The people are starved, there is a lot of curiosity and inquisitiveness and of course they will watch any film. But now people's taste has become more refined and they are not ready to swallow every product. They have started differentiating the bad from the good and are making new demands. And if this business continues further, and we, Bolsheviks are going to try and develop the audience's taste, I am afraid some of these Script-Writers, Producers and Directors will have served their time.

The film 'Nakhimov' also has elements of the producer's dishonest approach to their subject, which they wanted to show. They try to win on trivial details, they showed two, three paper ships, the rest is dances, various meetings, all kinds of episodes to engage the audience. This, strictly speaking, is not a film about Nakhimov but a film about anything else, with a few episodes about Nakhimov. We sent the film back and told Pudovkin that he has not studied his subject matter, he does not know history, does not know that the Russians were present in Sinop and had established their power. This work has been portrayed in such a manner as if the Russians were not there. The Russians took an entire

bunch of Turkish Generals into prison but this has not been conveyed in the film. Why? One doesn't know. Maybe, because this demands hard work, whereas it is easier to show dances. In one word, this is a callous attitude to the work, which this fellow took upon himself, which will be shown all over the world. If this person has any self-respect he would not have done this. He would have presented this film differently. But Pudovkin is not interested in social opinion or the viewers' response.

Or take another film of Eisenstein – 'Ivan Grozni' Part II. I do not know if anybody saw it. I saw it. Loathsome piece! The person has completely diverged from history. He has portrayed the *oprichnina* (bodyguards of tsar Ivan IV- ed.) as the lowest wretches, degenerates, something like the American Ku-Klux-Klan. Eisenstein did not understand that the *oprichnina* forces were progressive, upon whom Ivan Grozni (Ivan the Terrible) relied to unite Russia into one centralized state against the feudal princes who wanted to break up and weaken him. He, Eisenstein, has an outdated opinion about the *oprichnina*. The view of the old historians on the *oprichnina* was extremely negative because they regarded Grozni's repressions to be like the repressions of Nicholas II and completely deviated from the historical circumstances in which this took place. In our time there is a different view-point on the *oprichnina*. Russia, broken up into feudal principalities, i.e. into several states, needed to be unified if it did not want to come under the yoke of the Tatars for the second time. This is clear for everyone and should have been understood by Eisenstein as well. Eisenstein cannot but know this because there is a corresponding literature, but he portrayed some kind of degenerates. Ivan Grozni was a man with a strong will and character but for Eisenstein he is some kind of a spineless Hamlet. This is only pure form. What do we have to do with formalism, you have to give us historical truth. Studying a subject demands patience and some producers do not have sufficient patience and that is why they join everything into one and present us with a film: as if to say here, swallow it, more so, because it has on it the stamp of Eisenstein. How can one teach people to have a conscientious attitude towards their obligations, their own worth and towards the interests of the audience and the state? For we want to bring up our youth on truth and not on what can be twisted as truth.

And, lastly, the third film 'The Great Life'. That, which has been depicted, is obviously not the great life. All that has been done is to engage the interest of an undemanding audience. Someone likes the accordion with gypsy songs. So this is there. Another one likes songs sung in a restaurant. That is there. A third person likes discussions on various topics. That is also there. The fourth likes drinking and in this film there is a worker who cannot wake up without the smell of vodka or the sound of clinking glasses. Then he jumps up quickly. And this is there. Scenes of lovers strolling along are also there. Because the taste of the audience is varied. There is a little bit about restoration as well. Although this is a film about the restoration of Donbass, the restoration process occupies only one eighth of the film and that also in a playful laughable form. It is simply painful to watch; can it be really true that these people living amongst these golden people, amidst heroes, cannot portray them as is necessary, and should tarnish them. What the heck! We have good workers, they have proved themselves in war, they returned from the war and so must show themselves during restoration. This film is outdated when instead of an engineer they show an unskilled worker, and he says we workers are going

to be guided by ourselves, and that we do not need engineers. The engineer is pushed aside, a simple worker is put up and he will lead. In the same way, in this film an old worker is put up as a professor. The workers did have this kind of a mood in the first years of Soviet power, when the working class first took power and saw that power is in the hands of educated people and decided: down with the educated. This happened, but this was not right. A lot of time has passed since then. The country has risen to unprecedented heights with the help of mechanisation, we are producing coal 7 to 8 times more than before. Why? Because the entire work is mechanized, because coal-cutting machines carry out all the work. All these appliances together comprise the system of mechanisation. If there was no mechanisation we would simply have perished. All this has been achieved with the help of machines.

But what is this restoration that has been shown, where a single machine does not figure in the film. Everything shown is as the old way. These people simply did not study the subject matter, they do not know what is the meaning of restoration in our conditions. They have muddled up what took place after the civil war in 1918-1919 with that which takes place, say, in 1945-46. They have mixed up one with the other.

And now they say that the film needs to be corrected. I do not know how to do this, if this is possible technically, this must be done, but what will remain there? The gypsy scene should be thrown out. That eight girls, appearing accidentally, changed everything in Donbass is a fairy tale, is an unthinkable thing. This also has to be corrected. People living in terrible conditions, almost under the sky, the engineer does not know the Director of the mine, not knowing where to sleep – all this has to be eliminated. This, perhaps, may be taking place in some areas, but this is not typical. We have built whole cities, a whole 'state' of cities in Donbass, all this was not shown. If this film is to be called the first attempt towards restoration then the interest is lost, but this, in any case is not the great life after the Second World War. If we want to call this film 'The Great Life' it will have to be altered drastically. Then what will remain? You will need to get some more new artists along with these ones (though these artists act quite well). This entire partisan spirit that we do not need the educated, do not need engineers – this is stupid, this has to be thrown out. So, what will remain? Try and if it is possible, correct it. But the film cannot be released in this version. 4,700 thousand roubles have been wasted.

Lukov: Allow me to correct it. There are some mistakes.

Stalin: There are not mistakes. We understand things differently.

Lukov: Even then, allow me to correct it. I made the first part. I am, myself, from Donbass. I confused the times, now everything is clear. Allow me to correct it.

Stalin: Tell me, are you capable of correcting it. If it is possible, then correct it, please. But this will be very difficult. You will need to change everything. This, in fact, will be a new film. You know, we suggested to Pudovkin to correct the film 'Admiral Nakhimov'. He demanded 6 months but he will not manage it because he will need to change everything. He approached this big problem rather lightly and now the film is not yet

ready. In fact, he is re-doing it. You will also need to turn everything around. You can try, you may be successful. How does the Arts Council look at it; can we correct it?

Pirev: I think we can, but with the condition that we will need to take a lot of new material. We need to make a film about the restoration of Donbass.

Stalin: What will remain from this film?

Pirev: I think the people must remain because the audience knows and loves these artists from the first part. If they remain then they should be shown in a different way.

Stalin: The people should be shown in a different way. I don't think that Andreev and Alyeinikov are capable only of drinking, they were forced, pushed to alcohol. Give them another role and they may not drink. One has to think about this.

RGASPI F. 71 Op. 10 D. 140 ll. 9-14. This journal is grateful to the authorities of the Russian State Archive of Social and Political History for permission to reproduce this document.

Translated from the Russian by Neelakshi Suryanarayan.

Click [here](#) to return to the April 2001 index.

J.V. Stalin: The Discussion with Sergei Eisenstein on the Film Ivan the Terrible

One of the consequence of the anti-Stalin campaign initiated by the CPSU in 1953 has been that a number of facets of Stalin's interventions on cultural questions are virtually unknown in the Communist movement. It is a telling commentary on this state of affairs that Paresh Dhar in his review of Asok Chattopadhyaya's book *Martiya Chirayat Bhabana - Silpa Sahitya Prasanga* (in Bengali) can write that 'what is most striking is that by a special research work, Asok has unveiled Stalin's numerous involvements with art and literature of which we never heard before', (*Frontier*, May 24th, 1997).

This discussion took place between Stalin, Zhdanov and Molotov from the political leadership of the CPSU(b), and S.M, Eisenstein and N. Cherkasov at the end of February, 1947. It was an integral part of the attempt by the Bolshevik party in the post-war period to raise the artistic level of Soviet culture and to eliminate weaknesses in ideological and political content.¹ Prior to the discussion the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) had on September 4th, 1946 taken a decision on the film *Glowing life*. Parts of the decision which bear on *Ivan the Terrible* are cited here:

'The fact of the matter is that many of our leading cinema workers - producers, directors and scenario writers - are taking a lighthearted and irresponsible attitude to their duties and are not working conscientiously on the films they produce. The chief defect in their work is failure to study subject matter... Producer Eisenstein betrayed ignorance of historical facts in the second series of *Ivan Grozny*, depicting Ivan Grozny's progressive army, the *oprichniki*, as a gang of degenerates reminiscent of the American Ku Klux Klan. Ivan Grozny, a man of strong will and character, is shown as a spineless weakling, as a Hamlet type...

'One of the fundamental reasons for the production of worthless films is the lack of knowledge of subject matter and the lighthearted attitude of scenario writers and producers to their work.

'The Central Committee finds that the Ministry of Cinematography, and primarily its head, Comrade Bolshakov, exercises inadequate supervision over film studios, producers and scenario writers, is doing too little to improve the quality of films and is spending large sums of money to no useful purpose. Leading officials of the Ministry of Cinematography take an irresponsible attitude to the work entrusted to them and are indifferent to the ideological and political content and artistic merits of the films being produced.

'The Central Committee is of the opinion that the work of the Ministry's Art Council is incorrectly organized. The council does not ensure impartial and

business-like criticism of films for production. It often takes an apolitical attitude in its judgement of film and pays little attention to their idea-content. Many of its members

display lack of principle in their assessment of films, their judgment being based on personal, friendly relations with the producers. The absence of criticism in the cinema and the prevalent narrow-circle atmosphere are among the chief reasons for the production of poor films.

'Art workers must realise that those who continue to take an irresponsible, lighthearted attitude to their work, may well find themselves superfluous and outside the ranks of progressive Soviet art, for the cultural requirements and demands of the Soviet theatregoer have developed and the Party and Government will continue to cultivate among the people good taste and encourage exacting demands on works of art.'
(*Decisions of the Central Committee, C.P.S.U.(b) On Literature and Art (1946-1948)*, Moscow, 1951, pp. 26-28.)

1. An earlier criticism of the films of Eisenstein (*Strike, The Battleship Potemkin, October, and The General Line*) was published in 1931: I. Anissimov, 'The Films of Eisenstein'. This has been reprinted in *Bulletin International*, 64-67, April-July 1983, pp. 74-91. (In French).

We were summoned to the Kremlin at about 11 o'clock [In the evening - *Ed.*]. At 10.50 we reached the reception. Exactly at 11 o'clock Poskrebyshev came out to escort us to the cabinet.

At the back of the room were Stalin, Molotov and Zhdanov.

We entered, exchanged greetings and sat around the table.

Stalin. You wrote a letter. The answer got delayed a little. We are meeting late. I first thought of giving a written answer but then I decided that talking will be better. As I am very busy and have no time I decided to meet you here after a long interval. I received your letter in November.

Zhdanov. You received it while still in Sochi.

Stalin. Yes, yes. In Sochi. What have you decided to do with the film?

We are saying that we have divided the second part of the film into two sections, because of which the Livonsky March has not been included. As a result there is a disproportion between the different parts of the film. So it is necessary to correct the film by editing the existing material and to shoot mainly the Livonsky march.

Stalin. Have you studied History?

Eisenstein. More or less.

Stalin. More or less? I am also a little familiar with history. You have shown the *oprichnina* incorrectly. The *oprichnina* was the army of the king. It was different from

the feudal army which could remove its banner and leave the battleground at any moment - the regular army, the progressive army was formed. You have shown this *oprichnina* to be like the Ku-Klux-Klan.

Eisenstein said that they wear white cowls but we have black ones.

Molotov. This does not make a major difference.

Stalin. Your tsar has come out as being indecisive, he resembles Hamlet. Everybody prompts him as to what is to be done, and he himself does not take any decision... Tsar Ivan was a great and a wise ruler, and if he is compared with Ludwig XI (you have read about Ludwig XI who prepared absolutism for Ludwig XIV), then Ivan the Terrible is in the tenth heaven. The wisdom of Ivan the Terrible is reflected by the following: he looked at things from the national point of view and did not allow foreigners into his country, he barricaded the country from the entry of foreign influence. By showing Ivan the Terrible in this manner you have committed a deviation and a mistake. Peter Ist was also a great ruler, but he was extremely liberal towards foreigners, he opened the gate wide to them and allowed foreign influence into the country and permitted the Germanisation of Russia. Catherine allowed it even more. And further. Was the court of Alexander I really a Russian court? Was the Court of Nicolaus I a Russian court? No, they were German courts.

The most outstanding contribution of Ivan the Terrible was that he was the first to introduce the government monopoly of external trade. Ivan the Terrible was the first and Lenin was the second.

Zhdanov. The *Ivan the Terrible* of Eisenstein came out as a neurotic.

Molotov. In general, emphasis was given to psychologism, excessive stress was laid on internal psychological contradictions and personal emotions.

Stalin. It is necessary to show the historical figure in correct style. For example it was not correct that in the first series Ivan the Terrible kissed his wife so long. At that period it was not permitted.

Zhdanov. The film is made in the Byzantine style but there also it was not done.

Molotov. The second series is very restricted in domes and vaults, there is no fresh air, no wider Moscow, it does not show the people. One may show conversations, repressions but not this.

Stalin. Ivan the Terrible was extremely cruel. It is possible to show why he had to be cruel.

One of the mistakes of Ivan the Terrible was that he did not completely finish off the five big feudal families. If he had destroyed these five families then there would not have

been the Time of Troubles. If Ivan the Terrible executed someone then he repented and prayed for a long time. God disturbed him on these matters... It was necessary to be decisive.

Molotov. It is necessary to show historical incidents in a comprehensive way. For example the incident with the drama of Demyan Bedny *Bogatyp*. Demyan Bedny mocked the baptism of Russia, but in reality acceptance of Christianity was a progressive event for its historical development.

Stalin. Of course, we are not good Christians but to deny the progressive role of Christianity at that particular stage is impossible. This incident had a very great importance because this turned the Russian state to contacts with the West, and not to an orientation towards the East.

About relations with the East, Stalin said that after the recent liberation from the Tatar yoke, Ivan the Terrible united Russia in a hurried way so as to have a stronghold to face a fresh Tatar attack. Astrakhan was already conquered and they could have attacked Moscow at any moment, The Crimean Tatars also could have done this.

Stalin. Demyan Bedny did not have the correct historical perspective. When we shifted the statue of Minin and Podzharsky closer to the church of Vasily Blazhenova then Demyan Bedny protested and wrote that the statue must be thrown away and that Minin and Podzharsky must be forgotten. In answer to this letter, I called him 'Ivan, do not forget your own family'. We cannot throw away history...'

Next Stalin made a series of remarks regarding the interpretation of Ivan the Terrible and said that Malyuta Skuratov was a great army general and died a hero's death in the war with Livonia.

Cherkasov in reply said that criticism always helped and that after criticism Pudovkin made a good film *Admiral Nakhimov*. 'We are sure that we will not do worse. I am working on the character of Ivan the Terrible not only the film, but also in the theatre. I fell in love with this character and think that our alteration of the scenes will be correct and truthful'.

In response to this Stalin replied (addressing Molotov and Zhdanov) - 'Let's try?'

Cherkasov I am sure that the alteration will be successful.

Stalin. May god help you, - every day a new year. (Laughs.)

Eisenstein. We are saying that in the first part a number of moments were successful and this gives us the confidence for making the second series.

Stalin. We are not talking about what you have achieved, but now we are talking about the shortcomings.

Eisenstein asked whether there were some more instructions regarding the film.

Stalin. I am not giving you instructions but expressing the viewer's opinion. It is necessary that historical characters are reflected correctly. What did Glinka show us? What is this Glinka. This is Maksim and not Glinka. [They were talking about the film *Composer Glinka* made by L. Arnshtam. The main role was played by B. Chirkov.] Artist Chirkov could not express himself and for an artist the greatest quality is the capability to transform himself. (Addressing Cherkasov) - you are capable of transforming yourself.

In answer to this Zhdanov said that Cherkasov was unlucky with Ivan the Terrible. There was still panic with regard to *Spring* and he started to act as a janitor - in the film *In the Name of Life* he plays a janitor.

Cherkasov said that he had acted the maximum number of tsars and he had even acted as Peter Ist and Aleksei.

Zhdanov. According to the hereditary line. He proceeded according to the hereditary line.

Stalin. It is necessary to show historical figures correctly and strongly. (To Eisenstein). You directed *Alexander Nevsky*. It came out very well. The most important thing is to maintain the style of the historical period. The director may deviate from history; it is not correct if he simply copies from the historical materials, he must work on his ideas but within the boundary of style. The director may vary within the style of that historical period.

Zhdanov said that Eisenstein is fascinated by the shadows (which distracts viewers from the action), and the beard of Ivan the Terrible and that Ivan the Terrible raises his head too often, so that his beard can be seen.

Eisenstein promised to shorten the beard of Ivan the Terrible in future.

Stalin. (Recalling different actors from the first part of the film *Ivan the Terrible*) Kurbsky - is magnificent. Staritsky is very good (Artist Kadochnikov). He catches the flies excellently. Also: the future tsar, he is catching flies with his hands! These type of details are necessary. They reveal the essence of man.

...The conversation then switched to the situation in Czechoslovakia in connection with Cherkasov's participation in the Soviet film festival. Cherkasov narrated the popularity of the Soviet Union in Czechoslovakia.

The discussion then touched upon the destruction of the Czechoslovakian cities by the Americans.

Stalin. Our job was to enter Prague before the Americans. The Americans were in a great hurry, but owing to Koniev's attack we were able to outdistance the Americans and strike Prague just before its fall. The Americans bombed Czechoslovakian industry. They

maintained this policy throughout Europe, for them it was important to destroy those industries which were in competition with them. They bombed with taste.

Cherkasov spoke about the album of photographs of Franco and Goebbels which was with Ambassador Zorin at his villa.

Stalin. It is good that we finished these pigs. It is horrifying to think what would have happened if these scoundrels had won.

Cherkasov mentioned the graduation ceremony of the Soviet colony in Prague. He spoke of the children of emigrants who were studying there. It was very sad for these children who think of Russia as their motherland, as their home, when they were born there and had never been to Russia.

Stalin. It is unfortunate for these children. They are not at fault.

Molotov. Now we are giving a big opportunity to the children to return to Russia.

Stalin pointed to Cherkasov that he had the capacity for incarnation and that we have still the capacity to incarnate the artist Khmelev.

Cherkasov said that he had learnt a lot while working as an extra in the Marine Theatre in Leningrad. At that time the great master of incarnation Shaliapin acted and appeared on stage.

Stalin. He was a great actor.

Zhdanov asked: how is the shooting of the film *Spring* going on.

Cherkasov. We will finish it soon. Towards spring we are going to release *Spring*.

Zhdanov said that he liked the content of *Spring* a lot. The artist Orlova played very well.

Cherkasov. The artist Plyatt acted very well.

Zhdanov. And how did Ranevskaya act! (Waves his hand.)

Cherkasov. For the first time in my life I appeared in a film without a beard, without a moustache, without a cloak, without make-up. Playing the role of a director, I am a bit ashamed of my appearance and I feel like hiding behind my characters. This role is a lot of responsibility because I must represent a Soviet director and all our directors are worried: How will a Soviet director be shown?

Molotov. And here Cherkasov is settling scores with all the directors! When the film *Spring* was called into question, Cherkasov read an editorial in the newspaper *Soviet Art* regarding *Spring* and decided the film was already banned. And then Zhdanov said:

Cherkasov saw that all the preparations for *Spring* had perished so he took on the role of a janitor. Then Zhdanov spoke disapproving of the critical storm which had come up around *Spring*.

Stalin was interested to know how the actress Orlova had acted. He approved of her as an actress.

Cherkasov said that this actress had a great capability of working and an immense talent.

Zhdanov. Orlova acted extremely well. And everybody remembered *Volga-Volga* and the role of the postman Orlova had played.

Cherkasov. Have you watched *In the Name of Life*?

Stalin. No, I have not watched it, but we have a good report from Kliment Efremovich. Voroshilov liked the film.

Then that means that all the questions are solved. What do you think Comrades (addresses Molotov and Zhdanov), should we give Comrades Cherkasov and Eisenstein the opportunity to complete the film? - and added - please convey all this to Comrade Bolshakov.

Cherkasov asked about some details in the film and about the outward appearance of Ivan the Terrible.

Stalin. His appearance is right, there is no need to change it. The outward appearance of Ivan the Terrible is fine.

Cherkasov. Can the scene about the murder of Staritskova be retained in the scenario?

Stalin. You may retain it. The murder did take place.

Cherkasov. We have a scene in which Malyuta Skuratov strangles the Metropolitan Philip.

Zhdanov. It was in the Tver Otroch-Monastery?

Cherkasov. Yes, is it necessary to keep this scene? Stalin said that it was necessary to retain this scene as it was historically correct.

Molotov said it was necessary to show repression but at the same time one must show the purposes for which it was done. For this it was necessary to show state activities on a wider canvas and not to immerse oneself only with the scenes in the basements and enclosed areas. One must show wide state activity.

Cherkasov expressed his ideas regarding the future of the altered scenes and the second series.

Stalin. How does the film end? How better to do this, to make another two films - that is second and third series. How are we planning to this?

Eisenstein said that it was better to combine the already shot material of the second series with what was left of the scenario - and produce one big film.

Everyone agreed to this.

Stalin. How is your film going to end?

Cherkasov said that the film would end with the defeat of Livonia, the tragic death of Malyuta Skuratov, the march towards the sea where Ivan the Terrible is standing, surrounded by the army, and says, 'We are standing on the sea and will be standing!'

Stalin. This is how it turned out and a bit more than this.

Cherkasov asked whether it would be necessary to show the outline of the film for confirmation by the Politburo.

Stalin. It is not necessary to present the scenario, decide it by yourselves. It is generally difficult to judge from the scenario, it is easier to talk about a ready product. (To Molotov.) You must be wanting to read the scenario?

Molotov. No, I work in other fields. Let Bolshakov read it.

Eisenstein said that it was better not to hurry with the production of this film.

This comment drew an active reaction from everybody.

Stalin. It is absolutely necessary not to hurry, and in general to hasten the film would lead to its being shut down rather than its being released. Repin worked on the *Zaporozhye Cossacks Writing Their Reply to the Turkish Sultan* for 11 years.

Molotov. 13 years.

Stalin (with insistence) 11 years.

Everybody came to the conclusion that only a long spell of work may in reality produce a good film.

Regarding the film *Ivan the Terrible* Stalin said - That if necessary take one and a half, two even three years to produce this film. But the film should be good, it should be 'sculptured'. We must raise quality. Let there be fewer films, but with greater quality. The viewer has grown up and we must show him good productions.

It was discussed that Tselikovskaya acted well in other characters, she acts well but she is a ballerina.

We answered that it was impossible to summon another actress to Alma-Ata.

Stalin said that the directors should be adamant and demand whatever they need. But our directors too easily yield on their own demands. It sometimes happens that a great actor is necessary but it is played by someone who does not suit the role. This is because the actor demands and receives the role while the director agrees.

Eisenstein. The actress Gosheva could not be released from the Arts Theatre in Alma-Ata for the shooting. We searched two years for an Anastasia.

Stalin. Artist Zharov incorrectly looked upon his character without any seriousness in the film *Ivan the Terrible*. He is not a serious Army-General.

Zhdanov. This is not Malyuta Skuratov but an opera-hat.

Stalin. Ivan the Terrible was a more nationalist tsar, more foresighted, he did not allow foreign influence in Russia. Peter I opened the gate to Europe and allowed in too many foreigners.

Cherkasov said that it was unfortunate and a personal shame that he had not seen the second part of the film *Ivan the Terrible*. When the film was edited and shown he had been at that time in Leningrad.

Eisenstein also added that he had not seen the complete version of the film because he had fallen ill after completing it.

This caused great surprise and animation.

The discussion ended with Stalin wishing them success and saying 'May god help them!'

They shook hands and left. At 00.10 minutes the conversation ended.

An addition was made to this report by Eisenstein and Cherkasov:

'Zhdanov also said: 'In the film there is too much over-indulgence of religious rituals.'

Translated from the Russian by Sumana Jha.

Courtesy: *G. Maryamov: Kremlevskii Tsenzor, Moscow, 1992, pp. 84-91.*

Click [here](#) to return to the September 1997 index.

Apropos of the Statement of Mr. Morrison

J.V. Stalin

This reply to the declaration of the Foreign Minister in the Labour Government of Britain was first published in 'Pravda' on the first of August, 1951. The files of the former CPSU archives indicate that it was slated for publication in the 'Works' of Stalin. As is known only 13 volumes of this series was actually published. While the publication of the 14th volume was announced just prior to the 20th Congress of the CPSU held in 1956 the anti-communist turn at that congress effectively terminated the completion of this project. The following article has been translated and published as part of the ongoing endeavours of this journal to make available for the English-reading audience the writings of this classic of Marxism which have emerged from the archives after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. It has been gratifying to note that many of these materials have been translated and published in the principal languages of the world and especially so in the major tongues of the subcontinent.

Vijay Singh

Mr. Morrison has put forward two sets of questions: questions concerning internal politics and those dealing with external politics.

Internal Politics.

Mr. Morrison affirms that in the Soviet Union there is no freedom of speech, press or personal freedom.

Mr. Morrison is grievously mistaken. In no other country exists such kind of freedom of speech, press or personal freedom, organizations for workers, peasants and the intelligentsia as in the Soviet Union. Nowhere are there as many clubs for workers and peasants, as many newspapers specifically for them as in the Soviet Union. Nowhere has the working class been organized in such a systematic manner as in the Soviet Union. It is not a secret for anyone that the entire working class, literally all the workers of the USSR have been organized into unions, just as all the peasants have been organized into cooperatives.

Does Mr. Morrison know this? Obviously, he does not. Apparently he does not even have the desire to know. He prefers to derive his knowledge from the complaints put forward by the representatives of the Russian capitalists, expelled from the country by the will of the Soviet people.

In the USSR there is no freedom of speech, the press or organizations for the enemies of the people, for the landowners and the capitalists who have been overthrown by the revolution. Similarly, there is no freedom for the incorrigible thieves, for the saboteurs sent abroad on intelligence assignments, for terrorists, killers and for those criminals who shot at Lenin, killed Volodarski, Uritski, Kirov, poisoned Maxim Gorky, Kuibishev. All

these criminals, starting from the landlords and capitalists to the terrorists, thieves, killers and those involved in subversive activities are out to achieve only one thing – restore capitalism in USSR, restore the exploitation of man by man and flood the country with the blood of workers and peasants. The prisons and labour camps exist only for these gentlemen and only for them.

Is it for these people that Mr. Morrison is trying to achieve the freedom of speech, press and personal freedom? Does Mr. Morrison really think that the people of the USSR would agree to give these people the freedom of speech, press and personal freedom, that is the freedom to exploit the workers?

Mr. Morrison remains silent about the other freedom, which has a deeper meaning than the freedom of speech, press etc. He does not say anything about the freedom of the people from exploitation, about the freedom from economic crisis, from unemployment, from poverty. Perhaps Mr. Morrison is not aware that all these freedoms already exist in the USSR from a long time. And it is precisely these freedoms that are the basis of all other freedoms. Is it because of this that Mr. Morrison ashamedly keeps quiet about these basic freedoms, because these, unfortunately do not exist in England and the English workers still continue to live under the yoke of the exploiting capitalists, irrespective of the fact, that in England the Labour party has been in power for the last six years.

Mr. Morrison insists, that the Labour government is a socialist one, that the radio programmes organized under the control of such a government should not meet with any hindrance from the side of the Soviets.

Unfortunately we cannot agree with Mr. Morrison. At first when the Labour party came into power one could presume that it would follow the path of socialism. However, later it turned out that the Labour government differs little from any other bourgeois government, aiming at maintaining the capitalist structure and providing the capitalists with considerable profits.

In reality, the profits of the capitalists in England are growing from year to year but the wages for workers remain frozen. More so, the Labour government is defending this anti-worker, exploitative regime by all kinds of measures, persecuting and even arresting the workers. Can such a government be called socialist?

One would have thought that with the Labour government in power capitalist exploitation would be eliminated, measures taken for the systematic lowering of the prices of the goods for mass consumption, and the material conditions of workers be improved in a substantial way. Instead we have in England, the capitalists' profits rising, the wages of the workers being frozen and an increase in the costs of basic commodities. No, we cannot call such politics socialist. As far as the radio broadcasts to the Soviet Union from England are concerned (the BBC), they, as is well known, are mostly targeted at encouraging the enemies of the Soviet people in their striving to restore capitalist exploitation. It is understandable that the Soviets cannot support such anti-people propaganda, which in fact amounts to interference in the internal matters of the USSR.

Mr. Morrison states, that the Soviet power in the USSR is a monolithic power because it represents the power of only one party, the party of the Communists. With this reasoning we can say that the Labour government is also a monolithic government since it represents the power of one party, the Labour party.

The point, however, is not this. The point is that, the Communists in USSR, firstly, operate not in isolation, but in a bloc with the non-party people. Secondly, in the historical development of the USSR the party of the communists proved itself as the single anti-capitalist, people's party.

In the course of the last fifty years the people of the Soviet Union have been witness to all the main parties that existed in Russia, the landowner's party (the Black Hundreds), the party of the capitalists (the Kadets), the Menshevik party (the right 'socialists'), the party of the Social Revolutionaries (the defenders of the kulaks), the party of the Communists. In the course of the unfolding revolutionary developments our people rejected all the bourgeois parties and made the choice in favour of the Communists, taking into account that this party is the only anti-landowner and anti-capitalist party. This is a historical fact and it is understandable that the peoples of the USSR entirely supported the Communist party in its struggles.

How can Mr. Morrison counter this historical fact? Does Mr. Morrison think that just for the sake of a doubtful game of opposition one may turn around the wheel of history and resurrect these parties that had died long ago.

External politics.

Mr. Morrison claims that the Labour government stands for maintaining peace, that it is of no threat to the Soviet Union, that the North-Atlantic Treaty is a non-aggressive pact for armaments, that England is forced to go on the path of arms race because after the Second World War, the Soviet Union has not demobilized its army sufficiently.

In all these claims of Mr. Morrison, unfortunately, there is not a drop of truth.

If the Labour government really stands for peace then why is it shying away from a Peace Pact of the five powers, why does it voice its opinion against the reduction of arms by all the big powers, why does it speak against a ban on nuclear weapons, why does it persecute people standing on the path of peace, why does it not ban the war propaganda in England.

Mr. Morrison wants that we should believe him in words. But the Soviet people cannot believe anyone in words, whosoever it may be. They demand action and not declarations.

In the same way, Mr. Morrison's statement, that the USSR has not demobilized its army sufficiently after the Second World War, is rather lame. The Soviet government has already declared that it has demobilized, that its army, presently is almost of the size that it was in the peacetime before Second World War. The English army, on the other hand,

is twice as large as it was before the war. However, these irrefutable facts continue to be opposed by loud unsubstantiated declarations.

Maybe, Mr. Morrison would like that the USSR should have an army not needing weapons. An army actually takes up too much from the government budget and the Soviet people would willingly go in for the dismantling of its regular army, if there was no threat of war from outside. But the experience of 1918-1920 has taught us otherwise, then the English, Americans, French (together with the Japanese) attacked the Soviet Union and tried to take away the Ukraine, Caucasus, Central Asia, Far East, and the Arkhangelski region and tormented it for three years. This has taught us that the USSR must maintain its necessary minimum regular army so that it can defend its independence from the imperialist aggressors. There has not been a single instance in history when the Russians have invaded the territory of England, but history knows of a whole range of instances, when the English invaded the territories of Russia and captured them.

Mr. Morrison says, that the Russians have refused to co-operate with the English on the German question, on the question of restoration of Europe. This is a white lie and Mr. Morrison could not be believing his own words. The truth, as is known to all, is not the Russians who have refused cooperation, but the English and the Americans as they knew, that the Russians would not go on the path of restoring fascism in Germany, on transforming West Germany into a zone for aggression.

As for cooperation for the economic restoration of Europe, then the USSR has not refused cooperation, on the contrary, it has itself suggested to implement the programme on the principles of equality and sovereignty of the European countries, without any diktats from outside, without the diktat of the United States of America.

In the same way, the declarations of Mr. Morrison that the communists came to power in the people's-democratic countries by force, that the Cominform is engaged in coercive, propaganda activities are unfounded. Only people who are hell bent on slandering the communists can make these statements.

As a matter of fact, the communists came to power in the people's-democratic countries by way of general elections. Obviously, the people of these countries threw out the exploiters and the foreign secret service agents. This is the will of the people. The voice of the people is the voice of God.

As for the Cominform, only those who have lost all sense of balance can say that it is engaged in coercive propagandistic activities. The Cominform documents have been published and continue to be published. They are known to all and fully refute any slanderous or defamatory statements against the communists.

One must emphasize here, that using force is not a method followed by the communists. On the contrary, history shows, that it is actually the enemies of communism and other foreign secret service agents who practice these coercive methods. One need not go far for such examples. Recently the prime minister of Iran was killed, so was the prime

minister of Lebanon and the king of Trans-Jordan. All these killings have been carried out with the sole aim of forceful change of power in these countries. Who killed these people? Was it the communists, the supporters of the Cominform? It is rather amusing to put forth such a question. Perhaps, Mr. Morrison, who is better informed would help us to sort out this matter?

Mr. Morrison states, that the North-Atlantic Treaty is a defence pact. It has been formed not with the objective of aggression, on the contrary, is directed against it.

If that is true, why did the initiators of this pact not invite the Soviet Union to participate in it? Why did they cordon off the Soviet Union? Why did they sign it secretly, behind the back of the USSR? Has not the USSR proved that it can and wishes to fight against aggression, by fighting against Hitler's and the Japanese aggression? Was its struggle against aggression worse than that of Norway, which is a signatory of the pact? How can one explain this absurdity?

If the North-Atlantic Treaty is a defence pact why did the English and Americans not agree to the proposal of the Soviet government to discuss this pact at the level of the council of ministers of foreign affairs? Is it not because the North-Atlantic Treaty contains clauses about aggression against the USSR and that the initiators of this pact are compelled to hide this from the society at large? Is it not because the Labour government has agreed to turn England into a military and air base for the United States of America to attack the Soviet Union?

This is why the Soviet people reiterate that the North-Atlantic Treaty is a pact of aggression, targeted against the USSR.

This is particularly visible from the aggressive actions of the Anglo-American right wing circles in Korea. Already two years have passed since the Anglo-American forces are tearing apart the freedom-loving, peaceful people of Korea, destroying the Korean villages and cities, killing women, children and the aged. Can one call these bloody acts of the Anglo-American forces defensive? Who can confirm that that the English forces in Korea are defending England from the Korean people? Would it not be more honest to call these acts a military aggression?

Let Mr. Morrison show us even a single Soviet soldier who would direct his weapons against any peace-loving people. There is no such soldier. And let Mr. Morrison explain convincingly why English soldiers are killing the peace-loving citizens of Korea. And why is an English soldier dying far from his country in an alien land?

This is the reason why Soviet people consider that contemporary Anglo-American politics is instigating a new world war.

'Pravda', 1st August 1951.

From: L.K. Grigoriev, 'Stalin. sobytiya i dokumenty', opyt istoriko-arkhivnogo, kontrpropagandistskogo i filosofskogo issledovaniya, Electronic publication, Moscow, 2002, pp. 46-50.

Translated from the Russian by Neelakshi Suryanarayan

Click [here](#) to return to the September 2003 index.

Documentation

Marxism and the Nuclear Question

Joseph Stalin

1. From: Answers to the Questions of the Moscow Correspondent of the 'Sunday Times', Mr. Alexander Werth, in a Letter of 17 September, 1946.

24th September, 1946

Q. Do you believe that the actual monopoly of the United States on the atom bomb to be one of the greatest threats to peace?

A. I do not think that the atom bomb is such a power as certain politicians are disposed to state. The atom bomb is intended to frighten people with weak nerves, but it cannot decide the fate of a war, and would under no circumstances suffice for this purpose. Certainly, the monopoly on the secrets of the atom bomb poses a threat, but against that there are at least two things:

The monopoly on the possession of the atom bomb cannot last long;

The use of the atom bomb will be forbidden.

Pravda, 25th September, 1946

2. From: Answer to Questions of 23rd October, 1946, from the President of the American News Agency United Press, Hugh Baillie.

29th October, 1946

Q. Does Russia already have the atom bomb or any similar weapon?

A. No.

Q. What is your opinion of the atom bomb or a similar weapon as an instrument of war?

A. I have already given my opinion of the atom bomb in the well known answers to Mr. Werth.

Q. In your opinion, how can atomic energy be best controlled? Should this control be founded on an international basis, and in what measure should the power of your sovereignty be sacrificed in the interests of the establishment of an effective control?

A. Strict international control is necessary.

Pravda, 30 October, 1946

3. From: Interview with Elliot Roosevelt

27th December, 1946

Q. If you are of the opinion that the United Nations should control the atom bomb, must that not be done through inspection and the establishment of control over all research institutes and industrial plants that produce any manner of weapons, as well as over the peaceful application and development of atomic energy?

(At this point, Elliot Roosevelt adds: Stalin immediately asked: 'In general?' I said: 'yes, but especially, is the Soviet Union in agreement in principle with such a plan?')

A. Of course. On the basis of the principle of equality it is not for the Soviet Union to make exceptions. It must submit to the same rules of inspection and control, like all the other countries.

(At this point Roosevelt remarks: This answer followed without hesitation and the question of the reservation of the right of veto was not even mentioned).

Q. Do you believe that the convocation of a new assembly of the big three for the discussion of all international problems, the present threat to general peace, would be useful?

A. I am of the opinion that not one assembly, but rather several, must take place. If several assemblies take place, very useful objectives would be served.

(Here Roosevelt remarks: At this moment my wife asked whether he thought that such meetings would help establish closer contacts on lower government levels too. She also asked whether such cooperation had been achieved through the conferences during the war.

Stalin turned to her and answered with a smile: 'There is no doubt about that. The consultations of the war times and the successes achieved have greatly helped by the bringing about of a closer cooperation on lower government levels.')

Q. What do you think has caused the loosening of the friendly relations and mutual agreements between our two countries since the death of Roosevelt?

A. I am of the opinion that, if this question concerns the relations and mutual agreement between the American and Russian people, they have not deteriorated at all, but on the

contrary, they have improved. Concerning the relations of the two governments, there have been misunderstandings. There was a certain deterioration, then a big clamour arose that the relations would deteriorate further in the future. But I see nothing frightening in this, in the sense of damaging peace or in the sense of a military conflict. No one big power is presently able to, even if the government itself is striving to, raise a big army to fight against another Allied power, to set up another great power, because at the present nobody can make war without the people, but the people do not want to be led into another war. The people are tired of war, besides there is no obvious aim to justify a new war. Nobody would know what they were fighting for, and so I see nothing to be frightened of, in that some representatives of the government of the United States speak of the deterioration in our relations. In regard of all these considerations, I do not believe in the danger of a new war.

Bolshevik, No.1, 1947.

4. From: Interview with the American Republican Presidential Candidate, Harold Stassen

9th April, 1947

Stassen said that for the raising of living standards the mechanization and electrification was of great importance, and the application of atomic energy in industry was of great importance for all the peoples as well as for the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America. He, Stassen, was of the opinion that the creating of an inspection and control system and that the use of atomic energy for military purposes should be declared illegal, was of great importance for all the peoples of the world. Was Stalin of the opinion that in the future, they should come to terms over the control and regulation of the production of atomic energy and over its peaceful application?

Stalin answered that he hoped so. Between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America there stood great differences of opinion on this question, but finally both sides, - so he, Stalin, hoped, - would come to terms. In his, Stalin's, view there would need to be international control and inspection and this would be of great importance. The application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes would cause a great revolution in production procedure. Where the application of atomic energy for military purposes was concerned, it possibly would be forbidden. the desires and the conscience of the peoples demanded so.

Stassen answered that it was one of the most important problems. If it was solved, atomic energy could be a great blessing for the peoples of all the world, but if not, then a great curse.

Stalin said that he believed it would be possible to establish international control and inspection. The development moved towards that.

Pravda, 8 May 1947

5. From: Answers to the questions from the european general Director, of the American news agency 'International News Service', Kingsbury Smith. 27 January, 1949.

Q. Would the government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to consider a joint publication with the government of the United States of America, to discuss a declaration which confirms that neither the one nor the other government intends to allow a war between them?

A. The Soviet government would be prepared to discuss the question of the publication of such a document.

Q. Would the government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared, jointly with the government of the United States of America, to take steps towards the realization of this peace treaty, for example, gradual disarmament?

A. Of course the government of the U.S.S.R. would cooperate with the government of the United States of America in the carrying through of steps for the realization of the peace treaty and gradual disarmament.

Pravda, 31 January, 1948

6. From: Interview with a *Pravda* Correspondent.

17th February, 1951

Prime Minister Attlee needs to lie about the Soviet Union; he must represent the peaceful politics of the Soviet Union as aggressive, and the aggressive politics of the English government as peaceful politics to mislead the English people, to blindfold them with this lie about the Soviet Union, and in this way drag them towards a new world war that would be organized by the warmongering circles in the United States of America.

Prime Minister Attlee pretends to be a follower of peace. But if he really is for peace, why was he against the proposal of the Soviet Union in the United Nations Organization on the conclusion of a peace pact between the Soviet Union, England, the United States of America, China and France?

If he really is for peace, why is he against the proposals of the Soviet Union to immediately begin to limit armaments and to immediately forbid atomic weapons?

If he really is for peace, why does he persecute those that intercede for the defence of peace; why has he forbidden the peace congress in England? Could the campaign for the defence of peace possibly threaten the security of England?

It is clear that Prime Minister Attlee is not for the keeping of peace, but rather for the unleashing of a new world-encompassing war of aggression...

Q. Do you hold a new world war to be unavoidable?

A. No. At least, one can, at present, hold it to be not unavoidable.

Of course, in the United States of America, in England and also in France, there are aggressive powers that long for a new war. They need war to achieve super profits and to plunder other countries. These are the billionaires and millionaires that regard war as a fountain of revenue, that brings colossal profits.

They, the aggressive powers, hold the reactionary governments in their hands and guide them. But at the same time they are afraid of their people who do not want a new war and are for the keeping of peace. Therefore, they take the trouble of using the reactionary governments to ensnare their people with lies, to deceive them, to represent a new war as a war of defence, and the peaceful politics of peace-loving countries as aggressive. They take the trouble to deceive the people, to force them and draw them into a new war with their aggressive plans.

They therefore even fear the campaign for the defence of peace, they fear that this campaign would expose the aggressive intentions of the reactionary governments.

They therefore even oppose the proposals of the Soviet Union on the conclusion of a peace treaty, on the limitation of armaments and on the forbidding of atomic weapons; they fear that the acceptance of these proposals would frustrate the aggressive measures of the reactionary governments and render the arms race unnecessary.

Where will all this struggle between the aggressive and the peace-loving powers end?

Peace will be kept and strengthened if the people take the holding of peace into their own hands and defend it to the utmost. War could be unavoidable if the arsonists of war succeed in trapping the masses with their lies, in deceiving them and in drawing them into a new war.

Now, therefore, a broad campaign for the holding of peace, as a way of exposing the criminal machinations of the arsonists of war, is of prime importance.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it will continue to carry through the politics of preventing war and keeping peace.

For Lasting Peace, for People's Democracy, No.8.
23rd February-1 March, 1951.

7. From: Answers to the questions of a 'Pravda' Correspondent.

*On the Atomic Weapon
'Pravda', 6 October, 1951*

Q. What do you think of the clamour in the foreign press these days in connection with an Atom bomb test in the Soviet Union?

A. As a matter of fact, we have carried out a test of a certain kind of Atom bomb. Tests with Atom bombs of different calibres will also continue, in accordance with the plans for the defence of our country against an attack carried out by the Anglo-American aggressive bloc.

Q. In connection with the Atom bomb test, various well-known personalities in the U.S.A. pretend to be alarmed and shout that the security of the U.S.A. is threatened. Is there any ground for such excitement?

A. There is no ground whatsoever for such excitement.

These well-known personalities in the U.S.A. cannot be unaware that the Soviet Union is not only against the application of Atomic weapons, but also for their forbidding, for the cessation of their production. As it is known, the Soviet Union has repeatedly demanded the forbidding of Atomic weapons, but each time they were refused by the powers of the Atlantic bloc. That signifies that in the case of an attack by the U.S.A. on our country, the ruling circles of the U.S.A. would use the Atom bomb. This circumstance has forced the Soviet Union to also own Atomic weapons to meet the aggressors well armed.

Of course, it would please the aggressors if the Soviet Union was unarmed in the case of them undertaking an attack. But the Soviet Union is not in agreement with that, and believes that one must meet the aggressor well armed.

Consequently, if the U.S.A. does not have the intention of attacking the Soviet Union, one must hold the excitement of well-known personalities of the U.S.A. as purposeless howling, as the Soviet Union is not thinking of attacking, at any time, the U.S.A. or any other country.

Well-known personalities of the U.S.A. are dissatisfied that not only the U.S.A., but also other countries and, above all, the Soviet Union, possess the secret of Atomic weapons. They would rather that the U.S.A. had the monopoly on Atom bomb production, that the U.S.A. had unlimited possibilities to frighten and blackmail other countries. What grounds do they have for really thinking so, what right do they have? Do the interests of

safeguarding peace demand such a monopoly, perhaps? Would it not be more correct to say that it is exactly the opposite case, that the safeguarding of peace demands, above all, the liquidation of such monopolies and the unconditional forbidding of Atomic weapons? I think that the adherents of the Atom bomb would only agree to forbid Atomic weapons in the case of them seeing that they do not have the monopoly any more.

Q. What do you think of international control of the supply of Atomic weapons?

A. The Soviet Union is for the forbidding of Atomic weapons and for the suspension of the production of Atomic weapons. The Soviet Union is for the establishment of international control, for a decision on the forbidding of Atomic weapons, on the suspension of production of Atomic weapons and on the use of already manufactured Atom bombs for civilian purposes exclusively and conscientiously. The Soviet Union is for such an international control.

Well-known American personalities likewise speak of 'control', but their 'control' is based not on the suspension of the production of Atomic weapons, but rather on the continuation of such production and, this to such an extent that corresponds to the available sources of raw materials available to this or that country. Consequently, the American 'control' is not for the forbidding of Atomic weapons, but rather for their legalization and sanctioning. That would sanction the right of the arsonists of war, with the help of Atomic weapons, to annihilate tens of thousands, no, - hundreds of thousands of peaceful people. It is not difficult to understand that this is not control, but rather a mockery of control, a deception of the peace-desiring people. Of course, such a 'control' will not satisfy the peace-loving people, who demand the forbidding of Atomic weapons and the suspension of their production.

Unity, 18 October, 1951, p.1313.

8. From: Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR.

February 1, 1952

It is said that Lenin's thesis that imperialism inevitably generates war must now be regarded as obsolete, since powerful popular forces have come forward today in defence of peace and against another world war. That is not true.

The object of the present-day peace movement is to rouse the masses of the people to fight for the preservation of peace and for the prevention of another world war. Consequently, the aim of this movement is not to overthrow capitalism and establish socialism -- it confines itself to the democratic aim of preserving peace. In this respect, the present day peace movement differs from the movement of the time of the First World War for the conversion of the imperialist war into civil war, since the latter movement went farther and pursued socialist aims.

It is possible that in a definite conjuncture of circumstances the fight for peace will develop here or there into a fight for socialism. But then it will no longer be the present-day peace movement; it will be a movement for the overthrow of capitalism.

What is most likely is that the present day peace movement, as a movement for the preservation of peace, will, if it succeeds, result in preventing a *particular* war, in its temporary postponement, in the temporary preservation of a *particular* peace, in the resignation of a bellicose government and its supersession by another that is prepared temporarily to keep the peace. That, of course, will be good. Even very good. But, all the same, it will not be enough to eliminate the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries generally. It will not be enough, because, for all the successes of the peace movement, imperialism will remain, continue in force -- and, consequently, the inevitability of wars will also continue in force.

To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism.

Click [here](#) to return to the September 1998 index.

Notes of a Talk of Com. J.V. Stalin with the General Secretary of the C.C. of the French Communist Party Com. Thorez

(November 19, 1944)

The talk between Stalin and Thorez is being printed here in the English language for the first time, although it was previously published in the original Russian and in French. This publication is important because it exposes several lies and distortions about Stalin.

One of the most important of these lies, spread for decades by all the Trotskyites, as well as by social-democrats and other bourgeois apologists, is that Stalin sold out the French (as well as Italian) partisans by telling them to disarm. First, one should note the irony of the position of such people, for if the French or Italian Communist Parties had been able to take power, these people would be the first to denounce this as an extension of 'Stalinist totalitarianism.' But if we examine the text of the article, we see that what Stalin clearly advised was that the armed partisan detachments should be transformed into a political organization, 'but the arms should be hidden.' [a oruzhiye nuzhno spryatat'] Clearly, hiding ones arms is not at all the same as disarming.

*We will take just one example of the lies on this question, from the article 'Origins of the Cold War: New Evidence,' by Patrick Flaherty in the internationally known U.S. 'Independent Socialist Magazine' **Monthly Review** of May 1996. While criticizing the openly pro-imperialist 'scholars' who attack the Soviet Union and Stalin from the right, the **Monthly Review** article proceeds to attack Stalin from the 'left.' It even quotes from the talk, citing the Russian version published in **Istochnik**, saying that 'Stalin's main concern was to persuade reluctant French communists to dissolve their armed partisan militias and submit themselves to the authority of [a phrase never used by Stalin – George Gruenthal] 'a government recognized by the allied powers.' Of Stalin's admonition to the French CP that the militias should hide their arms there is, of course, no mention.*

*Furthermore, the **Monthly Review** article states that 'Stalin tacked on the suggestion that the French Communists stop flying their red flags in their parades and refrain from the use of the term 'communist' in their programmatic literature.' Readers of the actual text printed below will see that although Stalin makes a general reference to the fact that 'our flags frighten certain people a lot,' the only mention of not using the term 'communist' is in reference to creating a broad youth organization, not to programmatic literature.*

Of course, our phony 'lefts' say that the French CP should have immediately tried to take power. They would have liked the CP to fall into the trap that Stalin warned about, of trying to carry out what would have been in essence a 'putsch.'

The armed seizure of power (and not the 'peaceful transition to socialism' that all the revisionists preach) is not something that can be accomplished without carefully taking

account of the specific conditions of the country at the given time. In particular, what was the situation in France at the time of the discussion, in November 1944? Most of France had been liberated from Nazi occupation, with the exception of some of the western ports and some small areas on the west bank of the Rhine River. But the main armed forces in France, besides de Gaulle's five divisions mentioned in the talk, were the U.S. and British troops that had taken part in the long-delayed Second Front opened only some 5 months earlier. The partisans, although they had heroically carried out the main resistance against the Nazis and the collaborationist Vichy government (and due to which many thousands had died fighting or were summarily executed), were relatively weak militarily, having only rifles and no heavy weapons. Moreover, and most importantly, the French people, under the leadership of the Communist Party but in a correct alliance with the anti-German sector of the French bourgeoisie led by de Gaulle and with the U.S. and British bourgeoisies, as well as with the Soviet Union, were just winning victory in an anti-fascist war. It would have been impossible practically and politically to try to turn the situation into an immediate socialist revolution. That is why Stalin correctly emphasized the need for the French CP to consolidate a bloc against reaction to prevent their isolation. At the same time Stalin twice pointed out in the talk that such a bloc would also be useful in a future offensive.

Finally one should note Stalin's clear portrayal here of the war aims of the U.S. and British imperialists. Thorez points out that the French bourgeoisie was sabotaging the restarting of industrial production in France. Stalin adds his correct observation that this is because the U.S. and British monopolists want everyone to buy their goods, and that that is also the reason why they were bombing German industry. They did not want even a bourgeois France (or Germany) to be a source of future competition for them.

George Gruenthal

Notes of a Talk of Com. J.V. Stalin with the General Secretary of the C.C. of the French Communist Party Com. Thorez

Strictly confidential

November 19, 1944, 8 PM

Comrades Molotov and Beria are present at the interview.

After exchanging greetings Com. Stalin asks when Com. Thorez plans to leave for France.

Com. Thorez answers that he plans to leave Moscow tomorrow with his wife and a member of the CPF, Com. Ramette.

Com. Stalin asks on what plane Com. Thorez will fly.

Com. Thorez answers that he will fly on a Soviet plane up to Teheran and then on an English plane and, if it arrives, on a French plane.

Com. Stalin says that he might be able to arrange the flight of Com. Thorez on a Soviet plane to Paris. One never knows with the English, they might plot something.

Com. Molotov says that he can arrange the flight of Com. Thorez on our plane to Paris.

Com. Stalin asks what questions Com. Thorez has.

Com. Thorez answers that the most important question for the French Communists is how to get through the present difficult period since the Communists are not in control of France and since they have enemies and friends. How to rally their forces and not allow the reaction to rally its forces.

Com. Stalin asks how Bidault⁽¹⁾ presents himself.

Com. Thorez answers that Bidault before the war had belonged to the Popular Democratic Party. He is a Catholic. Before the war he edited a newspaper, *L'Aube* [*The Dawn*], an opposition Catholic paper.

Com. Stalin asks whom this paper was opposed to.

Com. Thorez answers that this paper was in opposition to the leading officials of the Catholic Church. On questions of foreign policy, Bidault before the war held a position close to that of the French Communists. He was for good relations with the USSR, he spoke out against Munich and against Germany. However, after the beginning of the war, as many people who were previously close to the communists, he began, more ardently than other enemies of the Communists, to speak out against us. After the beginning of the war he was drafted, he served in the army, he was taken prisoner by the Germans and later he was freed.

Com. Stalin asked whether Bidault was freed by the Germans or whether he escaped from prison.

Com. Thorez replied that Bidault was freed by the Germans because he had taken part in the First World War, and the Germans freed such people. However, the Germans did not apply this rule to all those who had taken part in the First World War.

Com. Stalin is surprised that a former prisoner of war holds a post in the government.

Com. Thorez says that there are other people in the government who were in German prisons. For example General Juin. He was taken prisoner by the Germans and was later freed and named by the Vichy Government in Africa Commander of the French troops in place of Weygand in whom the Germans did not have full confidence. The former Minister of Finance, Leparcq, who died recently, was in a German prison.

Com. Stalin asks what kind of relations the French Communists have with the Socialists.

Com. Thorez answers that the Communists have obtained some success in winning over the mass of Socialist workers to our side. However, the leadership of the Socialist Party does not want to collaborate with the Communists. Recently, at the Congress of the French Socialist Party, its Secretary declared in his report that the Socialists are for unity with the Communists, but in reality the Socialists refuse unity. The Socialists claim that everything is fine in France, all the people are fine, except for the Communists who should apologize for the position that they held at the beginning of the war with the Germans. The leadership of the Socialist Party insists on the fact that the Communists at the beginning of the war did not support the defence of the fatherland and that it was only after 1941 that they became heroes of the fight against the Germans.

Com. Stalin says that there may be pressure exerted on the Socialists to try to isolate the Communists. It is totally possible that de Gaulle is embarking on a process of isolating the Communist Party.

Com. Stalin says that he thinks that in that case, it would be good if the Party had allies. The Party should examine this question closely and should look for allies among the Radicals, including among those groups of Radicals that have not yet formalized themselves. One must also seek allies among the Socialists. One must try to create a bloc against reaction. It would be good to also attract Socialists to this bloc. One might still find certain elements whom one can use in this bloc. One must create determined forces grouped around the Communist Party for defence and, when the situation changes, for the attack. The Communists should not look among those Socialists who at one time spoke out against the Soviet Union. We know the Socialists well. The Socialists are the left wing of the bourgeoisie. Now the most important thing for us is to create a left bloc. The Communist Party, although it is stronger than ever, should not be the only force speaking out against reaction. The Communist Party must not be isolated. The present-day objective of the Party is the establishment of direct links with the trade unions and with the youth. The youth should not call itself the Communist Youth. One must take into account the fact that our flags frighten certain people a lot. One must take this into account.

The Communists, continues Com. Stalin, are not strong enough that they can carry out the fight against reaction on their own. Com. Stalin says that he hopes that the Party does not overestimate its forces. If the enemy manages to provoke it, the Party will be crushed. One must little by little and patiently create a left bloc. If one can achieve some success in this sphere, then reaction will be more cautious.

Com. Stalin says that that the Communists should keep in mind that fact that de Gaulle will take measures against the Communists, even if he does not want to do so himself, he will be incited by the English and the Americans, who want to create a reactionary government in France, as everywhere else that this might be possible. This is why the Party must have allies, even if they are weak at first. If the leader of the Socialist Party says in his report that the Socialist Party is for unity with the Communist Party, then one must answer him: 'Please do it!' One must attract other political groups into the bloc created. One must have allies in the trade unions, one must create something like a bloc.

Com. Stalin asks whether the resistance organizations have any armed forces.

Com. Thorez answers that there are armed detachments of the patriotic militia, which were the main forces of the resistance during the occupation of France. Presently these militia detachments retain their arms.

Com. Stalin says that one must take account of the fact that presently in France there is a government recognized by the allied powers. Under these conditions it is difficult for the Communists to have parallel armed forces, since there is a regular army. It can be asked of the Communists for what purpose they need parallel armed detachments. As long as there was no provisional government, as long as there was no rear area under its command, then the existence of these detachments had a definite sense. For what purpose do these detachments exist now when there is a government with its own army? Such could be the arguments of the enemies of the Communists. These arguments could convince the average French person. That is why the position of the Communist Party of retaining its own armed forces appears weak and will be weak. It is difficult to defend this position. This is why it is necessary to transform these armed detachments into another organization, into a political organization, but the arms should be hidden ('a oruzhiye nuzhno spryatat').

Com. Stalin explains that he has raised this question because it seems to him that the Communists have not yet understood that the situation in France has changed. The Communists are acting brashly and are continuing to follow the former line at a time when the situation has changed. They would like to send all the Socialist scoundrels to hell at a time when one must try to create a bloc and find allies among the Socialists. The Communists are trying to retain the militia. This will not happen. There is a government that is recognized by Great Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States and other powers, but the Communists continue to act by inertia. Meanwhile, the situation is new, different, it provides an opportunity for de Gaulle. The situation has changed and it is necessary to make a turn. The Communist Party is not strong enough to hit the government on its head. It must accumulate forces and search for allies. It must take measures so that, in the case of an offensive of reaction, the Communists can have a solid defence and can say that reaction is attacking not only the Communists but the people. If the situation changes for the better, then the forces united around the Party will be useful for the offensive.

There must be a platform for the political organization. This platform should include the recovery of industry, giving work to the unemployed, the defence of democracy, the punishment of those who stifle democracy.

Com. Stalin asks what the organization of the resistance in France is called.

Com. Thorez answers that this organization has the name 'Movement of the Resistance.'

Com. Stalin says that now one must give it another name. Maybe this organization should be called the 'Front for Reconstruction.' Formerly, it was a question of the liberation of the country and now it is a question of its reconstruction. If, under this banner, one rallies

the forces of the left, the workers, the intelligentsia, the cultural groups, this would be good.

Com. Thorez says that it would be good to also win over the peasants to this movement.

Com. Stalin says that he had forgotten to speak of the peasants. It is definitely necessary to win them to this movement. Among them there are people who can be useful.

It is necessary that the Communist Party be strong and that it should be surrounded by allies. The enemies want to isolate the Communist Party. One must not allow this.

Then Com. Stalin says that it is not useful to call this bloc a 'front.' In this case, the name will remind the bourgeoisie of the 'popular front.' One must find another name. Maybe it could be called: 'Movement to Strengthen Democracy in France.' If one says 'Movement of Struggle for Democracy,' they could reply that there already is democracy in France, that there is a Republic, etc. Perhaps the best would be to call it: 'Movement for the Reconstruction of a Strong France and the Strengthening of Democracy.' This name is certainly a bit long, but the French Communists can find a better name themselves. Com. Stalin explains that he is only giving his idea, but the French Communists can find the concrete forms of its realization.

In the platform of this movement, says Com. Stalin, one should include above all the economic reconstruction of the country and the consolidation of democracy. The platform should be explained in this framework.

Com. Stalin says that he has made the comments that he wanted to make and he asks whether Com. Thorez has any questions with regard to these comments.

Com. Thorez answers that he has no questions.

Then Com. Stalin says that de Gaulle wants to take part in the occupation of Germany. In one of his speeches de Gaulle said that the French want to put their forces to the test until the end of the war. Therefore de Gaulle wants to show what the Gauls are. He is not afraid to take a fighting position in relation to Germany. Among other things, de Gaulle is complaining to our people that he would like to receive arms for the army, but that the English and the Americans are not giving him arms.

Com. Stalin asks how many divisions de Gaulle has at his disposal.

Com. Thorez answers that de Gaulle has five French divisions equipped with American arms. Besides, there are French partisan detachments that do not have heavy weapons. They are armed only with rifles. Among other things, these partisan detachments are blocking the ports of the French west coast occupied by the Germans.

Com. Stalin says that while he was in Moscow, Churchill had touched on the question of the future of the Rhine region and of the Saar. Churchill called for the dismemberment of

Germany. He declared that Germany, not including East Prussia which would return to Poland, should be divided into the following three parts: first Prussia; second Austria centred at Vienna, including the southern provinces - Baden and Württemberg; third, Westphalia and the Rhine region, which should form a separate region under international control. The idea for the creation of this region would be not to allow Germany to make use of iron and coal. Massigli⁽²⁾ apparently supported this plan. He at one time called for the separation of the Rhine region and Westphalia and for the establishment of an international control over them.

Com. Stalin says that he would not advise the Communists to demand the annexation of the Rhine region and the Saar at the present time. The situation is not clear. One must find out what the attitude of the French people would be towards these demands. For now the best would be to abstain from raising slogans of annexation. If the situation changes and it becomes clear that public opinion, the intelligentsia, the people are for it, that would be another matter. Com. Stalin says that he is afraid that otherwise the Communists would find themselves in the same camp as the blackest reaction. Then it would be said to the Communists: 'Look whom you are with!' The best would be to wait with this slogan. Wait one month, maybe two months. It is necessary to gather information, to test the waters.

Com. Stalin comments that de Gaulle in his declaration called for the annexation of German territory, at the same time as Bidault spoke out against such annexation. What is this? How can it be that within one government there are two different political lines.

Com. Stalin asks what the attitude of Bidault is on the question of Alsace and Lorraine.

Com. Thorez replies that Bidault considers Alsace and Lorraine as part of French territory. In speaking against annexation by France, Bidault means that Alsace and Lorraine belong to France.

Com. Thorez says that, in his opinion, Bidault opposed the annexation of German territory in order to also oppose the transfer of part of present German territory to Poland. The French reactionaries want Poland to extend as deeply as possible into the Soviet Union and therefore the shifting of Poland towards the west is not to their liking. The French reactionaries, as also the English ones, would like to see Poland become a tool against the Soviet Union.

Com. Stalin says that, certainly, both the English and the French would like this but they will not achieve it. The Poles want to obtain German regions that are rich and developed, and they will lose only the Pinsk swamp.

Com. Stalin asks if the factories of the military industry are presently functioning in France.

Com. Thorez answers that the factories are standing still in the majority of cases. This is usually explained by the lack of raw materials, by the ruin of transportation and similar

reasons. In those places where the workers, on their own initiative, have started up the factories, the central authorities have intervened and disrupted the work of the factories. Thus, French industry is at a standstill and there are a great number of unemployed.

Com. Stalin says that one of the main objectives of the mass movement for the reconstruction of France should be the restarting of industrial enterprises, first of all the enterprises of military industry. Com. Stalin says that in the Soviet Union industry suffered from the war more than French industry, and nevertheless it has succeeded quickly enough in reestablishing industry in the regions that had been occupied by the Germans. The bridges, the railroads and such things were also restored.

Com. Thorez says that the workers in these places want to reestablish the industry but as soon as the matter reaches the central authorities it is delayed. Com. Thorez says that this is sabotage.

Com. Stalin agrees that this is sabotage, and says that one must fight for the reconstruction of French industry.

Com. Thorez remarks that the English and the Americans do not want the reconstruction of industry in France.

Com. Stalin agrees with this, and says that the English and the Americans want to be the only ones to have industry, so that the whole world would buy their goods. That is why their planes are bombing the industrial enterprises in Germany so ferociously. The English and the Americans want to destroy as many of the industrial enterprises in Germany as possible so that it would be difficult to obtain reparations from Germany. Com. Stalin asks what should be done if de Gaulle asks for arms from the Soviet Union. Should he give him arms?

Com. Thorez replies that it all depends on what these arms would be used for.

Com. Stalin says that it is difficult to provide arms with this particular condition in advance. Com. Stalin asks if the English are providing arms to the French.

Com. Thorez answers that Churchill, in one of his declarations, promised to give arms to the French, but afterward, in a second declaration, he said that since up to now the French have received only American arms, the question needs further examination in order to achieve the unification of a system of provision of arms.

Com. Stalin asks if the French troops have their own sector on the front against the German troops.

Com. Thorez answers that they have a sector at the extreme south of the front facing Belfort.

Com. Stalin asks if the 5 French divisions of de Gaulle are composed of French or colonial troops.

Com. Thorez answers that a large part of these divisions are made up of colonial troops.

Com. Stalin says that the old French commanders will try to maintain colonial troops, who are very obedient. One should try, as much as possible, to see to it that there are more French in the French Army. There are also good lads among the Algerians but all the same they are not French. Com. Stalin says that one should also try to see to it that the French troops have their own sector on the front and that the troops in this sector are under French command.

Com. Thorez says that, in his opinion, France should have a strong army.

Com. Stalin replies that he is in agreement with this and that the French Communists have nothing to fear from the creation of a large army. They should have their own people in the army.

Com. Stalin says that the 'Normandy' squadron is fighting on the Soviet-German front. Our people have praised the pilots of this squadron. They say that the French pilots fight well. Among them are real aces. Does Thorez know these pilots?

Com. Thorez replies that he knows some but not all of them. He says that among these pilots there are reactionary elements, representing the big noble families. They always keep to themselves and they behave towards us with a certain suspicion. However, when recently the aircrew of this squadron were decorated, these pilots also received a decoration. This made a great impression on the whole crew of the squadron. General Petit told Thorez about this recently.

Com. Stalin says that we do not give decorations for no reason and that they reward those who have fought well against the Germans. We plan to give some of the French pilots the title of Hero of the Soviet Union.

Com. Stalin says that it is possible that de Gaulle, when he arrives in the Soviet Union, will ask for permission to transfer the 'Normandy' squadron to France. Should one then permit the pilots to also take their arms and their planes with them?

Com. Thorez says that this would be good and he adds that the French pilots are very proud that they are fighting on such good fighter planes.

Com. Stalin replies that really these planes are not bad and he adds that it would be a pity if the pilots disarmed before leaving the Soviet Union. Let them leave with the planes. Com. Stalin asks if Com. Thorez has any more questions to put to him and the other comrades present.

Com. Thorez answers that he has no more questions.

In concluding the talk Comrade Stalin wishes Com. Thorez success and asks him to give his greetings to the French comrades, Duclos, Marty and the others. In shaking hands and saying goodbye to Com. Stalin, Thorez says that he assures him of his devotion to our cause and to Com. Stalin and thanks him for the meeting.

Com. Stalin replies that there is no need for thanks among comrades.

Com. Thorez says that he thanks Com. Stalin all the same and that he always is in need of his advice.

The talk lasted 1 hour 45 minutes.
Podtserob took the notes.

This translation into English has been made by George Gruenthal from the French translation in the journal 'Communisme', No. 45-46, 1996, and has been checked by 'Inter' from the Russian original as it appeared in the magazine 'Istochnik' No. 4, 1995, pp. 152-158. The document is from the Presidential Archives of the Russian Federation F 45/0/1/D/390/ff. 85-93.

Notes:

1) From 1943-44, Bidault was the leader of the National Council of Resistance of France. In September 1944 he was appointed foreign minister of the Provisional Government by de Gaulle.

2) From 1943-44, Massigli was the head of the Foreign Affairs department of the French Committee of National Liberation. From 1944-55, he was French Ambassador to Great Britain.

Click [here](#) to return to the April 2001 index.

Where is the Nationalism of Tito's Group in Yugoslavia Leading To

J.V. Stalin

This article was first published in the Soviet Union in December 1948 in the name of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b). The identity of the author became known only after the dissolution of the USSR and the opening up of the CPSU archives. The examination of the documents and materials relating to the publication of the 'Works' of Stalin revealed that the article was planned to be published as part of volume 15. The article had been preceded by the correspondence of Molotov and Stalin to Tito and Kardelj between March and May 1948 detailing the political and economic errors of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and which culminated in the resolution of the Cominform of June, 1948.¹ The immediate background to this article were the reports presented at the 5th Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia which indicated that Tito and his associates planned to continue to pursue their anti-socialist and anti-Soviet course.² These negative developments were confirmed in the following months and were recorded in the resolutions and reports of the Cominform meeting which was held in Hungary in November, 1949.³ Today when the full consequences of the path of Tito are clear the struggle of Molotov, Stalin, the CPSU(b) and Cominform stands as a monument to their commitment to preserve Bolshevik principles in the face of the onslaught of modern revisionism.

References

1. The Correspondence between the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), London, 1948.
2. Josip Broz Tito, 'Political Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.' Report Delivered at the V Congress of the CPY, Belgrade, 1948; Edvard Kardelj, 'The Communist Party of Yugoslavia in the Struggle for New Yugoslavia for People's Authority and for Socialism. Report Delivered at the V Congress of the CPY, Belgrade, 1948; Boris Kidric, 'On the Construction of Socialist Economy in the FPRY', Speech Delivered at the V Congress of the CPY, Belgrade, 1948.
3. 'The Struggle for Peace, National Independence, Working Class Unity', CPI, Bombay, 1950. Particularly important is the resolution, 'Communist Party of Yugoslavia in the Power of Murderers and Spies,' pp. 54-58. See also: ed. G. Procacci, 'The Cominform, Minutes of the Three Conferences 1947/1948/1949', Feltrinelli Editore, Milan, 1994.

Vijay Singh

In the well-known resolution of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties adopted in June 1948 'On the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia' it is pointed out that in recent months the nationalist elements that covertly existed even earlier have come to dominate the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, that the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia has broken away from the

internationalist traditions of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and has taken up the course of nationalism.

All the Communist Parties, the entire camp of Peoples' Democracy and Socialism unanimously accepts the Resolution of the Information Bureau 'On the Situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia'. All the Communist Parties of the world recognize that the present Yugoslavian leadership i.e. Tito's group, by pursuing a nationalist policy, is playing into the hands of the imperialists, isolating Yugoslavia and weakening it.

Has Tito's group learnt any appropriate lessons from these facts?

Has Tito's group understood that a nationalist policy means losing Yugoslavia's most loyal allies represented by the Communist Parties of the world and that it has already led to the isolation of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, and weakening of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia both within and outside the country?

Has Tito's group understood that the only way out of the difficult situation into which it has lead the party and the country is to recognize its mistake, break with the policy of nationalism and return to the fraternity of the Communist Parties?

No, Tito's group has not learnt any lessons and it does not appear that it understands these simple and unmistakable facts.

On the contrary, to all justified and comradely criticism of Tito's group by the fraternal communist parties and the entire camp of Peoples' Democracy and Socialism, Tito's group is responding in the pages of Belgrade's press with the foul language of the street, by igniting nationalist hatred towards the people of neighbouring democratic countries, widespread repressions, arrests and murders of communists and non-communists who dare to express doubts regarding the policy of nationalism pursued by Tito's group. Very recently, Colonel-General Arso Iovanovich, a hero of the liberation struggle of Yugoslavia was murdered by the agents of Tito's assistant, the infamous Rankovic. He was killed because he expressed doubts about the policy of nationalism and terrorism of Tito's group. In this connection it is openly said in Yugoslavia that 'Tito's group has degenerated into a clan of political murderers.'

Evidently, Tito's group has no intentions of recognizing and rectifying its mistakes. It is afraid and does not have the courage to recognize the mistakes because to recognize and rectify ones mistakes would need courage. Even worse, out of 'fear' it is arresting and subjecting to repression anyone who dares to remind it of its mistakes.

Lenin says: 'How a party relates to its mistakes is the most important and convincing criteria of a party's significance and its capacity to fulfill in deed its obligations towards its class and the working masses. Ability to recognize one's mistakes openly, reveal its causes, analyse the conditions leading to it and conscientiously discuss the means of rectifying it is the sign of a determined party, of fulfilling one's obligation and educating and teaching the class and, following it, the masses.'

Evidently Tito's group just cannot be put in the rank of such courageous, honest and devoted party leaders that Lenin speaks of.

The most important point in the evolution of nationalism of Tito's group occurred in the spring of 1948 just before the summoning of the Information Bureau. The unconcealed policy of nationalism of Tito's group began with its refusal to participate in the Meeting of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties and discuss the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia with the fraternal Communist Parties. Notwithstanding numerous requests to send a delegation of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia to and explain its position in the Meeting, following the example set by other Communist Parties in earlier meetings, Tito's group blatantly refused to participate in the working of the Meeting. It became evident that Tito's group attaches no importance to the friendship with other communist parties, including the Communist Party of the USSR. This constituted an open split with the international united front of the Communist Parties. It was breaking away from the position of internationalism and a shift to the rails of nationalism.

The newspaper 'Borba' printed from Belgrade asserts that Tito and his accomplices support the united anti-imperialist front. This, certainly, is a sham, designed to deceive 'simple people'. In reality, which anti-imperialist positions can we talk about when this group cannot stay together in a family even with the Communist Parties of the countries close to Yugoslavia.

The second major fact indicating the falling of Tito's group into the sin of nationalism is the improper, hypocritical and anti-Leninist conduct at the V Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. Some naïve people expected the Congress would work under the banner of friendship with the Communist Parties, under the flag of strengthening of the anti-imperialist front of the countries of People's Democracy and the USSR. In reality, however, everything happened to the contrary. In reality, Tito's group converted the Congress into an arena of tussle against the Communist Parties of the neighbouring countries, into an arena of a tussle against the united anti-imperialist front of the countries of Peoples' Democracy. This Congress was a campaign against the countries of People's Democracy and their Communist Parties, against the USSR and its Communist Party.

Of course in Yugoslavia it is not totally safe to speak openly about the campaign against the USSR and the countries of People's Democracy as the people of Yugoslavia fully support unity with the countries of People's Democracy and the USSR. Therefore, Tito's group has taken to deceit and has decided to disguise this reactionary campaign behind pompous words of praise for the USSR, friendship with the USSR, the enormous role of the USSR in the national liberation movement etc. Things reached a stage that Tito's accomplices advised Stalin to join up in this deceitful campaign and to take on himself to defend Tito's nationalist group from criticism by the Communist Parties of the USSR and other democratic countries. The Belgrade press let loose all possible tricks and intrigues, tried out the most unexpected and ludicrous twists and turns in order to prove to the peoples of Yugoslavia that black is white and white is black, that the campaign of Tito's group against Socialism and Democracy is of secondary importance and that 'alliance'

with the USSR and a 'united front' with it is the main concern of Tito's group. In reality it turns out that Tito's group in this period has placed itself in a common camp with the imperialists by rubbishing the Communist Parties of countries of Peoples' Democracy and the USSR to the satisfaction of the imperialists of the whole world. Instead of a united front with the Communist Parties we have a united front with the imperialists. The V Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia has approved and strengthened the nationalist policy of Tito's group.

The political acrobats from the newspaper 'Borba' demand that the Communist Parties stop exposing the mistakes of the group and that they extend support and confidence to this group as, otherwise, such a campaign can seriously harm Yugoslavia.

No gentlemen, the Communist Parties cannot trust or extend support to the nationalist policy of Tito's group. It is possible that such a situation can hurt Yugoslavia. It is not the Communist Parties that need to be held responsible for it, but Tito's nationalist group which has broken away from the Communist Parties and that has declared war on them.

The political acrobats from the newspaper 'Borba' must be clear in their minds that Marxism and nationalism are incompatible, that nationalism as a bourgeois ideology is antagonistic to Marxism. It must be clear to them that Marxism cannot reconcile with nationalism or nationalist leanings in the Communist Parties and that they must eliminate nationalism in whatever form it covers itself in the name and interests of the workers, in the name of peoples' freedom and friendship and in the name of the triumphant construction of socialism.

Lenin says: 'Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism are two ceaselessly incompatible slogans that correspond to the camps of the two large classes of the whole capitalist world and reflect two policies (even more so, two world perceptions)'.

In circumstances when the power of the bourgeoisie has already been put an end to, the exploiter class and its agents are trying to use the poisoned weapon of nationalism in order to reestablish the old formation.

Regarding this Stalin says: 'Nationalist leanings are an adjustment of the internationalism of the working class to the nationalism of the bourgeoisie... nationalist leanings are a reflection of the attempts by 'our' nationalist bourgeoisie to restore capitalism'.

Nationalism in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia is a blow not only for the common anti-imperialist front, but above all, for Yugoslavia herself, the peoples of Yugoslavia and the interests of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia both in the field of foreign and internal affairs.

The nationalism of Tito's group in foreign affairs leads to a break with the united front of the world revolutionary movement of the working people, to a loss of Yugoslavia's most trusted allies and to self-isolation of Yugoslavia. Nationalism of Tito's group works against Yugoslavia in the face of her external enemies.

The nationalism propagated by Tito's group in the sphere of internal politics leads to a policy of compromise between the exploited and the exploiter, to 'uniting' the exploited and the exploiter into a single 'national' front, to a policy of retreat from the class struggle, to propagating the falsehood of a possibility of constructing socialism without a class struggle, of a possibility of peaceful transformation of the exploiter under socialism i.e. to wrecking the combativeness and morale of the working people of Yugoslavia. The nationalism of Tito's group is incapacitating the working people of Yugoslavia before their internal enemies.

A year ago, when Tito's group did not yet expound nationalist leanings and cooperated with the fraternal communist parties, Yugoslavia was forcefully and fearlessly marching ahead supported by its closest allies represented by the Communist Parties of other countries. This was the situation in the recent past. However, after the change of course by Tito's group towards nationalism, the situation is altered radically. As Tito's group broke away from the united front of the Communist Parties and became scornful towards the countries of Peoples' Democracy it began to lose its most loyal allies and found itself isolated in the face of its external and internal enemies.

Such is the distressing outcome of the policy of nationalism pursued by Tito's group.

Tito's group has not understood that which is absolutely clear and obvious for any Communist. It has not understood the simple truth that in the present conditions of the international situation, the solidarity of the fraternal Communist Parties, mutual cooperation and friendship of countries of Peoples' Democracy and cooperation and friendship with the USSR is the crucial prerequisite of growth and prosperity of the countries of Peoples' Democracy in the construction of socialism and the main guarantee of their national freedom and independence in the face of imperialist coercion.

The political tricksters from the newspaper 'Borba' further assert that the criticism of the mistakes of Tito's group has now ballooned into a campaign against the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and against its people.

This, certainly, is a falsehood. There never was and there is no campaign against the peoples of Yugoslavia. It would be criminal to conduct any campaign against the peoples of Yugoslavia whose heroism is known to everyone. It is also known that the peoples of Yugoslavia strongly support a united front with the countries of Peoples' Democracy and the USSR. They are not at all responsible for the policy of nationalism pursued by Tito's group. We look upon the peoples of Yugoslavia as our true allies.

There never was and there is no campaign against the Communist Party of Yugoslavia as a whole. We know very well that the Communist Party of Yugoslavia stands determinedly for friendship with the Communist Parties of other countries, for friendship with the USSR and its Communist Party. The persistence of anti-imperialist traditions among the majority in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia is not doubted at all. We also know that the majority of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia does not approve of the

policy of nationalism of Tito's group. We know that for this particular reason it is being subjected to brutal repression by Tito's group and his agents.

A 'campaign' is being conducted not against the peoples of Yugoslavia and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia as a whole, but against Tito's nationalist group in order to help the Communist Party of Yugoslavia to figure out the mistakes of Tito's group and reverse the nationalist policy of the Yugoslavian leadership.

The political tricksters from the newspaper 'Borba' assert that, after all, Tito's group is inseparable from the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and that it represents the majority in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

This is also incorrect. A year ago Tito's group, perhaps, represented the majority in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. But that was one year ago. At present, after it has broken with the Communist Parties, after having fought the neighbouring republics and after defecting to the camp of nationalism, Tito's group does not any more represent the majority in the party. Now Tito's group represents Tito's faction enjoying the trust of only a minority in the party, that uses the State apparatus for the purpose of suppressing the internationalist majority in the party, that has thrown the party under the domination of the hangman Rankovic and that has established a regime of terror with its repressions, mass arrests and murders. Indeed, now Tito's faction is in a state of war with its own party. Only the blind cannot see this. If Tito's faction has been incapable of maintaining discipline in the party through usual democratic methods and has been forced to make use of mass repressions, then it means that it has already lost the trust of the majority of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

Tito's faction represents only a minority in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and does not enjoy the trust of the party but only of the administrative-police apparatus of Yugoslavia.

TSEKA
(Central Committee)

'Pravda', 8th December, 1948.

**With acknowledgements to Svetlana Alekseyevna Bondareva and Tim Davenport.
Translated from the Russian by Tahir Asghar.**

Click [here](#) to return to the September 2002 index.

Speech at the Session of the Politbureau of the CC of the AUCP(B)

(19th August 1939)

J.V. Stalin

The question of peace and war has become critical for us. If we sign a treaty with France and Great Britain, Germany will give up Poland and will try to reach a 'modus vivendi' with the Western powers. War may be avoided, however in the future things would be dangerous for the Soviet Union. If we accept the German proposal to sign a treaty of non-aggression, naturally Germany will invade Poland and the intervention of France and England in this war will become a fact. Western Europe will suffer. Under these conditions the chances are that we will manage to stay away from this conflict and then we might enter the war under more advantageous circumstances.

The experience of the past twenty years shows that the communist movement in these countries is not strong enough to seize power in peacetime. The dictatorship of this party will become possible only as a result of a great war. We have made our choice and we are clear in this respect. We should accept the German proposal and politely send back home the Anglo-French mission. This will give us the advantage that Poland will be destroyed all the way down to Warsaw including the Ukrainian Galicia. Germany leaves us complete freedom of action in the Baltic Republics and does not object to the return of Bessarabia to the USSR. They are yielding Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary as our zone of influence. The question of Yugoslavia will still remain open.... At the same time we should be able to foresee the implications of a possible victory or defeat of Germany in this war. In case of its defeat Germany will be sovietised and a communist government will be formed. We should not forget that a Soviet Germany will find itself in great danger if the sovietization of Germany will happen as a result of a defeat in a short war. England and France will be still strong enough to take Berlin and destroy Soviet Germany. And we will not be in a position to assist our Bolshevik comrades in Germany.

Therefore our task consists of having Germany wage a longer war so that England and France would be tired enough so that the last would refuse to liquidate Soviet Germany. We would take a neutral position till the right moment when the Soviet Union would assist Soviet Germany with food and raw materials. It is clear that the amount of assistance granted to the Soviet Germany should not exceed certain limits so our economy and our army would not be weakened.

At the same time we should develop active communist propaganda, specially within the English-French bloc, mainly in France. We should be ready for the possibility that in this country the party will be forced out of legality and will have to work underground. We know this will cost many victims, but our French comrades will not falter. Their tasks in turn will be the decomposition and demoralisation of the army and the police. If we

properly accomplish this preparatory work Soviet Germany will be safe and this will help the sovietization of France.

In order to accomplish these plans it is necessary that war last long enough, it should be here where we should focus all our forces in Western Europe and the Balkans.

Let us consider the second possibility, i.e. the victory of Germany. Some are of the opinion that this outcome would have serious consequences for us. These comrades are partially right, however it would be a mistake to believe the assurances of some comrades. If Germany wins the war it will be too exhausted to get engaged in an armed conflict with the Soviet Union at least for a period of 10 years.

Germany would be too worried about keeping an eye on a vanquished England and France in order to prevent their revival. On the other hand, victorious Germany will be too busy in the Germanization and exploitation of its enormous territories, something that will take entire decades. It is clear that Germany will be too busy elsewhere to seriously turn against us. In a defeated France the Communist Party of France will always be strong. The communist revolution would happen for sure and we could utilise this situation to help France and make her our ally. Subsequently all peoples under the domination of Germany would also become our allies. In this case we would be left with a large area of freedom of action to develop the world revolution.

Comrades! It is in the interests of the USSR, the homeland of workers that a war between the Reich and the capitalist Anglo-French bloc breaks out. We have to do everything possible so that this war lasts as long as possible so that both sides get exhausted. This is the reason we should accept the pact proposed by Germany and make everything possible for this war that has already been declared once lasts as long as possible. We should intensify our propaganda work within the belligerent nations so that we are better prepared when the war comes to an end.

A. N. Gordienko: 'Iosif Stalin', Minsk, 1998, pp. 274-78, from 'Voina 1939-1945: dva podkhoda', Moscow, 1995, Part I, and citing the Centre for the Conservation of Historical Documental Collections, former Special Archive of the USSR, f.7, op. 1, d. 1223. Translated from the Russian by 'Inter'.

Click [here](#) to return to the September 2000 index.