RIGHT-WING RESTORERS OF CAPITALISM

(COLLECTION OF ARTICLES)

Second, corrected edition

PARTIZDAT CC AUCP(b)

1937

This is a publication of STC — SPC — DD(CP).
October 2026.

Source: ПРАВЫЕ РЕСТАВРАТОРЫ КАПИТАЛИЗМА (СБОРНИК СТАТЕЙ), Издание второе, исправленное, 1937

Language: Russian

Produced by transcription, manually edited and prepared as an e-book. Translated into English using Gemini, Google Translate and Yandex Translate.

This is a publication of STC — SPC — DD(CP).

October 2026.

Direct Democracy (Communist Party)
Doğrudan Demokrasi (Komünist Parti)
Άμεση Δημοκρατία (Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα)
Прямая демократия (Коммунистическая партия)
www.directdemocracy4u.uk

Kıbrıs'ta Sosyalist Gerçek
Σοσιαλιστική Πραγματικότητα στην Κύπρο
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus
Социалистическая правда на Кипре
http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk

Kıbrıs Sosyalist Partisi
The Socialist Party of Cyprus
Το Σοσιαλιστικό Κόμμα Κύπρου
Социалистическая партия Кипра
https://st-cyprus.co.uk/kibris-sosyalist-partisi

R 357
410

ПРАВЫЕ РЕСТАВРАТОРЫ КАПИТАЛИЗМА

СБОРНИК СТАТЕЙ

ПАРТИЗДАТ ЦК ВКП(б) • 1937

RIGHT-WING RESTORERS OF CAPITALISM

(COLLECTION OF ARTICLES)

Second, corrected edition

PARTIZDAT CC AUCP(b)

1937

Table of Contents

P. Pospelov.....9
THE STRUGGLE OF BUKHARIN AND RYKOV AGAINST LENIN AND THE PARTY.....9
I.....9
II.....19
III.....24
Bl. Sorin.....27
THE STRUGGLE OF BUKHARIN AND RYKOV AGAINST THE PARTY OF LENIN — STALIN.....27
(Historical Reference).....27
I.....27
II.....38
III.....47
Em. Yaroslavsky.....59
THE STRUGGLE OF BUKHARIN AND RYKOV AGAINST THE PARTY.....59
B. Ponomarev.....81
THE PATH OF THE BUKHARINITE GROUPING FROM OPPOSITION TO COUNTER-REVOLUTION.....81
M. Moskalev.....125
FROM A POLITICAL CURRENT — TO AN UNMASKED GANG OF ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE*(Historical Reference)*....125
I.....126
II.....143
III.....154
IV.....170
V.....179
VI.....188
VII.....191

This collection contains a number of articles on the anti-party and anti-Soviet activities of the right-wing restorers of capitalism — Bukharin, Rykov, and others who, just like the Trotskyites, turned into a gang of wreckers, murderers, saboteurs, spies, agents of fascist intelligence services.

Partizdat CC AUCP(b)

"Now, I think, it is clear to everyone that the present wreckers and saboteurs, no matter what flag they mask themselves under —Trotskyite or Bukharinite—have long since ceased to be a political current in the working-class movement, that they have turned into an unprincipled and ideologically bankrupt gang of professional wreckers, saboteurs, spies, and murderers. It is clear that these gentry will have to be smashed and uprooted mercilessly, as enemies of the working class, as traitors to our Motherland."

STALIN

P. Pospelov

THE STRUGGLE OF BUKHARIN AND RYKOV AGAINST LENIN AND THE PARTY[1]

I

Even before the revolution, Bukharin opposed Lenin on the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat with his own special line, which signified a break with Marxism. In 1916, an article by Bukharin (signed Nota Bene) appeared in the journal *Jugend-Internationale* ("Youth International"), directed against Lenin. In this article, Bukharin put forward a semi-anarchist view that socialists should adopt a principled hostile attitude toward any state. "For Social Democracy, which either is or at the very least must be an educational mass, it is now more than ever necessary to emphasize its principled hostility to the state," wrote Bukharin. Emphasizing his principled hostility to the state in general, Bukharin thus slipped into a denial of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He propagated the anarchist theory of the "abolition," the "blowing up" of the state instead of Lenin's theory of "smashing" the bourgeois state machine.

Criticizing Bukharin's semi-anarchist views, Lenin wrote:

"What distinguishes us from the anarchists is (a) the use of the state now and (β) during the proletarian revolution ("the dictatorship of the proletariat")—points of the utmost practical

[1] *Pravda* No. 71, March 13, 1937.

importance right now. (Bukharin has forgotten them!)"[2] Lenin pointed out that Bukharin "...instead of exposing Kautskyism, helped them with his mistakes!!"[3]

Throughout our party's history, Bukharin confused things politically and theoretically. Here is what Lenin wrote about him back in 1916:

"...he (1) is gullible to gossip and (2) politically diabolically unstable.

The war pushed him toward semi-anarchist ideas. At the conference which passed the Bern resolutions (spring 1915), he gave out theses (I have them!) — the height of absurdity; disgrace; semi-anarchism."[4]

In 1925, Bukharin published in the collection *Revolution of Law* the article "Toward the Theory of the Imperialist State." This article had been rejected in its time by Lenin for publication in the *Collection of the Social Democrat*. Bukharin deemed it possible to crawl into print a year after Lenin's death with an article rejected by the great teacher's party with this article. Moreover, he made a blasphemous footnote to the article, in which he asserted that in the dispute over the state he, Bukharin, was right, and Lenin was not.

The period of the Brest-Litovsk Peace (February — March 1918), when the young, unfortified, unarmed Soviet republic

---

2 *Lenin Collection* XIV, p. 257.

3 Ibid., p. 259.

4 Lenin, vol. XXIX, pp. 229–230.

clashed with heavily armed German imperialism, was one of the most difficult moments of the proletarian revolution. The Brest Peace was a brilliant maneuver by Lenin, which made it possible to gain a breathing spell to strengthen the armed forces of the revolution. Bukharin and Pyatakov, heading the faction of the so-called "left communists," sought to disrupt this Leninist maneuver. They played an essentially treacherous role, pushing the Soviet power toward ruin under the pretext of "revolutionary war," which was hopeless under those conditions. They put forward truly monstrous, provocative resolutions, which spoke of "expediency"... of going along with the loss of Soviet power!

That is literally how it was recorded in the resolution of the Moscow Regional Bureau of February 24, 1918:

"In the interests of the international revolution, we consider it expedient to go along with the possibility of the loss of Soviet power, which is becoming for now purely formal."

By their adventurist policy, the "left communists" made it easier for imperialism to accomplish its task—to strangle the young Soviet republic. Lenin directly pointed out that by their struggle against concluding peace, the "left communists" "...thereby helped German imperialists and hindered the growth and development of the revolution in Germany."[5]

The struggle of the "left communists" against Lenin reached such ferocity that the Left SRs held negotiations with Bukharin

[5] Lenin, A Serious Lesson and Serious Responsibility, Works, vol. XXII, p. 307.

and Pyatakov on a direct conspiracy with the aim of arresting Lenin and forming a government from the "left communists" and Left SRs. The counter-revolutionary conspirators wanted to make Pyatakov Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars instead of Lenin. The fact of these criminal negotiations with the Left SRs was acknowledged by Bukharin himself in 1924 (see *Pravda* of January 3, 1924).

The "left communists" waged their struggle against the party and Lenin, in fact blocking with Trotsky, who was also criminally wrecking the cause of peace. Among the "left communists" there were not a few people who later opposed the party as Trotskyites (Pyatakov, Radek, Preobrazhensky, and others). The "left communists" waged a fierce, unceasing struggle against the party not only on the question of concluding the Brest Peace. They also opposed the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat, against the first steps of socialist construction that the party was making under Lenin's leadership after the conclusion of peace.

The "left communists" were characterized by Lenin as "frenzied petty bourgeois." The social nature of petty owners, hostile to proletarian discipline, was clearly manifested in the speeches of Bukharin and other "lefts" against Lenin on questions of the organization of socialist economy, labor discipline, one-man management, piece-rate wages, accounting and control, etc.

During the VII and VIII Party Congresses, Bukharin spoke against the party and against Lenin on such a most important issue as the party program.

What was the essence of the dispute over the party program? Bukharin proposed to throw out of the program the analysis of commodity production, crises, and replace it with an analysis of "pure imperialism." Bukharin believed that the fundamental contradictions of the capitalist system (competition, crises) in the epoch of imperialism within the framework of individual capitalist countries are "smoothed out." In such a formulation were laid the foundations of the right-opportunistic theory of "organized capitalism." As early as 1917, in a discussion on the party program, Bukharin wrote the following:

"The former fragmented and unorganized capitalism is replaced by organized capitalism" (journal *Spartak* No. 2, p. 6).

Further, Bukharin directly capitulated to the Menshevik thesis that the new type of capitalist relations in the epoch of imperialism eliminates the contradictions of capitalist society within the framework of a single country.

In the article "The Ruin of Capitalism," Bukharin poses the question: "Does this new type of capitalist relations eliminate the contradictions of capitalist society? Does it eliminate above all the anarchy of the modern mode of production?" And, unblushingly, he answers: "If one limits oneself only to the framework of state organization, i.e., to the framework of the capitalist fatherland, then one can answer this question in the affirmative" (journal *Spartak* No. 10, p. 6).

Objecting to Bukharin's theory of "pure imperialism," Lenin said at the VIII Party Congress:

"Pure imperialism without the basic foundation of capitalism has never existed, does not exist anywhere and never will exist. This is an incorrect generalization of everything that was said about syndicates, cartels, trusts, finance capital, when finance capital was depicted as if there were no foundations of the old capitalism beneath it. If a program is written like Comrade Bukharin wants, such a program will be incorrect"[6].

From Bukharin's anti-Leninist theory of "pure imperialism," which Bukharin stubbornly defended, grew Bukharin's right-opportunistic theory of "organized capitalism," which brought him close to the Menshevik II International.

Bukharin opposed Lenin during the discussion of the program and on the question of the growth of capitalist elements out of small peasant farming.

In his stubborn denial of the danger of the growth of capitalist elements from small-owner peasant farming, one can trace the roots of Bukharin's right-opportunistic theory of the "peaceful growing of the kulak into socialism," his denial of the necessity of the socialist transformation of the peasantry.

It should be noted that during the discussion of the program at the VII Party Congress, Bukharin proposed to proclaim the immediate withering away of the proletarian state. This proposal was connected with his mistakes during the period of the war, when he opposed the dictatorship of the proletariat. Objecting to Bukharin, Lenin said:

---

[6] Lenin, VIII Congress of the RCP(b), Works, vol. XXIV, pp. 131–132.

"To prematurely proclaim the withering away of the state will be a violation of historical perspective"[7].

During the discussion of the program at the VIII Party Congress, Bukharin spoke against Lenin on the national question.

Lenin and Stalin developed the programmatic views of the Bolsheviks on the national question as part of the theory of the proletarian revolution. Without the Lenin-Stalin national policy, the victory of the Great Proletarian Revolution, the victory of socialism in the USSR, would have been impossible.

Bukharin and Pyatakov even during the war years opposed Lenin, denying the significance of the national question in the epoch of imperialism. Thereby they in practice doomed the proletarian revolution to isolation and defeat, repelling reserves, the revolutionary possibilities of the national-liberation movement of oppressed nations. The views of Bukharin and Pyatakov Lenin called a "caricature of Marxism."

At the VIII Party Congress, Bukharin stated that the Bolshevik slogan of the right of nations to self-determination allegedly contradicts the principles of the proletarian dictatorship.

In 1921, Bukharin once again opposed Lenin in the discussion on trade unions. It is known that this discussion, started by Trotsky, did immense harm, created a party crisis in the most difficult conditions of early 1921. Bukharin initially assumed the role of a "buffer" in the discussion, but in reality acted

[7] Lenin, Seventh Congress of the RCP(b), Works, vol. XXII, p. 365.

solely against Lenin, as an ally of Trotsky. Bukharin treacherously fanned the discussion, pouring into it, in Lenin's expression, "buffer kerosene."

In Bukharin's theses, anarchist-syndicalist vacillations once again manifested themselves. Long differing from Lenin on the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the trade union discussion Bukharin began to deny the leading role of the party in relation to economic organizations. He proposed that the trade unions appoint so-called "compulsory candidates" to the corresponding economic main committees, without the approval of these candidates by the party. Bukharin denied the leading role of the Communist Party among non-party workers, the prolonged work of enlightening and educating the working masses ("school of communism").

Regarding Bukharin's position, Lenin wrote: "...the peak of ideological decay is the theses of Bukharin & Co...

This is a complete break with communism and a transition to the position of syndicalism"[8].

Lenin warned Bukharin that the objective logic of factional struggle against the party and stubborn persistence in his deviations from communism could lead him very far.

"The further... Bukharin defends his clearly incorrect theoretical and deceitful political deviation from communism, the sadder will be the fruits of stubbornness"[9].

---

8 Lenin, Party Crisis, Works, vol. XXVI, p. 92.

9 Lenin, Once More on the Trade Unions, Works, vol. XXVI, p. 145.

In 1920, Lenin harshly criticized in his remarks Bukharin's book *The Economics of the Transition Period*, uncovering in it the absence of a Marxist, dialectical approach, Bogdanovian scholasticism in Bukharin.

Shortly before his death, Lenin made another warning to Bukharin. "...His theoretical views," wrote Lenin about Bukharin, "can be attributed with very great doubt to entirely Marxist ones, because there is something scholastic in him (he never studied and, I think, never fully understood dialectics)."

But Bukharin did not heed these warnings of Lenin. His old deviations from Marxism, from communism served as the basis for the ideology of the right kulak deviation.

Another leader of the right deviation — Rykov — also more than once waged a struggle against Lenin and the party. In the years of reaction, Rykov held a conciliatory position toward all anti-party groups — toward the liquidators, Trotskyites, otzovists. Rykov, together with Kamenev, Zinoviev, Tomsky, and others, hindered Lenin in fighting these anti-party groups, together with other conciliators betrayed Lenin.

At the April Conference of 1917, Rykov, together with Kamenev, opposed Lenin's April Theses, against the party's line on the growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one. Rykov openly stated that in Russia a socialist revolution is impossible. "Where will the sun of the socialist coup rise?" Rykov asked. "I think," he said, "that according to all conditions, the philistine level, the

initiative of the socialist coup does not belong to us. We do not have the forces, the objective conditions for this"[10].

At the April Conference, Lenin characterized Rykov's views as a "break with Marxism," as a "parody of Marxism."

Rykov waged a struggle against Lenin and the party during the October Uprising; he was against the October Revolution. After the October Revolution, Rykov, together with Kamenev and Zinoviev, sought to transfer the dictatorship of the proletariat to the rails of bourgeois democracy. These people, the brakes on the revolutionary work, present an ultimatum to the party — to include Mensheviks and Right SRs in the government, to demand the renunciation of the socialist revolution. The Party Central Committee in a resolution of November 15 (2), 1917, written by Lenin, condemned his criminal vacillations and emphasized, that "the opposition that has arisen within the CC completely departs from all the fundamental positions of Bolshevism and the proletarian class struggle in general, repeating deeply non-Marxist cliches about the impossibility of a socialist revolution in Russia"[11]. On November 17 (4), 1917, Rykov submitted a statement of resignation from the CC and from the government, from the post of People's Commissar of Internal Affairs. Lenin branded this shameful act of Rykov as desertion and strike-breaking.

---

[10] Protocols of the Seventh (April) Conference of the RSDLP(b), p. 93, Partizdat, 1934. Underlined by us. — P. P.

[11] Lenin, Resolutions of the CC of the RSDLP(b), Works, vol. XXX, p. 360. Underlined by us. — P. P.

II

Bukharin did not learn lessons from the warnings of Lenin, who repeatedly harshly criticized Bukharin's deviations from Marxism. After Lenin's death, Bukharin organized an anti-party "school," which he "educates" in opposition to himself, Bukharin, and Lenin. As it turns out now from the confessions of some participants of this "school," Bukharin directly stated to these people that in disputes with Lenin, he, Bukharin, was right, and Lenin was mistaken, that Lenin could defeat Bukharin only because the latter had no cadres of his own.

What kind of "cadres" did Bukharin begin to group around himself? Among these people, considered "youth," a significant part before joining our party managed to visit the Cadets, SRs, etc. These people never had anything in common with the working class, were organically alien to all the traditions of Bolshevism.

Bukharin literally corrupted his "rotten cadres," flattered them and instilled in them that they, you see, should play a leading role in the party as "theoreticians."

In turn, the "disciples" deified Bukharin — this muddlehead, eclectic, who repeatedly broke completely with Marxism. The reflection of such moods was also the anti-party article by Maretsky, asserting that Bukharin was supposedly right in the dispute with Lenin over the state.

In this corrupted milieu of Slepkovs, Maretskys, Kuzminases for a number of years the ideology of the right deviation was cultivated, the basis of which were Bukharin's old anti-Leninist

mistakes on such root questions as the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Even in that period when Bukharin was fighting together with the party against the Trotskyites and Zinovievites, he had his own special line on a number of issues. In essence, he fought against the Trotskyites from his own special positions. Such was the case with the slogan "Enrich yourselves," condemned by the party, and with the theory of the "growing into" capitalism into socialism. Bukharin spoke at the XIV Party Congress that we would supposedly "crawl to socialism at a turtle's pace."

With the transition to the reconstruction period, the class struggle in the country sharpens, the resistance of capitalist elements to the socialist offensive intensifies. The wrecking activities of bourgeois specialists connected with the capitalist environment are uncovered (the Shakhty affair). The kulak element actively resists the implementation of grain procurements.

It is precisely in this period that the right opportunists take shape as an anti-party faction and wage fierce attacks on the party.

In the period of the July (1928) Plenum of the CC, the rights took shape as a finished anti-party faction with its center consisting of Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky.

Under the leadership of this center, fractional activity of the rights in the Moscow organization unfolds. A handful of right opportunists (Uglanov, Kotov, Kulikov, Ryutin, and others), later trying furiously to raise regional party organizations

against the party, was smashed. Tomsky develops vile anti-party activity among the bureaucratic elements of the trade union apparatus, cultivating enemies of the party and the people from them.

In the autumn of 1928, Bukharin speaks in the press with "Notes of an Economist," directed at disrupting the industrialization policy pursued by the party.

In the conditions of the reconstruction period, when the "last and decisive battle" with internal capitalism, growing out of small peasant farming, was underway, when the roots of capitalism were being eradicated, when the class struggle in the country sharpened, the rights became active and appeared as a direct agency of the kulak. The right elements in the party acted in unison with such counter-revolutionary ideologues of the kulak as Kondratiev, Chayanov, and others. The rights were sympathized with by wreckers from the "Promparty" (Ramzin and others).

The line of the rights on preserving the backwardness of our country, on rejecting collectivization, on preserving the kulak, on rejecting the policy of industrialization led to the strengthening of capitalist elements, to the restoration of capitalism. The policy of the rights literally drove the party into a trap, threatened the greatest dangers both from the standpoint of internal politics and international.

If the line of the right deviation, the line of preserving the backwardness of our country, had won in the party, we would undoubtedly have been threatened by China's fate. The Soviet Union would have become an easy prey for imperialist

plunderers, the prey of fascism. But the Lenin-Stalin party smashed the right deviation. Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, our party has transformed from a backward into an advanced industrial power, a living, impregnable fortress of socialism, which is not afraid of any attacks of enemies.

A most important role in the rout of the right deviation was played by the April (1929) Plenum of the AUCP(b). At the beginning of 1929, fractional negotiations of Bukharin with the Trotskyites, which took place in July 1928, were uncovered. When examining this issue, the leaders of the rights come out with a vile fractional "declaration," full of unheard-of, slanderous attacks against the party, taken from the arsenal of the Cadet leader Milyukov.

At the April Plenum of the CC, the rights again came out with their platform directed against socialist construction. Countering the five-year plan, Rykov put forward an opportunistic "two-year plan" with the aim of discrediting and disrupting the implementation of the five-year plan, disrupting allocations for the cause of industrialization.

The rights opposed new production forms of the bond with the village, proposed completely unleashing market spontaneity under the guise of "normalizing the market," proposed giving full freedom to the development of the kulak in the countryside and private trader in the city.

Comrade Stalin's speech "On the Right Deviation in the AUCP(b)," delivered at the April Plenum, was of immense significance. It completed the ideological rout of the right

deviation, the anti-leninist character of the system of views of the right opportunists.

Bukharin's complete break with Marxist-Leninist class struggle theory was the basis of the views of the right deviation.

"The liquidation of classes through fierce class struggle of the proletariat — such is Lenin's formula.

The liquidation of classes through the dying out of class struggle and the transformation of capitalists into socialism — such is the formula of Comrade Bukharin...

Here is the basis of all the mistakes of Comrade Bukharin and his friends," pointed out Comrade Stalin[12].

Comrade Stalin showed that the political essence of the Bukharinite group boils down to the decomposition of socialist construction, to the surrender of positions to capitalist elements, i.e., the betrayal of the revolution.

"Does Comrade Bukharin's group understand that to abandon the struggle against the right deviation means to betray the working class, to betray the revolution?" — thus Comrade Stalin ended his speech on the right deviation[13].

The Plenum of the CC in a special resolution condemned the right-opportunistic, fractional activity of Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky and warned them where this anti-party line is leading.

---

12 Stalin, Questions of Leninism, p. 254, 10th ed.

13 Ibid., p. 287.

The XVI Party Congress in its decision on the report of the CC AUCP(b) pointed out that "the implementation of the line of the right deviationists, who are objectively the agency of the kulak, meant the disruption of the construction of socialism and the restoration of capitalism in our country." The Congress declared the views of the right opposition incompatible with membership in the AUCP(b).

III

For a long time, right up to the very last time, the CC AUCP(b) gave the rights an opportunity to correct and redeem their sins before the party. The leaders of the rights, unlike the Trotskyites, were not expelled from the party, since they declared their abandonment of their anti-Leninist, anti-party views. However, after the formal recognition of their mistakes in 1929–1930, the rights began to employ a system of two-facedness, the most base deception of the party, and passed over to anti-Soviet views, methods and techniques of struggle.

A characteristic document of this final stage in the development of the right deviation is the counter-revolutionary platform of the so-called Ryutin-Slepkov group. This group of Bukharinites was closely connected with the Trotskyites and Zinovievites, including Kamenev and Zinoviev, and directly set in its platform the task of the restoration of capitalism in the USSR. As it now turns out, this platform was approved by the leaders of the rights. In the decision of the Presidium of the CCC AUCP(b) of October 9, 1932, it was indicated that this group of enemies of communism and Soviet power, traitors to the party and the working class, created through underground

means a "bourgeois, kulak organization for the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, and in particular, the kulak system"[14].

In July 1928, Bukharin conducts treacherous, dishonorable negotiations with Kamenev on a bloc with the Trotskyites. In 1932, in the case of the so-called Ryutin-Slepkov group, headed, as later transpired, by the leaders of the right deviation, a connection of the rights with the bitterest enemies of the people — the Trotskyites, with Kamenev and Zinoviev — is established. In 1936 and 1937, participants of the united Trotskyite-Zinovievites anti-Soviet center and participants of the Trotskyite-fascist "parallel" anti-Soviet center stated at the court about their counter-revolutionary connections and negotiations with the rights. The defendants claimed that the rights were aware of the transition of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite fascist band of mercenaries of capital to methods of terror, espionage, sabotage, wrecking, that the rights shared the traitorous platform of the restoration of capitalism.

Thus stretches the shameful chain of gravest, most vile treasons of the right two-facers and traitors, the chain of their "blocs" with the bitterest enemies of the people — the Trotskyites and Zinovievites.

Trotsky long ago ceased to be a political current in the ranks of the working class. In its time, this Menshevik current had certain roots in our country's economy in connection with the presence of capitalist elements. Now the roots of Trotskyism are not in our country, but in the capitalist environment, and

---

[14] AUCP(b) in Resolutions, part II, p. 669, Partizdat, 1936. Underlined by name. — P. P.

Trotsky himself from a political current turned into an unmasked, predatory gang of mercenaries of fascism, into a gang of bloody murderers, wreckers, spies, saboteurs, who do not dare to speak openly about their program even to their closest confidants.

As for the rights, they too have ceased to be a political current, have also turned into an unmasked gang of enemies of the people, irreconcilably hostile to Marxism-Leninism, ready for any and all crimes against our homeland.

For the rights as well, there are no longer any roots in our economy today, for the capitalist elements that nourished them, primarily the kulak, have been liquidated. Those remnants of capitalist elements in our country that still exist and are supported, are galvanized by the capitalist environment, nourish and will continue to nourish the rights and Trotskyites as a political current, but as a gang of fascist scoundrels.

This evolution of Trotskyism and the rights from a political current to a gang of criminals, to a gang of mercenaries of international capital must be firmly grasped, in order to be able to recognize the enemy and beat him in time.

Bl. Sorin

THE STRUGGLE OF BUKHARIN AND RYKOV AGAINST THE PARTY OF LENIN — STALIN (Historical Reference)[15]

I

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the AUCP(b), having examined the question of the anti-party activity of the right restorers of capitalism — Bukharin and Rykov, resolved to expel them from the party. The history of the stubborn struggle of Bukharin and Rykov against the party of the Bolsheviks has a long-standing history. Bukharin, who constantly manifested "diabolical instability in politics," as well as Rykov, for many years fiercely fought against Lenin, against the party of Lenin — Stalin, betraying the party and betraying Bolshevism.

Bukharin's struggle against the party, his anti-party political line have deep roots in his theoretical views. Advertising himself as an "orthodox" Marxist, Bukharin in reality never was a Marxist and dialectician. His general theoretical and philosophical views were formed not under the influence of Marx, Lenin, and dialectical materialism, but under the influence of the bourgeois philosophy of empiriocriticism — Avenarius, Bogdanov. When in 1909 Lenin's brilliant work

[15] *Izvestia* No. 79 of April 2, 1937.

Materialism and Empiriocriticism was published, Bukharin hostilely treated Marxist philosophy. All of Bukharin's "works" are thoroughly imbued with the spirit of bourgeois-idealist systems of mechanicism, scholasticism, and eclecticism. To these views of Bukharin always remained faithful.

Lenin, summing up his long-term observation of Bukharin's activity, wrote that "his theoretical views can be attributed with very great doubt to entirely Marxist ones, because there is something scholastic in him (he never studied and, I think, never fully understood dialectics)"[16]. Comrade Stalin in his speech at the April Plenum of the CC (1929) showed the complete insolvency of Bukharin as a Marxist theoretician and characterized him as a "theoretician without dialectics," a "theoretician-scholastic." Bukharin is a "theoretician" hostile to the proletariat and Marxism of class forces and trends.

Already in 1909, Bukharin appears as a "left," representing one of the shades of otzovism. Bukharin and his group (the future Sapronovites Smirnov, the future decist Osinsky) believe, that the bourgeois revolution has already been completed with us (this in 1909!), that questions of democracy are removed from the agenda. Thus, like Trotsky, Bukharin leaped over the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution. He opposed the necessity of the struggle for democracy, did not understand democratic tasks, ignoring democratic movements.

As a "left," Bukharin in 1913 tries in a disguised form to smuggle onto the pages of the press the rejection of support for

---

[16] Quoted from *Questions of Leninism*, p. 272, 10th ed.

the confiscation of landed estates in favor of the peasantry. Thereby Bukharin, in a Menshevik-Trotskyite manner ignoring the peasant movement, acts overtly against the serf-owning landlords.

Already at the very beginning of the imperialist war, sharp disagreements with Lenin and the Bolshevik CC revealed themselves in Bukharin. Bukharin and several of his friends, living in the village of Bozwi in Switzerland (hence the name "God's group"), decided to undertake the publication of their own newspaper. This newspaper was intended to be published behind the back of the CC, without its permission, in order to propagate their own views, different from the line of *Social-Democrat* — the central organ of our party, published in Switzerland by Lenin. Learning of the plan of the "Godites," the CC banned the publication of the new newspaper, which caused a flood of complaints from Bukharin, who swore to Vladimir Ilyich that he had absolutely no disagreements with the CC line, that all suspicions on this score were unfounded and that nothing in the world would force him to "form any new and oppositional tactical position in relation to you."

All of Bukharin's assurances were one solid hypocrisy and shameless lie. Bukharin deceived Lenin. Less than two months passed, when at the Conference of Foreign Organizations of our Party in Bern (spring 1915) Bukharin spoke with a declaration of the "Godite" group and, moreover, with personal theses, opposing them to Lenin's line. Together with other "Godites," Bukharin in a Trotskyite manner rejected the most important Bolshevik slogan of the "defeat of the tsarist

monarchy," declaring this slogan devoid of "any practical meaning."

Not daring to openly speak out against the Leninist slogan of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war, Bukharin diluted it with the pacifist slogan of peace. On the most important questions of tactics, Bukharin took a Trotskyite position. Trotsky, as is known, had already spoken out against the slogan of civil war and defeat. At the same conference, Bukharin demanded an agreement with the Trotskyite-Menshevik *Our Word*, once again contrary to the party line, which permitted agreement only with those groups that stand for a decisive break with social-chauvinism. *Our Word* defended unity with them. Lenin and the Bern Conference rejected Bukharin's and the "Godites'" Trotskyite platforms. Of Bukharin's own theses, Lenin spoke as follows: "...the height of absurdity; disgrace; semi-anarchism," and wrote that Bukharin "...is clearly sliding into a swamp"[17].

Lenin's famous article "On the National Pride of the Great Russians," Bukharin slanderously declared a social-patriotic article. Lenin's words: "We love our language and our homeland..." aroused the indignation of the "left" Bukharin. A refined petty-bourgeois intellectual, he did not appreciate the glorious revolutionary past of our country. He was alien to Lenin's fervent love for the homeland enslaved by tsars, capitalists, and landlords. An ill-fated prelude to the conspiracy of the right restorer of capitalism Bukharin with the leaders of

[17] Lenin, vol. XXIX, pp. 230, 264.

the anti-Soviet Trotskyite center, traitors selling out our homeland to the fascists!

Together with his friend Pyatakov, Bukharin opposed Lenin in the autumn of 1915 with theses in which he decisively rejected the principle of the right of nations to self-determination. Bukharin asserted that this slogan is "utopian" and "harmful" and that the defense of this slogan leads the party to sliding away from proletarian positions. Practicing "indifference" toward the "national movements," Bukharin thereby acted in the role of an agent of great-power chauvinism, was an exponent of the great-power influence of the bourgeoisie on the working class. Lenin wrote that Russian socialists, not demanding freedom of secession for Finland, Poland, Ukraine, "...behave like chauvinists, like lackeys of the blood and filth-stained imperialist monarchs and imperialist bourgeoisie"[18].

To deny the national question in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions meant to doom the proletarian revolution to isolation and defeat. Bukharin could never accept the Marxist-Leninist attitude toward national movements. On this most important question, he stubbornly disagreed with the Bolshevik party. The "left" Bukharin in practice played the role of standard-bearer and lackey of great-power chauvinist bourgeoisie.

In February 1916, a new turn to anarchism: Bukharin solidarizes with the ridiculed and smashed by Lenin semi-anarchist program of the Dutch left social-democrats, who later

[18] Lenin, Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination, Works, vol. XIX, p. 46.

became renegades, repeating the opportunistic mistakes of their Bern theses.

Acting in the role of a "left," criticizing our party for its supposedly insufficient revolutionariness, Bukharin in the years of the war and later especially denied the necessity of the struggle for the minimum program, for democracy. Lenin called Bukharin's direction "imperialist economism" by analogy with the economists of the 90s, who did not understand the necessity of political struggle.

Bukharin abstractly counterposed to the epoch of "pure imperialism" the coming imperialist era. A petty-bourgeois scholastic and doctrinaire, he completely misunderstood the concrete ways of the struggle of the working class for socialism, for the proletarian dictatorship. Lenin showed that the proletariat cannot prepare for victory over the bourgeoisie, for the socialist revolution, for the victory of the proletarian dictatorship, if it does not wage a preliminary all-sided, consistent revolutionary struggle for democracy.

The pseudo-radical rejection by Bukharin of the struggle for democracy in reality meant rejection of the effective struggle for socialism, for the socialist revolution. Thereby he poured water on the mill of all enemies of socialism. Instead of arming the proletariat with revolutionary slogans, leading the masses to higher stages of struggle, Bukharin "armed" the worker with empty, abstract phraseology. About Bukharin and Pyatakov, Lenin wrote, "...that their ideas have nothing in common with

Marxism, with revolutionary social-democracy"[19]. On all the most important stages of the revolutionary struggle, Bukharin invariably manifested vacillations and waverings on every major issue.

His "left-opportunistic," anarchist-syndicalist nonsense, deeply hostile and alien to Bolshevism, Bukharin declared a "new Bolshevism" — "Bolshevism on a West European scale," counterposing it to Lenin's teaching. Thus Bukharin slanderously denied the internationalist character of Leninism. "I can only say," wrote Lenin on this occasion, "that the Bolshevism proclaimed by the author on a West European scale, according to my deep conviction, is neither Bolshevism nor Marxism, but a small variant of that same stale 'economism'"[20]. Lenin showed that Bukharin turns the struggle with Kautskyism into an apology for imperialism. Apology for imperialism, connivance with imperialism — that is what Bukharin's position, masked by "left" phrases, actually represented.

On the most important question of the revolution — on the proletarian state, the proletarian dictatorship — Bukharin most sharply disagreed with the party line. Bukharin in 1916 began to preach in the journal *Jugend-Internationale* a hostile attitude toward any state, including the state of the working class, the proletarian dictatorship. "For social-democracy," wrote

---

[19] Lenin, On the Emerging Trend of "Imperialist Economism," Works, vol. XXX, p. 251.

[20] Ibid., p. 256.

Bukharin, "it is now more than ever necessary to emphasize its principled hostility to the state"[21].

In the Bolshevik *Collection of the Social-Democrat*, Lenin crushed Bukharin's gross mistake, his non-Marxist, semi-anarchist views on the question of the state. "Socialists," explained Lenin, "stand for the use of the modern state and its institutions in the struggle for the emancipation of the working class, as well as the necessity to use the state for its peculiar transitional form from capitalism to socialism. Such a transitional form, which is also a state, is the dictatorship of the proletariat".

In a theoretical work on the state, prepared by Vladimir Ilyich for the press, he gave the following critique of Bukharin's semi-anarchist views: "What distinguishes us from the anarchists is (a) the use of the state now and (β) during the revolution of the proletariat ("the dictatorship of the proletariat") — points of the utmost practice, right now. (Bukharin has forgotten them!)"[22]. By his mistakes on the question of the state, Bukharin helped the Kautskyites, harmed the Bolsheviks. Speaking of the necessity to restore a truly Marxist attitude to the question of the state, distorted by the opportunists, Lenin wrote that "...Bukharin's mistakes can ruin this 'right cause' in the struggle against Kautskyism." Instead of the Marxist proletarian state, Bukharin advocated the anarchist "blowing up" of any state. Bukharin denied that the proletariat needs a state, on the one hand, for the suppression of exploiters, on the other hand, for creative, constructive work in

---

21 Lenin, Jugend-Internationale, Works, vol. XIX, p. 296.

22 *Lenin Collection* XIV, p. 257.

building a socialist society. This position on the question of the state he took in 1918, "not noticing" the creative role of the proletarian state, seeing in the state only an apparatus of oppression in the capacity of a petty bourgeois, which must be "blown up."

Shortly after Lenin's death, Bukharin, republishing his article on the state rejected by Lenin during the war, had the audacity, counting on impunity, to write that in the dispute over the state, Lenin was not right, but Bukharin was!

At the VII Party Congress (March 1918), when the young Soviet state was just beginning to take shape and when the task was to comprehensively strengthen and consolidate Soviet power, Bukharin with his hostility to the proletarian state hastened to include in the program a point on the withering away, on the destruction of the proletarian state. Lenin, of course, speaks out against this harmful amendment of Bukharin, and it is rejected by the Congress.

Bukharin's hostility to the proletarian state was especially openly manifested during the period of the Brest-Litovsk Peace, when the "left communists" led by Bukharin agreed to a monstrous "idea" — on the expediency of going along with the loss of Soviet power. They did not value the proletarian dictatorship and therefore so easily went to surrender power, to its transfer into the hands of the bourgeoisie. Mensheviks and SRs could only applaud such "revolutionaries" — accomplices of the bourgeoisie.

During the war in Switzerland, one issue of the journal *The Communist* came out with Lenin's participation. Pyatakov and

Bukharin insisted on the continuation of the publication of this journal so that its pages would be provided for the opportunistic articles of Bukharin and Radek, denying the right of nations to self-determination and the necessity of a complete break with social-chauvinists. Pyatakov and Bukharin wanted to smuggle Radek into the journal, contrary to Lenin's opinion, and make this journal the organ of their opportunistic vacillations. To give Radek "freedom" to unpunishedly propagate anti-Marxist ideas from the pages of the Bolshevik journal — this meant introducing ideological decay not only into the ranks of the Bolsheviks, but also into the ranks of the "Zimmerwald Left" — the embryo of the III International. This is precisely what Pyatakov and Bukharin were striving for. Lenin, of course, indignantly rejected these aspirations.

The financial resources at the disposal of our party were negligible, and therefore Lenin published *Social-Democrat* with great difficulty. Because of the lack of funds, the central organ came out infrequently, which, of course, hampered the scope of Bolshevik agitation and propaganda. Meanwhile, Pyatakov had large financial funds, which he, however, did not wish to give for the all-party cause and agreed only to the publication of *The Communist* on the above conditions. Taking advantage of the fact that he had financial funds in his hands, and therefore the possibility for publication, Pyatakov behaved toward Lenin in the most insolent and unseemly manner, presenting Vladimir Ilyich with the demand to open a discussion on the pages of *The Communist* and threatening, in case of Vladimir Ilyich's refusal, not to provide the journal with funds. Like an insolent merchant, like a kulak, he tried to

directly dictate terms to Vladimir Ilyich, trying to exploit the difficult material situation of the central organ. In this shameful, repulsive business, Bukharin acted in the role of Pyatakov's broker. Pyatakov and Bukharin strove to make *The Communist* an organ propagating anti-party views of them and their friends, like Radek, and so that Vladimir Ilyich would endure this, because they had money in their hands which the CC did not have. In correspondence, Lenin harshly branded the vile behavior of Pyatakov, Bukharin and company. Having moved from Switzerland to Stockholm, these gentlemen tried to seize the communication links of our party with Russian organizations into their own hands and began to create a faction, sending their agents to Russia.

Giving a general description of Bukharin's political activity, Lenin wrote about him in the years of the war, that "he (1) is gullible to gossip and (2) politically diabolically unstable."[23]

Bukharin carried out his old dream of cooperation with Trotsky at the end of 1916, when together with Trotsky he entered the editorial board of the New York newspaper *New World*. Occupying a semi-Trotskyite position in previous years, Bukharin in *New World* continues the same line. With his denial of the struggle for democracy, for the liberation of oppressed nationalities, with his mistake on the question of the state, the Trotskyite denial of the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single country is united — this is the ideological preparation of the most vile betrayal of the proletarian dictatorship and the socialist homeland. In this decisive

[23] Lenin, vol. XXIX, p. 229.

question of the revolution, Bukharin finds himself entirely within the framework of the Trotskyite scheme.

II

When the autocracy was overthrown in Russia, Bukharin, calculating the prospects of the revolution after the victory of the proletarian dictatorship, wrote: "Can the proletariat, numerically weak, organize backward Russian economy?" To this question Bukharin answered as follows: "One — he himself would not be in a position to do this." But the Russian revolution will spill over into Western Europe. Then "the proletariat, having seized power in European countries, by its support will make impossible the return of the capitalist regime even in Russia." On the other hand, the highly developed countries of the West will sort out the economic backwardness of Russia."

This is the "concept" of the purest Trotskyite defeatism, denying the socialist character of the October Revolution.

But perhaps Bukharin adhered to the Trotskyite thesis on the impossibility of the victory of socialism in our country only in the period after the February Revolution? Perhaps, after Lenin's April Theses, after the VI Congress of the party, at which Comrade Stalin smashed the scheme of Preobrazhensky and Bukharin, Bukharin abandoned Trotskyite ideas? Not at all. At the VI Congress of the party, Bukharin developed the usual Trotskyite "scheme," according to which after satisfying the peasantry with land, the next stage of the revolution will inevitably lead to the withdrawal of the peasant masses from it; the proletariat will find itself in isolation and can be saved only

by the support of the proletarian revolution in the West. Comrade Stalin then called this scheme "toy-like."

In the days of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Bukharin in the Moscow *Social-Democrat* painted the following picture of the further development of the country after the victory of the working class: "Cut off by war, economic ties are restored. The victory of the proletariat in the West gives the opportunity to planarly heal economic wounds in Russia with highly developed Western European technology. The economic backwardness of Russia is compensated by the high economic level of Europe, and the Russian economy is quickly drawn — upon the victory of the proletariat in the West — into the pan-European socialist organization." Thus, without the victory of the Western European proletariat, it is impossible not only to build socialism, but even to heal the economic wounds of Russia. Here is the basis of shameful capitulationism, the betrayal of the October Revolution, the Trotskyite basis of the most vile behavior and the Trotskyite-Zinovievite and right restorers of capitalism in the USSR.

In the Brest-Litovsk period, the capitulationist tactics of Bukharin and the "left communists" stemmed from this very profound disbelief in the possibility of the victory of socialism in our country. In the Petrograd *Communist*, Bukharin wrote: "The isolated Russian workers' and peasants' revolution is not in a position to save itself. It will cross the borders of Russia or perish. It will perish not only from the military blows of capitalism, but from its own economic and organizational impotence."

And in subsequent years, Bukharin stubbornly continues to defend the counter-revolutionary idea of the impossibility of the victory of socialism in our country. In the brochure *Class Struggle and Revolution in Russia* (1919), Bukharin wrote, for example, that "the durable victory of the Russian socialist proletariat is impossible without the proletarian revolution in Europe." And further, on the question of building socialism in our country, even more frankly: "This task, which is put on the agenda in Russia too, cannot be solved within national borders."

In the summer of 1921, Bukharin, already after the proclamation of the New Economic Policy, continues to panic, not believing in victory: "Shall we hold out or not? There is no possibility to answer with complete certainty to this question."

By the time of the IV Congress of the Comintern (1922), Bukharin continues to assert that if socialism also wins in our country, then this will not be real socialism. He slanderously, slanderously snarls: "We can say completely openly that Russian socialism, compared to others, will look Asian."

In the Brest-Litovsk period, when the party was waging a heroic struggle to tear our country from the clutches of the imperialist war, Bukharin, together with Trotsky, wages a frantic struggle against the party, seeking to disrupt the peaceful policy of the Soviet government. Initially, he supports the criminal, treacherous policy of Trotsky, which serves the interests of German imperialism. Refusing to sign peace leads to the fact that the Soviet Republic loses huge territory and colossal military equipment. As a result of the criminal policy of Trotsky and Bukharin, our country is brought to the brink of

the abyss. When peace was nevertheless concluded, contrary to Trotsky and Bukharin, Bukharin together with the SRs and Mensheviks seeks to provocatively drag the republic into war. Lenin wrote in this period that "...to maneuver in a Bukharinite manner, then it is possible to ruin a good revolution completely"[24]. Bukharin's malice against Lenin and the Party CC knows no bounds. This "frenzied petty bourgeois" disrupts party discipline, sabotages work in the CC and Soviet institutions (the policy of resignations), refuses to carry out party decisions, in a number of documents insolently and basely slanders the party and Lenin. He even allows himself to call Lenin "the hero of opportunist phrase," comparing him to Petlyura!

In the struggle against the party, Bukharin organizes a faction with its own center and its own printing organ, with its own fractional discipline. This faction of war-mongers and their instigators (Bukharin, Pyatakov, Radek, Preobrazhensky, Sapronov) sends speakers and agents to all corners of the country. The fractional policy of Bukharin, who acted in the capacity of an accomplice of the bourgeoisie, in the role of an agent of imperialist provocation, causes the indignation of party organizations, which rally around Lenin and the CC. Bukharin's group was utterly smashed.

In his malice against the party, Bukharin reaches the point of conducting negotiations with the Left SRs on organizing a coup d'état, arresting Lenin and appointing his old friend in the

[24] Lenin, Seventh Congress of the RCP(b), Works, vol. XXII, p. 335.

struggle against the party — Pyatakov — as Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars.

In the period of the breathing spell, Lenin in *The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power* gave a plan for the reorganization of Russia on socialist principles. The ideas laid at the basis of this plan represented the first draft of that new economic policy which was proclaimed by our party in 1921 at the X Congress. Bukharin waged a fierce struggle against the Leninist plan for the socialist development of our economy.

In the period of the breathing spell, Bukharin and the "lefts" wage Menshevik-SR agitation against labor discipline, against one-man management, against the involvement of specialists, against firm centralization in the management of the economy, i.e., they hinder the cause of the economic revival of the country, disrupt socialist construction.

In the years of the civil war, Bukharin continues to develop opportunistic theories on a number of most important issues (national, party program).

In 1919, Bukharin sharply broke with Lenin on the question of the theoretical justification of our program. In economic reality, Bukharin as a "left" wanted to see only "pure imperialism." From Bukharin's scheme, counterposing "pure imperialism" to the proletarian dictatorship, petty commodity producers fell out. Bukharin's theoretical mistake politically signified Trotskyite-Menshevik forgetting and misunderstanding of the role of the peasantry and, as Lenin noted, led to a misunderstanding of our attitude toward the middle peasantry. The same decisive mistake signified

Bukharin's unwillingness to see the constant emergence and growth of kulak, capitalist elements from small peasant farming. At the VIII Party Congress, Bukharin again spoke against the recognition of the right of nations to self-determination, thereby feeding great-Russian chauvinism and causing the distrust of previously oppressed nations toward the proletarian dictatorship.

Known is the devastating critique given by Lenin to Bukharin's book *The Economics of the Transition Period* (1920), written in close cooperation with Pyatakov and under the influence of the anti-Marxist methodology of Bogdanov. Characteristically, in a number of places in this book, Lenin notes Bukharin's mistakes on the question of classes and class struggle.

During the trade union discussion, Bukharin once again opposed Lenin.

At the end of 1920 and beginning of 1921, in the period of the transition from civil war to peaceful economic construction, in the period of the transition from war communism to the new economic policy, a discussion on trade unions arose, started by Trotsky, who, taking advantage of the difficulties experienced in this period by the country, the party, the working class, waged a struggle against the Leninist policy of the CC. Bukharin initially acted in the role of a "buffer," supposedly called upon to fight against the "extremes" of both currents — the Leninist and Trotskyite, but in reality served as a cover for Trotsky, waged a struggle against Lenin, and when Bukharin's machinations were uncovered, he openly and shamelessly joined Trotsky's platform. The buffer group of Bukharin

hindered the party's struggle against Trotsky and, according to Lenin, did more harm than anyone else.

The position of Trotsky and Bukharin led to a split in the party, to the separation of the party from the trade unions. Trotsky and Bukharin disrupted the cause of building socialism, demanding an administrative-bureaucratic pressure from above on the masses. Bukharin and Trotsky treated initiative from the masses, their conscious struggle for socialism, with contempt, assuring that the path to socialism is the path of violence, extortion, commands, repressions, clubs. In reality, this line, having nothing in common with Bolshevik methods of building socialism, laid bare only enemies of socialism. Bukharin and Trotsky manifested the most crude, baronial-bureaucratic misunderstanding of the role of mass organizations (trade unions) in the cause of building socialism, carried out by the creative efforts of millions under the leadership of the Bolshevik party.

Waging a Trotskyite position during the trade union discussion, Bukharin at the same time manifested anarchist-syndicalist vacillations. He spoke out against the leading role of the party in relation to economic organizations, demanding that the trade unions apart from the party, without the party, appoint the heads of economic main committees ("compulsory candidates"). Lenin wrote on this occasion that the theses of Bukharin & Co. are "...the peak of ideological decay," that Bukharin's position is a "...break with communism and a

transition to the position of syndicalism," this is "...a split of the party, or rather: a break of syndicalists with the party"[25].

In the spring of 1921, the party was experiencing great difficulties. The panicked Bukharin shouted at the X Congress that "the republic is hanging by a thread." This in no way prevented him at the same Congress from continuing the fight against Lenin, against the majority of the party, thus further increasing the all-political difficulties of the situation.

The criminal anti-party, fractional activity of Trotsky, Bukharin, Shlyapnikov, Sapronov and others prompted Lenin to include in the resolution on party unity adopted by the Congress a paragraph which demanded the expulsion from the party of those members of the CC who do not submit to the decision of the Congress on the dissolution of all factions and will continue their fractional activity. This paragraph had in mind also Bukharin.

Bukharin broke with Lenin in 1922 on the question of proletarian culture. In this question, Bukharin defended Bogdanovian Menshevik views, which consisted in the fact that under the guise of "proletarian culture," bourgeois views and philosophy were foisted on the workers, and in the sphere of art, absurd, distorted tastes were instilled in the workers.

In 1922, during the trial of the Right SRs organizing terrorist acts against representatives of Soviet power, Bukharin and Radek, conspiring with the leaders of the II International, acted in the role of advocates for terrorists and petitioned for not

---

[25] Lenin, Party Crisis, Works, vol. XXVI, p. 92.

applying the supreme penalty to the Right SRs, thereby encouraging them to continue their criminal activity. Lenin harshly and publicly condemned the vile act of Bukharin and Radek, who took bandits under their protection.

In that same 1922, Lenin gave a harsh rebuke to Bukharin as a kulak hanger-on who tried to disrupt the monopoly of foreign trade. Waging a campaign against the monopoly of foreign trade, Bukharin, as Lenin wrote, "...comes to the defense of the speculator, the petty bourgeois and the upper strata of the peasantry against the industrial proletariat"[26]. Thereby Bukharin disrupted the task of transforming Soviet Russia into a powerful, economically independent industrial country.

On the eve of the discussion of 1923–1924, shortly before Trotsky waged an open struggle against the Leninist line of the party, well-known secret meetings of individual members of the CC on the leadership of the party took place in Kislovodsk "in the cave." The leadership of the party at this time in connection with the illness of Vladimir Ilyich lay upon Comrade Stalin. Opportunists of all stripes found the firmness of Comrade Stalin, his Leninist principledness, his Bolshevik irreconcilability to any manifestations of opportunism, to their liking. Therefore Bukharin, Zinoviev and Kamenev conspired to fight against the Leninist line of the party, against Comrade Stalin.

Characteristically, on the eve of the discussion of 1923–1924, Bukharin had already begun to smuggle into the press views which were one of the first "drafts" of the ultra-opportunistic

[26] Lenin, On the Monopoly of Foreign Trade, Works, vol. XXVII, p. 381.

theory later developed by him of the "growing into" of the kulak into socialism. Believing that in the countryside socialism can win quietly, peacefully, without class struggle, Bukharin wrote in No. 219 of *Pravda* in 1923: "The faster economic life improves, the faster the proletariat assimilates the peasantry, and peasant farming in an evolutionary manner (underlined by Bukharin) through the process of circulation, state credit, cooperation, etc. gradually 'grows into' the all-socialist organization of society."

III

Rykov — another leader of the right restorers of capitalism — just like Bukharin, constantly disagreed with the party, opposing its line as a right capitulator. Characteristically, before joining our party, Rykov was a member of the Saratov united organization of SRs and Social-Democrats. Rykov never understood the significance of Marxist theory and treated it dismissively, emphasizing his "practicality."

In 1909, when philosophical questions stood so sharply in the party, when Lenin energetically defended the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels against the revisionism of Bogdanov and company, Rykov opposed the illumination of central party questions of philosophy from the standpoint of dialectical materialism, propagating the rotten "neutrality" of the Bolsheviks in this sphere. This unprincipled position he occupied also at the most expanded meeting of the editorial board of *Proletary* (1909), which excluded Bogdanov from the ranks of the Bolsheviks.

In 1905, at the III Party Congress, Lenin, noting that in our party committees there were comparatively few workers, emphasized the necessity of including worker-Bolsheviks in party committees in as large a number as possible. Rykov furiously opposed this proposal of Vladimir Ilyich.

In the period preceding the new rise of the revolutionary movement, in those years when the Bolshevik party was waging a fierce struggle on two fronts — against liquidators and otzovists and against conciliators-centrists like Trotsky — and when preparation for the famous Prague Conference was underway, which is a major milestone in the history of Bolshevism, Rykov held a conciliatory, semi-Trotskyite position. He was conciliatory toward liquidators, forward-looking people (Bogdanovites), toward Trotsky. Lenin decisively warned Rykov against repeating his "idiotic conciliatory mistakes" of the 1910 Plenum. Instead of a merciless war with the forward-looking people (Bogdanovites), Rykov recommended a "union" with them. Lenin wrote on this score to Rykov: "They (i.e. the forward-looking people. — V. S.) have merged with the liquidators, they have set up a school against you, they are pulling wool over your eyes, saying: we are nothing, we are not otzovists, and you believe words and do not fight with deeds. This is the devil knows what!"[27]. While Lenin demanded an energetic struggle against forward-looking people and liquidators, Rykov "courted" these enemies of the party, braking the work of the Bolsheviks to rally truly revolutionary elements. Demanding from Rykov the conduct of the party line, Lenin wrote to him that it is necessary "...to

[27] *Lenin Collection* XVIII, p. 26.

work friendly (on the basis of agreement), and not to undermine, not to cross over to the Mensheviks"[28].

As is known, in 1911 the liquidators with all their might sought the destruction of the CC. To this end, Menshevik members of the CC refused to enter it, disrupted CC meetings, etc. Rykov, not wanting to work in the difficult conditions of that time, also decided to leave the CC, playing thereby into the hands of the liquidators. Lenin harshly warned Rykov of the criminality of such a capitulatory, treacherous act: "If you leave the CC, this will be flight from the battlefield, betrayal of Bolshevism in a difficult moment"[29].

After the overthrow of the autocracy, in the period of the April Conference, Rykov, just like Kamenev, stood on semi-Menshevik positions. He sought to limit the tasks of the proletariat by the framework of the bourgeois revolution, propagating the unification of all forces of "revolutionary democracy," i.e., unity with Mensheviks and SRs, and resolutely fought against the party's course on the growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one. Speaking at the April Conference against Lenin, against Vladimir Ilyich's April Theses, Rykov asserted that in our country socialism cannot win. "Where will the sun of the socialist coup rise? I think, that according to all conditions, the philistine level, the initiative of the socialist coup does not belong to us. We do not have the forces, the objective conditions for this"[30].

---

28 Ibid., p. 27.

29 Ibid., p. 33.

Rykov reacted with hostility to the Great Socialist Revolution. Together with Kamenev, Zinoviev and other strike-breakers, he deserted from responsible party and Soviet posts, wishing in this way to force our party to abandon the proletarian dictatorship and conclude an agreement with the Mensheviks and SRs, to capitulate to the bourgeoisie. Rykov's traitorous line was calculated to disrupt the proletarian revolution, to liquidate the proletarian dictatorship. Lenin branded Rykov's crime as strike-breaking and desertion.

In the CC resolution written by Lenin, it was emphasized that "...the opposition that has arisen within the CC completely departs from all the fundamental positions of Bolshevism and the proletarian class struggle in general, repeating deeply non-Marxist cliches about the impossibility of a socialist revolution in Russia"[31].

Just like the Mensheviks, the Trotskyites, Rykov, reflecting the interests of the bourgeoisie, class hatred for socialism, preached the impossibility of a socialist revolution in our country. At the Moscow regional conference held in December 1917, he propagated the Trotskyite-Menshevik idea, which was shared by the right capitulators and strike-breakers. "Pure Bolshevik power cannot maintain itself," Rykov assured, "in a backward country at a time when the socialist revolution has not occurred in Europe". In Russia, he developed his thought, "the forces of the proletariat are insufficient for the

---

[30] Protocols of the Seventh (April) Conference of the RSDLP(b), p. 93, Partizdat, 1934.

[31] Lenin, Resolution of the CC of the RSDLP(b) on the question of the opposition within the CC of November 15 (2) 1917, Works, vol. XXX, p. 360.

organization of the socialist system". Rykov dragged along in the tail, in the baggage train, firmly convinced that socialism could not win, that the proletarian dictatorship and socialist construction were doomed to ruin.

In the spring and summer of 1918, famine gripped the industrial centers of our country as a result of the occupation of Ukraine by German imperialism and kulak sabotage. In these conditions, the party implemented the grain monopoly with particular severity and proclaimed the food dictatorship in the name of saving the working class from ruin. The food measures of Soviet power were met with frantic howling by the bourgeoisie, the kulaks, the Mensheviks, the SRs and all other forces of counter-revolution. Against the food dictatorship, the opportunist Rykov spoke out. At the meeting of the Council of People's Commissars on May 9, 1918, opposing his own view to the line of Lenin and the party, Rykov directly stated that "the dictatorship is superfluous". In unison with the Mensheviks, he demanded such a food policy that would be profitable to speculators, kulaks, the rich upper strata of the village (the establishment of bonuses, increased payment for the delivery of grain, orientation toward private trade associations).

In 1920, during the period when the party was intensively discussing questions of economic construction and emphasized the necessity of Bolshevik one-man management in the management of industry, Rykov opposed the CC line, demanding collegiality.

He solidarizes on this issue with the Mensheviks and Sapronovites.

During the period of transition to the New Economic Policy, Rykov fought against Lenin's electrification plan. Comrade Stalin gave a harsh assessment of Rykov's opportunism at that time in a letter to Lenin: "philistine 'realism' (actually manilovism) of Rykov, who is still 'criticizing' GOELRO and is knee-deep in routine"[32].

During the period of acute struggle against the Trotskyites and Zinovievites, who denied the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single country and pushed the party toward a break of the alliance of the working class with the broad masses of the peasantry, Bukharin threw out (in April 1925) the kulak slogan "Enrich yourselves," which meant a call to restore capitalism. Waging a struggle on two fronts, primarily against the phantom Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc, the party simultaneously rebuffed Bukharin.

The proclamation of the slogan "Enrich yourselves" by Bukharin was by no means accidental. In the period following the rout of Trotskyism, the period when the party transitioned to a sweeping socialist offensive along the entire front and to the socialist reconstruction of the entire national economy, Bukharin from 1928 spoke even more fiercely against the party as the ideologue of the right capitulators. Together with Rykov, Tomsky, Uglanov, he appeared as an apologist for capitalist elements in the country, primarily the kulaks, who fiercely resisted the offensive of socialism. Bukharin and Rykov, to please the kulaks and foreign imperialists, opposed

[32] Stalin, Collection of articles on the fiftieth anniversary of his birth, p. 33, Giz, 1930.

industrialization, opposed the development of state farms and collective farms.

During the grain procurements in the winter of 1928/29, the kulak apostle Bukharin opposed pressure on the kulak, opposed the so-called emergency measures that were used in the struggle for grain. He spoke at the April Plenum of the CC 1928 with panic statements about the "disjunction" [razmychka] with the middle peasant and about the "economy standing on its head," assuring that the continuation of the party's policy would lead to the ruin of Soviet power. The slanderous outcries about the "disjunction" with the middle peasant represented a brazen attempt to shield the kulak from blows.

In July 1928, Bukharin, during the CC plenum, together with Sokolnikov, secretly, behind the party's back, like a thief, sneaks to a meeting with Kamenev, and with the knowledge of Rykov and Tomsky conducts negotiations with this bitter enemy of the party on changing the party leadership and on changing its policy, concluding thereby a bloc with the Trotskyites to fight against the Bolsheviks. And at the plenum he hypocritically declares the absence of any disagreements with the CC. Bukharin then undertakes steps to transfer his fractional activity to the international arena. During the VI Congress of the Comintern, he goes over the head of the AUCP(b) delegation to distribute his theses to foreign delegates. of the Comintern. In all his speeches, he gives a social-democratic assessment of the stabilization of capitalism (the theory of "recovery" of capitalism), glosses over the aggravation of contradictions in capitalist society, takes under

his protection within the ranks of the Comintern right-wing opportunists and conciliators. He tries in the Comintern to unite around himself all opportunistic elements and thus create for himself an international support in the struggle against the party.

In *Notes of an Economist*, which essentially constituted the platform of the right restorers of capitalism, in a number of speeches Bukharin wages agitation for curtailing the socialist offensive, for lowering the rates of industrialization, for leveling down to the bottlenecks. Seeking to frighten the party and the country with the inevitable difficulties of the reconstruction period, he calls for capitulating before them. In his slander against the party, the right restorer of capitalism Bukharin reaches such audacity as accusing it of Trotskyism.

At the same time, Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky desert work, submit resignations.

The socialist offensive and the aggravation of the class struggle lead to an intensification of the anti-party activity of the rights. On January 21, 1929, on the anniversary of the death of Vladimir Ilyich, Bukharin shamelessly slandered Lenin, portraying him as a great revolutionary in the guise of a bourgeois liberal. On January 30, 1929, Bukharin submits a statement to the CC, overflowing with unheard-of slanderous attacks against the party leadership.

In February 1929, the rights headed by Bukharin come out with their fractional platform, condemned by a joint meeting of the Politburo of the CC and the Presidium of the CCC.

Bukharin, Rykov and Uglanov tried to raise the Moscow organization to fight against the CC, but the Moscow Bolsheviks gave a crushing rebuff to the right opportunists.

Bukharin created his base of support in the form of a group of his disciples, whom he scattered across command ideological heights. This "school" of Bukharin, in which the spirit of "leaderism" [vozhdizm] was intensively cultivated (its fosterlings, kulak mouthpieces — Slepkov, Astrov, Maretsky, and others, whom Bukharin prophesied as leaders of the party), rapidly degenerated into a counter-revolutionary gang of rabid enemies of socialism, waging a direct struggle against the party and Soviet power.

The April Plenum of the CC (1929) dealt a decisive blow to the right capitulators and their leader Bukharin. Comrade Stalin left no stone unturned of Bukharin's theory of the "growing of the kulak into socialism," of his opportunistic ideas concerning the "dying out" of the class struggle. Comrade Stalin showed the entire worthlessness of Bukharin as a theoretician, his complete break with Marxism-Leninism.

The right opportunists, representing the main danger in the period of the sweeping offensive of socialism, were utterly smashed.

Bukharin and Rykov several times during the struggle against the rights wrote statements on recognizing their mistakes, but all these declarations and declamations were nothing other than deception and a lie. Hypocritically, two-facedly declaring the recognition of their mistakes, Bukharin and Rykov in reality continued to adhere to their anti-party views. The rabid

Bukharin allowed himself to revile the Russian nation as a "nation of Oblomovs," providing this with satisfaction to the fascists.

People who do not value the glorious revolutionary past of our people, who are imbued with a spirit of hostility and contempt for it, who hate the victory of socialism in the USSR and dream of the restoration of capitalism in our country, naturally, converged with scoundrels from the Trotskyite anti-Soviet center, traitors and betrayers of the USSR, seeking to give our country over to fascist enslavement.

In 1932 and 1933, two counter-revolutionary groups were uncovered: the Ryutin-Slepkov group and the Eismont-Tolmachev group. Both these groups represented bourgeois-kulak organizations, setting as their goal the disruption of the country's industrialization policy and the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, in particular the kulak system. These rabid kulak mouthpieces negotiated terror against the leaders of the party and government. Already in 1933, during the examination of the case of the Eismont group, it was established that Tomsky, Rykov and other right opportunists maintained contact with this group and encouraged it in its anti-party work, rendering it support. As was later transpired, Bukharin and Rykov were the inspirers of the Ryutin counter-revolutionary platform, approved it, were the leaders of the Ryutin-Slepkov group. The right restorers of capitalism — Uglanov & Co., the young bucks from the Bukharinite "school" — went all out in the struggle against the party and Soviet power up to terror and wrecking.

In 1936–1937, participants of the united Trotskyite-Zinovievite anti-Soviet center and the Trotskyite "parallel" anti-Soviet center recounted at the court that they were connected with the leaders of the right restorers of capitalism and conducted negotiations with them and that the rights knew about the transition of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bandits to methods of terror, espionage, sabotage, wrecking.

Fighters repeatedly for years against the party, Bukharin and Rykov met, finally, full understanding, recognition and trust on the part of scoundrels from the Trotskyite center. Here they found kindred spirits. The Bukharinite theories of "growing into" and "dying out" merge with Trotskyism. The boundary between the "left" and right deviations is conditional. "Not for nothing do our workers say: 'go to the left — you will come to the right' (Stalin)". Not by chance did Sokolnikov and Radek in the Menshevik theory of "organized capitalism" of Bukharin gladly find "ideological" justification for their treason to the homeland. And Trotsky and Bukharin strive for a single goal — the restoration of capitalism. And Trotskyites and Bukharinites are united by a bestial hatred for the party leadership, for the Bolshevik party, for the Soviet people.

To honeyedly swear loyalty to the party — and right there secretly, underhandedly betray it; hypocritically recognize one's mistakes, and in reality cherish the dream of revenge; with feigned trembling in the voice pronounce the name of Lenin — and prostitute Leninism; incessantly repent, swear, smear on one's physiognomy the tears of offended innocence — and at the same time fraternize with the bandits who killed Sergei Mironovich Kirov and prepared the assassination of the

leaders of our party, — this means falling lower than the female inhabitants of the licensed house described in Kuprin's *The Pit*. To the bottom of this stinking pit rolled Bukharin and Rykov.

And the right capitulators and Trotskyites — some earlier, others a little later — ceased to be a political current in the ranks of the working class. They turned into a rabid band of criminals, enemies of the people, mercenaries of imperialism. Neither the one nor the other stop at any crime, at any baseness in the struggle against the proletarian dictatorship, against the socialist system, for the restoration of capitalism. Both the one and the other are agents of fascism, ready wholesale and retail to sell our homeland for the purpose of restoring capitalism in the USSR, for the purpose of destroying the USSR as the base of the international revolution, as a guarantee of the victory of socialism throughout the world. The complete rout of the band of right restorers of capitalism, as well as the Trotskyites, masking their counter-revolutionary work with two-facedness, and their severe revolutionary punishment — such must be the attitude of the Bolsheviks and citizens of the USSR toward these enemies of the people.

Em. Yaroslavsky

THE STRUGGLE OF BUKHARIN AND RYKOV AGAINST THE PARTY[33]

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party expelled Bukharin and Rykov from the ranks of the AUCP(b) for their anti-party, treacherous activity directed toward restoring capitalism in our country. The anti-party, two-faced activity of Bukharin and Rykov continued for a long time. They always fought against Lenin, against our party, against the construction of socialism. Bukharin and Rykov, these ideologues of the kulak and leaders of the right opportunists, having begun their anti-party struggle with criticism of the most important provisions of Marxism-Leninism, slid down to vile counter-revolutionary activity against the AUCP(b), against the country of socialism.

Opportunism is an international phenomenon. From the very first days of their political struggle, the founders of our party Lenin and Stalin declared a resolute struggle against international opportunism. For what was preached in Russia by the economists, legal Marxists, and then the Mensheviks — liquidators of various shades, was merely a repetition of what was preached in the international workers' movement by Bernstein and other figures of social democracy, diluting revolutionary Marxism with petty-bourgeois liberalism.

---

[33] *Partiynoye Stroitelstvo* No. 6 of March 20, 1937.

Opportunists are, as Lenin repeatedly pointed out, conduits of bourgeois influence into the environment of the proletariat. In the workers' movement they play the role of bourgeois agency, hindering the independent definition of the working class as the most revolutionary force of modern society. Opportunism emasculates the revolutionary essence of Marxism, glosses over "sharp corners," glosses over class contradictions, and urges the proletariat in every possible way to believe that "peaceful" and not revolutionary paths to the victory of socialism are possible.

Without a resolute struggle against anti-Marxist, bourgeois influences on the part of Narodniks, anarchists and opportunists of all stripes, masking themselves with the banner of Marxism, there was no use thinking about creating a militant proletarian party, about the victory of the socialist revolution.

At the same time, it must be emphasized that between the "right" and "left" opportunists in the final analysis there never was any difference in essence.

"We have always stated," said Comrade Stalin at the XVII Party Congress, "that the 'lefts' are the very same rights, masking their rightness with left phrases".

It is known, for example, that the most "left," Gustav Hervé, who at one time criticized Marxists from "left" positions, during the imperialist war turned into a hardened right, bourgeois patriot of French capital. Just like the chauvinists, bourgeois patriots transformed themselves and such "lefts" as the anarchist Peter Kropotkin, etc. In that time it was difficult

to distinguish the social-defensist Plekhanov or the German Südekum from the "ultra-lefts" Kropotkin and Hervé.

The exact same thing can be said about the "ultra-left" Bukharin, who together with Radek and Pyatakov fought against Lenin and criticized him "from the left," and then turned into a frankly right opportunist — into the ideologue of the kulak bourgeoisie, speaking with a counter-revolutionary call to the rich peasants: "Enrich yourselves!"

All opportunists, all enemies of Marxism are united by one thing — their disbelief in the victory of the socialist revolution, in the cause of building socialism; they are united by a joint struggle against Marxism-Leninism as the theory ensuring this victory.

Having taken the path of struggle against Leninism, the rights, just like the Trotskyite enemies of the people, slid into the filthy swamp of counter-revolution, merging with Japanese-German-Trotskyite spies, murderers and the vilest traitors to the socialist homeland.

Our party had to more than once repulse the anti-party attacks of Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky and expose their opportunistic line.

It is known that Bukharin, long before the October Revolution, repeatedly spoke out and fought against Lenin, against the party. Bukharin spoke out with anti-Marxist, anarchist views on the state. He defended the theory of the "abolition" of the state, defending the anti-Leninist position of principled hostility to the state. Thereby Bukharin slid to a denial of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Back in 1929 at the April Plenum of the CC AUCP(b), Comrade Stalin reminded the party of Bukharin's anti-party views on the state. Comrade Stalin said then:

"...workers must emphasize, in Bukharin's opinion (and the anarchists'), their principled hostility to any state, and thus to the state of the transition period, to the state of the working class. Try to explain to our workers that the working class must be imbued with principled hostility to the proletarian dictatorship, which is after all a state. Bukharin's position, set out in his article in *Jugend-Internationale*, is a position of denying the state in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. Comrade Bukharin overlooked 'a trifle' here, namely — he overlooked a whole transition period, when the working class cannot do without its own state, if it really wants to suppress the bourgeoisie and build socialism. This is first. Secondly, it is untrue that Comrade Lenin did not touch at that time in his criticism upon the theory of "blowing up," "abolition" of the state in general. Lenin not only touched upon this theory, as is evident from the quotes given by me, but he also further unmasked it as an anarchist theory, opposing to it the theory of creating a new state after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, namely — the state of the proletarian dictatorship. Finally, one cannot confuse the anarchist theory of "blowing up" the state with the Marxist theory of "smashing," "breaking up" the bourgeois state machine. Some of the comrades are inclined to confuse these two different concepts, thinking that they represent the expression of one and the same thought. But this is incorrect. Completely incorrect, comrades. Lenin proceeded precisely from the Marxist theory of "smashing" the

bourgeois state machine when he criticized the anarchist theory of the "blowing up" and "abolition" of the state in general"[34].

Instead of recognizing as correct the criticism of Lenin and the party on the question of the state and correcting their mistakes, Bukharin slanderously asserted that, you see, Lenin was not right, but he, Bukharin, was right.

During the imperialist war, Bukharin fought against the consistent implementation of the revolutionary slogan of the defeat of "one's own" government in the war, asserting that this slogan of the Bolshevik party does not give the opportunity for agitation among the broad masses. Bukharin proposed to "supplement" this Leninist revolutionary slogan with the Kautskyite-Trotskyite slogan of the "struggle for peace".

Vladimir Ilyich, exposing hidden and open opportunists and chauvinists, wrote:

"Revolutionary struggle against war is an empty and unconscionable exclamation, to which such masters are heroes of the II International, if by it is not meant revolutionary actions against one's government and during the war"[35].

Thus, during the imperialist war, Bukharin slid to the positions of Trotsky, supporting and defending the Kautskyite-Trotskyite slogan of the "struggle for peace," a slogan which Lenin called philistine, petty-bourgeois.

---

[34] Stalin, Questions of Leninism, pp. 273–274, 10th ed.

[35] Lenin, On the defeat of one's government in the imperialist war, Works, vol. XVIII, p. 169.

Together with Radek and Pyatakov, Bukharin spoke against the Bolshevik views on the national question. He spoke out against the requirement of the Bolshevik party on the right of nations to self-determination up to secession. Lenin characterized Bukharin's viewpoint as chauvinistic.

Already at that time, Bukharin's complete misunderstanding of the relationship between the proletariat and the peasantry, his Trotskyite attitude toward the peasantry, was revealed. It is known, for example, Bukharin's speech at the Bern Conference (February — March 1915), where he argued that "one cannot call the revolutionary struggle a democratic petty bourgeoisie".

Fighting against Lenin, Bukharin, together with Pyatakov, tried to oppose to Lenin and the CC of our party his own special commission for communication with Russia. Lenin resolutely opposed these fractional actions of Bukharin.

At the pre-October VI Congress of the Party, where the most pressing questions of the preparation, strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution were decided, Bukharin argued that the peasantry is incapable of supporting the proletariat, that the peasant, as an owner, will inevitably lend a hand to allied imperialism. Comrade Stalin gave a harsh rebuff to these anti-Marxist, essentially Trotskyite views of Bukharin. Comrade Stalin said:

"Bukharin asserts that the bourgeois-imperialist has concluded a bloc with the muzhik [peasant]. With what muzhik? We have different muzhiks. A bloc has been concluded with the rights, but we have grassroots muzhiks, representing the poorest strata of the peasantry. We could not possibly not have a bloc with

them. They have not concluded a bloc with the big bourgeoisie, do not follow it out of unconsciousness, they are simply deceived, led along. Against whom is the bloc? Bukharin did not say this. This is a bloc of the allied and Russian capital, the command staff and the upper strata of the peasantry in the person of Socialist-Revolutionaries of the Chernov type. This bloc has formed at the expense of the peasantry's crises, at the expense of the workers. What is Bukharin's perspective? His analysis is incorrect in its very basis. In his opinion, at the first stage we are going toward a peasant revolution. But after all, it cannot fail to meet, not coincide with the workers' revolution. It cannot be that the working class, comprising the vanguard of the revolution, did not fight together with it for its own demands. Therefore I consider Bukharin's scheme unthought-out. The second stage, according to Bukharin — the proletarian revolution with the support of Western Europe without the peasants, who received land and were satisfied. But against whom is this revolution directed? Comrade Bukharin in his toy scheme does not give an answer to this"[36].

In September 1917, when the Russian bourgeoisie, mobilizing and rallying its forces, convened the so-called pre-parliament, which according to Lenin was a "bastard of Kornilovism," Bukharin, together with other opportunists, advocated participation in this "pre-parliament," as the workers called it.

After the October Revolution, when the young Soviet republic did not yet have its worker-peasant army, being surrounded by

[36] Protocols of the VI Congress of the RSDLP(b), pp. 138–139, Partizdat, 1934.

enemies, had to go to peace with Germany to obtain a "breathing spell," at that time Bukharin headed together with Pyatakov the organization of "left communists," who sank to the point of declaring their agreement to go along with the loss of Soviet power. "In the interests of the international revolution," these capitulators wrote at the time, "we consider it expedient to go along with the loss of Soviet power, which is becoming for now purely formal".

Is it not clear that Bukharin and others, masking themselves with "left" phrases about the international revolution, slid into the counter-revolutionary swamp of defeatism and betrayal in relation to the first proletarian state in the world.

Bukharin and Pyatakov already then sank to the point of conducting negotiations with the Left SRs on the arrest of Lenin, on organizing a counter-revolutionary coup d'état and on forming a government of "left communists" and Left SRs.

At the VIII Congress of the party, in 1919, Bukharin in cahoots with Pyatakov again tries to impose on the party an anti-Leninist, opportunistic line. Bukharin and Pyatakov spoke then on a number of program issues against Lenin. When discussing the party program, they all spoke against the requirement of the right of nations to self-determination, putting forward instead of this only correct slogan the requirement of the "right of nations of the working people to self-determination".

When our country after the rout of the White Guards and interventionists entered the rails of the New Economic Policy, proceeded to economic construction, at that time Bukharin again found himself in the same company with Trotsky, who

spoke out against Lenin. This was during the trade union discussion, when Bukharin, according to Lenin, was an "accomplice of the worst and most harmful factionalism".

The "buffer" position of Bukharin during the trade union discussion was only a mask in his struggle against Lenin. This is evident from the fact that Bukharin soon went over to the Trotskyites and together with Trotsky voted at the X Party Congress against Lenin.

History shows that Bukharin throughout his stay in the party pursued a confused, harmful, anti-Leninist line, and it is no accident that Lenin back in early 1916 wrote that Bukharin is "gullible to gossip and politically diabolically unstable".

The opportunistic instability of Bukharin soon after the trade union discussion manifested itself in the fact that together with Sokolnikov he defended the necessity of opening the borders of the USSR for free trade with the capitalist world. Lenin resolutely spoke out against this treacherous attempt to disrupt the monopoly of foreign trade. Lenin said that this path cannot but lead the Soviet state to serious defeats, and demanded that the incorrect decision undermining the monopoly of foreign trade be revised.

Then Comrade Stalin at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the party defended Lenin's point of view on this issue.

The opportunism of Bukharin sharply manifested itself in the period of the socialist offensive along the entire front, when he began to preach the theory of the "peaceful growing into" of kulak cooperative nests into socialism, the theory of enriching the kulak.

Bukharin for years nurtured "his cadres," grouping and schooling around himself dropouts from bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties — all these Slepkovs, Maretskys, Astrovs, Zaytsevs, Sapozhnikovs, etc. In turn, Rykov nurtured "his cadres" in the apparatus of the Council of People's Commissars, just as Tomsky nurtured them in the trade union apparatus. The overwhelming majority of these vile spawn of Bukharinite fosterlings turned into despised bandits, terrorists, spies and saboteurs, who together with counter-revolutionary Trotskyites waged subversive work against socialism.

It is known that another leader of the right opportunists — Rykov — also long before the October Revolution repeatedly spoke out against Lenin as a conciliator, semi-centrist and inconsistent Trotskyite. In the period of the first revolution, in the years of black reaction and revolutionary rise, he held conciliatory positions in relation to the Mensheviks, together with Kamenev rendering services to Trotsky. In 1920–1921, Tomsky went against Lenin, seeking in fact the separation of the trade unions from the leadership of the party, and waged fractional struggle against the Leninist Central Committee. At Lenin's demand, Tomsky was then removed from the leadership of trade union work.

At the new, most important stage of the development of the party and the Country of Soviets, in the period of socialist reconstruction of the national economy, Bukharin together with Rykov, Tomsky, Uglanov again spoke out against Leninism, against the Leninist Central Committee of the party, headed by Lenin's loyal companion — Comrade Stalin, who had fought

for decades together with Lenin against all anti-party groupings.

The right grouping began the struggle against the party shortly after the XV Congress of the AUCP(b).

At this time the party, on the basis of the decisions of the XV Party Congress, implemented the policy of an intensified offensive against the capitalist elements of town and country. At the XV Party Congress, Comrade Stalin put forward with all decisiveness the historical task:

"...to expand and strengthen our socialist commanding heights in all branches of the national economy both in the city and in the countryside, keeping the course toward the liquidation of capitalist elements in the national economy"[37].

The transition to the socialist reconstruction of the national economy meant a major turning point in the development of the country of the proletarian dictatorship. The party set and soon concretely wrote down in the plan of the first five-year plan the greatest task — to implement decisive measures for building a socialist society. It was necessary to transfer the economy of the USSR to the rails of modern technology and turn the Soviet Union from a backward, agrarian country into a leading, industrial country, fully independent of world capitalism. This made it possible to raise the country's defense capability to the proper level, to ensure the organization of a crushing rebuff to the military attack of imperialists.

---

[37] Lenin, From the Central Committee of the RCP(b), Works, vol. XXII, p. 59. *(Note: As cited in source)* Stenographic report of the XV Party Congress, part I, p. 52, Partizdat, 1935.

Especially great were the tasks of socialist reconstruction in the countryside. In the countryside then predominated backward, individual peasant farming. The task consisted in transferring fragmented agriculture onto the path of large-scale, collective farming and thereby ensure the creation of the economic basis of socialism in the countryside and liquidate the possibility of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

The working class went into the final, decisive battle with capitalism inside the country. The resolution of the tasks of the reconstruction period had to finally and unconditionally resolve the question of the victory of socialism in the USSR.

Representatives of capitalism, first of all the most numerous of them — the kulak class, these very beastly enemies of socialism, as Lenin characterized them, did not want to leave the stage voluntarily. They rendered fierce and stubborn resistance to the offensive of the proletarian dictatorship. With the transition to the reconstruction period, the class struggle in the country greatly intensified.

Reflecting the resistance of class enemies to the socialist offensive of the proletariat, right opportunists spoke out against the party's line. The party had to wage a major struggle against the rights, to smash them, like all other enemies, in order to ensure the implementation of the Lenin-Stalin general line, which led to the great victory of socialism in the USSR.

Bukharin's group spoke out before the July Plenum of the CC AUCP(b) in 1928. When discussing in the CC the grain procurement difficulties and ways of resolving the grain problem, Bukharin spoke with the slanderous assertion that the

implementation of the grain procurement policy in the winter of 1927–1928 allegedly led to a "disjunction" with the peasantry. Bukharin proposed complete freedom of private trade, not limited by state regulation. Bukharin spoke out against the sweeping of collectivization.

Having received a rebuff, Bukharin voted at the plenum along with everyone else, but in reality, as it soon transpired, organized vile, behind-the-scenes negotiations with the Trotskyites to fight against the party.

In October 1928, on the eve of the first five-year plan, Bukharin came out with the article "Notes of an Economist," directed against the country's industrialization policy, against the Bolshevik rates of socialist construction. In this article, Bukharin put forward the openly opportunistic slogan "leveling down to the bottlenecks". Bukharin in *Notes of an Economist*, demanding the suspension of socialist construction, tossed out the "catchphrase" that "from the bricks of the future one cannot build real factories," which became a slogan not only for right opportunists, but also for counter-revolutionary wreckers of the Ramzin, Kondratiev and other types.

At that time, on the basis of the directives of the XV Party Congress, the five-year plan was being compiled. Bukharin in *Notes of an Economist* directed his blow against the five-year plan. He directly wrote about the "unreality" of this plan, joining thereby the chorus of foreign and internal enemies of the Soviet country, who wailed about the "unrealistic plans" of the Bolsheviks.

"...from the report of *Economic Life* it is seen that too large demands presented by the five-year plan to the budget make it 'unrealistic,' and 'unreality' is a rather significant flaw," wrote Bukharin.

Bukharin's speech once again showed how correct Comrade Stalin's warning was that the right danger at the new stage is the main one.

At the November Plenum of the CC AUCP(b) 1928, the rights already came out with their opportunistic kulak platform. At the April Plenum of the CC AUCP(b) 1929, despite the rebuff received by the rights, they again speak out against the Central Committee with the vilest slander against the party. If one looks closely at this platform, it is seen as stitched together from rags of the routed and defeated Trotskyite-Zinovievite platform. The rights readily borrow from the Trotskyites their vile weapon for the struggle against the party.

Comrade Stalin at this plenum in his speech on the right deviation in the AUCP(b) vividly showed the anti-Bolshevik character of the views of Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky and others. Regarding Bukharin's theory that the further development of the class struggle proceeds along a supposedly dying curve, Comrade Stalin said:

"The liquidation of classes through fierce class struggle of the proletariat — such is Lenin's formula.

The liquidation of classes through the dying out of class struggle and the transformation of capitalists into socialism — such is the formula of Comrade Bukharin"[38].

Comrade Stalin uncovered and exposed the basis of all the mistakes of Bukharin, Rykov and other rights. All subsequent history of our party's struggle against the enemies of socialism showed how correctly Comrade Stalin characterized the anti-Leninist essence of the theory of the rights.

The rights more than once stated that they had finally ceased their opportunistic struggle, but at the same time they conducted negotiations with the Trotskyites on a joint struggle against the Central Committee, against the party. Thus, in the summer of 1928, Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky and other right fractionals held negotiations with the Trotskyite Kamenev on a joint struggle against the Central Committee and on changing the composition of the Politburo of the CC. The party exposed the machinations of the rights, their capitulatory line. The party struck not only at the right opportunists, but also at the conciliators.

The April Plenum of the CC and CCC AUCP(b) 1929 indicated that "Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky are increasingly becoming objectively the center of attraction for all opportunistic and conciliatory groups in the sections of the Comintern".

The November Plenum of the CC AUCP(b) 1929 recognized that the position of the right opportunists is "an expression of

[38] Stalin, Questions of Leninism, p. 254, 10th ed.

the pressure of the petty-bourgeois element, panic in the face of the aggravated class struggle, capitulation before the difficulties of socialist construction". The Plenum decided to recognize the propaganda of the views of right opportunism and conciliation with it as incompatible with membership in the AUCP(b).

Despite the fact that the rights swore loyalty to the party line, they all the time kept a stone in their bosom.Comrade Stalin at the XVI Party Congress characterized the behavior of the rights as follows:

"Gathering at their fractional meetings and discussing party questions," said Comrade Stalin, "they usually prefigured: let's wait until spring, maybe the party will fail with the crops — then we will strike as we should. Spring, however, did not give them any pluses, as the crops went favorably. They prefigured: let's wait until autumn, maybe the party will fail with grain procurements — then we will strike at the CC. However, autumn also let them down, leaving them empty-handed. And since spring and autumn repeat every year, the former leaders of the right opposition continued to sit it out, again placing their hopes either on spring or on autumn. (General laughter in the hall.) It is clear that, sitting it out from season to season and waiting for a favorable moment to strike at the party, they could not fulfill their obligations"[39].

The XVI Congress dealt a crushing blow to the right opposition. The Congress declared the views of the right

[39] Stalin, Questions of Leninism, p. 436, 10th ed.

opposition incompatible with membership in the AUCP(b). In its decisions, the Congress pointed to the two-faced methods of work of opportunists of all stripes:

"The Congress draws the attention of the entire party to the fact that opportunists of all stripes, especially the rights, apply a new maneuver, expressed in the formal recognition of their mistakes and in formal agreement with the general line of the party, without confirming their recognition by work and struggle for the general line, which in reality means only the transition from open struggle against the party to covert struggle or waiting for a more favorable moment to resume the attack on the party. The party must declare the most merciless war on this kind of two-facedness and deception and demand from all who recognize their mistakes by active defense of the general line of the party to prove the sincerity of their recognitions. Non-fulfillment of this requirement must entail the most decisive organizational measures"[40].

After the XVI Congress, the right opportunists increasingly slide into the swamp of counter-revolution, turning two-facedness into the main method of their hostile activity directed against the party.

After the crushing blow dealt to right opportunism by the XVI Party Congress, individual groups of rights and lefts try to unite for a joint struggle against the party. Thus the right-left group of Syrtsov-Lominadze was created in 1930. Thus the counter-revolutionary Ryutin-Slepkov, Eismont, Tolmachev

[40] AUCP(b) in Resolutions, part II, p. 406, Partizdat, 1936.

and Smirnov group was created. The party exposes these groups, uncovers their anti-Soviet counter-revolutionary essence, the merging of these groups with enemies of the people from the White Guards and overt restorers of capitalism in our country.

Enemies of the party from the camp of the rights increasingly pass over to the positions of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism in the sense that they are united by one common goal, that their "theoretical" disagreements do not prevent them from uniting for a common struggle against the party. "Cadres" nurtured by Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky, Uglanov seek application for their counter-revolutionary energy. Ryutin, Slepkov, Kotov, Kulikov, Matveev, Schmidt (Vasily), Slavinsky — all these cadres are activated precisely in that period when the activity of counter-revolutionary Trotskyites is activated.

They develop a counter-revolutionary platform, known under the name of the "Ryutin platform". But, as is now established, this Ryutin platform was the work not only of Ryutin, Kayurov, Galkina and other counter-revolutionaries: Rykov, Bukharin, Uglanov, Kotov, Slepkov and others participated in drawing up this platform. This platform was discussed by vile Trotskyites — Zinoviev and Kamenev.

This was an overt program for the restoration of capitalism in our country. This was a terrorist program, and therefore it united both the rights and the Trotskyite-Zinovievites.

During the trial of the anti-Soviet Trotskyite "parallel" center, it was established that former leaders of the right deviation — Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky, Uglanov — knew about the

criminal terrorist, espionage and sabotage-wrecking activities of the Japanese-German-Trotskyite enemies of the people. Radek and Sokolnikov repeatedly conducted negotiations with Bukharin, with Tomsky on a joint struggle against the party. Such negotiations were conducted by Bukharin, Tomsky, Rykov and Uglanov, Kotov, Kulikov, Matveev — on the necessity of activating the struggle against the Central Committee of the party.

Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky not only did not wage any struggle against the Trotskyite-Zinovievites, against their vile designs, but concealed these designs from the party, did not inform the Central Committee that they knew about the activities of the Trotskyite-Zinovievites, and thereby they became accomplices, protectors of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite murderers, traitors, spies and saboteurs. Of course, Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky were well aware of the counter-revolutionary activities of their disciples and followers, all these Slepkovs, Tseitlins, Astrovs, Maretskys, Radins, Zaytsevs, Matveevs, etc.

Moreover, Bukharin and Rykov not only did not fight against these traitors, but in every possible way encouraged them and led them.

To all these precisely established facts, Bukharin and Rykov could oppose nothing. Tomsky preferred to escape responsibility before the people, before the party. They did not find the courage to honestly confess before the party the enormous evil that they had caused the party. Vilely two-faced and writhing, they did not find the courage to honestly tell the party about all their anti-party activity.

The party, the Central Committee for a long time patiently checked Bukharin and Rykov, who took the path of anti-party struggle even during Lenin's life. The party did everything that was in its power to return them to the path of partyhood. Suffice it to point out at least that Bukharin and Rykov until recently were candidate members of the Central Committee of the party. But for all this Bukharin and Rykov repaid with betrayal of the party, the working class, the entire Soviet people.

Such people, of course, have no place not only in the composition of the Central Committee, but also in the ranks of the party.

The party demands from all its members an irreconcilable struggle against enemies of the people, counter-revolutionary Trotskyite-Zinovievite bandits, these Japanese-German agents, and against their accomplices — right renegades.

Facts confirm that in their hostile activity against the party, against the Soviet state, all enemies of socialism, all anti-competitive groups and groupings converge. All of them are united, brought together by hatred for the Leninist party, hatred for the proletarian revolution, for the socialist state. All of them alike dream of and try to restore capitalism in our country, using for this all means of struggle. All of them — these enemies of the people — have no soil either in the working-class environment or in the peasant environment.

Right renegades, like the Trotskyites, in their struggle against the party and the people can count only on the capitalist environment and on the remnants, fragments of smashed

parasitic classes. And just like the Trotskyites and Zinovievites, the rights grasp at the sharpest, most unbridled forms of struggle against the party and socialism. Like counter-revolutionary Trotskyites, the rights have ceased to be a political current, and we cannot view them otherwise than as an organization of irreconcilable enemies of the people, an unbridled gang of saboteurs and spies.

Back on October 9, 1932, the Presidium of the CCC AUCP(b) indicated that the Ryutin-Slepkov platform, i.e., the Bukharin-Rykov platform, stems from a bourgeois-kulak organization for restoring capitalism in the USSR and in particular the kulak system.

The warnings that the party gave to Bukharin, Rykov, Uglanov did not help. The Plenum of the Central Committee (February 1937) expelled Bukharin and Rykov from the ranks of the party.

Great party-educational work is needed, it is necessary that all party members and candidates knew, that the entire working class knew, how these people, raising the banner of struggle against Lenin — Stalin, against Leninism, step by step slid into the counter-revolutionary swamp, how they sank to betrayal and treason to the cause of the working class. It is necessary that communists and non-party masses, especially youth, learned to recognize and expose enemies, under whatever masks they concealed themselves. It is known that Bukharin more than once changed masks: then he acted as a rightist, then as a leftist, then as a "buffer". It is necessary that everyone knew that behind this was concealed a struggle against

Leninism, against Lenin and Stalin, which led Bukharin and his followers into the camp of unbridled enemies of the proletariat.

It is necessary to eradicate any remnants of conciliation with opportunists, because conciliation with opportunists harbors the danger of the revival of already smashed anti-party groups.

Party organizations, restructuring all their work on the basis of the decisions of the February (1937) Plenum of the CC AUCP(b), must comprehensively raise the ideological and political level of communists, striving to ensure that every party member masters Bolshevism. Party workers must firmly master that mastering Bolshevism is a necessary condition for increasing the combat capability and revolutionary vigilance of every member and candidate of the party.

B. Ponomarev

THE PATH OF THE BUKHARINITE GROUPING FROM OPPOSITION TO COUNTER-REVOLUTION[41]

The right-opportunist anti-party grouping of Bukharin — Rykov — Tomsky — Uglanov took shape and openly spoke out against the party at the beginning of the reconstruction period, in 1928–1929.

At the head of the opportunist group stood Bukharin, who many times during his stay in the party fought in a bloc with Trotsky against Lenin.

Already during the imperialist war of 1914–1918, Bukharin, together with Pyatakov and Radek, spoke out against Lenin on fundamental questions of the struggle for revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Bukharin held opportunistic, anti-Leninist positions on the question of the proletarian state, on attitude toward war, on the possibility of democratic movements in the epoch of imperialism, on the national question, etc.

Bukharin wrote an article in 1916 where he preached the anarchist theory of the "blowing up of the state". Lenin showed right then that Bukharin was sliding toward anarchists:

> "What distinguishes us from the anarchists is (a) the use of the state now and (β) during the

[41] *Bolshevik* No. 5–6 of March 15, 1937.

> revolution of the proletariat ("the dictatorship of the proletariat") — points of the utmost practical importance right now. (Bukharin has forgotten them!)"[42]
>
> "...Bukharin was written to in VIII. 1916: 'let your views on the state ripen.' He, not letting them ripen, rushed into print, as *Nota bene*, and did so in order to expose Kautskyism, but helped them with his mistakes!!"[43]

Bukharin continued to insist on his anti-Marxist position long afterwards. The article of Bukharin containing the specified mistakes was not published by Lenin in the Bolshevik organ *Social-Democrat* in 1916, but a year after Lenin's death Bukharin published this article with the unacceptable statement that in the dispute over the state he was right, and Lenin was not.

In 1915, Bukharin, together with Pyatakov, published special theses directed against the Leninist theory of the right of nations to self-determination up to secession. The opportunistic position of Bukharin on the national question was in inextricable connection with his denial of the possibility of any democratic movement in the epoch of imperialism. Lenin characterized Bukharin's views as "imperialist economism".

---

42 Quoted from Stalin's book *Questions of Leninism*, p. 272, 10th ed.

43 Lenin, vol. XXIX, p. 239.

Lenin then completely unmasked the anti-Marxist roots of the Bukharinite position. And many years later, on the eve of his death, Lenin wrote again about Bukharin:

> "...his theoretical views can be attributed with very great doubt to entirely Marxist ones, because there is something scholastic in him (he never studied and, I think, never fully understood dialectics)"[44].

Throughout the entire period of the imperialist war, Bukharin stubbornly tries to preserve his organizational isolation from Lenin, from the Bolshevik central organ *Social-Democrat*. At the Bern Conference of foreign sections of the RSDLP (Bolsheviks) in 1915, Bukharin, together with his so-called "Godite"[45] group, sought organizational independence, striving in essence to create a center entirely against Lenin.

Counterposing to the Leninist position — the only correct one in the entire world workers' movement — his "theories," Bukharin slid into the swamp of the most arrant opportunists, centrists of the Kautsky and Trotsky type. The "Godite" group on the most important question of attitude toward war, following Trotsky, advocated the slogan of the "struggle for peace" and stated that it rejected "...any putting forward as a slogan for Russia of the so-called defeat of Russia"[46].

Having spoken out against the Leninist slogan of the "defeat of your own government in the imperialist war," the Bukharin-Pyatakov group defended the most harmful, anti-Bolshevik

---

44 Quoted from Stalin's book *Questions of Leninism*, p. 272, 10th ed.

45 Bozhi — village in Switzerland.

46 *Proletarskaya Revolyutsiya* No. 5 (40), p. 172, 1925.

position of forming the "United States of Europe," merging with Trotsky on the anti-Leninist platform of denying the possibility of the victory of socialism initially in a single, separately taken capitalist country.

Bukharin waged an impermissible, intriguing struggle against Lenin. Taking advantage of the fact that financial funds were in the hands of his group, Bukharin and Pyatakov demanded that Lenin in the journal *The Communist* publish all articles setting forth the point of view and views of persons close to them (Radek and others). In response to the demand of the Bukharin-Pyatakov group, Lenin wrote in the discussion: "This is not a discussion, the height of intriguing, the height of baseness"[47].

Then, after the Bern Conference, in March 1916, Lenin wrote about Bukharin:

"...he (1) is gullible to gossip and (2) politically diabolically unstable. The war pushed him toward semi-anarchist ideas. At the conference which passed the Bern resolutions (spring 1915), he gave out theses (I have them!) — the height of absurdity; disgrace; semi-anarchism"[48].

By his struggle against Lenin, against the Leninist line that ensured the victory of the revolution, Bukharin began his theoretical and political activity. Many times after that he spoke out against Leninism, against the party of Lenin — Stalin, trying to drag the party onto a ruinous path.

---

47 Lenin, vol. XXIX, p. 239.

48 Ibid., pp. 229–230.

During the period of the struggle for the Great Proletarian Socialist Revolution, Bukharin at the VI Congress of the party spoke as the rapporteur of the CC — Comrade Stalin, arguing that in the socialist revolution the working class will be alone inside the country. Comrade Stalin, defending the Leninist teaching on the driving forces of the revolution, exposed Bukharin right then at the Congress.

> "His analysis is incorrect in its very basis," Comrade Stalin said. "In his opinion, at the first stage we are going toward a peasant revolution. But after all, it cannot fail to meet, not coincide with the workers' revolution. It cannot be that the working class, comprising the vanguard of the revolution, did not fight together with it for its own demands. Therefore I consider Bukharin's scheme unthought-out. The second stage, according to Bukharin — the proletarian revolution with the support of Western Europe without the peasants, who received land and were satisfied. But against whom is this revolution directed? Comrade Bukharin in his toy scheme does not give an answer to this"[49].

Shortly after the establishment of Soviet power, when German imperialism moved its troops against the young socialist republic, threatening to strangle the revolution, Bukharin together with Pyatakov, Radek and Trotsky unleashed a fierce struggle against Lenin. The group of "left communists," contrary to the Leninist line on concluding peace with

---

[49] Protocols of the VI Congress of the RSDLP(b), p. 138, Partizdat, 1934.

Germany, demanded waging war against it. And this meant in those conditions the certain ruin of the young, unfortified Soviet republic.

At the basis of Bukharin's position and his grouping lay the Trotskyite theory of denying the possibility of building socialism in our country. The "left communists" directly stated that "there is no use thinking and talking about the isolated existence of the Soviet country". Together with Trotsky, they asserted that the preservation of the proletarian dictatorship and the construction of socialism in the Soviet country are impossible without direct state support from the Western European proletariat.

"The Russian revolution, having ceased to stake on the European revolution, would thereby sign its own death warrant. In a single country, moreover a backward country, it is impossible to carry out socialism," wrote the Bukharin-Pyatakov organ *The Communist* (No. 2, 1918, article "Foreign Policy").

Defending their positions, which were ruinous for the socialist revolution, the Bukharin-Pyatakov group for several months waged an unbridled, anti-party campaign against Lenin.

The "left communists" directly merged with forces hostile to the proletarian dictatorship. All White Guardists, cadets, Mensheviks, SRs raised a frantic howl against the conclusion of peace. The Bukharin skaya group fell right into their arms; in its struggle against the party, the group reached the point where Bukharin conducted vile, treacherous negotiations with the Left SRs on the arrest of Lenin and replacing him with the

group's protege — Pyatakov, the bitterest enemy of the people, now shot.

The vile tactics of alliance with enemies of the party and the proletarian state Bukharin then applied more than once in order to achieve the implementation of his line. The "left communists" created their fractional center, which they counterposed to the Central Committee of the party. At the VII Party Congress in 1918, against the rapporteur of the CC — Lenin — spoke as co-rapporteur Bukharin. Lenin, scathing the adventurist policy of Bukharin, said then that "...if you maneuver in a Bukharinite manner, then you can ruin a good revolution nicely"[50].

As a result of the policy of Trotsky and the Bukharinite group, Germany managed to impose more severe peace terms on the Soviet Republic. Trotsky and the "left communists," who were included in the delegation that was to conduct negotiations with the German command in Brest on concluding peace, failed to fulfill the telegraphic instructions of Lenin and Stalin transmitted to them — to sign the peace treaty. German imperialism moved troops on the offensive, and the Soviet government was forced to accept more severe peace terms.

Lenin wrote:

> "And that the new conditions are worse, heavier, more humiliating than the bad, heavy and humiliating Brest conditions, for this are to blame,

[50] Lenin, Seventh Congress of the RCP(b), Works, vol. XXII, p. 335.

> in relation to the great Russian Soviet Republic, our poor-lefts Bukharin, Lomov, Uritsky and Co."[51]
>
> "...facts show that Bukharin denied the possibility of a German offensive, sowed illusions, which in reality, contrary to his desire, helped the German imperialists, hindered the growth of the German revolution"[52].

Lenin and his faithful and closest companions — Comrade Stalin, Sverdlov and others — waged a huge, most intense struggle against the Bukharin — Pyatakov — Radek group and against Trotsky. The victory of the Leninist line and its implementation depended on the fate of the first socialist state in the world.

> "The 'left communists' spoke out against the entire economic policy of the party. They accused Lenin and the Bolshevik party of 'degeneration,' in preserving only the 'external shell,' the 'firm' of proletarian soviets, with a completely non-proletarian content"[4].

At that moment, when the proletarian state embarked for the first time on solving the tasks of socialist construction, on establishing economic life on new, socialist bases, the "left communists" fought against the Leninist plan, fighting against discipline, control, accounting, etc.

---

[51] Lenin, A serious lesson and serious responsibility, Works, vol. XXII, p. 308.

[52] *The Communist* No. 4 for 1918.

Lenin qualified the "left communists" as direct conduits of the policy of "frenzied petty bourgeois".

Thus, in the very first months of the existence of the Land of Soviets, the party had to smash the Bukharinite grouping and Trotsky in order to preserve the conquests of the Great Proletarian Revolution.

At the VII and VIII Party Congresses, Bukharin spoke against Lenin on the question of the party program and on the national question. He achieved the re-smuggling of his hostile Leninism views on the assessment of capitalism, on the denial of the right of nations to self-determination, etc. At the VIII Party Congress, Bukharin, resurrecting his mistakes of the war period, tried to smuggle opportunistic views into the party program. He, proceeding from his theory of "pure imperialism," proposed to throw out of the program the definition of all pre-capitalist forms of economy, including commodity economy and capitalism. Lenin, unmasking the anti-Marxist essence of the Bukharinite position, said then:

> "The program that does not speak of the foundations of commodity economy and capitalism will not be a Marxist international program... If a program is written like Comrade Bukharin wants, such a program will be incorrect"[53].

The Party Congresses unconditionally condemned the Bukharinite sallies.

---

[53] Lenin, VIII Congress of the RCP(b), Works, vol. XXIV, pp. 132 and 153.

On the eve of the transition to the New Economic Policy, Bukharin again spoke in cahoots with Trotsky with an anti-party, opportunistic platform against Lenin.

Trotsky, who started the trade union discussion of 1920–1921, put forward the slogan of "statization" of trade unions in order to turn the trade unions into a simple appendage of the state apparatus. Trotsky proposed the method of compulsion in the work of trade unions, denied the necessity of developing workers' democracy in trade union organizations, etc. Trotsky, denying the role of trade unions as a school of communism, led things to the destruction of one of the fundamental pillars of proletarian power. Such a policy, as Lenin emphasized, led to a split of the party and trade unions, to a complete break with the masses.

Bukharin during the trade union discussion spoke initially with the so-called buffer platform, seeking to reconcile the party line defended by Lenin and Stalin with Trotskyism. Soon Bukharin completely slid to Trotskyite positions. Lenin fully exposed this Trotskyite line of Bukharin:

> "So far 'chiefly' in the struggle was Trotsky. Now Bukharin has far 'overtaken' and completely 'eclipsed' him, created an entirely new ratio in the struggle, because he has agreed to a mistake a hundred times larger..."[54]

Lenin branded Bukharin's position then as a "break with communism".

---

[54] Lenin, Party Crisis, Works, vol. XXVI, pp. 92–93.

The Trotskyite-Bukharinite grouping launched a fierce struggle against the party, creating with its fractional activity the threat of a split. In the anti-Leninist fraction together with Bukharin again spoke opportunists already known from the past: Pyatakov, Serebryakov, Preobrazhensky, Rakovsky, and others.

Then, on the eve of the transition to NEP, which meant a major turning point in the party's policy, Lenin directly pointed out to all united opportunists (Trotsky, Bukharin, Pyatakov, Serebryakov, and others), insisting on their mistakes, they would slide to enemies of the revolution. Addressing in particular directly to Bukharin, Lenin said:

> "There is an objective logic of fractional activity, which even the best people, if they insist on the incorrect position occupied by them, inevitably leads to a position in no way actually differing from unprincipled demagogy... It remains to find in oneself, using the expression of Lassalle, 'physical force (and character),' to recognize the mistake, correct it and turn over this page of the history of the R.C.P., either... either to clutch at remaining allies, whoever they may be, 'not noticing' any principles. The supporters of 'democracy' down to lawlessness remained. And Bukharin slides to them, slides to syndicalism"[55].

[55] Lenin, Party Crisis, Works, vol. XXVI, p. 93.

Bukharin did not heed the voice of the great leader of the proletarian revolution, the founder of the Bolshevik party.

Even at the transition to the reconstruction period, in 1925–1927, Bukharin committed a number of the grossest right-opportunistic mistakes. He put forward the slogan "Enrich yourselves," which radically distorted the entire policy of the party in the NEP period. Then Bukharin came out with the theory of the "peaceful growing into of the kulak into socialism," completely hostile to Leninism, in which he gave a bourgeois-liberal concept of the development of the Soviet country. This theory in reality led to the destruction of socialism, to capitalist restoration. Proceeding from this thoroughly opportunistic theory, Bukharin fabricated a number of right-opportunistic provisions on other issues (denial of collective farms and their role in the socialist transformation of the village, distortion of the Leninist cooperative plan, etc.).

The CC of the party, on the initiative and at the proposal of Comrade Stalin, gave a firm and resolute rebuff to Bukharin, exposing his opportunistic sallies. Bukharin outwardly recognized his mistakes then, but in reality hid under the rug these "theories" and in the period of socialist reconstruction pushed them, deepened them to the end, and they became the basis for all restorationist, capitulatory platforms of the right-opportunistic grouping. Then Bukharin organized his "school," which included Slepkov, Maretsky, Tseitlin, Astrov, Kuzmin, Sapozhnikov, and others. Many of them managed to visit bourgeois and conciliation parties of Cadets and SRs. All "schooling" grew on the yeast of anti-Leninist, Bukharinite theories, was educated in a spirit alien to Bolshevism, self-

advertising and self-delusion. Bukharin taught the "school" a hostile attitude toward proletarian ideology, puffing up the interests of his "teacher" and his own interests in opposition to the interests of the party and the working class, instilling a hostile attitude toward the Leninist leadership of the party. Bukharin instilled in the minds of his disciples the belief that in the struggle against Lenin he was right, and not Lenin.

Participants of the "schooling" intensively tried to popularize the right-opportunistic ideas put forward by Bukharin.

As subsequent events showed, the Bukharinite "school" prepared "cadres" of the right-opportunistic opposition, which spoke out in 1928. It formed the "cadres" of vile two-facers, terrorists, enemies of the working class, rabid defenders of capitalist restoration.

Rykov, who together with Bukharin entered the leading "troika" of right opportunists, held conciliatory positions in relation to the Mensheviks, forward-looking people and other enemies of Bolshevism in the period of tsarist reaction and revolutionary rise 1908–1914.

In the decisive days of the struggle for the Great Proletarian Revolution, Rykov, together with vile strike-breakers and traitors of the revolution — Zinoviev and Kamenev — spoke out against Lenin, against the socialist revolution. Back at the April Conference 1917, Rykov asserted in a Menshevik manner: "Russia is the most petty-bourgeois country in Europe. To count on the sympathy of the masses of the socialist revolution is impossible... Where will the sun of the socialist coup rise? I think that according to all conditions, the philistine

level, the initiative of the socialist coup does not belong to us. We do not have the forces, the objective conditions for this"[56].

The party, having cast off and exposed the Menshevik positions of Kamenev, Rykov, went into battle against imperialism in October 1917, and the working class achieved a world-historic victory. Rykov, who as early as October 25, 1917 fought against the party line on the uprising, in cahoots with Zinoviev and Kamenev began a vile, treacherous struggle against the Soviet government headed by Lenin, demanding the creation of a government "from all socialist parties," i.e., giving up only the conquered power of the proletariat into the hands of agents of the bourgeoisie. Seeking to achieve the overthrow of the government of the proletarian dictatorship and the departure of Lenin, Rykov together with Zinoviev, Kamenev, Ryazanov and others, who resigned from the government, announced their resignation from the Central Committee. He put forward vile slander against Lenin, asserting together with the cadets and other white-guardists that the Bolshevik government is maintained "by means of political terror".

Lenin with all his might lashed out against these strike-breakers of the revolution. In an appeal on behalf of the CC of the party (published in *Pravda* 20 (7) November 1917), Lenin wrote:

> "...Kamenev, Zinoviev, Nogin, Rykov, Milyutin and a few others came out yesterday, 17 (4) November, from the CC of our party — and three

[56] Protocols of the Seventh (April) Conference of the RSDLP(b), pp. 92–93, Partizdat, 1934.

> of the latter — from the Council of People's Commissars. ...But we declare that not for a minute and not by a hair's breadth will the desertion act of several people from the top of our party shake the unity of the masses marching behind our party, and, consequently, will not shake our party"[57].

For a number of years after this, Rykov at Lenin's demand was not elected to the leading organs of the party.

The right opportunist — Tomsky — also repeatedly spoke out with opportunistic positions against Lenin. In the years of tsarist reaction and revolutionary rise, he held conciliatory positions in relation to the Mensheviks, rendering services to Trotsky together with Kamenev. In 1920–1921, Tomsky went against Lenin, striving in fact for the separation of the trade unions from the leadership of the party, and waged an intriguing struggle against the Leninist Central Committee. At Lenin's demand, Tomsky was then removed from the leadership of trade union work.

At the new, most important stage of the development of the party and the Country of Soviets, in the period of socialist reconstruction of the national economy, Bukharin together with Rykov, Tomsky, Uglanov again spoke out against Leninism, against the Leninist Central Committee of the party, at the head of which stood Lenin's loyal companion — Comrade Stalin, who had fought for decades together with Lenin against all anti-party groupings.

---

[57] Lenin, From the Central Committee of the RCP(b), Works, vol. XXII, p. 59.

The right grouping began the struggle against the party shortly after the XV Congress of the AUCP(b).

At this time the party, on the basis of the decisions of the XV Party Congress, implemented the policy of an intensified offensive against the capitalist elements of town and country. At the XV Party Congress, Comrade Stalin put forward with all decisiveness the historical task:

> "...to expand and strengthen our socialist commanding heights in all branches of the national economy both in the city and in the countryside, keeping the course toward the liquidation of capitalist elements in the national economy"[58].

The transition to the socialist reconstruction of the national economy meant a major turning point in the development of the country of the proletarian dictatorship. The party set and soon concretely wrote down in the plan of the first five-year plan the greatest task — to implement decisive measures for building a socialist society. It was necessary to transfer the economy of the USSR to the rails of modern technology and turn the Soviet Union from a backward, agrarian country into a leading, industrial country, fully independent of world capitalism. This made it possible to raise the country's defense capability to the proper level, to ensure the organization of a crushing rebuff to the military attack of imperialists.

---

[58] Stenographic report of the XV Party Congress, part I, p. 52, Partizdat, 1935.

Especially great were the tasks of socialist reconstruction in the countryside. In the countryside then predominated backward, individual peasant farming. The task consisted in transferring fragmented agriculture onto the path of large-scale, collective farming and thereby ensure the creation of the economic basis of socialism in the countryside and liquidate the possibility of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

The working class went into the final, decisive battle with capitalism inside the country. The resolution of the tasks of the reconstruction period had to finally and unconditionally resolve the question of the victory of socialism in the USSR.

Representatives of capitalism, first of all the most numerous of them — the kulak class, these very beastly enemies of socialism, as Lenin characterized them, did not want to leave the stage voluntarily. They rendered fierce and stubborn resistance to the offensive of the proletarian dictatorship. With the transition to the reconstruction period, the class struggle in the country greatly intensified.

Reflecting the resistance of class enemies to the socialist offensive of the proletariat, right opportunists spoke out against the party's line. The party had to wage a major struggle against the rights, to smash them, like all other enemies, in order to ensure the implementation of the Lenin-Stalin general line, which led to the great victory of socialism in the USSR.

Bukharin's group spoke out before the July Plenum of the CC AUCP(b) in 1928. When discussing in the CC the grain procurement difficulties and ways of resolving the grain problem, Bukharin spoke with the slanderous assertion that the

implementation of the grain procurement policy in the winter of 1927–1928 allegedly led to a "disjunction" with the peasantry. Bukharin proposed complete freedom of private trade, not limited by state regulation. Bukharin spoke out against the sweeping of collectivization.

Having received a rebuff, Bukharin voted at the plenum along with everyone else, but in reality, as it soon transpired, organized vile, behind-the-scenes negotiations with the Trotskyites to fight against the party.

In October 1928, on the eve of the first five-year plan, Bukharin came out with the article "Notes of an Economist," directed against the country's industrialization policy, against the Bolshevik rates of socialist construction. In this article, Bukharin put forward the openly opportunistic slogan "leveling down to the bottlenecks". Bukharin in *Notes of an Economist*, demanding the suspension of socialist construction, tossed out the "catchphrase" that "from the bricks of the future one cannot build real factories," which became a slogan not only for right opportunists, but also for counter-revolutionary wreckers of the Ramzin, Kondratiev and other types.

At that time, on the basis of the directives of the XV Party Congress, the five-year plan was being compiled. Bukharin in *Notes of an Economist* directed his blow against the five-year plan. He directly wrote about the "unreality" of this plan, joining thereby the chorus of foreign and internal enemies of the Soviet country, who wailed about the "unrealistic plans" of the Bolsheviks.

"...from the report of *Economic Life* it is seen that too large demands presented by the five-year plan to the budget make it 'unrealistic,' and 'unreality' is a rather significant flaw," wrote Bukharin.

"Notes of an Economist" became at that time the main platform of the rights. For all those who slid onto the right-opportunist path, it was a signal for unification, for the struggle against the Lenin-Stalin line of the party.

The rights organized and came out to fight against the party. In the autumn and winter of 1928, an acute struggle unfolded against the rights in the Moscow organization. A group of workers of the Moscow Party Committee, headed by Committee Secretary Uglanov, came out in defense of the right-opportunist line; it tried to rally the opportunistic active, to win over to the side of the rights the Moscow party organization in order to speak out together with Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsky against the Lenin-Stalin Central Committee.

Uglanov, Kotov, and following them district committee secretaries: Ryutin, Kulikov, Yakovlev, Komsomol IC secretary Matveev and some others gathered "their people" at meetings, unfolded right-opportunist criticism of the general line of the party, slandered the party, and discussed measures for overthrowing the Leninist leadership of the CC headed by Comrade Stalin.

At the heart of Uglanov's line lay the views put forward in Bukharin's "Notes of an Economist": the struggle against the country's industrialization and the collectivization of

agriculture, against the offensive against the kulak. Uglanovites put into circulation the rabidly right "theory" of the "calico bond" of the working class with the peasantry. They argued that it is necessary to develop not heavy, but light, in particular textile, industry, and slandered about the "degradation" of agriculture.

In August and September, articles by "Uglanov's agitprop" appeared in the press. In one of them, tolerance toward deviations was openly preached. In another article, the Leninist theory of the socialist transformation of the poor-middle-peasant masses of the peasantry was replaced by the right-opportunist and restorationist in essence policy of "uninterrupted concessions" to the entire peasantry, put forward by Tomsky back in July 1928.

Thus, instead of the party's line on the industrialization of the country, which ensured the creation of a socialist economy and the socialist transformation of the countryside, the rights proposed their own policy, which led to the growth of capitalist elements and the restoration of capitalism, which doomed the Soviet country to becoming a toy in the hands of capitalists.

Comrade Stalin, summing up the results of the first five-year plan, said that if the party had refused to implement the country's industrialization, then "...we would have had in such a case a military intervention, no non-aggression pacts, but a war, a war dangerous and mortal, a bloody and unequal war, because in this war we would have been almost unarmed

before enemies having at their disposal all modern means of attack"[59].

To implement the five-year plan, it was necessary first of all to smash the right opportunists.

The Bolsheviks of the Moscow organization opposed the Uglanov group and Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsky standing behind it. The overwhelming majority of the active and the entire Moscow organization gave a decisive rebuff to the rights.

An enormous role in the struggle against the opportunists was played by the address of the CC AUCP(b) to all members of the Moscow organization and Comrade Stalin's speech at the Plenum of the Moscow Committee in October 1928. Comrade Stalin pointed out that right opportunism reflects the resistance of capitalist elements — and above all the kulak — to the socialist offensive, that the party must rout the rights and give a merciless rebuff to the conciliators in order to ensure the construction of a socialist society.

Uglanov's supporters, representing a small handful of right opportunists, were quickly exposed and isolated. The Moscow organization, under the leadership of the CC, routed the right opportunists in its midst, expelled them, placing at the head of the organization leaders devoted to the Leninist party and CC.

Comrade Molotov was elected Secretary of the Moscow Committee — Secretary of the CC AUCP(b), a staunch Leninist and fighter for the victory of socialism.

---

[59] Stalin, Questions of Leninism, p. 492, 10th ed.

At the November Plenum of the CC in 1928, Comrade Stalin focused the attention of the entire party on the struggle against right opportunism, exposing its line leading to the undermining of the power of the working class and to the restoration of capitalism in the USSR. The party emphasized with all its might that in the reconstruction period the right deviation is the main danger. "...the right deviation reflects the resistance of the main elements of outliving classes, it is precisely for this reason that the right deviation is the main danger of our time in the party"[60] — called Comrade Stalin.

Seeking to disrupt the implementation of the party line and the struggle of the party against right opportunism, Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsky applied the "politics of resignations". They acted in the same way as Rykov had acted at one time, deserting in the first period of Soviet power, or as Bukharin had acted during the Brest-Litovsk Peace, fighting against Lenin. Before the CC Plenum in November 1928, Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsky submitted resignation statements. The "politics of resignations" was a clear demonstration testifying to the unwillingness to implement the party line and to the preparation of new attacks against the party. The Central Committee rejected the resignations and proposed to Bukharin, Tomsky, and Rykov to remain at work and implement all decisions of the party. But the rights in reality did not submit to the decision of the Central Committee and unfolded an even more stubborn anti-party struggle.

[60] Stalin, Questions of Leninism, p. 422, 10th ed.

In December 1928, during the VIII Trade Union Congress, a struggle against the rights unfolded in the trade unions. Tomsky, standing then at the head of the AUCCTU, tried to lead the trade unions along the right-opportunist path and use them as a support for the rights in the struggle against the party. Instead of mobilizing trade union members to struggle for rapid rates of industrial development, to help the collectivization of the village, to struggle against bureaucracy, the right opportunists from the AUCCTU tried to keep trade union masses away from these tasks and thereby disrupt the implementation of socialist reconstruction. A striking manifestation of this line of theirs is the fact that socialist emulation and shock work began bypassing the leadership of the trade unions and amidst stubborn sabotage on its part.

Tomsky and his grouping directly slid onto Menshevik positions; they Menshevistically opposed the trade unions to the proletarian state.

At the VIII Trade Union Congress, the right opportunists unfolded a fierce struggle against the party. The CC AUCP(b) sent a group of party workers headed by CC Secretary L. M. Kaganovich to the leading trade union organizations to implement the party line in the trade unions. Tomsky's grouping met this measure of the CC AUCP(b) on bayonets. Particularly fiercely, the rights resisted the introduction of Comrade Kaganovich into the Presidium of the AUCCTU. The introduction of Comrade Kaganovich into the Presidium of the AUCCTU, an irreconcilable fighter against opportunism and a loyal exponent of the Leninist-Stalinist line of the party,

ensured the rout of opportunism in the trade unions and the implementation of the party line in trade union leadership.

Despite the maneuvers of Tomsky's grouping, the rights in the trade unions suffered complete defeat. The overwhelming mass of communists — members and workers of trade union organizations — staunchly defended the party line, rebuffed the rights, and when after the VIII Trade Union Congress Tomsky tried to speak out against the party again, he was exposed, and the Central Committee removed him from work in the AUCCTU.

In January 1929, Bukharin, at a meeting dedicated to the memory of Lenin, spoke with a report that radically distorted the Leninist views on the party's policy and the proletarian government regarding the peasantry. Not a word was said in his report about the class struggle in the village, about the struggle against the kulak, about the sweeping of collectivization, etc. Bukharin's report was directed with its spearhead against the party's policy, against the production forms of the bond, against the socialist reconstruction of the country.

At the same time, in January 1929, new scandalous facts of the treacherous behavior of Bukharin and the entire "troika" of the rights were uncovered. In a Trotskyite counter-revolutionary leaflet discovered at that time, it was reported about Bukharin's negotiations with Kamenev. The investigation established that Bukharin, on instructions from the right center, back in July 1928, through Sokolnikov, conducted secret, behind-the-scenes, treacherous negotiations with Kamenev, who after hypocritical repentance was only recently re-admitted to the

party. During these negotiations, Bukharin maliciously slandered the party leadership, asserted that a crisis in the country was inevitable, and agreed with Kamenev on creating a bloc to fight against the party.

In his negotiations with Kamenev, Bukharin acted similarly to how he had acted during the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk Peace, when he agreed with enemies of the party and the proletariat — the Left.

SRs, waging an unbridled, vile campaign against Lenin. Now he likewise spoke out against Comrade Stalin, negotiating with the bitterest enemies of the party, strike-breakers of October, on the struggle against the Lenin-Stalin plan for building socialism in our country.

The uncovering of Bukharin's negotiations with Kamenev vividly highlighted all the behavior of the right opportunists, showed how far the rights had gone in their anti-party struggle, how false and hypocritical their behavior had been during the July and November plenums of the CC 1928, when they declared that they were subordinating themselves to the will of the party.

Here again all the anti-Bolshevik properties of Bukharin were vividly revealed. With a hypocritical air of sanctity, masking himself with a mask of sincerity, Bukharin right at the very beginning of the struggle carried out foul, intriguing, fractional secret machinations against the party and its leadership. Bukharin concluded a bloc with the bitterest, unmasked enemies of Bolshevism, who only recently, in November 1927,

had participated in an anti-Soviet demonstration on the streets of Moscow and Leningrad.

During the discussion in the CC AUCP(b) of these treacherous actions, Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsky spoke out on all questions against the party line. At the April Plenum of the CC 1929, where the question of the behavior of the rights was raised, they came out with fierce attacks against the party's policy. To the general line of the party they opposed their right-opportunist platform. At the plenum, the party discussed the great plan of the first five-year plan. This plan ensured the victory of socialism in the USSR, the liquidation of capitalist elements and the eradication of all their roots. Our party's Central Committee at this historical, responsible moment mobilized all forces for the struggle to implement the plan for the victory of socialism.

Bukharin's grouping spoke out against this plan, seeking a retreat before capitalist elements, seeking the implementation of its own line, which led to the restoration of capitalism in our country. All anti-leninist, right-opportunist views of Bukharin, repeatedly condemned by the party, were revealed here in an expanded form. "The theoretical basis" of the position of the rights was the anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist theory of the "dying out of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat," the theory of the "peaceful growing of the kulak into socialism".

Marxism-Leninism teaches that after the conquest of power by the proletariat, the class struggle does not stop, but becomes even more acute. Countering this teaching, Bukharin argued that the transition to socialism would proceed peacefully,

spontaneously, without the aggravation of class struggle. "The main network of our cooperative peasant organizations," wrote Bukharin, "will consist of kulak-type, [and] 'labor' type cooperatives, growing into the system of our all-state organs... On the other hand, kulak cooperative nests will just as well through banks, etc. grow into this same system; but they will to a certain extent be a foreign body, like, for example, concession enterprises" (*Path to Socialism and Workers-Peasants Union*)[61].

The line of Bukharin, the ideologue of the kulak, served in practice the class enemies of the proletarian state. All development of the country spoke of the fact that capitalist elements launched a fierce struggle in response to the strengthening of the positions of socialism. In those very days, when the rights with foam at the mouth defended Bukharinite "theories," the kulaks in response to the development of the collectivization of the village, in response to grain procurements organized arsons of procurement stations, waged malicious, counter-revolutionary agitation against collective farms, against the delivery of grain, buried grain in pits, killed defenders of collectivization, leaders of party and Soviet organizations in the village. The kulak, sensing his end, which collectivization and the victory of socialism were bringing him, went to the most beastly methods of struggle.

And the Bukharinite group argued at that time at the April Plenum that in the country there is no kulak at all, that "all the peasantry is poor" and those who are considered kulaks are also

[61] Quoted from *Questions of Leninism*, p. 251, 10th ed.

poor, possess negligible means and have absolutely nothing to fear.

The rights at the plenum spoke out against the five-year plan, seeking to disrupt its approval and implementation. Rykov proposed his "two-year plan" — a plan of retreat before capitalism.

The rights proposed to abolish emergency measures, through which the party provided the country with grain. Instead of grain procurements inside the country and pressure on the kulak strata, the rights proposed importing grain from abroad. They opposed state farms and collective farms, insisting on the development of individual farming, including kulak farming, in the village.

The rights spoke out against the new production forms of the bond between the working class and the peasantry and the entire economic policy, proposing to build on the basis of free trade and the development of market spontaneity. This Bukharinite proposal on "normalizing the market" meant the abandonment of the leading role of the proletarian state, full freedom of trade, freedom of development for the private trader in the city and the kulak in the village.

Bukharin came out with vile, white-guard slander, stating that the party is conducting a "policy of military-feudal exploitation of the peasantry". Straight from Milyukov — the leader of the Cadets — Bukharin borrowed slanderous attacks against the party of Lenin — Stalin.

The platform of the rights with complete clarity showed that the rights are the kulak agency in the ranks of the party.

Comrade Stalin in his historical speech at the April Plenum of the CC AUCP(b) in 1929 fully exposed the right-opportunist platform of Bukharin and his grouping and showed that it serves the cause of restoring capitalism.

Comrade Stalin mobilized the entire party to the struggle for the great plan of building socialism, for the implementation of which it was necessary first of all to rout the opportunists in the ranks of the party[62].

"...to abandon the struggle against the right deviation means to betray the working class, to betray the revolution"[63].

The right opportunists received a crushing rebuff at the CC AUCP(b) Plenum. Comrades Molotov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov, Kuibyshev, Kirov, Ordzhonikidze and other members of the CC exposed the Bukharinite grouping, its anti-Leninist essence and defended the Stalinist five-year plan.

The CC AUCP(b) categorically condemned the behavior of Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomsky, removed Bukharin and Tomsky from their posts and categorically warned the rights that in case of violation of party decisions and failure to comply with party discipline they will be expelled from the elective organs of the party.

The party, exposing and eradicating manifestations of right opportunism in theory and in practice, mobilized the attention of all organizations, striving to raise Bolshevik vigilance in the struggle against kulak agency. A crushing rebuff was received

---

[62] Quoted from *Questions of Leninism*, p. 251, 10th ed.
[63] Stalin, Questions of Leninism, p. 287, 10th ed.

by participants of the Bukharinite "school" — Slepkov, Astrov, Maretsky, Aizenvald and others, crawling out with preaching of the right-opportunist platform, were exposed by party organizations everywhere they spoke.

The party in this period waged a major struggle against Bukharin in the Comintern. Back by the VI Congress of the Comintern, Bukharin had drafted theses in which he asserted that capitalism is being restructured and strengthened, at a time when the capitalist world was on the eve of the fiercest economic crisis and the party was saying that the dismantling of capitalist stabilization and the aggravation of the crisis of capitalism are taking place. In Bukharin's theses, the question of the struggle against right opportunists and conciliators was not posed and a number of other political mistakes were made. The AUCP(b) delegation in the Comintern exposed Bukharin's opportunistic sally and introduced essentially new theses at the VI Congress of the Comintern.

Bukharin, repenting further and further into the opportunist swamp, became the center of attraction for all right-opportunist elements in the Comintern and organized them for the struggle against the Leninist Bolshevik line. At the heart of the Bukharinite grouping's position lay the theory of "organized capitalism," which doomed the proletariat to subordination to capitalist exploitation and led to the abandonment of revolution.

Throughout the entire period after the VI Congress of the Comintern, Bukharin, rallying opportunists in various sections of the Communist International, defended his rabidly-

opportunistic positions. But in the ranks of the Communist International, Bukharin received a resolute rebuff.

The X Plenum of the ECCI, gathered at the end of 1929, exposed Bukharin, removed him from work in the Comintern and called upon all fraternal communist parties to cleanse their ranks of right opportunists.

Having approved at the XVI Party Conference, despite the resistance of the rights, the five-year plan in the "optimal variant," the party under the leadership of Comrade Stalin unfolded a heroic struggle to implement this plan. For the party's general line, embodied in the concrete indicators of the five-year plan, went the heroic builders of the Stalingrad Tractor Plant, the Dnieper expanses, the working class of all Soviet lands. The collectivization of poor-middle-peasant farms unfolded widely, smashing the fierce resistance of the kulantry.

At the November Plenum of the CC AUCP(b) in 1929, when the party was summing up the results of the "year of the great breakthrough" and outlining further tasks of socialist construction, the right leaders again spoke out against the party line, applying a new maneuver. It was already clear to everyone that the positions of the rights were smashed by life, by the rapid growth of industry and the collective farm movement. But the rights did not want to lay down arms before the party; they stated at the November Plenum of the CC that they had disagreements with the party only on the question of emergency measures, and "the remaining disagreements are removed".

The Plenum exposed the anti-party maneuvers, all their behavior at the plenum as preparation for new attacks against the party. The Central Committee branded the speech of the rights as "...a fractional maneuver of political bankrupts, analogous to the 'capacitatory' maneuvers of the Trotskyites, who more than once used their allegedly conciliatory statements as a method of preparing new attacks against the party"[64].

The CC Plenum warned the rights that "in case of the slightest attempt on their part to continue the struggle against the line and decisions of the ECCI and CC AUCP(b), the party will not hesitate to apply corresponding organizational measures to them".

At the same time, the Plenum issued a decision that the propaganda of the views of right opportunism and conciliation with it is incompatible with membership in the AUCP(b).

The capitulatory, restorationist essence of the position of right opportunism was fully understood by all open enemies of socialism, who fought for the restoration of capitalism in the USSR through wrecking and sabotage. The leaders of wrecking organizations — the "Promparty," the "Trudarms," "Labor Peasant Party" — these graybeards and ideologues of capitalism — stated that the line of the right opportunists coincided with their line. Kondratiev — an overt defender of the kulak and participant in the kulak, counter-revolutionary organization — directly stated that he desired the victory of right opportunism.

[64] AUCP(b) in Resolutions, part II, p. 396, Partizdat, 1936.

Ramzin during the trial of the "Promparty" participants stated that one of the main methods of wrecking was the artificial reduction of the rates of development of the national economy. This line in its direction coincides with the guidelines of the right deviation in the communist party, why during the implementation of artificially truncated minimalist plans through planning and governmental organs from the center, an original bloc was created with the right communists, which greatly facilitated for the center the approval of such plans" (from Ramzin's testimony at the "Promparty" trial).

The Central Committee of our party repeatedly warned the rights that they are sliding into the camp of open enemies, bourgeois restorers.

At the XVI Party Congress, where the historical victories of the party in the matter of the country's industrialization and the collectivization of the village were summed up, leading to the USSR entering the period of socialism, Comrade Stalin uncovered and exposed the general line of the enemies of the Bolshevik party, the enemies of socialism — the Trotskyites and right opportunists.

The Trotskyites for many years directly fought against the Leninist-Stalinist teaching on the possibility of building socialism in a single country.

About the Bukharinite grouping, Comrade Stalin said at the XVI Party Congress:

"...right deviationists slide in practice to the point of view of denying the possibility of building socialism in our country"[65].

Thus, the Trotskyites and rights converged on the fundamental, decisive question, denying the possibility of building socialism in our country. Even earlier, in a number of speeches, Bukharin had slipped into the Trotskyite position. In 1922, at the IV World Congress of the Comintern, he asserted that genuine socialism cannot be achieved by the Soviet Union. "...Socialism can grow exclusively on the soil of the existing, and therefore it can be said that various socialist forms in a certain sense will be a continuation of former capitalist forms... We can say completely openly that Russian socialism, compared to others, will look Asian... The proportion between the developing and unyielding rationalization in our country, the proportion between industry and the peasantry, etc., etc., all these features of the backwardness of our economic development will find expression in backward forms of our socialism".

This Bukharinite provision, put forward back at the beginning of NEP, is directly linked with the liquidatory, right-opportunist platform of Bukharin in the period of socialist reconstruction, when Bukharin in practice slid to the point of view of denying the possibility of building socialism in our country. The question of building socialism in the USSR is a programmatic question that determined the line of development of the party of Lenin — Stalin, which determined the fate of the first socialist country and the liberating struggle of the

[65] Stalin, Questions of Leninism, p. 421, 10th ed.

peoples of the whole world. Under the banner of the Lenin-Stalin teaching, our party won world-historic victories.

Right opportunists, fighting against the methods and ways of building socialism implemented by the party, proposing instead of the plan of offensive against capitalist elements their own plan — the plan of retreat, spoke out against the party on the fundamental programmatic question — on building socialism in the USSR.

Having united with Trotskyism on a common platform on the programmatic question, the rights took the common path with the Trotskyites of vile counter-revolutionary struggle.

At the XVI Party Congress, Rykov and Tomsky, seeing that the right opposition was completely smashed, that the party masses everywhere were giving a crushing rebuff to right-opportunist sallies, spoke out with penitent speeches. Bukharin was not present at the Congress. The Congress, summing up the results of the party's struggle against right opportunism, declared the views of the right opposition incompatible with membership in the AUCP(b).

In addition, the XVI Party Congress in a special point of the decision indicated:

"The Congress draws the attention of the entire party to the fact that opportunists of all stripes, especially the rights, apply a new maneuver, expressed in the formal recognition of their mistakes and in formal agreement with the general line of the party, without confirming their recognition by work and struggle for the general line, which in reality means only the transition from open struggle against the party to covert

struggle or waiting for a more favorable moment to resume the attack on the party. The party must declare the most merciless war on this kind of two-facedness and deception and demand from all who recognize their mistakes by active defense of the general line of the party to prove the sincerity of their recognitions. Non-fulfillment of this requirement must entail the most decisive organizational measures"[66].

The subsequent course of events showed all the correctness and exceptional political importance of this decision.

As facts showed, the Bukharinite grouping, verbally recognizing the erroneousness of its line and assuring of its devotion to the party, in reality waged anti-party, fractional, subversive activity.

The rights from 1930 changed their methods of struggle: they went underground, conspiring their organizations. Having taken this path, the rights slid into the abyss of counter-revolution. All activity of the right renegades was conspiratorially led by the center of the rights: Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky, and Uglanov.

1931, 1932 were years of the greatest victories of socialist construction, years of overcoming the greatest difficulties. These were years of intensified class struggle for the construction of socialism in the USSR. And it was precisely at this time that right opportunists, who had slid into counter-revolution, again spoke out against the party and Soviet power. At the end of 1932, the counter-revolutionary grouping of

[66] AUCP(b) in Resolutions, part II, p. 406, Partizdat, 1936.

Ryutin and others was uncovered, showing where the right-opportunist opposition had come, how it had slid into the abyss of counter-revolution, defending an openly restorationist platform, organizing a vile, terrorist gang.

This platform was developed by the counter-revolutionary center of the rights and put it into circulation, hiding its participation for purposes of conspiracy under the guise of the "Ryutin platform". The Ryutin group showed the merging, unification of the rights with the Trotskyites. The line, started in 1928 during Bukharin's negotiations with Kamenev, culminated in the creation of a common counter-revolutionary organization. The exposure of this group uncovered the unfolding of underground anti-Soviet activity of the rights and Trotskyites, their vile counter-revolutionary terrorist methods and methods of struggle, masked by two-faced statements of agreement with the party line.

The Ryutin grouping was, as the Presidium of the CCC AUCP(b) indicated in its resolution of October 9, 1932, a grouping "...of traitors to the party and the working class, trying to create through underground means under the fraudulent flag of 'Marxism-Leninism' a bourgeois, kulak organization for the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, and in particular, the kulak system"[67].

Into this counter-revolutionary group entered such people as Ryutin, who held in 1928–1930 a rabid right-opportunist position and was already expelled from the ranks of the AUCP(b); Bukharin's closest disciples: Slepkov, Maretsky, and

[67] AUCP(b) in Resolutions, part II, p. 669, Partizdat, 1936.

Petrovsky P.; remnants of the "workers' opposition" like Kayurov; Uglanov and a number of others who were in the right opposition. Along with this, active participants in the Trotskyite counter-revolutionary organization, a representative of the lefts — Stan and others — operated in this grouping. Taking part in this counter-revolutionary grouping were Bukharin, Tomsky, and Rykov on the one hand, Zinoviev and Kamenev on the other.

If the right opportunists, speaking out in 1928–1929 against the party line, waged a struggle against the country's industrialization and the collectivization of agriculture, against the policy of liquidating the kulak as a class, sought the disruption of the construction of socialism in the USSR, then, speaking out against the party at the end of the first five-year plan, the rights waged a struggle for the surrender of capitalism to the already created foundation of socialist economy embodied in the greatest enterprises of the five-year plan, in 200 thousand collective farms, in 5 thousand state farms, etc. By this time the party had ensured enormous historical victories of socialism: unemployment was completely liquidated in the country, the fulfillment of the five-year plan in four years was ending, in the main grain regions total collectivization was completed and on its basis the liquidation of the kulak as a class.

The final, decisive battle with capitalism inside the country was ending with the great victory of the party, ensuring forever the ruin of capitalism, the impossibility of its restoration.

The class enemy at this time by all methods, passing over to the struggle "by stealth," tried to destroy the socialist economy created by the heroic labor of workers and collective farmers.

This resistance of class enemies and above all the extreme embittered kulak was reflected by the Ryutin counter-revolutionary grouping, which united with the Trotskyites, and the soon-to-be-exposed Eismont-Tolmachev-Smirnov A.P. grouping, created by the center of the rights. They took the path of vile methods of struggle, with which Trotskyite counter-revolutionaries operated.

S. M. Kirov said in October 1932 about the vile activity of the rights and Trotskyites united in the Ryutin grouping:

"Recently, the bankrupt remnants of broken party oppositions, right and left opportunists, have merged into a single counter-revolutionary group, setting as their goal the restoration of the bourgeois-capitalist system. In this group we find not a few familiar people, partly thrown out of the party, partly remaining in its ranks through two-facedness. These pitiful bankrupts tried to shake the iron might of the proletarian dictatorship. They will meet a crushing rebuff from the party and the working class, they have signed their final verdict, they are political corpses"[68].

The Eismont-Tolmachev counter-revolutionary underground group, which was one of the offshoots of the counter-revolutionary organization of the rights, was uncovered at the

[68] Kirov, *Leningrad Bolsheviks between XVI and XVII Congresses of the AUCP(b)*, p. 302, Partizdat, 1934.

end of 1932. Rotten, degenerated, extremely embittered against the leadership of the party and government, these vile spawn of right opportunism organized terrorist groups to fight against the party. They sought, like the Ryutin grouping, the implementation of the program for restoring capitalism in our country. Rykov, Tomsky, Schmidt and others were exposed at that time in ties with the Eismont group and others. Once again they vilely deceived the party, strenuously denied everything, tried to cover up the tracks of their criminal activity.

Being exposed as exponents of the aspirations of outliving exploiter classes, as defenders of the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, the right renegades closed ranks in their circle, full of hatred for the party and its leadership, which personified the victory of socialism and its further victorious march. Isolated from the masses and unable to count on any support in the ranks of the party and working people, the right renegades, having slid from opportunism to counter-revolution, following the Trotskyites, took the vilest, most treacherous path of terrorism. The leaders of the Bukharinite group began to seek allies among the bitterest enemies of socialism and the Soviet country. For all eternity branded with the curse of the working people, traitors of the revolution — Mensheviks, SRs and the scum of the vile servants of the fascist bourgeoisie — Trotskyites — Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky and their adherents sought to gather.

Participants of the Bukharinite "school," degenerated to the end, imbued with mortal hatred for the party and the country of socialism, quickly passed their path from unbridled opportunistic sallies to the party line to vile terrorist

conspiracies. The Bukharinite upbringing of the "school" in the spirit of self-glorification, on principles and traditions alien to Bolshevism, bore its poisonous fruits now. Defending the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, participants of the Bukharinite "school" came out with open preaching of the struggle against Marxism. These people, who earlier had engaged in proclaiming anti-Leninist Bukharinite theories, now together with foreign enemies of the proletariat openly stated that "Marxism has outlived itself". Together with Hitlerite-fascist executioners seeking the "eradication of Marxism," came out in this way those brought up in the Bukharinite stinking, rotting "school" — its disciples.

The rights were aware of the conspiratorial, criminal activity of the freaks of humanity, Hitler's bloody mercenaries — the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bandits — and became their accomplices.

Bukharin, as was stated in the testimony of the defendants in the case of the Trotskyite anti-Soviet center, was most closely connected through the Trotskyite-fascist bandit Radek with the Trotskyite center. The center of the rights, proceeding from the community of its platform with the platform of the Trotskyite bandits, organized the struggle against the Soviet people, against its leaders. On instructions from the Bukharinite center, Tomsky conducted negotiations with Zinoviev and Kamenev, with murderers, saboteurs, spies and wreckers. The Bukharinite center also instructed Uglanov to establish ties with Zinoviev, and they agreed on organizing terrorist gangs to commit villainous crimes against the peoples of the USSR and the working people of the whole world. The rights created their

terrorist groups, which included Uglanov's adherents like Kulikov, Kotov, Bukharin's disciples: Slepkov, Tseitlin, Kuzmin, Sapozhnikov and others.

Bukharin following Radek "theoretically substantiated" his treason. They preached a vile, counter-revolutionary theory, which is a continuation and development of Bukharin's theory of "organized capitalism," arguing that fascism represents a high stage of organized economy and managed to overcome the contradictions inherent in capitalism. They defended the counter-revolutionary theory of the impossibility of the victory of socialism in the USSR and proposed surrendering to fascism all the great conquests of the revolution. United by a common platform, a common hatred for the leader of the party and working people — Comrade Stalin, for the leading workers of the party and government, who organizing the struggle for the great victory of socialism, smashed the Trotskyites and rights — the Trotskyite and Bukharinite centers conducted their vile, treacherous, counter-revolutionary activity, preparing the doom of the already won socialism.

The curse of the peoples of the USSR and working people of all countries, with which the Trotskyite-Zinovievite gang is forever branded, falls also on the heads of the renegades — accomplices of the Trotskyite bandits.

All facts, which have now become known to the party, show what vile, thoroughly hypocritical and two-faced statements of the rights about stopping the struggle and agreement with the party line were. The counter-revolutionary groupings organized by the rights, exposed some time ago, showed that the right opportunists passed over to vile, counter-revolutionary activity.

But only now was it possible to uncover the activity and platform of the center of the rights — Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky, Uglanov and their adherents, directed toward the restoration of capitalism in our country.

Trotskyism has long ceased to be a political current. It has no roots in our country, where exploiter classes are liquidated and socialist reconstruction is carried out, ensuring the eradication of capitalist elements. Trotskyism degenerated into a band of fascist lackeys, murderers, saboteurs, spies, who even consider it possible to disclose their present monstrous program to their accomplices. Trotskyism has roots in the camp of imperialism, in the capitalist encirclement of the USSR, in the camp of mortal enemies of socialism and the working masses.

The rights also ceased to be a political current. Their social base, primarily the kulak, was liquidated as a result of the victory of socialism. The rights, who slid into the abyss of counter-revolution, represent a gang of criminals and enemies of the people. Capitalism, which still exists in five-sixths of the globe, tries to use in its struggle against the country of socialism the last remnants of capitalist elements, Trotskyites and rights, as a gang of criminals ready to execute the most villainous fascist crimes.

The Bolshevik party, carrying out its great historical role of creating a new, communist system, destroys and sweeps from the road all those who fight against it, against the socialist society, against the Soviet people.

Despite the machinations of the dark forces of outliving the capitalist world and its agency, our party under the leadership

of the Lenin-Stalin Central Committee, headed by Comrade Stalin, on the lessons of the struggle against enemies of socialism, mobilizing all communists and all working people of the USSR, raising their vigilance for winning further victories of socialism.

M. Moskalev

FROM A POLITICAL CURRENT — TO AN UNMASKED GANG OF ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE*(Historical Reference)*

The Plenum of the CC AUCP(b) that ended in March 1937 expelled Bukharin and Rykov from the ranks of the AUCP(b) for anti-party, treacherous activity directed toward destroying the socialist conquests of workers and peasants, toward restoring capitalism.

Bukharin, Rykov, and others for many years before and after the victory of the Great Proletarian Revolution in October 1917 waged a struggle against Lenin and the Bolshevik party, trying to impose their anti-Marxist bourgeois views on it. Throughout all periods of our party's life, Bukharin, Rykov, and their like-minded people spoke out against the line of the Lenin-Stalin party.

With the transition of the USSR to the reconstruction period, Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky, and others formalized the faction of the right deviation.

The platform of the rights — this kulak agency — was directed toward the restoration of capitalism in our country.

Having been repeatedly beaten by the party, the rights, verbally recognizing the anti-party nature of their views, in reality, vilely two-faced, passed over to underground anti-Soviet

activity directed toward disrupting socialism, toward restoring capitalism in our country.

Bukharin, Rykov, and others were direct allies and accomplices of the Japanese-German-Trotskyite band.

The counter-revolutionary fall of Bukharin, Rykov, and others is only the logical culmination of their prolonged, vile, treacherous struggle against the Bolshevik party.

This historical reference highlights only the main moments of the vile, treacherous struggle of Bukharin, Rykov, and others against the Bolshevik party, against the Soviet state, against socialism, against the Soviet people.

I

Long before the October Revolution, Bukharin spoke out against Lenin and the revolutionary policy of the Bolsheviks. In the years of reaction (1909–1910) he sided with the otzovists 1. Bukharin stated that the bourgeois-democratic revolution had ended and therefore all questions of the struggle for democracy are removed, one should not lead the peasant and national-revolutionary movement.

Bukharin spoke out against the Bolshevik requirement of support by the working class of the peasantry in its struggle for the confiscation of all landlord lands.

At the beginning of the imperialist world war, in the spring of 1915, Bukharin, having organized an anti-party group, which included Pyatakov and others, began a struggle against the

fundamental questions facing the revolutionary movement of Russia and the whole world.

In the years of the world imperialist war, the Bolshevik party, led by the great Lenin, was the only party that gave a thoroughly consistent Marxist assessment of the character of the war and put forward clear slogans of revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. In these years the leader of the Bolshevik party and the world proletariat Lenin gave a completed theory of imperialism as the final, dying phase of capitalism, formulated the law of unevenness and spasmodic development of capitalist countries under imperialism and on the basis of this law gave the working class the teaching on the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single country.

Imperialism means the omnipotence of monopolistic trusts, banks, and financial groups. In the epoch of imperialism, contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie become extremely aggravated. "Imperialism leads the working class to revolution"[69], notes Comrade Stalin. Characteristic of the epoch of imperialism are the exploitation and oppression by a handful of imperialist states of colonial and semi-colonial countries, whose populations begin to rise against imperialist oppression. In connection with the unevenness of the development of capitalist countries in the epoch of imperialism, contradictions between them, their struggle for markets, for sources of raw materials, for spheres of investment of capital, for the redivision of the already partitioned world inevitably lead to wars. The specified contradictions weaken

[69] Bukharin defended the expelled from the party otzovist-god-seeker A. Bogdanov and defended in practice his anti-Marxist views.

the capitalist system, which in the epoch of imperialism "as a whole is already ripe for revolution"[70]. In the chain of the capitalist system, weak links appear, and conditions are created for the victory of the proletarian revolution and the building of socialism in a single, separately taken country.

The only correct tactical slogans, stemming from the Leninist assessment of imperialism and the character of the world war as an imperialist war, were the Bolshevik slogan of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war and the directly connected slogan of the defeat of "one's own" government in the imperialist war. These revolutionary slogans served as the watershed between the Bolsheviks-Leninists, on the one hand, and social-chauvinists and centrists of the Kautsky and Trotsky type — on the other.

The Bolsheviks in the years of the war had to wage a struggle for the correct theoretical stance and revolutionary tactical line not only against opportunism in the international workers' movement, but also against opportunists inside the party.

The behavior of Kamenev was treacherous, who, being at the beginning of the war arrested, solidarized at the tsarist court with social-defensists, speaking out against Lenin, against Bolshevik revolutionary slogans.

Anti-Bolshevik, essentially purely Trotskyite was in these years the position of Bukharin, who jointly with Pyatakov, Radek and others fought against the Leninist policy and Leninist slogans.

---

[70] Stalin, Questions of Leninism, p. 3, 10th ed.

In March 1915, the conference of foreign sections of the RSDLP was held in Bern, at which the tasks of the Bolsheviks in the struggle against war were discussed. Bukharin jointly with Pyatakov spoke at this conference with their theses and resolutions directed against Lenin.

Instead of the Leninist slogan of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war, Bukharin tried to impose on the party the centrist slogan of Kautsky and Trotsky of the struggle for peace. The slogan of the struggle for peace in the conditions of the imperialist war of 1914–1918 was non-revolutionary, it prevented the party from carrying out the preparation of the proletariat for using war for revolution. The slogan of peace sowed illusions about the possibility of getting out of the war without revolution, about the possibility of a fair democratic peace without overthrowing the power of the bourgeoisie. This slogan made the proletariat, as Lenin points out, "...a toy in the hands of secret diplomacy of warring countries"[71]. Lenin wrote at the beginning of the war about the slogan of peace: "This is a philistine, priestly slogan. The proletarian slogan must be: civil war"[72].

Lenin persistently argued that one can put an end to war only as a result of overthrowing the power of the imperialists, that without the victory of the proletarian revolution the conclusion of peace will mean only a temporary breathing spell for preparing even greater imperialist wars. Lenin wrote: "We cannot stand for the slogan of peace, because we consider it

[71] Lenin, Conference of foreign sections of the RSDLP, Works, vol. XVIII, p. 128.
[72] Ibid., p. 56.

arch-confused, pacifist, philistine, helping governments (they now want with one hand to 'be for peace,' in order to entangle themselves) and braking revolutionary struggle"[73]. To this Trotskyite position, braking, according to Lenin, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, slid Bukharin, who spoke out against the Bolshevik slogan of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war.

Lenin taught that for the victory of the revolution it is necessary to promote the defeat of "one's own" government in the imperialist war. Every revolutionary must know that the defeat of the imperialist army unties the forces of revolution, facilitates the victory of the proletariat. The defeat of tsardom in the war not only facilitated the victory over tsardom and the bourgeoisie, but opened the road to the world socialist revolution. Social-defensists, centrists (Trotsky and others) sharply spoke out against the Bolshevik slogan of the defeat of "one's own" government. Sliding to the position of Trotsky, Bukharin jointly with Pyatakov in the spring of 1915 also openly spoke out against this Leninist slogan, especially objecting against the slogan of the defeat of tsarist Russia in the war. Bukharin wrote: "The group categorically rejects... any putting forward as a slogan for Russia of the so-called defeat of Russia".

Bukharin and his group categorically objected to all kinds of "agitation for defeat".

Lenin pointed out that only by waging a constant agitation against war, exposing the imperialist goals of "one's own"

[73] Ibid., p. 179.

government, only by organizing strikes, demonstrations, fraternization at the front, etc., can one prepare the victory of the revolution and the conquest of power by the proletariat. "Revolutionary struggle against war," wrote Lenin, "is an empty and unconscionable exclamation, to which such masters are heroes of the II International, if by it is not meant revolutionary actions against one's government and during the war"[74].

Rejecting the slogan of the defeat of "their" governments, refusing to call for revolutionary mass actions, Bukharin and his group with both feet stood on Trotsky's position. It is no accident that the Bukharinite group at this same conference of foreign groups of the RSDLP in March 1915 insisted on an agreement with Trotsky and his group, who published the centrist newspaper *Nashe Slovo* in Paris.

Trotskyites and their allies in the Bukharinite group, speaking then against the defeat in the war of "their" imperialist governments, actually supported the social-chauvinists who openly spoke out in defense of the imperialist war, and showed themselves as opponents of the victory of socialism over capitalism. After the victory of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism in our country, the Trotskyites and their allies in the Bukharinite group, having become enemies of the people, bet on the defeat of the socialist fatherland, betrayed the fatherland, and helped international fascism.

[74] Lenin, On the defeat of one's government in the imperialist war, Works, vol. XVIII, p. 169.

Bukharin's struggle in the years of the imperialist war against the fundamental tactical slogans of the Bolshevik party stemmed from his anti-Leninist views on all major issues.

Bukharin, just like Trotsky, denied the Leninist assessment of the epoch of imperialism. Instead of concrete analysis of imperialism, Bukharin viewed imperialism as a system, completely transformed industrial capitalism and simple commodity production. He denied the presence under imperialism of pre-capitalist structures. Bukharin denied the Leninist proposition that "imperialism is a superstructure over capitalism"[75]. Bukharin and his group had an empty scheme of "pure imperialism"[76]. Bukharin stated that imperialism completely destroyed competition, the market, crises, the anarchy of production, etc. In the theses of Bukharin-Pyatakov (1915) it was said: "The imperialist epoch is an epoch of the absorption of small states by large state units and the constant redrawing of the political map of the world in the direction of its greater state homogeneity".

Bukharin's viewpoint on imperialism converged with the theory of ultra-imperialism (super-imperialism) of Kautsky (on whose position stood Trotsky). Kautsky pointed out that a new epoch of ultra-imperialism will come and then the contradictions of the capitalist world will be smoothed out, there will be no political upheavals, conflicts, wars, and imperialists will peacefully distribute colonies among themselves.

---

[75] See *History of the Civil War*, vol. I.

[76] Lenin, VIII Congress of the RCP(b), Works, vol. XXIV, p. 134.

Talking about the new epoch of ultra-imperialism, "organized capitalism," Kautsky, Trotsky, and others distracted the masses from the struggle against modern imperialism, dulled the class consciousness of the proletariat, subjecting it to the influence of the bourgeoisie. Lenin mercilessly exposed the anti-revolutionary essence of Kautsky's theory of ultra-imperialism.

Just like Kautsky and Trotsky, Bukharin refused to view imperialism in all its concrete content, denied the fact that imperialism, giving birth to monopoly, does not destroy the contradiction within unions of capitalists: trusts, syndicates, etc., but even more aggravates and intensifies competition both in individual branches of production and simultaneously throughout capitalist economy as a whole. "Pure imperialism" does not exist and cannot exist. "There are no pure monopolies," wrote Lenin, "but monopolies side by side with exchange, market, competition, crises — that is the most essential feature of imperialism in general"[77].

Proceeding from the anti-Leninist theory of "pure imperialism," Bukharin, Pyatakov, Radek talked about a "pure" socialist revolution, in which only two classes fight against each other — the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Behind the talk about a "pure" socialist revolution was concealed the ignoring of the peasantry as a reserve of the proletarian revolution, ignoring the national-revolutionary movement in Europe, in colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Exposing Bukharin, Pyatakov, Radek and others, Lenin wrote: "Whoever waits for a 'pure' social revolution will never live to

[77] Lenin, Materials for revising the party program, Works, vol. XX, p. 297.

see it. That is a revolutionary in words, who does not understand actual revolution"[78].

The Bukharinite group denied the features of the socialist revolution and its driving forces. Lenin wrote: "...to think that a social revolution is thinkable without uprisings of small nations in colonies and in Europe, without revolutionary explosions of a part of the petty bourgeoisie with all its prejudices, without the movement of unconscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against the landowners, church, monarchical, national, etc. oppression — to think so means to renounce social revolution"[79].

Insisting on his anti-Leninist theory of "pure" revolution, Bukharin at the Bern Conference of the RSDLP in March 1915, speaking against Lenin, stated that one cannot call revolutionary struggle a democratic petty bourgeoisie. One cannot think, Bukharin said, that the petty bourgeoisie can act against organized unions of capitalists — trusts, etc. For Bukharin, the petty bourgeoisie is stock-holders connected with big capital. Proceeding from this anti-Bolshevik position, Bukharin and Pyatakov denied the necessity for the party of the working class to put forward democratic slogans, including the slogan of the right of nations to self-determination up to secession.

Denying the necessity of leading the national-revolutionary movement, Bukharin thereby was an exponent of the influence of great-power chauvinism in the workers' movement.

---

[78] Lenin, Results of the discussion on self-determination, Works, vol. XIX, p. 269.
[79] Ibid.

This viewpoint of the Bukharinite group also coincided with Trotsky's position, who wrote that "imperialism opposes the non-bourgeois nation to the old regime, and the bourgeois nation to the proletariat". Lenin wrote regarding Trotsky's position: "He is for self-determination, but... he has an empty phrase, because he does not demand the freedom of secession of nations, of oppressed 'fatherlands' of the given national socialist"[80].

Lenin subjected to harsh criticism the views of the Bukharinite group, which was sliding toward Trotsky. Regarding Bukharin's assertion that democracy is unrealizable under imperialism and therefore we must throw out democratic requirements from our program, Lenin, exposing Bukharin, pointed out that imperialism turns democracy into an illusion, but petty-bourgeois masses strive for democracy. Imperialism draws into the revolutionary struggle enormous masses of the peasantry, wakes up the oppressed peoples of colonies and semicolonies. These peoples enter the struggle with imperialist states for national liberation.

Lenin proved that the Marxist solution of the question of democracy consists in using by the proletariat leading its class struggle all democratic aspirations of the petty bourgeoisie for the purposes of preparing the proletariat for overthrowing the bourgeoisie. One cannot deny democracy in general also because the working class must educate itself in the struggle for democracy, and having come to power and established the dictatorship of the proletariat, must conduct genuine

[80] Lenin, On the peace program, Works, vol. XIX, p. 53.

democracy for the working people. "Socialism is impossible without democracy for the working people. Socialism cannot be victorious without democracy, if it does not lead humanity to the withering away of the state without fully implementing democracy"[81].

The denial of democratic reserves in the person of the peasant and national-revolutionary movement meant the Menshevik-Trotskyite denial by the Bukharinite group of the hegemony of the proletariat.

Lenin called the position of Bukharin — Pyatakov "imperialist economism". Exposing the position of Bukharin — Pyatakov Lenin wrote: "Capitalism has won — therefore there is no need to think about political questions, reasoned the old 'economists' in 1894–1901, reaching up to the denial of political struggle in Russia. Imperialism has won — therefore there is no need to think about questions of political democracy, reason modern 'imperialist economists'"[82]. The abandonment of the hegemony of the proletariat, of leadership over the broad democratic masses, thereby pushing them under the influence of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie — to this boiled down the position of the Bukharinite group.

Denying the possibility of using allies — the reserves of the proletariat in the struggle for power, the Bukharinite group slid to Trotsky's bourgeois theory of the impossibility of socialist revolution and the victory of socialism in a single country. In the article "World Economy and Imperialism" (1915) Bukharin

[81] Lenin, On the caricature of Marxism... Works, vol. XIX, pp. 233–234.
[82] Lenin, On the caricature of Marxism... Works, vol. XIX, p. 195.

wrote that the actions of the proletariat of individual countries against the bourgeoisie will inevitably "be disjointed, hesitant, weak and will not be able to defeat the bourgeoisie. For the destruction of the power of the bourgeoisie, a 'storm' by millions of armies of the proletariat in all countries is necessary".

Exposing this Trotskyite position of the Bukharinite group, Lenin wrote, that to dream "about 'combined action of the proletarians of all countries'... means postponing socialism to the Greek kalends, i.e., to 'never'"[83].

Lenin proved (and life brilliantly confirmed this Leninist proposition): "The development of capitalism proceeds to the highest degree unevenly in various countries. Otherwise it cannot be under commodity production. Hence the infallible conclusion: socialism cannot conquer simultaneously in all countries. It will conquer initially in one or several countries, while the remaining ones will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois"[84]. The Trotskyite denial of the law of uneven and spasmodic development of capitalism in the epoch of imperialism, the denial of the possibility of the victory of socialist revolution and socialism in a single, separately taken country — on this position stood the Bukharinite group back in the years of the imperialist war.

The denial of the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist revolution intertwined in Bukharin with a semi-anarchist attitude toward the state. In the theses presented by Bukharin at

[83] Ibid., pp. 220–221.
[84] Lenin, Military program of the proletarian revolution, Works, vol. XIX, p. 325.

the Bern conference of foreign sections of the RSDLP (March 1915), it was stated that the working class must implement "despotic encroachments on private property" (for example, transfer of bourgeois-military organizations of economic life — grain monopoly, distribution of labor, etc. — into the hands of workers; transfer of closed enterprises into the hands of the unemployed). But the most important thing in Bukharin's theses was missing. He had nothing said about the conquest of power by the proletariat as a necessary condition for socialist construction. Without the conquest of power, all these measures proposed by Bukharin were no different from the soviets of reformers of the II International. In these theses, reformist hushing up of the question of conquering the dictatorship of the proletariat intertwined in Bukharin with syndicalist ideas of seizing capitalist enterprises by workers, distribution of labor, etc. without conquering state power. We will see further that syndicalism slipped out in Bukharin later too, during the trade union discussion of 1920–1921.

Then, in the years of the war, regarding Bukharin's theses, Lenin wrote: "The war pushed him (i.e. Bukharin. — Ed.) toward semi-anarchist ideas. At the conference which passed the Bern resolutions (spring 1915), he gave out theses (I have them!) — the height of absurdity; disgrace; semi-anarchism"[85].

In the article published in the journal *Jugend-Internationale* in 1916 under the pseudonym Nota-Bene, Bukharin wrote: "For social-democracy, which is or at the very least must be an educational mass, it is now more than ever necessary to

[85] Lenin, vol. XXIX, p. 230.

emphasize its principled hostility to the state". Similar semi-anarchist views Bukharin developed in the article "Toward the Theory of the Imperialist State" in the collection *Revolution and Law*, which he published in 1925. "Any speech inevitably turns into... an attack on state power. Hence the definite tactical requirement: social democracy must increasingly emphasize its principled hostility to state power". Thus, Bukharin anarchistically denied not only the bourgeois state, but also any state power in general, Bukharin denied the necessity of the proletarian state. The path to socialism lay through the dictatorship of the proletariat, through strengthening the workers' state, and Bukharin and his group in practice were opponents of the dictatorship of the proletariat, opponents of building a socialist society.

Bukharin defended the anarchist theory of the "blowing up" of the state after the victory of the revolution. The anarchist theory of the "blowing up" was counterposed to the Marxist-Leninist theory of the "smashing" of the old bourgeois state machine and the building of a new state of effective democracy for the working people — the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin, exposing Bukharin's anarchist views on the state, wrote: "Socialists stand for the use of the modern state and its institutions in the struggle for the emancipation of the working class, as well as the necessity to use the state for a peculiar transitional form from capitalism to socialism. Such a transitional form, also a state, is the dictatorship of the proletariat".

Anarchists want to "abolish" the state, "blow it up" (*sprengen* it, as expressed in one place by Comrade Nota-Bene (i.e.,

Bukharin. — Ed.), mistakenly attributing this view to socialists)[86].

Thus Lenin, exposing Bukharin, proved that the state is not blown up, but the victorious proletariat smashes the old bourgeois state machine and creates a new, proletarian state.

In his famous work *The State and Revolution* (1917) Lenin developed the teaching of Marx — Engels on the state, and summing up the experience of the revolutionary international and Russian movement, exposed the reformist distortion of the II International (primarily its leader Kautsky) of Marx's teaching on the state. At the same time in this work Lenin spoke out against the semi-anarchist views of Bukharin. Lenin wrote that "Bukharin's mistakes can ruin this 'right cause' in the struggle against Kautskyism"[87].

Comrade Stalin at the April Plenum of the CC in 1929 reminded Bukharin of his anarchism in assessing the state, which (Bukharin) defended not only in the years of the war, but also after the victory of the October Revolution. Comrade Stalin said that with his theory of the "blowing up" of the state Bukharin "overlooked a trifle here," namely — he overlooked a whole transition period, when the working class cannot do without its own state, if it really wants to suppress the bourgeoisie and build socialism[88].

In the work *World Economy and Imperialism* (1915) Bukharin wrote that after the victory of the proletarian revolution

---

[86] Lenin, *Jugend-Internationale*, Works, vol. XIX, p. 296.
[87] *Lenin Collection* II, p. 283.
[88] Stalin, Questions of Leninism, p. 274, 10th ed..

"instead of the idea of defending or expanding the borders of the bourgeois state... the slogan of destroying state borders and merging nations into a single socialist family is put forward." The preface to this book was written by Bukharin at the end of 1917, after the October Revolution, and then he also did not pose the question of defending borders except for the borders of the victorious Soviet state. And in this question Bukharin completely repeats Trotsky, in whose opinion the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat within the framework of a single country is impossible.

After the Bern Conference of the RSDLP in 1915, Lenin, criticizing and exposing the anti-Marxist essence of Bukharin's positions, wanted at the same time to give Bukharin and his group an opportunity to correct their mistakes. At the end of 1915, one issue of the journal *The Communist* came out abroad. Lenin wrote that the journal *The Communist* "was a temporary bloc of ours with two groups or elements: 1) Bukharin and Co.; 2) Radek and Co. As long as it was possible to go together with them, it had to be done"[89].

Lenin had to stubbornly work on gathering genuinely internationalist elements in the international workers' movement and in these conditions wage a struggle against the Bukharinite group.

Bukharin and Pyatakov tried to use the journal to defend their anti-Bolshevik views. They tried to smuggle into the work in Radek's journal and thus sought to make the journal *Kommunist* an organ of struggle against Lenin. As early as

[89] Lenin, vol. XXIX, p. 263.

autumn 1915, Bukharin and Pyatakov moved to Stockholm, and taking advantage of the fact that correspondence of the foreign center with Russia was conducted through Stockholm, they intended to establish themselves as a "special commission for relations with Russia". Pyatakov had large personal financial resources; Lenin characterized him as a man with power, as a capitalist. Pyatakov refused to give his funds for party purposes. Pyatakov, supported by Bukharin, stated that he would give money only for the publication of *Kommunist*, which should be granted freedom to propagate the anti-Marxist views of Pyatakov, Radek, and Bukharin. This was an attempt to create their own faction. Lenin rejected this pretension of the Bukharinite group. Then Bukharin and his group, moving further away from Lenin towards Trotsky, relying on Radek's group, utilizing Zinoviev's favoritism, who behind Lenin's back strongly supported and encouraged these opportunists, proclaimed the necessity of creating "Bolshevism on a West European scale".

"Bolshevism on a West European scale" meant a departure from Leninist theory and revolutionary tactics, a refusal of the victory of the socialist revolution and the construction of socialism in a single, separately taken country.

Lenin wrote on this occasion: "I can only say that the author's (i.e., Bukharin's. — Ed.) projected 'Bolshevism on a West European scale', according to my deep conviction, is neither Bolshevism nor Marxism, but a small variant of the very same old 'economism'."[90]

---

[90] Lenin, *On the Nascent Trend of "Imperialist Economism"*, Works [Соч.], vol. XXX, p. 256.

Lenin demanded an open and decisive struggle against these capitulators. "The bloc with Bukharin's group is impossible. 'The journal, as an organ of Polish-Bukharinite vacillations, is harmful,'"[91] — wrote Lenin. The journal *Kommunist* ceased to exist. The Bolsheviks continued publication of their independent organ *Sotsial-Demokrat*.

In 1916, while in New York, Bukharin was on the editorial board of Trotsky's newspaper *Novy Mir*, together with Trotsky he fought against Lenin and the Bolshevik party.

Opportunistic distortions of Bukharin on the most important political questions during the war led Lenin to the conclusion that Bukharin "(1) is trusting to gossip and (2) in politics is diabolically unstable."[92] At the same time, Lenin emphasized Bukharin's grossest errors on economic questions.

II

After the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917, the Bolshevik party placed on the agenda the task of immediate struggle for the socialist revolution.

In Lenin's famous theses of April 4 (17), 1917, a developed program of struggle for the Soviet socialist republic, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, was given.

In this responsible period in the life of the party, Rykov, together with Kamenev and Zinoviev, were fierce opponents of the struggle for the socialist revolution.

---

[91] Lenin, vol. XXIX, p. 254.
[92] Ibid., p. 229.

At the VII (April) Conference of the RSDLP(b) in 1917, Rykov, hand in hand with Kamenev, spoke in his speech: "Can we count on the support of the masses, throwing out the slogan of the proletarian revolution? Russia is the most petty-bourgeois country in Europe. To count on the sympathy of the masses for the socialist revolution is impossible... The impetus for the socialist revolution must be given from the West."[93]

Like all opportunists, Rykov did not believe in the possibility of raising the working class and its ally — the rural poor — to accomplish the proletarian socialist revolution. Like all Mensheviks, Rykov did not believe in the strength of the working class, in its ability to victoriously accomplish the socialist revolution. Rykov said: "Where will the sun of the socialist revolution rise? I think that, according to all conditions, according to the philistine level, the initiative of the socialist coup does not belong to us. We do not have the forces, the objective conditions for this."[94]

Rykov, standing on Menshevik-Trotskyist positions, fought against the socialist revolution, not believing in its victorious completion.

Lenin said on this occasion: "...Rykov says that socialism must come from other countries with a more developed industry. But this is not so. It is impossible to say who will begin and who will end. This is not Marxism, but a parody of Marxism."[95]

---

[93] *Minutes of the Seventh (April) Conference of the RSDLP(b)*, p. 92, Partizdat, 1934.
[94] Ibid., p. 93.
[95] Ibid., p. 98.

It should be noted that Rykov long before the proletarian revolution fought against Lenin. In 1909 Rykov, just like Bukharin, supported the otzovist-god-builder Bogdanov, acting together with Kamenev and Zinoviev against the expulsion from the party of Bogdanov and other enemies of Bolshevism. Rykov in 1910–1911 acted as an agent of Trotsky, demanded an alliance with the liquidators, with Trotsky, the Vperedists. Rykov in those years belonged to the conciliator group, whose position Lenin characterized as the position of "inconsistent Trotskyists".

Regarding Rykov's attempt to unprincipledly unite with the liquidators, Trotsky and the Vperedists, Lenin wrote that Rykov continued to "flirt with the anti-party factions of *Golos* and *Vpered*, hindering our work (in the party spirit)."[96] This explains why after the victory of the February revolution Rykov was in close alliance with Kamenev and other opponents of the socialist revolution.

Pyatakov, who subsequently turned into a vile traitor, fascist spy and wrecker from the anti-Soviet Trotskyist gang, a companion-in-arms of Bukharin, who together with him already in the years of war opposed the Bolshevik program on the national question, at the VII (April) Conference of 1917 defended all his anti-Bolshevik provisions. In the report on the national question, Comrade Stalin substantiated the revolutionary program of the Bolshevik party on the national question. He said: "...our point of view on the national question reduces to the following provisions: a) recognition of the right

[96] *Lenin Miscellany [Ленинский сборник]* XVIII, p. 27.

of nations to secede; b) for nations remaining within the borders of a given state — regional autonomy; c) for national minorities — special laws guaranteeing them free development; d) for the proletarians of all nationalities of a given state — a single indivisible proletarian collective, a single party."[97]

Pyatakov spoke with a special hatred on the national question, defending the bourgeois views condemned by Lenin. Pyatakov and Bukharin essentially denied the struggle for the socialist revolution, and therefore ignored the question of the allies of the working class, the question of the peasantry and the national-liberation movement. Pyatakov argued that in the era of imperialism the national state is already a bypassed stage, that instead of the slogan "right of nations to self-determination up to secession" one must put forward the slogan "down with borders".

Lenin and Stalin sharply criticized the views of Bukharin's associate — Pyatakov. Lenin emphasized:

"The method of socialist revolution under the slogan: 'down with borders', is complete confusion... What does this mean — 'method of socialist revolution under the slogan "down with borders"'? We stand for the necessity of the state, and the state presupposes borders... One must go mad to continue the policy of Tsar Nicholas."[98]

---

[97] *Minutes of the Seventh (April) Conference of the RSDLP(b)*, p. 194, Partizdat, 1934.
[98] Ibid., pp. 199–200.

Criticizing Pyatakov's denial of the right of nations to secede, Comrade Stalin in his concluding speech at the April Conference on the national question said:

"I ask — and life itself asks — are we for those nations that are fighting against oppression, or for those classes that oppress them? We say: social democracy, since it holds a course towards the socialist revolution, must support the revolutionary movement of peoples directed against imperialism."[99]

In his position on the national question, Pyatakov, like Bukharin, actually supported the imperialist policy of the Provisional Government and defended the line in favor of imperialist states.

The correct resolution by the Bolsheviks of the national question was of exceptional importance in that period. Upon it depended attracting to the side of the proletarian revolution the peoples oppressed by Russian tsarism and the bourgeoisie. In essence, the position of Pyatakov, as well as Bukharin, coincided with the capitulatory position of Kamenev and Rykov. For whoever was against the allies of the proletariat, reserves, was in fact against the victory of the socialist revolution.

The Party Program is the greatest theoretical document in which the goals of the working movement are defined with all clarity. The old party program was divided into two parts: the minimum program and the maximum program. The maximum program set forth our ultimate goal — communist society; the

[99] Ibid., p. 209.

minimum program set forth immediate requirements subordinate to the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution: a democratic republic, an 8-hour workday, etc.

The minimum program showed the ways of revolutionary struggle, helped mobilize the broad popular masses under the leadership of the workers' party.

Bukharin, already in the years of war, as we already know, argued the uselessness of the minimum program (the presentation of democratic demands). In connection with this, the British Socialist Party gathered to abolish the minimum program, Lenin wrote in early 1917: "here is the temptation and danger for Bukharin, who stumbled 'in the seventh place' with us since 1915!"[100]

After the victory of the February bourgeois-democratic revolution, in the famous April Theses of 1917, Lenin wrote that it is necessary to revise our minimum program. It is necessary to take into account the higher tasks put forward by the era of imperialism, the victory over the tsarist autocracy, the struggle of the working class for Soviet power. Lenin demanded a revision of the minimum program, and Bukharin stated that it is necessary to completely throw it away, to abandon the minimum program.

Lenin proved that as long as the power of the working class is not won, it is impossible to abandon the minimum program, "because this would be equal to empty boasting: we do not want to 'demand from the bourgeoisie', but to carry it out

[100] *Lenin Miscellany II*, p. 282.

ourselves, we do not want to work in small things within the framework of the bourgeois system."[101]

Until the final victory of the working class, there are still many difficulties to overcome; if we have not yet won, we cannot act as if we had already won. Lenin reminded Bukharin of the famous proverb: "Do not boast when going to battle, but boast when coming from battle".

Bukharin therefore demanded an immediate abandonment of the minimum program, that he did not believe in the revolutionariness of the working peasantry, following Trotskyist lines denied the leadership of the working class over the rural poor.

In 1917 Bukharin developed the bourgeois theory of "organized capitalism." In the article "State Capitalism and Socialist Revolution" Bukharin wrote that "previously dispersed and unorganized capitalism is replaced by organized capitalism".

In connection with the discussion of the party program, Lenin once again subjected Bukharin's views to criticism. To assert that monopoly capitalism is organized capitalism is to refuse to see the essential feature of imperialism, in which monopoly exists alongside competition and above competition, that within the united alliances of capitalists there are contradictions, struggle. All this leads to the intensification of capitalist contradictions, aggravates the class struggle, preparing the socialist revolution. "Imperialism," wrote Lenin,

[101] Lenin, *On the Revision of the Party Program*, Works, vol. XXI, p. 312.

exposing Bukharin, "is a continuation of the development of capitalism, its highest stage... Imperialism in reality neither reconstructs nor can reconstruct capitalism from top to bottom. Imperialism complicates and aggravates the contradictions of capitalism, 'confuses' them with the freedom of competition, monopoly, but cannot eliminate exchange, the market, competition, crises, etc. in imperialism."[102]

At the VI Congress of the Party, in August 1917, Bukharin in a Trotskyist manner denied the possibility of an alliance of the proletariat with the poorest peasantry in the socialist revolution and thereby denied the possibility of the victory of the socialist revolution and socialism in our country. Lenin and Stalin pointed out that broad strata of the peasantry are not interested in the imperialist war, that they are honest defensists, that they only through misunderstanding support the bourgeois Provisional Government, that through patient explanatory work the broad strata of the peasantry will be won over to the side of the revolution. Bukharin did not agree with this. Just like the Trotskyists, like Kamenev, Rykov and other capitulators, Bukharin spoke of a solid bloc of the peasantry with the imperialist bourgeoisie. At the VI Congress of the party, in August 1917, Bukharin stated: "The peasant as a property owner will inevitably have to shake hands with allied imperialism".

Bukharin stated with all categoricalness that a bloc of the peasantry with landowners and manufacturers had been realized. Exactly like Trotsky, Bukharin denied the presence of

[102] Lenin, *Materials on the Revision of the Party Program*, Works, vol. XX, p. 297.

allies for the proletariat inside the country, therefore, in his opinion, one should not deal with the peasant question.

Bukharin denied the Bolshevik assessment of the driving forces of the revolution: the alliance of the proletariat with the rural poor along the path of the growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into socialist.

Exposing Bukharin, developing the Leninist theory of the socialist revolution and the victory of socialism in a single, separately taken country, Comrade Stalin at the VI Congress pointed out that one cannot view the peasantry as a "single proprietary mass." Comrade Stalin also exposed Bukharin's anti-Marxist, fundamentally incorrect "toy scheme", which mechanically separated the first phase of the revolution from the second. On the first phase, Bukharin stated — in the bourgeois-democratic revolution — the working class has an ally — the peasantry, and on the second phase — in the socialist revolution — the working class inside the country has no allies.

Comrade Stalin at the VI Congress of the party, exposing the opportunists and mobilizing the party and the working class for the struggle for the socialist revolution, pointed out:

"Bukharin asserts that the bourgeois-imperialist has concluded a bloc with the muzhik. But what kind of muzhik? We have different muzhiks. With us there are grassroots muzhiks representing the poorest strata of the peasantry. With them — this bloc could not be built. They have not concluded a bloc with the big bourgeoisie, but go along with it through misunderstanding, they are simply deceived, they are led."

"Against whom is the bloc?"

"This Bukharin did not say. This is a bloc of allied and Russian capital, the command staff and the top of the peasantry in the form of Socialist-Revolutionaries of the Chernov type. This bloc was formed at the expense of the grassroots of the peasantry, at the expense of workers."

"Where is the perspective of t. Bukharin? His analysis is incorrect in its very basis. In his opinion, in the first stage we go with the peasant revolution. But after all, it cannot not meet, not coincide with the worker revolution. It cannot be that the working class, constituting the vanguard of the revolution, did not fight together with this for its own demands. Therefore, I consider t. Bukharin's scheme ill-conceived."

"The second stage according to t. Bukharin is the proletarian revolution with the support of Western Europe without peasants, who received land and were satisfied. But against whom is this revolution directed? Comrade Bukharin in his toy scheme does not give an answer to this."[103]

These provisions of Comrade Stalin were brilliantly justified.

At the VI Congress of the party, in August 1917, Comrade Stalin, exposing the Trotskyist Preobrazhensky, who denied the possibility of the victory of socialism in our country, gave a battle to the entire front of opportunism — Kamenev,

---

[103] *Minutes of the VI Congress of the RSDLP(b)*, pp. 138–139, Partizdat, 1934.

Zinoviev, Rykov, Bukharin and others — and with all clarity defined the tasks of the party of the working class in the struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism in our country.

Not agreeing with the Leninist-Stalinist policy, Bukharin, together with Kamenev, Rykov and other capitulators, spoke out in September 1917 against participation in the pre-parliament, this "abortive offspring of Kornilovism", as Comrade Stalin characterized this monstrosity. Bukharin did not believe in the possibility of the victory of the socialist revolution, therefore he, just like Kamenev, Pyatakov, Rykov and other opponents of the Leninist-Stalinist line, wanted an agreement with the Mensheviks, wanted to linger at the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The Great Proletarian Revolution followed the path indicated by Lenin and Stalin.

Rykov, Bukharin, Tomsky, as well as the despicable strike-breakers of October Kamenev and Trotsky, were not included in the military-practical center for the leadership and conduct of the armed uprising in October 1917. Lenin and the Central Committee could not entrust this most responsible task to opportunist, semi-Menshevik elements.

Rykov, being in Moscow, opposed the organization of the armed uprising and the overthrow of the Provisional Government. Rykov joined the company of strike-breakers of the October Revolution.

Rykov and Bukharin were opponents of the Leninist-Stalinist line in the struggle for the socialist revolution. At the most

important stage of the history of our party, in the period of preparation of the victorious socialist revolution, in the period of the direct transition of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist one, Rykov and Bukharin stood on capitulatory, essentially Menshevik-Trotskyist positions.

III

On the very first day of the socialist revolution, November 7, 1917, Lenin, speaking at a meeting of the Petrograd Soviet, said:

"Now a new strip in the history of Russia begins, and this third Russian revolution must in its ultimate outcome lead to the victory of socialism."[104]

What position did Rykov and Bukharin occupy at this responsible moment? They believed, just like Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev, that Soviet power would not stand against numerous enemies without direct state support of the world socialist revolution.

A position of Rykov in the following days after the victory of the Great Proletarian Revolution, when he together with Kamenev and Zinoviev tried to return the Soviet country to the path of bourgeois democracy? It is known, for example, that Rykov supported then the capitulatory policy of Kamenev and Ryazanov, who insisted on accepting the counter-revolutionary proposal of Vikzhel (All-Russian Committee of Railwaymen, led by Mensheviks and SRs) on the creation of a government

[104] Lenin, *Meeting of the Petrograd Soviet of W. and S. D. November 7 (October 25) 1917*, Works, vol. XXII, p. 4.

with the participation of Mensheviks and SRs. When, upon Lenin's proposal, the CC of the party ceased any negotiations with Vikzhel, Rykov insisted on continuing negotiations with them and on accepting the counter-revolutionary proposals.

At the meeting of the Party CC on November 14, 1917, Rykov, supporting Kamenev, said that if we stop negotiations, "then those groups that support us will fall away from us, and we will not be in a position to hold power".

Rykov, like other capitulators, insisted on the repeal of the decree of the Soviet government on the closure of counter-revolutionary newspapers. He, like other capitulators, tried by all means to find a common language with Mensheviks and SRs. Deserting at this responsible moment from the CC and the government, Rykov in this way tried to impose a bourgeois line on the party. But this was an attack on the party line with unworthy means. The party routed the right opportunists.

Bukharin, actually solidifying with Kamenev, Zinoviev, Rykov and other capitulators, proposed to wait for a blow against the counter-revolutionary party of Cadets before convening the Constituent Assembly. Bukharin, just like the right-wing capitulators, placed hopes on the counter-revolutionary Constituent Assembly. At the meeting of the party CC with criticism of Bukharin's position, Comrade Stalin said: "At the present time we definitely must finish off the Cadets or they will finish us off, since they have opened fire on us."[105]

---

[105] *Minutes of the CC of the RSDLP(b). August 1917 — February 1918*, p. 182.

After the victory of the October Socialist Revolution, Soviet power considered it necessary to finish as quickly as possible with the war and conclude peace with Germany and its allies. This Leninist line for the immediate conclusion of peace proceeded from the main and decisive task of the proletariat in that period: to win a breathing space in order to preserve and strengthen the conquered dictatorship of the proletariat and organize socialist construction.

Bukharin and his group (Pyatakov, Radek and others), not believing in the internal forces of the revolution, decisively opposed peace and advocated a "revolutionary war", which would inevitably have led to the ruin of the Soviet power. Bukharin's group, calling themselves "left communists", proceeding from the Trotskyist denial of the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single country, stated that the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia would not hold out, that to strengthen the socialist revolution in Russia is impossible without the prior victory of the socialist revolution in the West.

In their theses, Bukharin's group wrote: "No socialist revolution can be victorious without going beyond national limits, without turning into an international socialist revolution." Trotsky and Bukharin believed that without the West European revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat would inevitably degenerate and perish. Therefore, not believing in the possibility of preserving the dictatorship of the proletariat and building socialism in our country, Bukharin tried to impose on the party the capitulatory line of "revolutionary war", which led at that period to the inevitable defeat and ruin of Soviet power.

Exposing the Trotskyist stance of Bukharin's group of "left communists", Lenin wrote that the policy of "revolutionary war" "would perhaps meet the needs of a person in the desire for a beautiful, effective and bright, but completely failed to take into account the objective correlation of class forces and material factors in the experienced moment of the beginning socialist revolution."[106]

Opposing the immediate conclusion of peace, Bukharin denied the possibility of a German offensive, thereby sowing illusions about the kindness of German imperialism and objectively helping it.

Lenin and Stalin decisively warned against these illusions. The Trotskyists and Bukharinites in January 1918 disrupted the peace business, the Germans went on the offensive, and we had to sign harsher peace terms.

"Facts say," wrote Lenin, "that Bukharin denied the possibility of a German offensive, sowed illusions, which in fact... helped German imperialists. The harsher peace terms proposed by the German command in March 1918 resulted because alongside with Trotsky... our woe-left Bukharins and Co."[107]

To get a breathing space — such is the central point of Bolshevik tactics in this period. The working class and its party use the breathing space to crush the Russian bourgeoisie, carry

---

[106] Lenin, *Theses on the Question of the Immediate Conclusion of a Separate and Annexationist Peace*, Works, vol. XXII, p. 196.
[107] Lenin, *A Serious Lesson and a Serious Responsibility*, Works, vol. XXII, p. 308.

out the socialist reorganization of the country and create a mighty Red Army.

Bukharin's group wrote that it considers Soviet power formal and ready to go to its elimination.

This monstrous assertion of the formal, so-called meaning of Soviet power was the result of the fact that the "left communists", like the Trotskyists, were defeatists in relation to the Soviet motherland.

It is necessary to treat the revolutionary war and defense capability seriously — taught Lenin and Stalin. Lenin wrote: "We are defenders now, from November 7 (October 25) 1917, we are for the defense of the fatherland from this day. For we have proved in practice our break with imperialism. We tore up and published the secret imperialist treaties-plots. We overthrew our bourgeoisie. We gave freedom to the peoples oppressed by us. We gave land to the people and workers' control. We are for the defense of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Russia."

But precisely because we are for the defense of the fatherland, we demand serious attention to the defense capability and combat training of the country. We declare a ruthless war against revolutionary phraseology about revolutionary war. It must be prepared for lengthily, seriously, starting with the economic recovery of the country, with the laying of railways (for without them modern war is the emptiest phrase), with the

restoration everywhere and of the strictest revolutionary discipline and self-discipline.[108]

The Trotskyists and Bukharinite group, actually fulfilling the tasks of the Russian and international bourgeoisie, pushed Soviet power to war with the German imperialism armed to the teeth, knowing full well that in such a war we will suffer defeat.

In that period we did not yet have an army. The old army had to be demobilized as soon as possible. Soldiers must return to the village, taste the land that the October Revolution gave, and then they will protect the land and Soviet power, which ensured these conquests.

Lenin and Stalin pointed out that the continuation of the war entailed the inevitable rupture with the peasantry. The Bukharin group, like the Trotskyists, called for a rupture with the peasantry. In No. 1 of the newspaper *Kommunist*, the organ of the Bukharin group, on March 19, 1918, in the editorial article "Politics of Concessions and the Proletariat" it was recorded: "The further policy of the Russian proletariat must less and less be built on its alliance with the Russian peasantry, its reliable ally is now only the international proletariat." Here is a striking example of the Trotskyist denial of the alliance with the peasantry, Trotskyist disbelief in the internal forces of the revolution.

Opposing Lenin and Stalin, pursuing a Trotskyist policy, Bukharin actually helped the bourgeoisie. "If one maneuvers in

[108] Lenin, *A Heavy, but Necessary Lesson*, Works, vol. XXII, p. 291.

the Bukharin way," wrote Lenin, "then one can ruin the revolution nicely."[109]

The Brest-Litovsk peace was signed, despite the desperate resistance of the Trotskyists and Bukharinites. The signing of peace, the revolutionary exit from the war saved the Soviet Republic.

Not agreeing with the decision of the CC, and then with the decision of the VII Party Congress (March 1918) confirming the Leninist-Stalinist policy of peace, Bukharin at the head of his faction sought to disrupt the policy pursued by Lenin and Stalin. Bukharin and his anti-party group published a factional organ in which they continued to stubbornly insist on "revolutionary war."

To complicate the situation of the party and government, the Bukharinites (like the Trotskyists) fled from responsible party and Soviet posts. The Bukharin group went on a split of the party. It was blocked with the party of Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, who also occupied a defeatist position in relation to Soviet power. Bukharin in a number of articles published in their factional organ *Kommunist*, slandered the leader of the Bolsheviks — Lenin. Lenin's policy of consistent struggle for peace, for strengthening the Soviet country — the stronghold of the world revolution — Bukharin called "opportunistic."

Bukharin had the audacity to compare Lenin with Kautsky, who, as is known, betrayed the cause of the working class. It

[109] Lenin, *Seventh Congress of the RCP(b)*, Works, vol. XXII, p. 335.

should not be forgotten that later, in 1923, with the same slander acted Trotsky and his disciples, a significant part of which in 1918 was in the Bukharin anti-party group.

The struggle of the opponents of peace against Lenin and our party reached such fierceness that the Left SRs, supported by the Bukharin group of "left communists", began to plan a coup d'état. In March 1918 at the III Petrograd Conference, the Left SRs threatened to disrupt Brest, which in essence meant a threat of armed struggle against Soviet power. To disrupt the peace business, the SRs wanted to arrest Lenin and make chairman of the Sovnarkom the "left communist", companion-in-arms of Bukharin, now shot one of the ringleaders of the fascist gang of Trotskyists — Pyatakov. With this proposal, the Left SRs turned to Bukharin. The fact of these criminal negotiations with the Left SRs Bukharin then hid from the party.

Later Comrade Stalin wrote: "Never, it seems, inside-party struggle among the Bolsheviks did not reach such fierceness as in this period, in the period of the Brest Peace. It is known, for example, that the left communists, who constituted a separate fraction at that time, went to such fierceness, that they seriously talked about replacing the then existing Sovnarkom with a new Sovnarkom of new people entering the composition of the fraction of left communists."[110]

In the spring of 1918, Soviet power received a "breathing space". Lenin developed a plan for economic construction. From the "Red Guard attack" on capital, which was necessary

[110] Stalin, *Coll. "On the Opposition"*, p. 37.

in the first months of Soviet power, because capital stubbornly and in a military way resisted, and it had to be subdued in a military way, in the spring of 1918 it was necessary to move to accounting, control, organization of socialist production.

The Leninist plan of socialist construction meant the struggle for high labor productivity, for the slogan "catch up and surpass" in technical and economic relation the advanced countries of capitalism, for building in the Land of Soviets the foundation of a socialist economy.

Lenin attached great importance to socialist emulation.

"Our task now, when the socialist government is in power, is to organize emulation."[111]

Agitation for emulation, for a conscious attitude to labor — is only one side of the task in the struggle against indiscipline, slackness. For all this, firm power is needed. The struggle against the influence of petty-bourgeois elements on the working class, said Lenin, cannot be conducted only by persuasion, the struggle must be conducted by persuasion and coercion.

Lenin wrote: "It is necessary at the same time, going to increase labor productivity, to take into account the features of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, which require, on the one hand, that the foundations of the socialist organization of emulation be laid, and on the other hand, require the application of coercion, so that the slogan of the

[111] Lenin, *How to Organize Emulation?*, Works, vol. XXII, p. 158.

dictatorship of the proletariat is not desecrated by the gelatinous state of proletarian power."[112]

Incorrigible wreckers, truants, hooligans — to court. To ensure order, discipline, it is necessary to create in factories, plants, at all enterprises of the proletarian state one-man management. "It must be learned," Lenin pointed out, "to combine together the stormy, beating spring flood, breaking out of all banks, meeting democratic spontaneity of the working masses with iron discipline during work, with unquestioning obedience — to the will of one person, the Soviet leader, during work."[113]

This great plan of socialist construction, outlined by Lenin, proceeded from the Leninist theory of building socialism in our country. But for the implementation of this plan, it was required that the working class, which showed heroism and self-sacrifice in the struggle for power, also showed heroism in raising labor productivity, in the organization of socialist economy. Lenin wrote: "We, the party of Bolsheviks, have convinced Russia. We have won back Russia — from the rich for the poor, from exploiters for the working people. We must now govern Russia."

Against the petty-bourgeois element — this enemy threatening Soviet power, Lenin mobilized the party of Bolsheviks.

At the time when the entire party met with enthusiasm the Leninist plan of socialist construction, the Bukharin group — "left communists", expressing the influence of the petty-bourgeois element, opposed the Leninist plan. In its struggle

---

[112] Lenin, *Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power*, Works, vol. XXII, p. 455.
[113] Ibid., p. 464.

against the Leninist economic plan, the Bukharin group (Bukharin, Pyatakov and others) proceeded from the Menshevik-Trotskyist platform of denying the possibility of building socialism in our country.

"If there is no socialist revolution in the West, it is impossible to think about socialist construction in our country," the "left communists" stated.

"Doomed in advance to failure are attempts to organize 'socialism on the side' from the high road of the European revolution," — was written in the Bukharinite journal *Kommunist* No. 1 of March 5, 1918. The anti-proletarian Trotskyist-Menshevik platform — such was the ideology of the "left communists."

"The state of affairs with the socialist revolution in Russia must be made the basis of any definition of the international tasks of Soviet power," — said Lenin. Against this fought the Trotskyists and Bukharinites. The Bukharin group denied the socialist character of the October Revolution, the necessity of strengthening Soviet power and victorious socialist construction.

"Left communists" opposed one-man management, accounting, control, against raising socialist labor discipline. In their theses "On the Current Moment" the Bukharin group slandered the working class, saying that to raise discipline means to "enslave" the working class. "Left communists" defended petty-bourgeois license and slackness. They wrote that the introduction of piece-rate wages systems means that we will have a dictatorship over the proletariat. This position was

defended by Mensheviks, SRs and other counter-revolutionary parties.

Lenin emphasized that the complete coincidence of the views of "left communists", their attacks against the plan of socialist construction with counter-revolutionary attacks on this plan from the side of the Mensheviks, in particular the Menshevik Isuv. In the article "On 'Left-Wing' Infantilism and Petty-Bourgeoisness" Lenin wrote: "Here is the most striking proof that the 'lefts' fell into a trap, succumbed to the provocation of Isuvs and other agents of capitalism... Such speeches, as the cited thesis of the 'lefts', are the greatest disgrace and complete renunciation of communism in practice, a complete transition to the side of precisely the petty bourgeoisie."[114]

The use of state capitalism by the proletarian state was regarded by the "left communists" as capitulation to the bourgeoisie, as an agreement with the bourgeoisie. Meanwhile, state capitalism implemented during that period by the proletarian state in a country where the petty-bourgeois element predominated was a step forward to socialism. Small-scale commodity and capitalist production, eluding accounting and control, — here is the main enemy of socialism in that period. Exposing the harmful anti-proletarian positions of "left communists" on economic questions, Lenin wrote: "Precisely because from Russia's present economic position it is impossible to move forward without passing through what is common and state capitalism and socialism (all-people's accounting and control), to frighten others and oneself with

[114] Lenin, *On "Left-Wing" Infantilism and Petty-Bourgeoisness*, Works, vol. XXII, p. 524.

'evolution towards state capitalism' (*Kommunist* No. 1, p. 8, col. 1) is sheer theoretical nonsense. This means to roam and spread thoughts 'aside' from the real path of 'evolution', not to understand this path; in practice this is equivalent to dragging back to small-proprietor capitalism."[115]

The Leninist directive on the necessity of attracting bourgeois specialists to work at enterprises was regarded by "left communists" as a "deal with Russian capitalists." They in general were opponents of the use of bourgeois specialists by the proletarian state.

In the article "Economic Notes" published on April 20, 1918 in the newspaper of the "left communists", it was said that instead of using bourgeois specialists by the Soviet government, these specialists use Soviet power in the interests of the bourgeoisie. In response to this Lenin wrote:

"And when I read in the left communists the ironic words: it is still unknown who uses whom, it becomes strange to me their shortsightedness. Of course, after the seizure of power in October and after the victorious campaign against the bourgeoisie from October to April, we can doubt who uses whom — the workers organizers of the trust, or dividing and milking the workers, if it were so, then we need to pack our bags and clear out to our own place, giving way to Milyukovs and Martovs. But this is not so. And the conscious worker will not believe, and the petty-bourgeois fear is ridiculous; they know that socialism begins where more large-scale production

[115] Ibid., p. 518.

begins, that this cause is learned by merchants and money-changers from their own experience."[116]

Lenin was confident that the proletariat, having cast off the power of the bourgeoisie, will be able to use the experience and knowledge of bourgeois specialists and subordinate them to its proletarian leadership.

Under "left" phrases about "pure" socialism, in the disrespectful to accounting and control was hidden the defense of the petty-bourgeois element. The refusal to understand the "mosaic nature", multi-formity of the then economy of Russia, the desire to "leap over" through the small-peasant character of the country meant the Trotskyist line for the rupture with the peasantry. The position of the Bukharin group was explained by the fact that it did not believe in the alliance of the proletariat with the working peasantry, did not believe in the victory of socialism in our country.

The hostile attitude of the petty bourgeois to the proletarian state appeared also in the question of the state. Bukharin placed an equal sign between state capitalism under the conditions of the dominance of capitalism and state capitalism being under the direct control of the proletarian state.

The entire position of the "left communists" on economic questions proceeded from the denial of the proletarian state and the transitional period. The leader of the "left communists"

---

[116] Lenin, *Meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee April 29 1918*, Works, vol. XXII, pp. 484–485.

Bukharin continued to defend his semi-anarchist view of the state. In the materials for the preparation of the brochure "State and Revolution" still in early 1917, Lenin, subjecting Bukharin's semi-anarchist views to criticism, wrote: "What distinguishes the anarchists from us is (a) the use of the state now and (b) during the revolution of the proletariat ('dictatorship of the proletariat') — points most important for practice right now. (And Bukharin forgot!)"[117]

In 1918 Lenin exposed the anti-Bolshevik review by Bukharin of the book "State and Revolution". Lenin noted that Bukharin enthusiastically accepts everything said regarding the proletariat to the bourgeois state, and completely hushes up the tasks that faced the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat. Bukharin "wrote about what — says Lenin — is already embodied in Soviet organizations, and was silent about what concerns accounting, control, discipline."[118] Here in the denial of the tasks of strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat and the struggle against the petty-bourgeois element, against capitalism, for the victory of socialism was expressed the petty-bourgeois nature of the Bukharin group. "They," wrote Lenin, "reveal their petty-bourgeoisness precisely in that they do not see the petty-bourgeois element as the main enemy of socialism with us."[119]

Taking a defeatist line in relation to the dictatorship of the proletariat, showing Trotskyist disbelief in the victory of

---

[117] *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, p. 257.
[118] Lenin, *Meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee April 29 1918*, Works, vol. XXII, p. 493.
[119] Lenin, *On "Left-Wing" Infantilism and Petty-Bourgeoisness*, Works, vol. XXII, p. 513.

socialism, "left communists" were the most typical representatives of the "frenzied" petty bourgeois. The social source of "left communism" Lenin considered the petty bourgeois "who went mad from the horrors of war, from sudden ruin, from the unheard-of torments of hunger and destruction, who hysterically rushes, looking for an exit and salvation, fluctuating between trust in the proletariat and support of it, on the one hand, a fit of despair — on the other."[120]

"Left communists" were smashed. The party was rallied around Lenin and Stalin. The implementation of the Leninist plan of socialist construction was hindered by the started civil war war, which disrupted the "breathing space". The significance of the Leninist plan theoretically and practically is enormous. In this brilliant plan Lenin anticipated in main features the New Economic Policy introduced in 1921.

In the summer of 1918 the civil war unfolded. German troops occupied Ukraine. Throughout the country, kulak counter-revolution raised its head, helping White Guards organize their forces to fight Soviet power. In industrial regions, a shortage of grain was felt. The kulak sabotaged the food procurement measures of the Soviet government.

The party carried out the grain monopoly and established food dictatorship. Lenin and Stalin were directly engaged also in the food question. The opportunist Rykov spoke on May 9, 1918 at a meeting of the Sovnarkom against the food dictatorship,

[120] Lenin, *Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power*, Works, vol. XXII, p. 468.

which was in fact an attempt to hinder the struggle of Soviet power against kulak counter-revolution.

IV

In March 1919 at the VIII Party Congress, among other most important questions, a new party program was discussed. With a report on the program of the party delivered Lenin. Unlike the old program, adopted by the II Congress of the RSDLP, the new draft program gave not only an assessment of industrial capitalism, but also an assessment of imperialism and the unfolding socialist revolution. In the program program also was given an assessment of Soviet power as the state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the experience of the first steps of socialist construction was summarized.

In the program commission of the congress and at the congress itself, there was a struggle of Lenin against Bukharin, Pyatakov, who sought to push opportunist provisions into the program.

Bukharin proposed to throw out of the general part of the program the analysis of pre-monopoly forms of economy (simple commodity economy, industrial capitalism), limiting himself only to the consideration of imperialism. Bukharin continued to persist in his anti-Marxist theory of "pure imperialism", criticized by Lenin still in the years of war. Yet again exposing Bukharin's opportunist conception of imperialism, Lenin pointed out that "pure imperialism" never existed anywhere and cannot exist, that everywhere along with monopolies exist other, lower forms of economy. In such a peasant country like Russia, the predominance of simple

commodity economy was especially clearly visible, and this required of the victorious Russian proletariat and its party large and serious work on the restructuring of peasant small-commodity economy into socialist. Denying the significance in the economy of the country of simple commodity economy, Bukharin thereby denied the tasks of the socialist restructuring of small-commodity economy.

Lenin wrote: "if we had before us integral capitalism, which through and through remodeled capitalism, our task would have been a hundred thousand times easier. This gave such a system when everything was subordinated to single finance capital. Then it remained only to remove the top and transfer the rest into the hands of the proletariat. This would be extraordinarily pleasant, but this does not exist in reality... In reality there is a huge hotbed of old capitalism."[121]

To draw up the program according to Bukharin, proceeding from his theory of "pure imperialism", meant a complete ignoring of real reality and first of all ignoring the middle peasant as the bearer of simple commodity economy. Lenin taught Bukharin: "In reality, where could the middle peasant come from in the era of pure-imperialist capitalism? Indeed, even in countries of pure capitalist economy he was not there. If we are to decide our attitude to this as almost a medieval phenomenon (to the middle peasant), standing exclusively on the standpoint of imperialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, we will not have ends meet at all, and we will break our heads a lot. If we are also to change our attitude to the

[121] Lenin, *VIII Congress of the RCP(b)*, Works, vol. XXIV, p. 133.

middle peasant, then in the theoretical part you will take the trouble to say where he came from, what he is. He is a small commodity producer. Here is the ABC of capitalism that needs to be said, because we have not yet gotten out of this ABC. To wave this aside and say: 'Why should we deal with the ABC, when we have studied finance capital!' — is extremely frivolous."[122]

Bukharin's theory of "pure imperialism", which denied the significance of small-commodity production, led to the Trotskyist ignoring of the peasantry.

Together with this, when discussing the program at the VIII Congress, Bukharin denied the danger of the growth of capitalist elements from small-proprietor peasant economy. Here lie the roots of the right-opportunist theory of "peaceful growing of the kulak into socialism."

During the discussion of program questions, Bukharin spoke out against Lenin and Stalin also on the national question. In the party program is formulated: "the right of nations to self-determination up to state secession." The correct resolution of the national question played a huge role in our victories on the fronts of the civil war. At the VIII Congress of the party against the Bolshevik slogan of "the right of nations to self-determination up to state secession" spoke Pyatakov and Bukharin, defending anti-Leninist positions on the national question. Bukharin stated: "The concept of a nation includes all classes of a given society. Therefore, since we are now pursuing a course towards the proletarian dictatorship... we

[122] Ibid., pp. 134–135.

cannot put forward the slogan of the right of nations to self-determination." Bukharin, Pyatakov put forward the slogan "self-determination of the working people within each nation." Lenin, exposing these opportunists who tried to instill bourgeois views on the national question into our party, emphasized that Bukharin, Pyatakov refused to see all the complexity of the differentiation of classes within the nation, all the complexity of the process of secession of the proletariat from the bourgeoisie within the oppressed nation.

The fuller the self-determination of the nation occurs, the sooner the proletariat will separate from the bourgeoisie within each nation, fully and to the end realizing the opposition of its class interests to the interests of "its" bourgeoisie.

"Each nation," said Lenin, "must receive the right to self-determination, and this promotes the self-determination of the working people."[123] Until national oppression is finished off, semi-proletarians feel themselves bound to their bourgeoisie. If a nation is liberated and there is no national oppression, the class struggle by the proletariat against the national bourgeoisie unfolds wider and working people within the nation easier and faster separate from "their" bourgeoisie. The path to this lies through the self-determination of the whole nation. The program states: "At the forefront is placed the policy of rapprochement of proletarians and semi-proletarians of different nationalities for joint revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of landowners and bourgeoisie..." In the question of who is the bearer of the nation to secession, the WCP stands on

[123] Lenin, *VIII Congress of the RCP(b)*, Works, vol. XXIV, p. 133.

a historically class point of view, considering at what stage of its historical development a given nation stands: on the path from feudalism to bourgeois democracy or from bourgeois democracy to Soviet or proletarian democracy, etc.

In any case, from the side of the proletariat of those nations which were nations-oppressors, special caution and special attention to the remnants of national feelings in the working masses of oppressed or disenfranchised nations is necessary. Only under such a policy is the creation of conditions for truly solid, voluntary unity of nationally diverse elements of the international proletariat possible, as the experience of uniting a number of national Soviet republics around Soviet Russia showed.

Bukharin, speaking out against the slogan "right of nations to self-determination up to secession", simultaneously spoke out against the slogan "defense of the fatherland." Bukharin did not recognize that this slogan "defense of the fatherland" after the conquest of power by the working class will become the sacred duty of every working person of the Soviet country.

The Leninist-Stalinist resolution of the national question was of enormous importance in strengthening the alliance of the working class with the peasantry of formerly oppressed nationalities. Comrade Stalin wrote: "The revolution in Russia would not have been victorious, and Kolchak with Denikin would not have been smashed, if the Russian proletariat had not had the sympathy and support of the oppressed peoples of the former Russian Empire."[124]

[124] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 49, 10th ed.

Opposing the Bolshevik slogan "right of nations to self-determination", Bukharin and Pyatakov actually supported great-power chauvinism. The VIII Congress of the Party gave a resolute rebuff to the anti-Marxist, chauvinist views of Bukharin.

In 1919 in the brochure "Class Struggle and Revolution in Russia" Bukharin defended the Trotskyist proposition about the impossibility of the victory of socialist revolution and the construction of socialism in our country. Bukharin wrote: "The proletariat cannot remain within the limits of property relations of bourgeois society. It goes to power, to socialism. However, this task, which is 'placed on the agenda' and in Russia, cannot be resolved 'within national borders'." Here the working class runs into an impassable wall which can be broken through only by the ram of the international workers' revolution.

In 1920 Bukharin wrote the book "Economics of the Transition Period", in which he tried to show how capitalist society turns into communist. Originally Bukharin dedicated this book to Lenin, but when Lenin familiarized himself with the contents of the book, he refused this dedication, and by Lenin's order it was removed from the book.

On the margins of this book by Bukharin, Lenin noted anti-Marxist provisions, especially on the peasant and class struggle questions. Lenin and Stalin repeatedly pointed out that individual peasant economy breeds capitalism. Bukharin did not agree with this. He wrote in the book "Economics of the Transition Period": "The dictatorship of the proletariat is inevitably accompanied... by struggle between the organizing tendency of the proletariat and the commodity-anarchist

tendency of the peasantry." Underlining these places, Lenin on the margins of Bukharin's book makes the following sharp remark: "it should have been said: between the socialist tendency of the proletariat and the commodity-capitalist tendency of the peasantry. Substituting here the word organizing is a theoretical untruth, a step backward from Karl Marx to Louis Blanc."[125]

As is known, Louis Blanc was a petty-bourgeois socialist in the first half of the 19th century in France. Louis Blanc thought "socialism" on the basis of small-proprietor economy. He stated that it is enough to organize small commodity producers into cooperatives for marketing and purchase, to overcome private capital in circulation, and then capitalism in general will be destroyed. The main evil Louis Blanc saw in the existence of the market, and not in the presence of private ownership of the instruments of production.

Lenin even before the revolution repeatedly noted that Bukharin is not a consistent Marxist, that he is under the influence of Bogdanov, who in questions of philosophy defended idealism, and in politics defended bourgeois views. Bogdanov was expelled from the Bolshevik party back in June 1909. In the resolution of the Bolshevik center in June 1909 it was stated that Bogdanov's views are idealism and priest-serving, and therefore the Bolsheviks have no path with Bogdanov and his supporters. Bukharin even in pre-revolution years and in subsequent times was under the direct influence of Bogdanov and departed from Marxism to his bourgeois

[125] *Lenin Miscellany XI*, p. 368.

theories. Regarding Bukharin's book "Economics of the Transition Period" (1920) Lenin again notes that it is not Marxism, but Bogdanovism, and since Bukharin was not a consistent Marxist, but a scholastic, eclectic, his political line was therefore non-revolutionary, anti-Bolshevik.

Somewhat later, in 1922, Lenin gave the following characteristic of Bukharin as a theoretician: "his theoretical views can be attributed with very great doubt to fully Marxist ones, because there is something scholastic in them (he never studied and, I think, never fully understood dialectics)."[126]

In April 1920, the IX Congress of the party took place, which along with military questions discussed a single economic plan for restoring the ruined national economy in the conditions of the still continuing civil war.

The Leninist line in the economic construction of the party had to be implemented in a ruthless struggle with opposition elements inside the party — with the Trotskyists and the anti-party group of "democratic centralism." Leaders of this group — Sapronov, Maximovsky, Osinsky and others were participants in Bukharin's group of "left communists" in 1918.

The entire platform of the "decists" was permeated with overtly Menshevik views on party and Soviet construction. They opposed the leading role of the party in the country, against the alienation of the local Soviet apparatus from the leadership of the central power; they insisted on the Trotskyist requirement of freedom of factions and groupings. The entire platform of

[126] Quoted from *Problems of Leninism*, p. 272, 10th ed.

the "decists" inevitably led to the Menshevik denial of the party and the dictatorship of the proletariat. "Decists" were direct continuers of the views of Bukharin's group of "left communists", reflecting the dissatisfaction of petty-bourgeois, kulak elements with the regime of the dictatorship of the working class.

At the IX Congress of the RCP(b) Sapronov and other "decists" particularly sharply opposed one-man management in administration, i.e., against the principle defended by Lenin. The introduction of one-man management in administration dealt a strong blow to petty-bourgeois slackness; therefore against one-man management, for petty-bourgeois collegiality in administration spoke the Sapronovites. With the Sapronovites blocked against one-man management, for collegiality Tomsky and Rykov, who in the future became leaders of the right capitulators, champions of the restoration of capitalism.

Tomsky already at that time opposed Bolshevik organizational principles, he insisted that Bolshevik fractions (now party groups) in local soviets of trade unions be subordinate not to their territorial party organizations, but to the fraction of the AUCCTU (All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions). Tomsky thereby wanted to make the AUCCTU fraction a special anti-party center opposed to the CC of the party. The Central Committee of the party rapped Tomsky's knuckles, and his anti-party attempt failed.

By the end of the civil war, in late 1920, under the leadership of Lenin was developed a grandiose plan for the electrification of the country — the GOELRO plan (State Commission for

Electrification of Russia). The Leninist idea of electrification of the entire country was warmly supported by Comrade Stalin. In a famous letter to Lenin in early 1921 Comrade Stalin exposes Trotsky and Rykov, who were opponents of the Leninist plan of electrification of the country. Comrade Stalin wrote to Lenin: "Remember last year's 'plan' of Trotsky (his theses) of 'economic revival' of Russia on the basis of mass application to the remnants of pre-war industry of unqualified peasant-worker mass (labor army). What poverty, what backwardness compared to the GOELRO plan! Medieval artisan, imagining himself an Ibsen hero, called upon to 'save' Russia with old-fashioned saga... Or else: philistine 'realism' (in reality Manilovism) of Rykov, still 'criticizing' GOELRO and up to his ears in routine."[127]

V

In late 1920 and early 1921, on the eve of the transition from war communism to the new economic policy, an acute discussion took place in the party on the role and tasks of trade unions.

This was one of the most difficult periods in the life of the Soviet republic: it was necessary to move from war to peaceful construction, strengthen the dictatorship of the working class and in a new way, in new conditions, strengthen the economic alliance with the middle peasant. For this it was necessary to restructure the work of the party and all mass organizations. The Trotskyists did not recognize the necessity of strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat, the alliance of

[127] Stalin, *Collection of Articles for the Fiftieth Birthday*, p. 33.

the working class with the middle peasant, denied the necessity of transition from war communism to the new economic policy, denied the necessity of restructuring the work of all organizations. Trotsky again began the struggle against the party. At the signal of Trotsky against the party spoke the anarcho-syndicalist "workers' opposition" (Shlyapnikov, Kollontai, Medvedev and others). As Trotsky's assistant in the struggle against Lenin and the party acted Bukharin.

Trotsky spoke at the trade union conference in November 1920 with the proposal to "statize" trade unions, "shake up" the leadership of trade unions from above, "wipe with sandpile" trade union cadres, etc. The Trotskyists believed that trade unions as mass organizations of the working class had outlived themselves, they needed to be merged with the state apparatus. Lenin pointed out that the views of Trotsky were hostile to the very essence of the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The party fought against the Trotskyists also on the question of "how to master the mass, in the approach to it, in connection with it." This was noted by Comrade Stalin in the article "Our Disagreements", published on January 19, 1921 in *Pravda*.

"Our disagreements," wrote Comrade Stalin, "lie in the area of questions on methods of strengthening labor discipline in the working class, on methods of approach to the working masses, drawn into the business of reviving industry, on ways of

turning the present weak trade unions into powerful, truly production unions capable of reviving our industry."[128]

Instead of the Trotskyist method of coercion, Lenin and Stalin spoke about the method of persuasion as the main method in the work of the party among workers and working people.

During the discussion on trade unions, Bukharin formed his own faction, which initially tried to occupy an intermediate ("buffer") position, but in fact Bukharin fought against Lenin, supporting Trotsky.

At the plenum of the Central Committee of the party on December 7, 1920, when Lenin and Stalin proposed to condemn the bureaucratic methods of jerking trade unions, which were applied by the Trotskyists, which led to a split in the Central Council (Central Committee of Transport Workers), Bukharin occupied a "buffer" position, supporting in essence Trotsky. Lenin wrote on this occasion: "There resulted in the Central Committee porridge and commotion; this is the first time in the history of our party during the revolution, and this is dangerous. The nail of it was that there resulted a split, resulted the 'buffer' group of Bukharin, Preobrazhensky and Serebryakov, which did more harm and muddled more than anyone."[129]

The factional struggle of Trotskyists against the party, supported by the "buffer" group of Bukharin, led to the fact that disagreements on the role of trade unions went beyond the CC. On December 25, 1920, Trotsky published his factional

[128] Lenin, *On Trade Unions*, Works, vol. XXVI, p. 68.
[129] Lenin, *On Trade Unions*, Works, vol. XXVI, p. 75.

brochure-platform. At the joint meeting of the fraction of the RCP(b) of the VIII Congress of Soviets, the AUCCTU and MGPS on December 30, 1920, Trotsky and Bukharin publicly spoke against Lenin. Not coincidentally, Lenin in his brochures unites Trotsky and Bukharin: "On Trade Unions and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin", "Once Again on Trade Unions and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin."

Bukharin boasted of his "buffer" position, he said that when a train is threatened with wreck, a buffer is a very good and necessary thing. Bukharin's "buffer" helped Trotsky fight against Lenin and the Bolshevik party. Exposing Bukharin's "buffer" position, Lenin wrote: "If the 'buffer' is dialectical, it with all its power attacks every mistake which it perceives on both sides or on all sides. This is what Bukharin does not do. He does not even try to analyze Trotsky's brochure from the point of view of the policy of rummaging. He simply is silent about it. Is it not remarkable that such a performance by the buffer of its role causes laughter in everyone?"[130]

Bukharin not only supported Trotsky, but he also put forward anarcho-syndicalist proposals that candidacies for the management of trade unions be made mandatory for corresponding economic bodies. According to Bukharin, not the party should nominate candidates for leading economic bodies, but trade unions. This is anarcho-syndicalism.

Lenin considered the theses of "Bukharin and Co." the "height of ideological decay." Bukharin's syndicalist thesis means, as Lenin pointed out, "complete rupture with communism and

[130] Lenin, *Once Again on Trade Unions*, Works, vol. XXVI, p. 133.

transition to the position of syndicalism. This is, in essence, a repetition of Shlyapnikov's slogan "to make the state go into trade unions"; this is the transfer of the apparatus of the Supreme Council of the National Economy, in parts, into the hands of corresponding trade unions. If trade unions, i.e., non-party workers, appoint (mandatory candidacies) the management of industry, then what is the party for?" And logically, theoretically, and practically what Bukharin reached means a split of the party, rather: the rupture of syndicalists with the party.

Thus, in Bukharin's "buffer" position, Trotskyism merged with anarcho-syndicalism. This anarcho-syndicalist digression by Bukharin was not accidental, since he already in the years of imperialist war (and in subsequent years), speaking against the dictatorship of the proletariat, defended anarchist views on the state.

Lenin said that Bukharin does not understand materialist dialectics, that in all his reasoning is "dead and empty eclecticism."[131] Thus, for example, Bukharin contrasted the political and economic approach to trade unions. Lenin wrote on this occasion: "The theoretical essence of the mistake which t. Bukharin makes here consists in that he replaces the dialectical correlation between politics and economy (which Marxism teaches) with eclecticism. 'And the one, and the other' — here is the theoretical position of Bukharin. This is eclecticism. Dialectics requires comprehensive consideration of

[131] Lenin, *Crisis of the Party*, Works, vol. XXVI, p. 92.

relations in their concrete development, and not pulling out a little piece of one, a little piece of the other."[132]

Speaking at the discussion on December 30, 1920, Bukharin, developing his point of view, was ready to agree with Lenin that "trade unions are a school of communism", but immediately agreed with the Trotskyist provision that "trade unions are an apparatus for managing production."

"This is dead and empty eclecticism," Lenin answered Bukharin. "Therefore, the theses of the Bukharin group are purely eclectic trash. Bukharin fundamentally incorrectly, eclectically places the whole question of the correlation between 'school' and 'apparatus'."[133] Showing concretely with figures what this means, Lenin said that out of 6 million trade union members only 1.5% of working representatives of trade unions manage production, and 98.5% learn and will long learn conscious and active participation in the arrangement of the national economy.

Lenin wrote: "trade unions are a school of administrative-technical management of production. Not 'on the one hand' — school, and on the other — something else, but from all sides, under this dispute, under this formulation by Trotsky, trade unions are essentially a school, a school of unification, a school of solidarity, a school of protecting their interests, a school of economic management, a school of management. Instead in order to understand and correct this fundamental error...

---

[132] Lenin, *Once Again on Trade Unions*, Works, vol. XXVI, p. 136.
[133] Ibid., p. 132.

Trotsky... Bukharin gave a ridiculous correction: on the one hand, on the other hand[134].

And on the examples of the role of trade unions in this most responsible period of transition from war communism to NEP, Lenin once again confirms that Bukharin is not a consistent Marxist, that he has "theoretical falsity", "muddle", "forgetting of Marxism".

Bukharin with his "buffer" group, as Lenin pointed out, did great harm to the party and was an accomplice of the "worst and most harmful factionalism". Bukharin ended this period by completely uniting with Trotsky's group, entering his fraction and at the X Congress in March 1921 voting against Lenin and Stalin on the theses of Trotsky condemned by the congress.

In Lenin's resolution "On Party Unity" there was a paragraph which proposed that the CC expel from the party those CC members who would conduct criminal anti-party struggle against the party. This paragraph applied also to Bukharin.

Bukharin denied the Leninist understanding of NEP as the policy of the proletarian state, ensuring the overcoming of capitalist elements in the country, ensuring the building of socialism. Lenin said at the All-Russian Party Conference in May 1921 that we need such an alliance of the working class with the peasantry, which would ensure the socialist restructuring of the peasant, ensure the destruction of classes. In the brochure "On the Food Tax" Lenin wrote that Soviet power will facilitate the gradual unification of the least

[134] Lenin, *Once Again on Trade Unions*, Works, vol. XXVI, p. 136.

profitable and most backward small peasant farms into large socialist farms.

Bukharin did not agree with these Leninist provisions. In the article "The New Course of Economic Policy" (1921) opposing Lenin, he wrote that he considers only petty-bourgeois development of agriculture possible. These anti-Leninist views of Bukharin in the period 1920–1921 have a direct bearing on his subsequent struggle against the socialist restructuring of agriculture, have a bearing on his further defense of the kulak.

In the summer of 1922, during the trial of the Right SRs who organized terrorist acts against the leaders of the party and Soviet power, Bukharin and Radek, violating Lenin's directives, conspired with the leaders of the II International that capital punishment would not be applied to the SR-terrorists. Lenin stigmatized the behavior of Bukharin and Radek. In the article "We Paid Too Much" Lenin wrote that Radek and Bukharin "acted incorrectly".

In late 1922 Bukharin together with Sokolnikov opposed Lenin on the question of the monopoly of foreign trade, proposing its partial abolition. The monopoly of foreign trade is one of the most important commanding heights of socialism, and this monopoly of foreign trade helped us create our own large industry. To weaken the monopoly of foreign trade meant to harm the working class, to weaken the positions of socialism and render support to capitalist elements inside the country, render support to the world bourgeoisie.

Bukharin was an opponent of the Leninist-Stalinist policy on the national question.

At the XII Congress of the party (in 1923) Bukharin again spoke against the Leninist-Stalinist policy on the national question. Comrade Stalin in his report at this congress on the national question pointed out the necessity of waging a struggle on two fronts, against great-power chauvinism and local nationalism. Against the Leninist-Stalinist policy on the national question at the XII Congress of the party spoke the group of Georgian deviationists — allies of Trotsky in the struggle against the Bolshevik party (the current counter-revolutionary hireling of fascists Mdivani and others), which led a line towards turning Soviet Georgia into an appendage of the capitalist world, which was against the creation of the USSR and the organization of the Transcaucasian Federation, which defended the position of the chauvinistic Georgian bourgeoisie in relation to the peoples of Transcaucasia (Armenians, Turks, etc.). The Georgian deviationists — allies of Trotsky — were routed.

Bukharin at the XII Congress of the party (in 1923) supported the nationalism of the Georgian deviationists. Bukharin, who for many years fought on the national question against Lenin, at the XII Congress stated that the struggle against the Georgian deviationists was exaggerated, that local nationalism does not represent a serious danger. Comrade Stalin exposed this anti-Leninist position of Bukharin. On the national question it is obligatory to wage a struggle on two fronts, since both deviations represent the ideology of capitalist elements: great-power chauvinism — the ideology of the Russian bourgeoisie, and local nationalism — the ideology of the bourgeoisie of a previously oppressed nation.

VI

After Lenin's death, Bukharin organizes an anti-party "school" to fight the party. "Cadres" of Bukharin: Slepkov — former cadet, Sapozhnikov — former SR, Ayxenvald, Astrov, Maretsky and other figures from a bourgeois background, alien to the working class and the party, wormed their way into the Institute of Red Professors and with Bukharin's help advanced on the ideological front. These degenerate elements, grouped around Bukharin, tried to "popularize" the anti-Marxist views of Bukharin on the state, on the dictatorship of the proletariat and others, smashed by Lenin and the party. These degenerate elements were Bukharinite cadres, traitors, two-facers as well in all their subsequent counter-revolutionary struggle against the Leninist-Stalinist party.

The party, led by Comrade Stalin, firmly and unwaveringly following the Leninist path, strengthening socialist commanding heights, strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat and the alliance of the working class with the middle peasant, prepared conditions for a launched socialist offensive. The party of Lenin and Stalin led the working class and working masses to the building of socialist society. It was necessary to rearm industry, create our own heavy industry, which could ensure the independence of the Soviet homeland. Creating a powerful industry was necessary for the socialist restructuring of small peasant farming, for creating collective and state farms, for strengthening the defense capability of our country.

Only in fierce struggle with class enemies can capitalist elements be liquidated and a socialist society built. The

offensive of socialism could not but evoke fierce resistance of the class enemy, could not but create new difficulties. It was impossible to lead the masses into battle for socialism without routing the saboteurs of the class enemy in the ranks of the party. Waging the struggle on two fronts, the party in 1925–1927 directed its main fire against the Trotskyist-Zinovievite group — restorers of capitalism, which staked on the rupture of the proletariat with the main masses of the peasantry, trying to drag the party off the Leninist-Stalinist path of building socialism in our country.

In December 1925, at the XIV Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) [VKP(b)], the Zinoviev-Kamenev group was exposed, which had slid to the positions of Trotskyism, opposing the building of socialism in our country, defending the program of restoring capitalism. "The historical significance of the XIV Congress of the VKP consists in that," said Comrade Stalin, "it managed to uncover the roots of the errors of the new opposition, cast aside all its disbelief and whinging, clearly and distinctly outlined the path of further struggle for socialism, gave the party the perspective of victory and armed the proletariat with indestructible faith in the victory of socialist construction"[135].

In 1925–1927 the main danger in the party was Trotskyism, against which the main fire was concentrated, but the party even in that period did not cease the struggle against the right deviation, representing the interests of the kulak.

[135] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 150, 10th ed.

The XIV Congress of the party in the resolution on Comrade Stalin's report underlined the necessity of the struggle against restorers of capitalism — Trotskyists, Zinovievites, who denied "the main question of politics in the village, the question of the attitude to the middle peasant — the central financial figure of agriculture, to cooperation, as the main organizational form of the movement of the village to socialism". And the XIV Congress of the party also noted the necessity of the struggle against the right kulak deviation, also leading, though from the other side, to the restoration of capitalism in the country.

"The congress resolutely condemns the deviation consisting in underestimating differentiation in the village, not seeing the dangers associated with the growth of the kulak and various forms of capitalist exploitation, not wishing to understand the full necessity of rebuffing the kulak and limiting his exploitative aspirations, not seeing the obligation for the party of the proletariat to organize and rally the poor and farmhands against the kulak and in the struggle against him"[136].

As an exponent of the right deviation, Bukharin already stood forth then. As early as April 1925, in connection with the decisions of the XIV Party Conference, Bukharin put forward the kulak, restorationist slogan "enrich yourselves", which was a call to unleash capitalism in the country and encourage the kulak. Comrade Stalin at the XIV Party Conference underlined that we have every opportunity for overcoming capitalism and winning socialism in our country, and Bukharin with his slogan "enrich yourselves" called onto the path of restoring capitalism.

[136] *VKP(b) in Resolutions*, part II, p. 51.

In June 1925 Comrade Stalin said that "this slogan is not ours", the slogan "enrich yourselves" represented "in essence a call to restore capitalism, etc." Bukharin's mouthpieces (Sypov and others) said: "Accumulate in good time". The present-day counter-revolutionary, student of Bukharin — Slepkov called for unleashing capitalist elements in the village.

On the initiative of Comrade Stalin, the Party CC condemned even then, in 1925, Bukharin's overtly restorationist slogan.

At the XV Congress of the party, in December 1927, the rout of the Trotskyists was completed, who had slid into the swamp of White Guardism, becoming rabid counter-revolutionaries, and then a gang of hired assassins, the vanguard of international fascism. In the period when the party moved to a launched socialist offensive, the right deviation, which was the agency of the kulak, became the main danger. But concentrating in new conditions the main fire against the right restorers, the party did not leave off the struggle against the remnants of Trotskyism, against the restorers of capitalism from the camp of counter-revolutionary Trotskyist-Zinovievites.

VII

At the XV Congress, in December 1927, Comrade Stalin outlined the tasks of the party: "to expand and strengthen our socialist commanding heights in all branches of the national economy both in town and in the countryside, maintaining a course towards the liquidation of capitalist elements in the national economy"[137].

[137] *Minutes of the XV Congress of the VKP(b)*, p. 52, Partizdat, 1935.

The offensive of socialism against capitalist elements inevitably led to the aggravation of the class struggle in the country. To smash the agency of the class enemy in the party was an indispensable condition for the victory of socialism.

Comrade Stalin pointed out: "it is impossible to wage a real struggle against class enemies, having in the rear their reflection in the party, leaving in the rear people who do not believe in our cause and in every way try to slow down our movement forward"[138].

The leaders of the rights were Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky and others, who again began the struggle against the party of Lenin — Stalin, against the launched socialist offensive, defending the interests of capitalist elements, the interests of the kulak.

Already in the spring of 1928, the working class had to withstand an acute struggle with the kulak on the grain front. The kulak put up resistance to the Soviet power in grain procurement, establishing ties with urban traders, incited the middle peasant not to sell grain to the state, trying in this way to disrupt the deployment of socialist construction. All this threatened the food supply of cities and the Red Army.

Around the grain question, an acute class struggle unfolded in the countryside in this period. To break the resistance of kulaks and profiteer-speculators, emergency measures were carried out (bringing profiteer-speculators to judicial responsibility and confiscating hidden grain reserves from kulaks). Carried out with the broad participation of poor-middle-peasant masses, the

[138] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 417, 10th ed..

emergency measures helped obtain the necessary amount of grain for state needs and were a strong blow to the kulak-dom.

In this period the class struggle was aggravated not only in the countryside. In 1928 a counter-revolutionary wrecking organization in the coal industry was uncovered in the Shakhty district. The wrecking work was paid for by former Donbass factory owners, who fled abroad after the October Revolution, and foreign counter-intelligence agents. Wreckers existed also in a number of other branches of industry. They set as their task — to disrupt socialist construction and thereby help the attack of imperialist governments on the Soviet Union.

"What is the essence of the Shakhty case from the point of view of improving industry? The essence and meaning of the Shakhty case is that we turned out to be almost unarmed and completely backward, hopelessly backward in the matter of providing our industry with a certain minimum of specialists devoted to the cause of the working class. The lesson arising from the Shakhty case is to accelerate the pace of training, creation of a new technical intelligentsia from people of the working class devoted to the cause of socialism and capable of technically leading our socialist industry"[139].

Just in this period of acute class struggle, the right capitulators — champions of the restoration of capitalism — raised a struggle against the general line of the Leninist-Stalinist party, helping class enemies.

---

[139] Stalin, *On the Results of the July Plenum of the CC VKP(b)*, coll. "Lenin and Stalin", vol. III, pp. 303–304.

The right restorers spoke out in defense of the kulak, against the application of emergency measures to him, moreover Bukharin stated that the struggle against the kulak leads supposedly to a "rupture with the middle peasant". Bukharin and Rykov proposed to give complete freedom to trade, not limiting it by state regulation, i.e., proposed to help the strengthening of the privateer-speculator.

In the summer of 1928 one of the rights — Frumkin (then working in Narkomfin) in his letter to the Politburo of the CC demanded full support for Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky's revision of the party's policy. Frumkin proposed to abandon the decisions of the XV Congress on the accelerated offensive against the kulak, to abandon the course on the development of collectivization and not to hinder the development of kulak farms, proposed to slow down the paces of industrialization. This kulak platform Frumkin covered with the slogan "back to the XIV Congress". The decision of the Politburo adopted on Comrade Stalin's initiative — to give a rebuff to Frumkin's anti-party letter — met with resistance from Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky and Uglanov.

The July Plenum of the CC 1928 in its decisions pointed out the necessity of solving the grain problem through the collectivization of peasant farms and the construction of state farms. Solving the grain problem was necessary to ensure the fast pace of industrialization.

The rights did not agree with the decisions of the July Plenum of the CC. Bukharin continued to speak out, stating that the struggle against the kulak leads to a rupture with the middle peasant. Rykov, delivering a report to the Moscow party active,

hushed up the acute class struggle that had unfolded around grain procurements, and spoke against the party's line on the question of collectivization.

The restorer of capitalism Uglanov stated that Moscow should be textile, chintz. Mechanical engineering, electrical industry in Moscow, as well as in the whole country should not be created. In general Uglanov and other rights stated that the link could only be "on the textile", and therefore excluded the collectivization of fragmented peasant farms on the basis of new technology.

In his report to the Leningrad party active "On the Results of the July Plenum of the CC VKP(b)" on July 13, 1928, Comrade Stalin exposed the positions of the right capitulators — defenders of the kulak.

"In connection with grain difficulties, we faced the question of the link, of the further fate of the alliance of workers and peasants, of the means of strengthening this alliance... The matter is clear: who thinks to ensure the link only along the line of textiles, forgetting about metals and machines transforming peasant farming on the basis of collective labor, he perpetuates classes, he is not a proletarian revolutionary, but a peasant philosopher"[140].

Thus Comrade Stalin exposed Bukharin, Tomsky, Rykov, Uglanov and others, who wanted to shift the center of gravity to heavy industry and instead of collectivization perpetuate small peasant farming from which the kulak grows.

---

[140] Stalin, *On the Results of the July Plenum of the CC VKP(b)*, coll. "Lenin and Stalin", vol. III, pp. 302–303.

Party organizations were closely rallied around the Leninist-Stalinist CC. Bukharin seeks a bloc with the Trotskyists and in June 1928 with the full agreement of Rykov and Tomsky, through the mediation of Sokolnikov, conducts behind-the-scenes negotiations with Kamenev on joint struggle against the CC of the party, against the leader of the party Comrade Stalin. The rights and the Trotskyists had one goal — the restoration of capitalism in the USSR. Not coincidentally, the outcast from the USSR Judas Trotsky wrote at that time that since he was against socialism, then he was against industrialization and collectivization. The Trotskyists considered the platform of the rights acceptable, and the leader of the rights Bukharin sought a bloc with the Trotskyists. Struggle against socialism, for the restoration of capitalism — that is what always united Trotskyists and rights.

Already in 1928 Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky, conducting behind-the-scenes negotiations with Trotskyists, applied vile two-faced methods of struggle against our party. At the time when they conducted behind-the-scenes negotiations with Trotskyists, at the CC plenum they voted for the resolution of the Central Committee of the party on economic questions.

The right capitulators borrowed from the Trotskyists methods of subversive, factional struggle against the party. In the summer of 1928 the rights tried to use the Moscow party organization to fight the party. At the head of the right capitulators, the present counter-revolutionaries — bandits Uglanov, Ryutin and others, created in the Moscow committee a stronghold of the rights to fight the CC of the party.

Uglanov and his assistants gathered in Moscow the so-called "narrow active", where supporters of the right capitulators were invited. At this "narrow active" questions of factional struggle against the party were discussed. The restorer of capitalism Uglanov at the plenum of the Moscow Committee in September 1928 asserted that there is no right deviation in the party. This speech of Uglanov was supposed to underpin Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky in their struggle against the CC. But Uglanov and his plan failed. Moscow Bolsheviks rose against them. On October 18 the Central Committee addressed a special letter "To all members of the Moscow organization", and on October 19, 1928 at the plenum of the Moscow Committee spoke Comrade Stalin with the speech "On the Right Danger in the VKP(b)", in which he lambasted the right restorers of capitalism and conciliators towards them.

Comrade Stalin said in his speech that "there are people in the ranks of our party who try to adapt, maybe without realizing it themselves, the cause of our socialist construction to the tastes and needs of the 'soviet' bourgeoisie". The victory of the right deviation in our party meant a huge strengthening of capitalist elements in our country. And what does the strengthening of capitalist elements in our country mean? This means weakening the proletarian dictatorship and strengthening the chances of the restoration of capitalism. Thus the victory of the right deviation in the party meant the growth of conditions necessary for the restoration of capitalism in our country[141].

[141] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 231, 10th ed..

Comrade Stalin's speech played a huge role in mobilizing the party to fight the right restorers. The plenum of the Moscow Committee removed Uglanov and his henchmen from leadership. As the first secretary of the Moscow Committee was elected V. M. Molotov, who rallied the Moscow organization around the CC, around Comrade Stalin.

In July 1928 in Moscow met the VI Congress of the Comintern, which had great significance in strengthening communist parties.

The capitalist world by the time of the VI Congress of the Comintern had entered a period of shaking of temporary and relative stabilization of capitalism and a sharp aggravation of the revolutionary struggle.

Bukharin tried to push through his opportunist views on international questions as well, recruiting his supporters in the Comintern for this purpose. Over the head of the VKP(b) delegation, Bukharin sent his theses on the international situation to foreign delegations of the VI Congress of the Comintern. In his theses on the international situation Bukharin wrote that capitalism is not being shaken, but is strengthening. This was an obvious retreat to the positions of the leaders of the II International, all the time asserting that "strengthening and recovery" of capitalism is taking place and therefore the victory of the socialist revolution is impossible. "With Bukharin," Comrade Stalin said, "it turned out in these theses that nothing new, shaking capitalist stabilization, is happening at the present moment, but on the contrary, capitalism is being reconstructed and holds on basically more or less solidly... Whether capitalist stabilization is shaken or strengthened — on

this depends the orientation of communist parties in their everyday political work. Whether we are experiencing a period of decline of the revolutionary movement, a period of simple gathering of forces, or we are experiencing a period of growth of conditions for a new revolutionary upsurge, the period of preparation of the working class for upcoming class battles — on this depends the tactical orientation of communist parties". The amendment of the VKP delegation, adopted by the subsequent congress, is actually good in that it gives a clear orientation to the second perspective, to the perspective of the growth of conditions for a new revolutionary upsurge[142].

Bukharin's theses also said nothing about the tasks of the struggle against conciliation towards the right deviation in the sections of the Comintern, said nothing about the necessity of iron discipline in the ranks of Bolshevik parties. On the initiative of Comrade Stalin, the VKP(b) delegation at the VI Congress introduced about 20 amendments and gave essentially new theses on the international situation. "To safeguard the party from factional sallies of right deviationists, it is necessary to put the question of iron party discipline and unconditional subordination of party members to this discipline. Without this there is no use thinking about a serious struggle against the right deviation". Therefore the VKP(b) delegation introduced into Bukharin's theses a corresponding amendment, adopted then by the VI congress[143].

---

[142] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, pp. 246, 247, 10th ed..
[143] Ibid., p. 248.

The leader of the rights Bukharin was isolated at the VI Congress of the Comintern, and the capitulatory platform of the rights was condemned.

In the summer of 1928 the CC addressed a letter to all party organizations and the working class on deploying self-criticism, in order to uncover shortcomings in the work of all organizations, to expel bureaucratic, degenerate and opportunist elements. Being bureaucratic, degenerate elements, resisting the restructuring of organizations and activation of the masses, the rights opposed the deployment of self-criticism.

A rabid representative of the Bukharinite "school" Slepkov spoke with theses in which he travestied the party's slogan on self-criticism. Comrade Stalin pointed out that the theses of Bukharin's disciple Slepkov "only outwardly resemble the theses on the slogan of self-criticism... I have no doubt," wrote Comrade Stalin, "that the bureaucratic elements of our party and Soviet organizations will read Slepkov's theses without a feeling of some satisfaction".

The party smashed the resistance to self-criticism from the rights. Bolshevik self-criticism hardened and hardens the army of builders of socialism and exposed and exposes all uncleanness, all rot.

In autumn 1928 Bukharin without the knowledge of the CC publishes his programmatic, right-opportunist article "Notes of an Economist", in which he attacks the general line of the Party CC.

If the party evaluates the reconstructive period as the most serious turning point, causing class shifts inside the country,

causing an aggravation of class struggle, an intensification of the resistance of capitalist elements, then for the right deviationists the reconstructive period does not represent a principled change in the correlation of class forces in the country. "The transition to the reconstructive period, of course, does not express a principled shift in economic policy," — wrote Bukharin in "Notes of an Economist". The capitulatory line of the rights flowed from this incorrect evaluation of the new period in the development of our country. "They are connected with that strip of development," says Comrade Stalin, "which has already been passed and which is called the period of restoration of the national economy, when construction went peacefully, so to speak, in an order of run-as-you-please, when there were not yet those class shifts, there was not yet that aggravation of class struggle which we observe now. But now we have a new strip of development, different from the old period, from the restoration period. Now we have a new period of construction, a period of reconstruction of the entire national economy on the basis of socialism. This new period causes new class shifts, aggravation of class struggle. It requires new methods of struggle, regrouping of our forces, improvement and strengthening of all our organizations. The misfortune of t. Bukharin's group lies precisely in that it lives in the past, it does not see the characteristic features of this new period and does not understand the necessity of new methods of struggle"[144].

[144] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, pp. 250–251, 10th ed. Underlined by me. — Ed..

In his "Notes of an Economist" Bukharin opposed the five-year plan, against the paces of industry, calling these paces "fantastic somersaults". He proposed that the party be guided by narrow spots. "If there is no brick," — wrote Bukharin, — "and it cannot be produced in a given season (according to technical conditions) more than a definite magnitude, then one cannot invent construction programs exceeding this limit, and provoke by this demand which cannot be met, because no matter how you push construction further, you still won't make factory buildings and housing out of air. It is necessary to narrow down the paces of industrialization," wrote Bukharin.

The party, led by Comrade Stalin, exposed the capitulation of the rights before difficulties, overcoming all narrow spots, all difficulties on the paths of the socialist offensive.

Bukharin's fellow thinker Frumkin invented the thoroughly right-opportunist theory of "needs and possibilities", the essence of which is that we supposedly cannot reckon with the needs of fast paces of industrialization, that we must reckon with possibilities, i.e., be guided by narrow spots.

This theory of Bukharin, defended by Frumkin, in practice resulted in the desire to slash the control figures of the Supreme Council of the National Economy (VSNKh) from 825 million capital investments to 650 millions. Comrade Stalin at the November plenum of the CC in 1928 said: "Frumkin defends the figure 650 million rubles not out of stinginess, but on the basis of the newly minted 'theory of possibilities', asserting in his second letter and in a special article in the organ of Narkomfin that we will certainly worsen the condition of our economy if we let VSNKh have more than 650 million

rubles for capital construction. And what does this mean? This means that t. Frumkin stands against preserving the current pace of development of industry"[145].

Bukharin in his "Notes" wrote that we need to "mark out the conditions for the correct combination of various spheres of production and consumption and various spheres of production among themselves, in other words, the conditions of mobile economic equilibrium. In essence, this is what the task of drawing up a national economic plan consists of".

We see, therefore, that the capitulatory provisions of the rights on the question of the paces of industrialization completely stem from Bukharin's right-opportunist theory of equilibrium. This theory was not an invention of Bukharin. It was borrowed by him from his teacher A. Bogdanov.

Lenin repeatedly uncovered the theoretical errors of Bukharin, repeatedly pointed out that Bukharin is captive to Bogdanov, that Bukharin combines human language with Bogdanov's organizational gibberish. Lenin wrote that Bukharin "worsens Marx's theory with 'sociological' scholastics", that Bukharin places the dialectical process "next to (and in 2nd place) Bogdanov's *Begriff-scholastik*[146]"[147]. Next to it one cannot place it: either — or.

What did Bukharin's theory of "equilibrium" mean in practice? It meant that the proportions which then existed between various branches of production were eternal, immutable and in

---

[145] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 375, 9th ed..
[146] Meaning of concepts.
[147] *Lenin Miscellany XI*, pp. 356, 361.

no way should be disturbed. The socialist industrialization of the country is unfeasible if it disturbs existing proportions.

Thus, the theory of "equilibrium" is needed in order to use it to cover up the principled disagreement of restorers of capitalism with the party's policy on the questions of the country's industrialization. The right-opportunist theory of "equilibrium" meant not only the rejection of the industrialization of our country, but also the rejection of the socialist restructuring of small peasant farming.

According to Bukharin's "equilibrium" theory, socialist industry, the paces of which were to be lowered, had to be based on small fragmented peasant farming. Bukharin's "equilibrium" theory is anti-Marxist. Comrade Stalin teaches and life brilliantly confirmed that socialist industry develops, expanding the scale of production on the basis of socialist accumulation and expanded socialist reproduction. In our small-commodity economy there did not even always take place simple reproduction, besides, from this small-commodity economy grew capitalist elements. Thus, Bukharin's theory of "equilibrium", as Comrade Stalin showed, was directed against the Marxist-Leninist theory that expanded reproduction of socialist industry can be based only on the expanded reproduction of large socialist agriculture.

Comrade Stalin brilliantly uncovered and proved that "this theory has nothing in common with Leninism... that this theory has as its objective goal to defend the position of individual peasant economy, to arm kulak elements with 'new' theoretical weapons in their struggle against collective farms and to

discredit the position of collective farms"[148]. Such is the class meaning of this theory.

Right capitulators defended the theory of "spontaneity", which complemented the "equilibrium" theory. This theory of "spontaneity", just like the "equilibrium" theory, substantiated the uselessness of the socialist transformation of agriculture, abandonment of the struggle against the kulak, abandonment of the construction of state and collective farms. "The theory of spontaneity in the matter of socialist construction," — said Comrade Stalin in his speech at the conference of agrarian-Marxists, — "is a rotten, anti-Leninist theory"[149]. Developing such a theory, the rights moved to the bourgeois standpoint of the stability of small peasant farming.

Bukharin in his "Notes" wrote about the regression of our agriculture. Frumkin in November 1928 submitted a second letter to the CC, in which he slanderously stated about the "degradation" of agriculture and proposed "not to hinder the production of kulak farms". Comrade Stalin exposed the kulak essence of this Bukharinite slogan. "What does it mean not to hinder the kulak farm? This means giving the kulak freedom. And what does giving him freedom mean? This means giving him power"[150].

Bukharin did not agree with the Leninist provision that "the abolition of classes is a matter of long, difficult, stubborn class struggle, which after the overthrow of the power of capital,

---

[148] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 301, 10th ed..
[149] Ibid., p. 304.
[150] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 375, 9th ed..

after the destruction of the bourgeois state, after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat does not disappear... but only changes its forms, becoming even more ferocious in relations"[151].

Bukharin argued that in the process of socialist construction the class struggle will gradually soften, fade away. Refusing to recognize the inevitability of the aggravation of class struggle as our socialist offensive proceeds, Bukharin stated that if class struggle is aggravated anywhere, then this is the direct result of the party's incorrect policy or shortcomings of the grassroots Soviet apparatus. If according to Lenin — under the dictatorship of the proletariat only the forms of class struggle changed, then according to Bukharin — class struggle comes to naught.

The rights did not see in the kulak an implacable enemy of socialism and denied the necessity of suppressing the kulak in the interests of the collectivization of the countryside. "Kulaks," wrote Lenin, "are a rabid enemy of Soviet power... There can be no peace with them: the kulak can be easily and simply reconciled with the landowner, tsar and priest, even if they quarreled, but with the working class never"[152].

Bukharin, fighting against Lenin, wrote: "We give assistance to him (the kulak. — Ed.), but he to us. In the end, perhaps, the grandson of the kulak will say thank you to us for getting along with him".

---

[151] Lenin, *Greetings to Hungarian Workers*, Works, vol. XXIV, p. 315.
[152] Lenin, *Comrades-workers! Let's go into the last, decisive battle*, Works, vol. XXIII, p. 206.

This bourgeois theory of Bukharin about "peaceful growing of the kulak into socialism", about cooperative nests growing into the system of socialist economy, directly stems from the denial of the dictatorship of the working class and the denial of the fact that with the development of the offensive of socialism the class struggle does not weaken, but on the contrary, becomes more aggravated.

The harm of Bukharin's theory of the growing of capitalism into socialism consists in, as Comrade Stalin noted, "that it lulls the working class, undermines the mobilization readiness of the revolutionary forces of our country, demobilizes the working class and facilitates the offensive of capitalist elements against Soviet power"[153].

At the November plenum of the CC 1928 Comrade Stalin in his speech on the industrialization of the country and the right deviation in the VKP(b) once again squarely posed the task of implementing high paces of socialist industrialization, developing heavy industry as the leading principle of our national economy, as the key to transforming backward and fragmented agriculture on the basis of collectivization. The victory of the right deviation, as well as Trotskyism, Comrade Stalin said, would inevitably lead to the restoration of capitalism in our country.

Before the November CC plenum in 1928 Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky submitted a statement to the Politburo on resignation, thinking by these methods to force the party to make concessions to them. But this maneuver of the rights was

[153] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 258, 10th ed..

exposed. At the CC plenum the rights voted for the resolution on the control figures of the national economy for 1928/29 and took back their resignation statement. This was hypocritical, two-faced behavior of the rights, because at that time they formalized their group, prepared factional sallies against the party, in order to impose their restorationist platform.

The rights deployed factional work, first of all widely using trade unions, where at the head of the leadership stood one of the leaders of the right restorers — Tomsky. Instead of mobilizing the working masses to overcome the difficulties of the reconstructive period, the rights disarmed the proletariat, refused to fight to strengthen labor discipline, defended idlers, truants. Comrade Stalin wrote: "It is hardly possible to doubt that one of the most important factors, if not the most important factor, of our construction at the present moment is the widely deploying emulation of the millions-strong masses of workers"[154].

The rights, being opponents of deploying socialist emulation and shock-work, entrenched in trade unions, braked the creative initiative of the masses who deployed a powerful movement of socialist emulation and shock-work in the country.

At the VIII Congress of Trade Unions (December 1928) Tomsky mobilized his supporters to fight the CC of the party. But the rights led by Tomsky suffered defeat. L. M. Kaganovich was introduced into the presidium of the AUCCTU. The struggle of L. M. Kaganovich against right

[154] Coll. *Lenin and Stalin on Socialist Emulation*, p. 39, Partizdat, 1934.

opportunists played a huge role in restructuring trade unions and expelling right deviationists, assistants of Tomsky, from them. After the VIII Congress of Trade Unions Tomsky was removed from work in the AUCCTU.

Having routed the rights, the party highly raised the banner of socialist emulation and shock-work. The historical words of Comrade Stalin, that emulation "...turns labor from a shameful and heavy burden, as it was considered before, into a matter of honor, into a matter of glory, into a matter of valor and heroism"[155], became the slogan of millions of masses, selflessly fighting for the building of socialist society.

1929 — the year of the great turning point. The working class, led by the Leninist-Stalinist party, overcoming difficulties, more and more deployed the struggle for the victory of the five-year plan. In the countryside all the work of the party was directed towards the socialist restructuring of peasant farms. The middle peasant went into collective farms. In the second half of 1929 Comrade Stalin posed before the party the task — to move to a socialist offensive along the whole front. In his historical speech at the conference of agrarian-Marxists in December 1929 Comrade Stalin put forward a new slogan of liquidating the kulak class as a class on the basis of total collectivization. The liquidated kulak-dom stubbornly resisted, and its agency in the party — the right restorers intensified the struggle against the socialist offensive along the whole front.

Already in January 1929 the rights came out with their bourgeois platform of defending the liquidated kulak, in which

[155] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 393, 10th ed..

they put forward the White Guard slogan of supposedly conducted by the party "military-feudal exploitation of the peasantry". The right restorers, following in the footsteps of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, wrote about the "degeneration of the party". On January 30, 1929 Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky, trying to "scare" the party, again submit a resignation statement. In reality this statement served as a call for all right capitulators — kulak agents to unite to fight the party.

In this period the Central Committee of the party became aware of the behind-the-scenes negotiations of the leader of the right restorers — Bukharin with Trotskyist-Zinovievite restorers of capitalism about a joint bloc to fight the general line of the party, against Comrade Stalin. Rykov and Tomsky were aware of all these negotiations. The Politburo of the CC and the Presidium of the CCC on February 9, 1929 sharply condemned this fractional step of the rights, proposing that they disarm. The right restorers did not submit to this decision and continued to wage the struggle against the Leninist-Stalinist party.

Bukharin, speaking on January 21, 1929 at a mourning meeting dedicated to the fifth anniversary of Lenin's death, with the report "Lenin's Political Testament", gave an overtly opportunist interpretation of Lenin's latest articles. Bukharin did not mention Lenin's directive — "to catch up and surpass in technical and economic relation the advanced countries of the West", but instead tried to portray the party's line on the universal deployment of the pace of industrialization as a line contradicting Lenin's directive. In his report Bukharin gave an

anti-Leninist assessment of the driving forces and character of our revolution.

For Bukharin, the main moment characterizing the October Revolution is the combination of the proletarian revolution with the peasant war.

Bukharin therefore believes that in the October Socialist Revolution all the peasantry participated. This point of view is connected with this defender of the restoration of capitalism with the denial of the socialist character of the October Revolution and with its assessment as a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Meanwhile in the Great October Socialist Revolution our party led the masses under the strategic slogan of the alliance of the proletariat with the poorest peasantry against the bourgeoisie of city and country with the neutralization of the middle peasant. The revolution of October 1917, being socialist in its character, at the same time "in passing", "incidentally" completed the unresolved tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Bukharin assesses the October Revolution as bourgeois-democratic. He, Bukharin, believed that in 1929 as well there remained the combination of the proletarian revolution with the peasant war in a new form, but this time "in a construction form". He, therefore, continued to assess all our construction not as socialist, but as capitalist.

From the denial of the socialist character of the October Revolution flowed and Bukharin's distortion of the Leninist understanding of the alliance of the working class with the peasantry. Bukharin gave the assessment of the peasantry as a "solid middle-peasant mass", he did not want to see various social groupings in the village. Just like the Trotskyist restorers

of capitalism, the rights denied the Leninist understanding of the hegemony of the proletariat and the alliance with the peasantry. The Trotskyists asserted that all peasantry is hostile to the proletariat, they led a line towards a rupture with the peasantry, mainly with the middle-peasant mass. The positions of the Trotskyists were directed towards the destruction of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the triumph of capitalism. To this in practice amounted also the position of the rights. The rights spoke generally about an alliance with the peasantry, denying differentiation within the peasantry, denying the necessity of the struggle against the kulak, denying the leading role of the proletariat in this alliance. By alliance with the peasantry Bukharin understood the abandonment of the struggle against the kulak, he preached the non-abolition of classes, and the perpetuation of classes.

Thus, both Trotskyists and rights denied the Leninist understanding of the hegemony of the proletariat and actually opposed the alliance with the peasantry.

Exposing Bukharin, Comrade Stalin said: "Leninism unconditionally stands for a solid alliance with the main masses of the peasantry, for an alliance with the middle peasant, but not for any alliance, but for such an alliance with the middle peasant, which ensures the leading role of the working class, strengthens the dictatorship of the proletariat and facilitates the matter of abolishing classes"[156].

The rights gave a liberal interpretation of the new economic policy, they regarded NEP as full freedom of trade, they

[156] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 259, 10th ed..

refused to see such an important side of NEP, as the regulating role of the Soviet state in relation to commodity turnover, market prices, etc. The rights in practice slid to the position of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, which saw in NEP only the admission of capitalism, free trade. They denied, said Comrade Stalin, that "NEP is a special policy of the proletarian state, designed for the admission of capitalism, with commanding heights in the hands of the proletarian state, designed to combat elements of capitalist and socialist, designed to increase the role of socialist elements to the detriment of capitalist elements, designed for the victory of socialist elements over capitalist elements, designed for the abolition of classes, for building the foundation of a socialist economy"[157]. The rights believed that it is necessary to unleash the market spontaneous force, not to hinder the kulak and trader from robbing the working people. Like the Trotskyists, the rights in assessing NEP defended an overtly bourgeois-capitalist line.

Travestying the Leninist cooperative plan, Bukharin stated: "Collective farms are not the main highway, not the trunk road, through which the peasantry will come to socialism"; therefore the right restorers were opponents of collectivization and new forms of the link — opponents of the production link with the middle peasant.

Comrade Stalin wrote:

"As long as it was a matter of restoring agriculture and the peasantry mastering former landowner and kulak lands, we could make do with old forms of the link. But now, when it

[157] Stalin, *Coll. "On the Opposition"*, p. 211.

comes to the reconstruction of agriculture, this is no longer enough. Now we must go further, helping peasants to restructure agricultural production on the basis of new technology and collective labor"[158].

The rights fought against the five-year plan of socialist construction. At the April Plenum of the CC 1929 Rykov instead of the five-year plan proposed a two-year plan, which excluded the construction of new factories and the growth of our heavy industry. Comrade Stalin said: "The two-year plan was put forward by t. Rykov onto the scene in order then, in the course of practical implementation of the five-year plan, to pit the five-year plan against the two-year plan, to restructure the five-year plan and adapt it to the two-year plan, cutting and lopping off allocations for the cause of industrialization"[159].

Thus, the right restorers were against industrialization, against an economically powerful and independent Soviet country, against strengthening the defense capability of the Soviet country, — this explained their struggle against Stalin's five-year plan.

At the April Plenum of the CC 1929 in Comrade Stalin's speech "On the Right Deviation in the VKP(b)" it was underlined that the rights passed over to the side of enemies of the proletarian dictatorship, that the implementation of their capitulatory platform means the restoration of capitalism.

---

[158] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 264, 10th ed..
[159] Ibid., p. 280.

By decision of the plenum, Bukharin and Tomsky were removed from their posts. The Plenum of the CC VKP(b) posed before the party the task by the end to overcome and rout the right capitulators — the agency of the kulak in the party.

The Plenum stigmatized the behind-the-scenes negotiations of Bukharin with Kamenev on a joint bloc to fight the Leninist-Stalinist party. The Plenum established that the right capitulators in the VKP(b) — Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky — more and more become the center of attraction for right-opportunist and conciliatory elements in the sections of the Comintern.

In 1929 Bukharin again spoke in defense of the criticized by Lenin social-democratic theory of "organized capitalism". In the article "The Theory of Organized Un-management" he wrote: "The problem of the market, prices, competition, crises becomes more and more a problem of world economy, replacing within the country the problem of organization. Even the problem of all problems, the so-called 'social question', the problem of the correlation of classes and class struggle is a problem to the highest degree connected with the position of one or another capitalist country on the world market". Bukharin's theory of "organized capitalism" coincides with Hilferding's theory of "organized capitalism". Proceeding from the bourgeois theory of "organized capitalism", the rights and conciliatory elements in the Comintern made the following conclusion, completely coinciding with the views of the II International: internal contradictions, they stated, class struggle inside capitalist countries recede into the background, and in

the best case revolution can be born only as a result of international clashes.

Of course, in no way should one underestimate the significance of war as a factor revolutionizing the masses, but it is completely wrong and objectively harmful to reduce all contradictions of capitalism only to wars and see in them the sole condition of the proletarian revolution. Lenin did not connect revolution necessarily with wars. He wrote: "Socialist revolution can break out not only because of a big strike or street demonstration or hunger riot or military uprising or colonial mutiny, but also because of any political crisis"[160]. In Bukharin's formulation of the question, reducing to the assertion that class struggle becomes a "problem connected with the position of one or another capitalist country on the world market", internal contradictions are ignored, the development of which inevitably leads to military clashes, to revolutionary explosions.

Bukharin's defended theory of "organized capitalism" coincided with Hilferding's theory of "organized capitalism" and Kautsky's Menshevik theory of ultra-imperialism. If for Bukharin the creation of "organized capitalism" of state-capitalist trusts, the elimination of competition and the destruction of anarchy of production within the country is possible, then what prevents the creation of a certain organization in the world economy? As was indicated above, Bukharin in his book "Economics of the Transition Period" (1920) admitted such a possibility. He considered that

[160] Lenin, *Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, Works, vol. XIX, p. 39.

tendencies to organization lead beyond the boundaries of an individual state, lead to the creation of "syndicates of state-capitalist trusts". This is precisely a direct slide into Kautsky's theory of ultra-imperialism. The theory of "organized capitalism" leads to the denial of the prospects of revolutionary struggle. The leaders of the II International, proceeding from the theory of "organized capitalism", drew the conclusion that capitalism has destroyed its inherent contradictions and can "peacefully grow into socialism". Bukharin and his group, proceeding from this theory of "organized capitalism", did not see the crisis of the world capitalist system, the colossal growth of unemployment and the indignation of the masses. They denied the aggravation of class struggle and the inevitability of the growth of the revolutionary upsurge. This theory lulls class vigilance, weakens the revolutionary will and energy of the proletariat in the struggle against capitalism.

The X Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Comintern (July 1929) condemned the social-democratic theory of "organized capitalism" and removed Bukharin from the composition of the Presidium of the ECCI.

The ECCI Plenum recognized the defense of the right deviation as incompatible with staying in the Communist Party.

At the April Plenum of the CC VKP(b) in 1929 Comrade Stalin sharply underlined the huge significance of the party's struggle against right restorers. "The struggle against the right deviation is not a secondary task of our party. The struggle against the right deviation is one of the decisive tasks of our party". The goal of the rights — "to demobilize the party, rout the working class, adapt our policy to the tastes of the 'soviet' bourgeoisie

and save themselves in this way from the difficulties of our construction, — if we do all this," — asked Comrade Stalin, — "then what will this mean? Will it not mean to slow down the revolution, rout our socialist construction, flee from difficulties, surrender positions to capitalist elements? Does Bukharin's group understand that to abandon the struggle against the right deviation means to betray the working class, betray the revolution? Does Bukharin's group understand that without overcoming right deviation and conciliation it is impossible to overcome the difficulties facing us, without overcoming these difficulties it is impossible to achieve decisive successes of socialist construction"[161].

The right leaders did not wish to hearken to this warning of the party. They continued to fight against the party under the same banner of the Bukharinite bourgeois platform. The rights as before insisted on slowing down the paces of industrialization, on abandoning collective farms, on capitulation to the kulak.

Comrade Stalin repeatedly warned about the possibility of a bloc of right and "left" opportunists against the Leninist line. As early as at the CC Plenum of the VKP(b) in November 1928 in his speech "On the Industrialization of the Country and the Right Deviation in the VKP(b)" Stalin said that the Trotskyists ("lefts") more than once blocked with openly opportunist elements, since they have one program — against socialism, for the restoration of capitalism.

"Right blocists will act henceforth precisely as rights, and 'lefts' will cover their rightness with 'left' phrases. But what is the

[161] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, pp. 286–287, 10th ed..

guarantee that 'lefts' and rights will not find each other again? (Laughter.) It is clear that there is not and cannot be any guarantee"[162]. Comrade Stalin pointed out that rights and "lefts" have common social roots, a common opportunist nature, a common goal of struggle — the restoration of capitalism.

Comrade Stalin reminded that the Trotskyists more than once tried to criticize the rights, but usually their squabbles ended in a bloc on the basis of joint struggle against the party.

The common hope for the failure of Leninist-Stalinist policy, for the disruption of victorious socialist construction, the common restoration program brought closer together counter-revolutionary Trotskyist-Zinovievites and kulak agency in the party — the right opportunists.

At the November Plenum of the CC VKP(b) in 1929, finding themselves faced with the fact of the failure of all their "prophecies" and seeing that they cannot knock together in the party any significant group of supporters, Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky submit a statement, in which they write that their disagreements with the CC VKP(b) "are removed", however in this statement they refused to condemn their bourgeois, kulak views.

This was a two-faced, hypocritical statement of the rights, similar to the statement of Trotskyites and Zinovievites on October 16, 1927 — a verbal refusal of factional work, in practice an order to their supporters for a temporary retreat, in order to preserve the already sparse cadres, in order at a more

[162] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 378, 9th ed..

favorable moment to speak out again against the party and its leadership.

The November Plenum of the CC VKP(b) removed from the Politburo of the CC VKP(b) Bukharin "as the instigator and leader of the right deviationists" and issued a warning to Rykov and Tomsky. The Plenum recognized the propaganda of the views of right opportunists as incompatible with staying in the ranks of the VKP(b).

The program of right opportunists was a program of struggle against the victory of socialism and led to the restoration of capitalism in our country.

At the XVI Congress of the party Comrade Stalin spoke about the right deviationists: "they do not want to recognize those ways and methods of struggle, without which it is impossible to build socialism. They do not want to recognize that the universal development of industry is the key to restructuring the entire national economy on socialist lines. They do not want to recognize the irreconcilable class struggle against capitalist elements and the launched socialist offensive against capitalism. They do not want to understand that all these ways and methods are that system of measures without which it is impossible to maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat and build socialism in our country. They do not want to think that socialism can be built quietly, spontaneously, without class struggle, without an offensive against capitalist elements. They do not want to think that capitalist elements either themselves will die out quietly, or will grow into socialism. But since such miracles in history do not happen, it turns out that the right

deviationists slide in practice to the point of denying the possibility of building socialism in our country"[163].

In spring 1930 left distortions occurred during the implementation of collectivization. The rights immediately began to intensify their factional struggle. They hoped that left excesses would lead to the failure of the collective farm movement and to the triumph of their bourgeois platform.

But the party, stubbornly overcoming difficulties, routed the right opportunists, these kulak agents. The XVI Congress of the party (1930) in the resolution on Comrade Stalin's report, exposing opportunists, specially underlined that "opportunists of all stripes, especially the rights, apply a new maneuver, expressed in formal recognition of their errors and in formal agreement with the general line of the party, without confirming their recognition of work and struggle for the general line, which in practice means only the transition from open struggle against the party to secret or biding time for a more favorable moment to resume the attack on the party".

The party must declare the most ruthless war against this kind of two-facedness and deception and demand from everyone recognizing their errors through active defense of the general line of the party to prove the sincerity of their recognitions. Non-fulfillment of this requirement must entail the most decisive organizational measures[164].

The XVI Congress declared the views of the right opposition incompatible with membership in the VKP(b).

---

[163] Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, pp. 420, 421, 10th ed..
[164] *VKP(b) in Resolutions*, part II, p. 406.

And even after the rout of the rights at the XVI Congress of the party, before the face of the greatest victories of socialism and the triumph of the Leninist-Stalinist line of the party, Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky still continued two-facedly deceiving the party, stating that they honestly serve, while in practice helping enemies. In late 1930 the right-left block of Syrtsov-Lominadze was exposed. These two-facers, enemies of the party, combined in themselves the counter-revolutionary views of Trotskyist restorers on the impossibility of the victory of socialism with the views of right restorers. In their "platform" the right-leftists repeated all the slanderous accusations of the right capitulators against the party.

In October 1932 the counter-revolutionary group of Ryutin-Uglanov was exposed and routed, in which Bukharin's students — Slepkov and Maretsky took an active part. The counter-revolutionary Ryutin-Slepkov group, connected with Zinoviev and Kamenev, set as its task the violent overthrow of Soviet power, restoration of the smashed kulak-dom, restoration of capitalism, and found full support in Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky. Ryutin's restoration platform, as it turned out now, was the program of the entire group of the rights. Only for conspiratorial considerations was the Ryutin platform issued by the leaders of the rights — Bukharin, Rykov and others as the platform of a separate group. Bukharin and Rykov were inspirers of the counter-revolutionary Ryutin-Slepkov platform. The counter-revolutionary Slepkov, being in exile, sent through a Trotskyist friendly greetings to the right restorer Tomsky.

In early 1933 the counter-revolutionary group of Eismont-Tolmachev was uncovered, which, just like the Ryutin-Slepkov

group, set as its task the overthrow of Soviet power and restoration of capitalism in our country. The Joint Plenum of the CC and CCC VKP(b) in January 1933, at which party leader Comrade Stalin delivered a report on the world-historic victories of the first five-year plan, also discussed the question of the Eismont-Tolmachev-A. P. Smirnov group.

Enemies of the party were expelled from our ranks. About Rykov, Bukharin and Tomsky the Joint Plenum of the CC and CCC VKP(b) said that instead of active struggle against enemies of the party they stood aside and even maintained contact with Eismont and Smirnov, which in practice meant encouraging their counter-revolutionary activity.

These counter-revolutionaries, kulak mouthpieces, agreed on terror against leaders of the party and government. Rykov, Bukharin, Tomsky and others maintained contact with this group and encouraged their counter-revolutionary activity.

On the eve of the XVII Congress of the party, characterizing all groupings of 1932–1933, which consisted of remnants and remains of the right opposition, L. M. Kaganovich said: "Their ideology was in the full sense a wrecking ideology, counter-revolutionary, conspiratorial"[165].

Former leaders of the rights did not lay down the arms of their anti-party "theory", did not abandon the struggle against the party. In recent years sorties were undertaken from time to time on one or another question, testifying to the unwillingness to

[165] Kaganovich, *From the XVI to the XVII Party Congress*, p. 44, Lenpartizdat, 1934.

abandon the struggle against the party, abandon the promotion of restorationist ideas.

Bukharin in January 1936 published an article in *Izvestia* with a reactionary statement that the Russian people in the past represented a solid mass of idlers, were the embodiment of universal Oblomovism, savagery, etc. "The Nation of Oblomovs," — slanderously stated Bukharin about the great Russian people, who put forward giants of artistic creativity and scientific thought, who gave the great party of Bolsheviks and Stalin. Our great people gave brilliant examples of liberating mankind from the shackles of capitalism, victorious struggle for communism. The reactionary theory about the Russian people as a "nation of Oblomovs", having nothing in common with leninism, Bukharin defended back in the years of war, speaking against Lenin's article "On the National Pride of Great Russians".

New facts, uncovered recently, showed that Trotskyist-Zinovievite monsters, agents of fascist secret services, murderers of the group of Kemerovo workers, murderers of Red Army soldiers, enjoyed the abetment of the rights — Bukharin, Rykov and others. They knew about the prepared Trotskyist-Zinovievite terrorist acts, wrecking, espionage, treason to the homeland.

In January 1937 the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union passed its verdict on the German-Japanese-Trotskyist gang of restorers of capitalism from the parallel anti-Soviet center.

As emerged at the trial from the testimony of Radek and Sokolnikov, the right counter-revolutionaries also had their

anti-Soviet center. Together with the Trotskyists, the right counter-revolutionaries prepared a coup d'état for the restoration of capitalism.

Sokolnikov testified at the trial: "As for programmatic provisions, that is, in 1932 both Trotskyists, Zinovievites, and rights converged in the main on a program which earlier was characterized as the program of the rights. This is the so-called Ryutin platform; but to a significant extent it expressed precisely this, common to all three groups, programmatic provisions back in 1932".

As for the further development of this program, the leading members of the center believed that as an isolated revolution, our revolution cannot hold out as socialist, that the theory of Kautskian ultra-imperialism and Bukharin's theory of "organized capitalism", akin to it, turned out to be correct. We believed that fascism is the most organized capitalism, it wins, seizes Europe, strangles us. Therefore it is better to come to terms with it, better to make some compromise in the sense of retreating from socialism to capitalism.

Thus, in the struggle against socialism, on a common platform of restoring capitalism, united counter-revolutionaries — Trotskyists and rights, who became a gang of criminals, a gang of hired agents of international capital.

Trotskyism has long ceased to be a political current in the ranks of the working class. The roots of Trotskyism are not in our country, but in the capitalist environment; Trotskyism from a political current turned into a rabid gang of bloody murderers, spies, saboteurs, who do not dare to speak openly

about their program even to closest accomplices. Trotskyists are a "direct find for intelligence agencies of foreign states" *(Stalin)*.

The rights were aware of the transition of the Trotskyist-Zinovievite fascist gang to the methods of espionage, sabotage and wrecking, and they, the rights, shared this platform.

Right counter-revolutionaries, just like Trotskyist scoundrels, engaged in espionage and wrecking, fulfilled the vile tasks of their fascist masters. Bukharinites, Rykovites and other right counter-revolutionaries were in the same gang of Japanese-German-Trotskyist agents.

The rights just like Trotskyists ceased to be a political current in the working movement, they too turned into a rabid gang of enemies of the people.

Such is the vile finale of the history of the rights, their struggle against the party and socialism, their shameful feats in the name of and for the glory of bourgeois restoration in our country.

Comrade Stalin said at the CC Plenum in March 1937:

"Now, I think, it is clear to everyone that the present-day leaders and saboteurs, under whatever flags they were masking themselves, Trotskyist or Bukharinite, long ago ceased to be a political current in the working movement, that they turned into an unscrupulous and unprincipled gang of professional saboteurs, saboteurs, spies, murderers. It is clear that these gentlemen will have to be smashed and weeded out

mercilessly, as enemies of the working class, as traitors to our homeland"[166].

For the rights as a political current there are no longer roots in the economy of our country, since liquidated are capitalist elements, first of all the kulak-dom. Those remnants of capitalist elements, which still exist, are supported by the capitalist environment, which will feed the right counter-revolutionaries not as a political party, but as a gang of fascist mercenaries.

Capitalist encirclement is the soil for the activity of Trotskyist and right counter-revolutionaries. Socialism triumphed on only one-sixth of the world. Our country is surrounded by enemies. As long as capitalist encirclement exists, fascist intelligence services will send saboteurs, spies, saboteurs and murderers into our country. Capitalist encirclement in the future as well will use mercenaries, counter-revolutionaries — Trotskyists and rights as its agents.

Trotskyist and right counter-revolutionaries are faithful flunkeys of fascist instigators of war, fascist monsters, who shot peaceful population and try to strangle democratic Spain. This gang of criminals, who sold themselves to fascism, who became its direct agents, who sold our homeland to fascism, preparing in case of fascist attack on the Soviet Union the defeat of the Red Army, contributed to the dismemberment of the USSR and the restoration of the power of landowners and capitalists. In June 1937 in the name of the great Soviet people

[166] Stalin, *On Shortcomings of Party Work and Measures to Liquidate Trotskyist and Other Two-Facers*, Partizdat, 1937.

was routed another gang of traitors, spies and saboteurs, murderers, hirelings of fascist intelligence services, who ensconced themselves in the ranks of the Red Army — Tukhachevsky and Co.

It should not be forgotten, that class struggle continues. It is necessary to smash and cast aside the rotten and dangerous theory, that with our further advance class struggle will fade away. "This is not a rotten theory, but a dangerous theory, because it lulls our people, leads them into a trap, gives the class enemy the opportunity to recover for the fight against Soviet power".

On the contrary, the more we will advance, the more we will have successes, the more the remnants of beaten exploitative classes will become embittered, the faster they will go to more acute forms of struggle, the more they will muck up the Soviet state, the more they will cling to the most desperate means of struggle, as the latest means of the doomed ones[167].

It is necessary to master Bolshevism, to finish with complacency, with smugness.

It is necessary to remember the capitalist encirclement. The struggle against all forces of counter-revolution and its vile agents must be intensified. In order to uncover these machinations of enemies, under whatever mask they did not hide, in order to destroy all Trotskyist-Zinovievite and right bandits, all these despicable scoundrels — agents of fascism,

[167] Stalin, *On Shortcomings of Party Work and Measures to Liquidate Trotskyist and Other Two-Facers*, Partizdat, 1937.

— the greatest revolutionary vigilance of the party and the entire Soviet people is necessary.