

# Stalin's Speech on the Five Year Plan

Stalin's speech at the conference of the responsible directors of industry in the Soviet Union, gives us once again an opportunity to speak to the French workers about the real situation in the U. S. S. R. More than any other official speech, this last speech of Stalin's distinguishes itself by its bragging, boastfulness and bluff. Stalin has nothing new to say to the responsible leaders of industry—his speech only increases by a degree the spirit of irresponsible adventurism of the centrist leadership in Soviet economy: the slogan of "The five year plan in 4 years" is replaced by the slogan of "the five year plan in 3 years".

Stalin's reasoning is very simple, of the simplicity of the lower bureaucrat. In order to realize an increase of 45 percent, in production in 1931 over that of 1930, two main conditions are necessary: (1) the objective conditions and (2) the subjective conditions. When Stalin attempts to decipher these altogether new and profound formulae, he does not succeed in making us understand even the most elementary thing. Where are the new factors which make for a change in the economic policies of the Soviet Union in the direction of an accelerated rhythm of industrialization?

Among the objective conditions favorable for the realization of the Five Year Plan (in the decisive industries) in three years, Stalin enumerates the following: natural resources (minerals, ores, coal, oil, wheat, cotton) a strong power; the support of the laboring masses; a solid party etc. But Stalin has discovered this new America for at least the second time: the first time he used these arguments about the resources of Russia (rubber excepted, it is true) in his polemic against the Left Opposition, in order to create his theory of socialism in one country. It was at that time that he "panneled off" the countries ripe and unripe for the construction of socialism according to the their quantity of natural resources.

The Soviet Union was classed among those countries which thanks to the resources it possesses is equipped with everything necessary for the construction and completion of socialism within its own boundaries. Now, it is clear to everybody, that if there are enough resources to transform the entire backward economy of the U. S. S. R. into a socialist economy there must certainly be enough to realize at least a part of the plan of socialization such as that of the third year of the Five Year Plan. The responsible directors of industry, gathered at the congress in order to determine the best methods of realizing the figures prescribed by the Five Year Plan for the third year, heard from "the best disciple of Lenin" clearer indications than these and particularly more concrete ones. As one indication Stalin issued the slogan of "The Five Year Plan in 3 years". If for us, who read these trite and primitive reflections in Stalin's speech, this slogan appears to be unexpected and in crying contradiction to the entire mode of reasoning of the author, the directors of industry, the responsible executors of all the caprices of the general line, must have received this new slogan with rage in their hearts and fear in their souls. Which did not prevent them from applauding the orator excitedly.

In order to be able to judge if industry is capable of accelerating the rhythms of production in the year to come, we must pose one simple and logical question: the rhythms that had been prescribed for the past year—have they been attained? In spite of all the red tape of the official press, despite all the ever favorable statistics "enlisted in the service of the general line", Stalin was forced to admit that "industrial production which should have increased by 32 percent in 1930 only increased 25 percent. The plan was not realized". Ordjonikidze, the reporter of the conference, had to add to this bitter admission "that the reduction of the cost price was not realized either" and in an even more dangerous measure: 7 percent. Instead of 11 percent" (*Pravda*, Feb. 2, 1931.)

Let us not forget that between the second and the third year there was inserted a supplementary trimester: the second year, which was to end the 30 of September was extended three months, to the 31 of December, that is to say, that instead of the 32 percent. increase prescribed for 12 months only a 25 percent. increase was realized in 15 months.

But the slowing down of Soviet industry did not stop with the eve of the new year. on the 31 of December: socialist production, even less than capitalist production does, not take stock in the superstitution of the calendar, that the Stalinist bureaucrats have.

The *Pravda* of February 1, 1931, the very day of the conference of the directors and several days before the speech of Stalin,

published the following note under the title "Alarm Signals": "the month of January did not bring any changes in the realization of the industrial plan. The figures that we publish elsewhere show that if industry does not measure up to the provisions of the plan, the first trimester of the third year will be gravely compromised. These poor indices of industrial work are, of course, caused partially by the poor transport work, the functioning of which has been impeded by the hardships of winter. But that is no excuse. The results of the industrial work of the 25 days of January are—an alarm signal (emphasis by *Pravda*.)" The statistic tables of the work of the most important branches of industry for January 1931 published in the same number of *Pravda*, show that not a single one of the branches attained 100 percent. of plan this month. There are branches that realized only 39 percent. of the provisions. The percentage of monthly realization for most of the branches, like coal, coke, cast iron, steel, tractor production varies between 50 and 60 per cent.

We have witnessed then, only a few days ago, a considerable slow down for the first month of the third year. Added to this enormous slow down at the end of the second year, this global slow down very clearly endangers the realization of the Five Year Plan in four years. Under such conditions, what should have been the task of a serious leadership, conscious of its responsibilities? Such a leadership should have posed the real problem before the responsible leaders of industry and before the entire working class, that is, the task of Soviet industry to overcome its lagging behind in order to be able to advance. Instead of this, Stalin announces in a spirit of bragging and pomposity a still greater increase of the industrial rhythms and de-

crees the completion of the Five Year Plan in three years. Pure bluff and sleight of hand, for industry cannot be conducted by speeches nor by exclamations so narrowly and stupidly chauvinistic as: "there is not a fortress which we will not be able to capture."

The unheard of efforts of the working class of the Soviet Union are creating wonders. In these times of general economic crisis, Soviet production, equipped with a powerful weapon such as the concentrated power of the proletariat and a safeguarding armor like the foreign trade monopoly, progresses in unprecedented proportions. But the figures which *Pravda* gives and the altogether contradictory conclusions which Stalin draws from them in his speech, assure us once more that the magnificent achievements of the Soviet proletariat are obtained despite and against the Stalinist leadership. Stalin's speech will only cause the accumulation of new difficulties instead of liquidating the very burdensome ones of the two preceding years. The new slogan of Stalin endangers the realization of the Five Year Plan as a whole.

Stalin's speech from the first word to the very last, bears the imprint of a nationalist spirit.

"There is nothing impossible for the Russians". What support can Stalin expect from the international proletariat and the Comintern when he says disdainfully: "the Comintern? Cut off its victuals and it will no longer exist." (As the "chief of the world proletariat" confided to Lominadze).

Stalin devoted only a few words to the foreign countries; only to mock at Churchill and at Poincaré who "foam with rage against our party". The explanations of Stalin about the campaign of the bourgeoisie against the U. S. S. R. are just as

simple and as impotent as the arguments in favor of the slogan of the Five Year Plan in three years: "why these yelps and these enraged attacks? Because our policies are correct".

The Marxist analysis of the antagonisms in the capitalist world is here replaced by the banality of the agitator. The capitalists who fight each other in a grave crisis seek to throw on the shoulders of the working class the burdens of this crisis (by legislation, through financial and economic measures). But that is not enough. Menaced by this economic crisis, which in its development causes the crumbling of the regime, the bourgeoisie is forced to throw the responsibility of the crisis on its irreconcilable external enemy, the Soviet Union. It is alone with the aim of discrediting the Soviet Union in the eyes of the workers and to make it responsible for all the ills that strike them, that the bourgeoisie carries on its furious campaign against the U. S. S. R. In fact, when it raises a howl in its entire press against Soviet "dumping", it is not because the 1.5 percent. of Soviet trade "threatens to destroy civilization", or even to prevent capitalism from solving the present crisis, but in order to divert the attention of the masses from the responsibilities of its regime in this chronic post-war crisis and to direct their wrath against the Soviet state. The Soviet bogey has become a weapon of mass propaganda in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

The *Temps* of February 7 says, commenting on Stalin's speech, that the struggle against "dumping"—as a result of the achievements of the plan—"is a vital question for the laboring masses; it is an economic and political question of prime importance for all of the civilized world". The demagogic preoccupation with anti-Soviet propaganda is far stronger in the author of the article than the real fear of the achievements of the Five Year Plan. What other political value can one attach to this talk, when the most "serious" journal of the French bourgeoisie, studying in a fundamental article the question of industrialization in the U. S. S. R., speaks of the provisions of the Five Year Plan which according to it, are made "for the next four years". The pen slaves of the bourgeoisie do not even take the pains to study seriously the formulation and the functioning of the Five Year Plan. They must arouse the readers. They must make anti-Soviet propaganda. For that purpose all lies about the Soviet Union are good enough. The lie about the famine and the lie about the Soviet chaos have given place to the lie about "dumping" and about the threat to civilization that the Five Year Plan constitutes.

The methods of the bourgeoisie have not changed: the bourgeoisie always rules over the sentiment of the masses by means of lies. But must we Communists facilitate the work of the bourgeoisie by the same methods of falsehood and bluff?

Stalin at Moscow and the official party press abroad deceive the masses and deceive themselves when they say that the Five Year Plan, which has not to the present moment been realized within the limits of four years and which can hardly be realized in five years, is going to be completed in three years, that is to say, in 11 months. These methods of exaggeration and bluff are alien to the revolutionary movement. They arouse distrust and apathy in the masses. Stalin's speech and the campaign of the entire official party press around the false and deceptive slogan of the Five Year Plan in three years only lulls the watchfulness of a great part of the international proletariat and deepens the distrust of the broad masses of the people.

The Left Opposition does not hold a defeatist position in regard to the Soviet Union. The defense of the U. S. S. R. is one of the most important principles of its activity. But it poses the question of the defense of the U. S. S. R. and of the construction of socialism in the Soviet land in relation with the international movement of the proletariat. The fate of Soviet economy and of the Five Year Plan depends in a large measure upon the intensity of the struggle of the world proletariat against capitalism. That is why the workers must know what the real situation of Soviet economy is. They must render themselves an account of the enormous difficulties that the Soviet workers face in the course of constructing socialism.

Stalin's speech and his slogan of the Five Year Plan in three years is full of exaggerations and big talk and throws dust into the eyes of the workers. That is why we say that it constitutes a new danger for the Five Year Plan

## Ghandi Makes His Peace with Imperialism

By ALBERT GLOTZER

The splendid revolutionary struggle of the Indian masses against the rule of British imperialism has suffered another betrayal by their leader, Gandhi. It is not the first time that the "little man" played this ignominious rôle. In 1922, when the struggle for independence reached proportions threatening to the Empire, Gandhi was again at the helm of the movement—and then, as now, he was there to call off the fight at the moment when the ferment in the masses reached a point too dangerous to the tottering rule of Great Britain.

While the bourgeois press speculates as to who will profit more through the pact signed by Lord Irwin and Gandhi on March 4, 1931, the betrayal is unmistakable fact. In clause Five of the pact, it states:

"Civil disobedience will be effectively discontinued and reciprocal action will be taken by the Government. By effective discontinuance of the civil disobedience movement is meant the effective discontinuance of all activities in furtherance thereof of whatever methods pursued and in particular the following:

(a) Organized defiance of the provisions of any law; (b) Movement for non-payment of land revenue and other legal dues; (c) Publication of news sheets in support of the civil disobedience movement; (d) Attempt to influence civil or military servants or village officials against the government or to persuade them to resign their posts." (Emphasis mine—A. G.)

Gandhi adds, as if to make this more effective, I shall strain every nerve to make the provisional peace a PERMANENT one." (Emphasis mine—A. G.). In the name of the Nationalist Party, the Mahatma calls off the civil disobedience movement, the defiance of the salt laws, non-payment of taxes, illegal assemblies, and mass picketing of factories and shops selling British goods. In return the Nationalist Party will be allowed to participate in the round-table conference to discuss Indian independence, and will have the right to continue the primitive manufacture of salt, which will however, continue to remain under the monopoly of the Empire.

The meaning of this truce is quite clear. It seeks to liquidate the revolutionary struggle and force into submission the rebellious masses. It leaves the proletariat and peasantry defenseless against the bitter exploitation of the British as well as their own bourgeoisie. In a word, it fulfills the wishes of the British imperialists and proves again that Gandhi is their loyal servant. He writes, on March 2, 1931, to Lord Irwin, "... I feel no hatred for the British, nor the least wish to harm their legitimate rights in this". Legitimate rights! This can only mean the right of British imper-

ialism to loot and exploit India at its will.

Britain's fierce struggle against Indian independence is easily understood when it is realized that without India, there is no British Empire. This is the key to the question. What is necessary for the revolutionary proletariat of the world as well as for India, is to determine the rôle of Gandhi and the Nationalist Party. They represent the interests of the native bourgeois and petty-bourgeois classes and in the present struggle, as in all others, they reflect the deep fermentation in the masses. When the movement of the revolutionary workers and peasants becomes too threatening, they enact the rôle of traitors.

Gandhi's policy of "non-violence" is a rejection of the revolutionary methods of struggle. It signifies capitulation to Great Britain, and in essence expresses a deep fear of the proletariat. It is this small but highly developed Indian proletariat that can give leadership to the impoverished peasant masses in the revolution, and it is the proletariat alone that can successfully carry through its tasks. This is precisely what the native bourgeoisie, in the person of Gandhi, fears most. Gandhi expresses this clearly when he says: "It is dangerous to make use of the factory proletariat".

The significance of the revolution lies in its mass character, and the will to power by the masses. The objective conditions are ripe for the seizure of power. There remains however, the burning question of leadership in this struggle. It is upon the solution of this problem that the success of the Indian revolution depends. At present it constitutes the greatest weakness of the revolution.

The native bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie have conclusively demonstrated that they cannot lead the revolution to a victorious conclusion. They fear the revolution, and more than that they fear the proletariat. Only the Communists organized into a revolutionary party, with a correct program, can achieve the victory of the revolution. They can achieve it only as a dictatorship of the proletariat and in no other way. There are the lessons of all revolutionary struggles under imperialist capitalism.

What is needed today in India, is a strong Communist party to give leadership to the Indian masses. It is necessary to put forth the strategic aim of the dictatorship of the proletariat immediately. Without it one of the main barriers in the road of the emancipation of India's workers and peasants—that is, the barrier artificially erected by Roy and the Right wing on one hand, and its Stalinist caricature on the other—will remain in the way.