

"Five Years of the Russian Revolution and the Prospects of the World Revolution"

BY N. LENIN.

Editor's Note: The following article comprises a speech by Lenin at a plenary session of the fourth congress of the Third International, held November 13th, 1922. Our reproduction is from "Inprecorr" (Berlin); the article will be concluded in our next issue. In the meantime, it may be observed that "Current History" (New York) of January 1923 contains the full article, although apparently through a different translation.

Comrades! I have been named as chief speaker on the list, but you will understand that after my long illness I am not in a position to give a long report. The theme: "Five years of Russian revolution and the prospects of the world revolution" is much too extensive to be exhausted by one speaker in the course of a single speech. I shall therefore select a small part of the material—the question of the New Economic Policy. At present this theme is of the greatest importance, at least for me it is of the greatest importance, as I am working on it just now. I shall therefore speak on the subject: How did we begin the New Economic Policy, and what results have we obtained by this policy?

If I am to begin with how we began this New Economic Policy, I must go back to an article written by me in the year 1918. At the beginning of 1918 I had polemically touched upon the question of what attitude we were to adopt towards state capitalism. At that time I wrote: "State capitalism is a step forward compared with the present economic position of the Soviet Republic"—that is, compared with the economic situation at that time. If we could introduce state capitalism within six months, that would be a great success, and the best guarantee that within a year Socialism would be firmly established and unconquerable among us."

In the year 1918 I was thus of the opinion that, in comparison with the economic position of the Soviet Republic at that time, State Capitalism would be a step forward. That may sound very strange and even absurd, for at that time we adopted new economic measures daily, as quickly as possible, probably too quickly; measures which were distinctly socialist measures. And despite this I expressed the opinion that State Capitalism signified a step forward as compared with the economic situation of the Soviet Republic at that time.

I explained the idea further by simply enumerating the elements of Russia's economic structure. In my opinion these elements were: in the first place patriarchal, that is, those furnished by the most primitive forms of agriculture; and secondly, production on a small scale; to this category belong the majority of peasants dealing in corn. Thirdly, private capitalism; fourthly, state capitalism; fifthly, Socialism.

All of these economic elements were represented in Russia at that time. And so I set myself the task of explaining the relations of these elements to one another, and of ascertaining whether we should not perhaps estimate a non-socialist element, i.e., State Capitalism, higher than Socialism.

I repeat that it appears strange to everyone that a non-socialist element should appear to be higher, and should be acknowledged as higher than socialism, in a republic which has declared itself to be socialist.

But the matter becomes clear when you remember that we did not consider Russia's condition to be final, but fully recognized that: in Russia we have first the patriarchal system of agriculture, that is, the most primitive form, and then the socialist form. The question is, what role can state capitalism play under these circumstances?

I further asked myself which of these elements was stronger. It is clear that in a petty bourgeois

milieu the predominant element is petty bourgeois in character. The question which I asked myself was: what is our attitude to state capitalism? And my own reply was: state capitalism, although not socialistic, would be more favourable for Russia than the present form. This means that even then we understood, to a certain degree, that it would be better for us to arrive soon at state capitalism, and later, to direct Socialism.

I must lay special emphasis on this part, for I believe that this alone enables us to explain what the present economic policy represents; secondly, we can draw from it very useful practical conclusions for the Communist International. I am not prepared to say that at that time we already had our plans of retreat ready. This is not what was meant. The few lines of my polemical article were no plan of retreat at that time. No mention was made of free trade—a most important point and one of fundamental importance for state capitalism—but nevertheless there is a vague general idea of a retreat in it. And I am of the opinion that we, as a communist International, as the International of the Western European, advanced countries, must take this into consideration.

At the present time, for instance, we are occupied with the program. For my part I believe that we should do best if we were to first subject all programs to our judgment,—and not come to any hasty decisions this year. Why? One reason is of course that in my opinion we have not yet thought out everything thoroughly. But a special reason is that we have scarcely taken the thought of a retreat, or of securing the retreat, into consideration at all. We should not only consider how we are to act when we make an attack and are immediately victorious. In revolutionary times that is not so very difficult. In the course of a revolution there are always moments when the enemy loses his head. If we utilize this moment for attack, we may easily gain the victory. But there is no certainty in this, for the enemy, having thought the matter over, collects his forces. He is then likely to provoke us to attack, and then to defeat us for many years. The idea of the necessity of providing for a retreat is of great importance, not only from a theoretical standpoint. From a practical standpoint it is also necessary that all parties thinking of making direct attacks on capitalism in the near future should occupy themselves with the need of securing the retreat.

(To be concluded)

ROUGH REVIEW OF BRITISH POLITICS.

(Continued from page 1)

ligation to the stronger by reason of foreign investment within their borders. To whoever lends there grow strong economic ties. The Versailles Treaty is but the most recent of many preceding ones. The Germanised capital threatened British and Western capital, thus the war. So another treaty is made. The British Co-operators support ancient thought and ideas and expect a "new social order." Such treaties, such leagues and reparations are a sandy foundation to build a new social order upon.

It is easy to prophesy what conditions will exist under decaying capitalism, by whoever managed. Ever since 1907 depressions have ruled in the main. There have been short periods of so called prosperity. From 1907 to 1914 each crisis worsened until it actually broke into a world conflict. From 1914 to 1918 a fictitious prosperity, as far as the actual producers were concerned, existed. The crisis from 1918 to 1922—and the end is not yet—has eaten up all the savings of the workers.

Normality today equals crisis. In other words, prosperity is an abnormal period within a developed

capitalistic society, and the crises is a normal state. The British elections have come and gone. The workers have a great deal to learn yet, it is true, but they will find and hold to a steady course in time.

WHICH?

Continued from page 5)

tinople, but Britain will hold the pass-key. The League of Nations may internationalise the Straits, but the blue ensign shall flutter above the pennant of the League. The Turk may return to Thraee; it will be an intrigue for the dominance of British "glory." The Turk may pillage to his liking—if he will but counter the "designs" of the Bolsheviks. And for the power of his gods in Egypt, in the middle and the far East, he may enjoy the prestige of a favored nation of Europe.

(To be concluded)

HERE AND NOW.

IT would be altogether too orthodox a proceeding to muster all hands and jointly resolve to rustle more Clarion subs. during 1923 than during the sub-famine year of 1922. Orthodoxy or no we must solve the sub. problem somehow, or shrink. Let's have the resolutions—accompanied by the subs. of course—the more the merrier. Commencing with next issue.

Following \$1 each: J. Mackenzie, A. Legg, H. P. Graham, W. Morrison, J. Woods, M. Mindlin, A. M. Neelands, Mrs. H. Stephens, R. Temple, A. W. Cantrell, Mrs. Mailey, E. Fiala, C. A. Harding, J. Harrington, J. A. Goodspeed, G. Beagrie, F. Noha, J. A. Mitchell, P. W. Robitzsche, J. C. Blair, J. Mitchell, P. Brendler, Jack Shepherd, C. Lee, C. F. Orchard, A. Leopold, G. L., G. Donaldson, H. Christians, Sr.

Following \$2 each: Oscar Motter, H. Taylor, Dr. Inglis, C. Lestor, J. A. Untinen, Bert Smith, Sturgis, Sask. (no name), B. E. Polinkos, Sam Guthrie, M. L. A., C. W. Springford.

T. G. Daly \$1.87; E. Hunt \$4.50; Oscar Erickson \$7.

Above Clarion subs. received from 15th to 29th December, inclusive, total \$62.37.

Note: Will the reader who sent a M.O. to the amount of \$6.40 (\$2 sub. and \$4.40 literature) from Sturgis, Sask., please send in his name? He omitted to mention his name in the letter accompanying M.O.

ALBERTA NOTES.

Alberta and Saskatchewan P. E. C. of the S. P. of C. Secretary, R. Burns, 134 a 9th Avenue, West, Calgary, Alberta.

Local Calgary. Same address as above. Business meetings every alternate Tuesday, 8 p.m. Study class in Economics every Thursday at 8 p.m. Correspondence from all parts of Alberta and Saskatchewan is earnestly invited from all comrades interested in the organizational and educational work of the Party, and attendance at the classes and interest in their development and usefulness will be welcomed.

Socialist Party of Canada

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

STAR THEATRE, 300 Block, Main Street

SUNDAY DECEMBER 31st.

Speaker: SID EARP.

SUNDAY JANUARY 7th.

Speaker: J. HARRINGTON.

All meetings at 8 p.m.

MEETINGS EVERY SUNDAY.

Questions. Discussion.