

**STALIN  
ON  
LENIN**



**Scanned / Transcribed by**  
**The Socialist Truth In Cyprus**  
**Web: <http://www.KibristaSosyalistGercek.net>**  
**<http://www.kibristasosyalistgercek.net/intro.htm>**  
**E-mail: [info@KibristaSosyalistGercek.net](mailto:info@KibristaSosyalistGercek.net)**








This reprint is published by  
RED STAR PRESS LTD.  
P.O. BOX 71 LONDON S.W.2

1975  
PRINTED IN ENGLAND









# STALIN ON LENIN

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE ★ MOSCOW 1939

*W. M. Zhdanov (Lenin)*



## CONTENTS

LENIN AS THE ORGANIZER AND LEADER OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY . . . . .	7
NOTES . . . . .	19
ON THE DEATH OF LENIN . . . . .	25
LENIN . . . . .	33
INTERVIEW GIVEN TO THE FIRST AMERICAN LABOUR DELEGATION (Excerpt) . . . . .	45
INTERVIEW GIVEN TO THE GERMAN WRITER EMIL LUDWIG (Excerpt) . . . . .	53
SPEECH DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF VOTERS OF THE STALIN ELECTORAL AREA, MOSCOW (Excerpt) . . . . .	59
SPEECH DELIVERED AT A RECEPTION IN THE KREMLIN TO HIGHER EDUCATIONAL WORKERS . . . . .	65



Remember, love and study Lenin, our teacher and leader.

Fight and vanquish the enemies, internal and foreign—as Lenin taught us.

Build the new life, the new existence, the new culture—as Lenin taught us.

Never refuse to do the little things, for from little things are built the big things—this is one of Lenin's important behests.

J. STALIN

И. Сталин



Remember, love and study Lenin, our teacher and leader.

Fight and vanquish the enemies, internal and foreign—as Lenin taught us.

Build the new life, the new existence, the new culture—as Lenin taught us.

Never refuse to do the little things, for from little things are built the big things—this is one of Lenin's important bequests.

J. STALIN

Жанна, моёму, ученице  
Ульяна, нашего учителя, нашего товарища  
борьбы и победоносного врага  
внутренних и внешних, — во  
Ульяну.

Смысл новой жизни, новой  
борьбы, новой победы — во Ульяну  
Никогда не отворачивайся от  
малого в работе, ибо из малого стро-  
ится великое, — в этом один из  
важных заветов Ульяна

Н. Сталин



# LENIN AS THE ORGANIZER AND LEADER OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

WRITTEN ON THE OCCASION  
OF LENIN'S FIFTIETH BIRTHDAY

*April 23, 1920*







HERE are two groups of Marxists. Both work under the flag of Marxism and consider themselves "genuine" Marxists. Nevertheless, they are by no means identical. More, a veritable gulf divides them, for their methods of work are diametrically opposed to each other.

The first group usually confines itself to an outward acceptance, to a ceremonial avowal of Marxism. Being unable or unwilling to grasp the essence of Marxism, being unable or unwilling to translate it into reality, it converts the living and revolutionary principles of Marxism into lifeless and meaningless formulas. It does not base its activities on experience, on what practical work teaches, but on quotations from Marx. It does not derive its instructions and directions from an analysis of actual realities, but from analogies and historical parallels. Discrepancy between word and deed is the chief malady of this group. Hence that disillusionment and perpetual grudge against fate which time and again betrays it and leaves it "with its nose out of joint." This group is known as the Mensheviks (in Russia), or opportunists (in Europe). Comrade Tyshko (Yogisches) described this group very aptly at the London Congress when he said that it does not stand by, but *lies down on* the Marxist view.

The second group, on the other hand, attaches prime importance not to the outward acceptance of Marxism, but to its realization, its translation into reality. What this group chiefly concentrates its attention on is to determine the ways and means of realising Marxism that best answer the



situation, and to change these ways and means as the situation changes. It does not derive its directions and instructions from historical analogies and parallels, but from a study of surrounding conditions. It does not base its activities on quotations and maxims, but on practical experience, testing every step by experience, learning from its mistakes and teaching others how to build a new life. This, in fact, explains why there is no discrepancy between word and deed in the activities of this group, and why the teachings of Marx completely retain their living, revolutionary force. To this group may be fully applied Marx's saying that Marxists cannot rest content with interpreting the world, but must go farther and change it. This group is known as the Bolsheviks, the Communists.

The organizer and leader of this group is V. I. Lenin.



situation, and to change these ways and means as the situation changes. It does not derive its directions and instructions from historical analogies and parallels, but from a study of surrounding conditions. It does not base its activities on quotations and maxims, but on practical experience, testing every step by experience, learning from its mistakes and teaching others how to build a new life. This, in fact, explains why there is no discrepancy between word and deed in the activities of this group, and why the teachings of Marx completely retain their living, revolutionary force. To this group may be fully applied Marx's saying that Marxists cannot rest content with interpreting the world, but must go farther and change it. This group is known as the Bolsheviks, the Communists.

The organizer and leader of this group is V. I. Lenin.



LENIN DEBATING WITH THE NARODNIK VORONTSOV (1894)

By A. Moravov



1.

## LENIN AS THE ORGANIZER OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

THE formation of the proletarian party in Russia took place under special conditions, conditions differing from those prevailing in the West at the time the workers' parties were formed there. Whereas in the West, in France and in Germany, the workers' party emerged from the trade unions at a time when trade unions and parties were legal, when the bourgeois revolution had already been made, when bourgeois parliaments existed, when the bourgeoisie, having climbed into power, found itself face to face with the proletariat, in Russia, on the contrary, the formation of the proletarian party took place under a most ferocious absolutism, in expectation of a bourgeois-democratic revolution; at a time when, on the one hand, the Party organizations were filled to overflowing with bourgeois "legal Marxists" who were thirsting to utilize the working class for the bourgeois revolution, and when, on the other, the tsarist gendarmerie were robbing the Party's ranks of its best workers, while the growth of a spontaneous revolutionary movement called for the existence of a steadfast, compact and sufficiently secret fighting core of revolutionaries, capable of leading the movement for the overthrow of absolutism.

The task was to separate the sheep from the goats, to dissociate oneself from alien elements, to organize cadres of experienced revolutionaries in the localities, to provide them with a clear program and firm tactics, and, lastly, to form these cadres into a single, militant organization of professional revolutionaries, sufficiently secret to withstand the onslaughts of the gendarmes, and at the same time sufficiently connected with the masses to lead them into battle at the required moment.

The Mensheviks, the people who "lie down" on the Marxist view, settled the question very simply: inasmuch as the workers' party in the West had emerged from non-party trade unions fighting for the improvement of the economic conditions of the working class, the same, as far as possible, should be the case in Russia; that is, the "economic struggle of the workers against the employers and the government" in the various localities was enough for the time being, no all-Russian militant organization should be created, and later . . . well, later, if trade unions did not arise by that time, a non-party labour congress should be called and proclaimed the Party.

That this "Marxist" "plan" of the Mensheviks, utopian though it was under Russian conditions, would entail extensive agitational work designed to disparage the very idea of party, to destroy the Party cadres, to leave the proletariat without a party and to surrender the working class to the tender mercies of the liberals, the Mensheviks, and perhaps a good many Bolsheviks too, hardly suspected at the time.

It was an immense service that Lenin rendered the Russian proletariat and its Party by exposing the utter danger of the Mensheviks' "plan" of organization at a time when this "plan" was still in the germ, when even its authors perceived its outlines with difficulty, and, having exposed it, opening a furious attack on the license of the Mensheviks in matters of organization and concentrating the whole attention of the militants on this question. For the very existence of the Party was at stake; it was a matter of life or death for the Party.

The plan that Lenin developed in his famous books, *What Is To Be Done?* and *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, was to establish an all-Russian political newspaper as a rallying centre of Party forces, to organize staunch Party cadres in the localities as "regular units" of the Party, to gather these cadres into one entity through the medium of the newspaper, and to unite them into an all-Russian militant party with sharply-defined limits, with a clear program, firm tactics and a single will. The merit of this plan lay in the fact that it fully conformed to Russian realities, and that it generalized in a masterly fashion the organizational experience of the best of the militants. In the struggle for this plan, the majority of the

Russian militants resolutely sided with Lenin and did not shrink from the prospect of a split. The victory of this plan laid the foundation for that closely-welded and steeled Communist Party of which there is no equal in the world.

Our comrades (and not only the Mensheviks!) often accused Lenin of an extreme fondness for controversy and splits, of being relentless in his struggle against conciliators and so on. At times this was undoubtedly the case. But it will be easily understood that our Party could not have rid itself of internal weakness and diffuseness, that it could not have attained its characteristic vigour and strength if it had not expelled non-proletarian, opportunist elements from its midst. In the epoch of bourgeois rule, a proletarian party can grow and gain strength only to the extent that it combats the opportunist, anti-revolutionary and anti-Party elements in its own midst and within the working class. Lassalle was right when he said: "A party strengthens itself by purging itself." The accusers usually cited the German party, where "unity" at that time flourished. But, in the first place, not every kind of unity is a sign of strength, and secondly, one has only to glance at the late German party, now rent into three parties, to realise the utter falsity and fictitiousness of "unity" between Scheide-mann and Noske, on the one hand, and Liebknecht and Luxemburg, on the other. And who knows whether it would not have been better for the German proletariat if the revolutionary elements of the German party had split away from its anti-revolutionary elements in time. . . . No, Lenin was a thousand times right in leading the Party along the path of irreconcilable struggle against the anti-Party and anti-revolutionary elements. For it was only because of such a policy of organization that our Party was able to create that internal unity and astonishing cohesion which enabled it to emerge unscathed from the July crisis during the Kerensky regime, to bear the brunt of the October uprising, to pass through the crisis of the Brest-Litovsk period unshaken, to organize the victory over the Entente, and, lastly, to acquire that unparalleled flexibility which permits it at any moment to reform its ranks and to concentrate hundreds of thousands of its members on any big task without causing confusion in its midst.



2.

## LENIN AS THE LEADER OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

**B**UT the merits of the Russian Communist Party in the field of organisation are only one aspect of the matter. The Party could not have grown and fortified itself so quickly if the political content of its work, its program and tactics had not conformed to Russian realities, if its slogans had not fired the worker masses and had not impelled the revolutionary movement forward. We shall now deal with this aspect.

The Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution (1905) took place under conditions differing from those that prevailed during the revolutionary upheavals in the West, in France and Germany, for example. Whereas the revolution in the West took place in the period of manufacture and of an undeveloped class struggle, when the proletariat was weak and numerically small and did not have its own party to formulate its demands, and when the bourgeoisie was sufficiently revolutionary to win the confidence of the workers and peasants and to lead them in the struggle against the aristocracy, in Russia, on the other hand, the revolution began (1905) in the period of machine industry and of a developed class struggle, when the Russian proletariat, relatively numerous and welded together by capitalism, had already fought a number of battles with the bourgeoisie, had its own party, which was more united than the bourgeois party, and its own class demands, and when the Russian bourgeoisie, which, moreover, subsisted on government contracts, was sufficiently scared by the revolutionary temper of the proletariat to seek an alliance with the government and the landlords against the workers and peasants. The fact that the Russian revolution broke out as a result



LENIN AND STALIN SPEAKING TO RED GUARDS IN THE SMOLNY, 1917

By P. Fasil'yev



## LENIN AS THE LEADER OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

**B**UT the merits of the Russian Communist Party in the field of organisation are only one aspect of the matter. The Party could not have grown and fortified itself so quickly if the political content of its work, its program and tactics had not conformed to Russian realities, if its slogans had not fired the worker masses and had not impelled the revolutionary movement forward. We shall now deal with this aspect.

The Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution (1905) took place under conditions differing from those that prevailed during the revolutionary upheavals in the West, in France and Germany, for example. Whereas the revolution in the West took place in the period of manufacture and of an undeveloped class struggle, when the proletariat was weak and numerically small and did not have its own party to formulate its demands, and when the bourgeoisie was sufficiently revolutionary to win the confidence of the workers and peasants and to lead them in the struggle against the aristocracy, in Russia, on the other hand, the revolution began (1905) in the period of machine industry and of a developed class struggle, when the Russian proletariat, relatively numerous and welded together by capitalism, had already fought a number of battles with the bourgeoisie, had its own party, which was more united than the bourgeois party, and its own class demands, and when the Russian bourgeoisie, which, moreover, subsisted on government contracts, was sufficiently scared by the revolutionary temper of the proletariat to seek an alliance with the government and the landlords against the workers and peasants. The fact that the Russian revolution broke out as a result



LENIN AND STALIN SPEAKING TO RED GUARDS IN THE SMOLNY, 1917

By P. Vasilyev



of the military defeats suffered on the fields of Manchuria only accelerated events without essentially altering them.

The situation demanded that the proletariat should take the lead of the revolution, rally the revolutionary peasants and wage a determined fight against tsardom and the bourgeoisie simultaneously, with a view to establishing complete democracy in the country and ensuring its own class interests.

But the Mensheviks, the people who "lie down" on the Marxist view, settled the question in their own fashion: inasmuch as the Russian revolution was a bourgeois revolution, and inasmuch as it is the representatives of the bourgeoisie that lead bourgeois revolutions (see the "history" of the French and German revolutions), the proletariat could not exercise the hegemony in the Russian revolution; the leadership should be left to the Russian bourgeoisie (which was betraying the revolution); the peasantry should also be left under the tutelage of the bourgeoisie, while the proletariat should remain an extreme Left opposition.

And this vulgar rehash of the tunes of the wretched liberals the Mensheviks passed off as the last word in "genuine" Marxism!

It was an immense service that Lenin rendered the Russian revolution by utterly exposing the futility of the Mensheviks' historical parallels and the danger of the Menshevik "scheme of revolution" which would surrender the cause of the workers to the tender mercies of the bourgeoisie. The tactical plan which Lenin developed in his famous pamphlets, *Two Tactics* and *The Victory of the Cadets*, was as follows: a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, instead of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; boycott of the Bulygin Duma and armed uprising, instead of participating in the Duma and carrying on organic work within it; the idea of a "Left bloc," when the Duma was after all convened, and the utilisation of the Duma tribune for the struggle waged outside the Duma, instead of a Cadet Ministry and the reactionary "cherishing" of the Duma; a fight against the Cadet Party as a counter-revolutionary force, instead of forming a "bloc" with it.

The merit of this plan was that it bluntly and decisively formulated the class demands of the proletariat in the epoch of the *bourgeois-democratic*

*revolution* in Russia, facilitated the transition to the Socialist revolution, and bore within it the germ of the idea of the *dictatorship of the proletariat*. The majority of the Russian militants resolutely and unswervingly followed Lenin in the struggle for this tactical plan. The victory of this plan laid the foundation for those revolutionary tactics with whose help our Party is now shaking the foundations of world imperialism.

The subsequent development of events: the four years of imperialist war and the shattering of the whole economic life of the country; the February Revolution and the celebrated dual power; the Provisional Government, which was a hotbed of bourgeois counter-revolution, and the Petrograd Soviet, which was the form of the incipient proletarian dictatorship; the October Revolution and the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly; the abolition of bourgeois parliamentarism and the proclamation of the Republic of Soviets; the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war and the offensive of world imperialism, in conjunction with the pseudo Marxists, against the proletarian revolution; and, lastly, the pitiable position of the Mensheviks, who clung to the Constituent Assembly and who were thrown overboard by the proletariat and driven by the waves of revolution to the shores of capitalism—all this only confirmed the correctness of the principles of the revolutionary tactics formulated by Lenin in his *Two Tactics*. A party with such a heritage could sail boldly forward, fearless of submerged rocks.

\* \* \*

In these days of proletarian revolution, when every Party slogan and every utterance of a leader is tested in action, the proletariat makes special demands of its leaders. History knows of proletarian leaders who were leaders in times of storm, practical leaders, self-sacrificing and courageous, but who were weak in theory. The names of such leaders are not soon forgotten by the masses. Such, for example, were Lassalle in Germany and Blanqui in France. But the movement as a whole cannot live on reminiscences alone: it must have a clear goal (a program), and a firm line (tactics).

There is another type of leader—peace-time leaders, who are strong in theory, but weak in questions of organization and practical affairs. Such

leaders are popular only among an upper layer of the proletariat, and then only up to a certain point; when times of revolution set in, when practical revolutionary slogans are demanded of the leaders, the theoreticians quit the stage and give way to new men. Such, for example, were Plekhanov in Russia and Kautsky in Germany.

To retain the post of leader of the proletarian revolution and of the proletarian party, one must combine strength of theory with experience in the practical organization of the proletarian movement. P. Axelrod, when he was a Marxist, wrote of Lenin that he “happily combines the experience of a good practical worker, a theoretical education and a broad political outlook” (see P. Axelrod’s preface to Lenin’s pamphlet: *The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats*). What Mr. Axelrod, the ideologist of “civilized” capitalism, would say now about Lenin, is not difficult to guess. But we who know Lenin well and can judge dispassionately have no doubt that Lenin has fully retained this old quality. It is here, incidentally, that one must seek the reason why it is Lenin, and no one else, who is today the leader of the strongest and most highly tempered proletarian party in the world.



# NOTES

*September 15, 1922*







**I**T seems to me not quite in order to write about "Comrade Lenin on Vacation" now that the vacation is coming to an end and Comrade Lenin is about to return to work. Besides, my impressions are so plentiful, and they are so precious, that it is scarcely advisable to write of them in a brief article, as the editors of *Pravda* request. However, write I must, for the editors insist.

I have often met old veterans at the front who had been continuously in action for days "on end," without sleep or rest; they would come back from the firing line looking like shadows and drop like a log: but having "slept the clock round" they would rise refreshed and eager for new battles, without which they "cannot live." When I first visited Comrade Lenin at the end of July, not having seen him for six weeks, this was just the impression he made on me—an old veteran who had managed to get some rest after incessant and exhausting battles, and who was refreshed by the repose. He looked bright and recuperated, but still bore traces of overwork and fatigue.

"I am not allowed to read the newspapers," Comrade Lenin remarked ironically, "and I must not talk politics. I carefully walk around every scrap of paper lying on the table, lest it turn out to be a newspaper and lead to a breach of discipline."

I laugh heartily and laud Comrade Lenin for his good discipline. We also make merry over the doctors who cannot understand that when professional men of politics get together they cannot help talking politics.

What strikes you in Comrade Lenin is his thirst for information and his craving, his insuperable craving for work. It is clear that he is famished for work. The trial of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, Genoa and the Hague, the harvest prospects, industry and finance—one question follows another in swift succession. He is in no hurry to express his opinion, complaining that he is out of touch with events; he mostly plies you with questions and takes mental notes. He grows quite animated on learning that the harvest prospects are good.

I found an entirely different picture a month later. This time Comrade Lenin was surrounded by stacks of books and newspapers (he was now allowed to read and talk politics to his heart's content). There was no longer any trace of fatigue and overwork. There was no sign of that nervous craving for work—he was no longer famished. Calmness and self-assurance had fully returned. This was our old Lenin, gazing shrewdly, one eye screwed up, at his interlocutor. . . .

And our talk too was of a more lively character.

Home affairs . . . the harvest . . . the state of industry . . . the ruble quotation . . . the budget. . . .

"Times are hard. But the worst is over. The harvest will make a big difference. It is bound to be followed by an improvement in industry and finance. The thing now is to relieve the state of unnecessary expenditure by retrenching our departments and industries and improving them. We must be very firm in this, and we shall squeeze through, we shall most certainly squeeze through."

Foreign affairs . . . the Entente . . . France's conduct . . . England and Germany . . . the role of America. . . .

"They are greedy, and they hate each other intensely. They will be at loggerheads yet. We need be in no hurry. Our's is a sure road: we are for peace and for agreement, but we are against enslavement and enslaving terms of agreement. We must keep a firm hand on the wheel and steer our own course, and not yield to either flattery or intimidation."

The Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks and their rabid agitation against Soviet Russia. . . .



What strikes you in Comrade Lenin is his thirst for information and his craving, his insuperable craving for work. It is clear that he is famished for work. The trial of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, Genoa and the Hague, the harvest prospects, industry and finance—one question follows another in swift succession. He is in no hurry to express his opinion, complaining that he is out of touch with events; he mostly plies you with questions and takes mental notes. He grows quite animated on learning that the harvest prospects are good.

I found an entirely different picture a month later. This time Comrade Lenin was surrounded by stacks of books and newspapers (he was now allowed to read and talk politics to his heart's content). There was no longer any trace of fatigue and overwork. There was no sign of that nervous craving for work—he was no longer famished. Calmness and self-assurance had fully returned. This was our old Lenin, gazing shrewdly, one eye screwed up, at his interlocutor. . . .

And our talk too was of a more lively character.

Home affairs . . . the harvest . . . the state of industry . . . the ruble quotation . . . the budget. . . .

"Times are hard. But the worst is over. The harvest will make a big difference. It is bound to be followed by an improvement in industry and finance. The thing now is to relieve the state of unnecessary expenditure by retrenching our departments and industries and improving them. We must be very firm in this, and we shall squeeze through, we shall most certainly squeeze through."

Foreign affairs . . . the Entente . . . France's conduct . . . England and Germany . . . the role of America. . . .

"They are greedy, and they hate each other intensely. They will be at loggerheads yet. We need be in no hurry. Our's is a sure road: we are for peace and for agreement, but we are against enslavement and enslaving terms of agreement. We must keep a firm hand on the wheel and steer our own course, and not yield to either flattery or intimidation."

The Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks and their rabid agitation against Soviet Russia. . . .



LENIN AND STALIN IN GORKI (NEAR MOSCOW), 1922



"Yes, they are bent on defaming Soviet Russia. They are making it easier for the imperialists to fight Soviet Russia. They have been caught in the mire of capitalism, and are sliding into an abyss. Let them flounder. They have been dead a long time as far as the working class is concerned."

The Whiteguard press . . . the émigrés . . . the incredible fairy tales about Lenin's death, with full details. . . .

Comrade Lenin smiles and says: "Let them lie if it is any consolation to them; one must not rob the dying of their last consolation."

Originally published in an  
illustrated supplement to PRAVDA  
of September 24, 1922,  
entitled "Lenin on Vacation."



# ON THE DEATH OF LENIN

A SPEECH DELIVERED AT  
THE SECOND ALL-UNION CONGRESS OF SOVIETS

*January 26, 1924*





COMRADES, we Communists are people of a special mould. We are made of a special stuff. We are those who form the army of the great proletarian strategist, the army of Comrade Lenin. There is nothing higher than the honour of belonging to this army. There is nothing higher than the title of member of the Party whose founder and leader was Comrade Lenin. It is not given to everyone to be a member of such a party. It is not given to everyone to withstand the stresses and storms that accompany membership in such a party. It is the sons of the working class, the sons of want and struggle, the sons of incredible privation and heroic effort who before all should be members of such a party. That is why the party of the Leninists, the party of the Communists, is also called the party of the working class.

DEPARTING FROM US, COMRADE LENIN ADJURED US TO HOLD HIGH AND GUARD THE PURITY OF THE GREAT TITLE OF MEMBER OF THE PARTY. WE VOW TO YOU, COMRADE LENIN, THAT WE WILL FULFIL YOUR BEHEST WITH CREDIT!

For twenty-five years Comrade Lenin moulded our Party and finally trained it to be the strongest and most highly steeled workers' party in the world. The blows of tsardom and its henchmen, the fury of the bourgeoisie and the landlords, the armed attacks of Kolchak and Denikin, the armed



intervention of England and France, the lies and slanders of the hundred-mouthed bourgeois press—all these scorpions constantly chastised our Party for a quarter of a century. But our Party stood firm as a rock, repelling the countless blows of the enemy and leading the working class forward, to victory. In fierce battles our Party forged the unity and solidarity of its ranks. And by unity and solidarity it achieved the victory over the enemies of the working class.

DEPARTING FROM US, COMRADE LENIN ADJURED US TO GUARD THE UNITY OF OUR PARTY AS THE APPLE OF OUR EYE. WE VOW TO YOU, COMRADE LENIN, THAT THIS BEHEST, TOO, WE WILL FULFIL WITH CREDIT!

Burdensome and intolerable has been the lot of the working class. Painful and grievous have been the sufferings of the labouring people. Slaves and slaveholders, serfs and sires, peasants and landlords, workers and capitalists, oppressed and oppressors—so the world has been built from time immemorial, and so it remains to this day in the vast majority of countries. Scores, nay, hundreds of times in the course of the centuries have the labouring people striven to throw off the oppressors from their backs and to become the masters of their own destiny. But each time, defeated and disgraced, they have been forced to retreat, harbouring in their breasts resentment and humiliation, anger and despair, and lifting up their eyes to an inscrutable heaven where they hoped to find deliverance. The chains of slavery remained intact, or the old chains were replaced by new ones, equally burdensome and degrading. Ours is the only country where the crushed and oppressed labouring masses have succeeded in throwing off the rule of the landlords and capitalists and replacing it by the rule of the workers and peasants. You know, comrades, and the whole world now admits it, that this gigantic struggle was led by Comrade Lenin and his Party. The greatness of Lenin lies before all in this, that by creating the Republic of Soviets he

gave a practical demonstration to the oppressed masses of the world that hope of deliverance is not lost, that the rule of the landlords and capitalists is short-lived, that the kingdom of labour *can* be created by the efforts of the labouring people themselves, and that the kingdom of labour must be created not in heaven, but on *earth*. He thus fired the hearts of the workers and peasants of the whole world with the hope of liberation. This explains why Lenin's name has become the name most beloved of the labouring and exploited masses.

DEPARTING FROM US, COMRADE LENIN ADJURED US TO GUARD AND STRENGTHEN THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT. WE VOW TO YOU, COMRADE LENIN, THAT WE WILL SPARE NO EFFORT TO FULFIL THIS BEHEST, TOO, WITH CREDIT!

The dictatorship of the proletariat was established in our country on the basis of an alliance between the workers and peasants. This is the prime and fundamental basis of the Republic of Soviets. The workers and peasants could not have vanquished the capitalists and landlords without such an alliance. The workers could not have defeated the capitalists without the support of the peasants. The peasants could not have defeated the landlords without the leadership of the workers. This is borne out by the whole history of the civil war in our country. But the struggle to consolidate the Soviet Republic is by no means at an end—it has only taken on a new form. Before, the alliance of the workers and peasants took the form of a military alliance, because it was directed against Kolchak and Denikin. Now the alliance of the workers and peasants must assume the form of economic co-operation between town and country, between workers and peasants, because it is directed against the merchant and the kulak, and its aim is the mutual supply by peasants and workers of all they require. You know that nobody worked for this more persistently than Comrade Lenin.



DEPARTING FROM US, COMRADE LENIN ADJURED US TO STRENGTHEN WITH ALL OUR MIGHT THE ALLIANCE OF THE WORKERS AND THE PEASANTS. WE VOW TO YOU, COMRADE LENIN, THAT THIS BEHEST, TOO, WE WILL FULFIL WITH CREDIT!

A second basis of the Republic of Soviets is the alliance of the labouring nationalities of our country. Russians and Ukrainians, Bashkirs and Byelorussians, Georgians and Azerbaijanians, Armenians and Daghestanians, Tatars and Kirghiz, Uzbeks and Turkmens are all equally interested in strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat. Not only does the dictatorship of the proletariat deliver these nations from chains and oppression, but these nations for their part deliver our Soviet Republic from the intrigues and assaults of the enemies of the working class by their supreme devotion to the Soviet Republic and their readiness to make sacrifices for it. That is why Comrade Lenin untiringly urged upon us the necessity of maintaining a voluntary union of the nations of our country, the necessity for fraternal co-operation among them within the framework of the Union of Republics.

DEPARTING FROM US, COMRADE LENIN ADJURED US TO CONSOLIDATE AND EXTEND THE UNION OF REPUBLICS. WE VOW TO YOU, COMRADE LENIN, THAT THIS BEHEST, TOO, WE WILL FULFIL WITH CREDIT!

A third basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat is our Red Army and Red Navy. Time and again did Lenin impress upon us that the respite we had won from the capitalist states might prove a short one. Time and again did Lenin point out to us that the strengthening of the Red Army and the improvement of its condition is one of the most important tasks of our Party. The events connected with Curzon's ultimatum and the crisis in Germany once more confirmed that, as always, Lenin was right. Let us then

vow, comrades, that we will spare no effort to strengthen our Red Army and our Red Navy.

Like a vast rock, our country towers amid an ocean of bourgeois states. Wave after wave dashes against it, threatening to submerge it and crumble it to pieces. But the rock stands solid and firm. Where lies its strength? Not only in the fact that our country rests on an alliance of workers and peasants, that it embodies an alliance of free nationalities, that it is protected by the strong arm of the Red Army and the Red Navy. The strength, the firmness, the solidity of our country is due to the profound sympathy and unfailing support it finds in the hearts of the workers and peasants of the whole world. The workers and peasants of the whole world want the Soviet Republic to be preserved, as a bolt shot by the sure hand of Comrade Lenin into the camp of the enemy, as the pillar of their hopes of deliverance from oppression and exploitation, as a reliable beacon pointing the path to their emancipation. They want to preserve it, and they will not allow the landlords and capitalists to destroy it. There lies our strength. There lies the strength of the working people of all countries. And there lies the weakness of the bourgeoisie all over the world.

Lenin never regarded the Republic of Soviets as an end in itself. To him it was always a link needed to strengthen the chain of the revolutionary movement in the countries of the West and the East, a link needed to facilitate the victory of the working people of the whole world over capitalism. Lenin knew that this was the only right conception, both from the international standpoint and from the standpoint of preserving the Soviet Republic itself. Lenin knew that this alone could fire the working people of the world to fight the decisive battles for their emancipation. That is why, on the very morrow of the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, this most brilliant of all leaders of the proletariat laid the foundation of the workers' International. That is why he never tired of extending and strengthening the union of the working people of the whole world—the Communist International.

You have seen during the past few days the pilgrimage of scores and hundreds of thousands of working folk to the bier of Comrade Lenin. Soon



you will see the pilgrimage of representatives of millions of working people to the tomb of Comrade Lenin. You need not doubt that the representatives of millions will be followed by representatives of scores and hundreds of millions from all parts of the earth, come to testify that Lenin was the leader not only of the Russian proletariat, not only of the European workers, not only of the colonial East, but of all the working people of the globe.

DEPARTING FROM US, COMRADE LENIN ADJURED US TO REMAIN FAITHFUL TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL. WE VOW TO YOU, COMRADE LENIN, THAT WE WILL NOT SPARE OUR LIVES TO STRENGTHEN AND EXTEND THE UNION OF THE TOILERS OF THE WHOLE WORLD—THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL!

# LENIN

SPEECH DELIVERED AT A MEMORIAL MEETING  
OF THE KREMLIN MILITARY SCHOOL

*January 28, 1924*





COMRADES, I am told that you have arranged a Lenin memorial meeting this evening, and that I have been invited as one of the speakers. I believe there is no need for me to deliver a set speech on Lenin's activities. It would be better, I think, to confine myself to a few facts to bring out certain of Lenin's characteristics as a man and a statesman. There may perhaps be no inherent connection between these facts, but that is of no vital importance as far as gaining a general idea of Lenin is concerned. At any rate, I am unable on this occasion to do more than what I have just promised.

## A MOUNTAIN EAGLE

I first became acquainted with Lenin in 1903. True, it was not a personal acquaintance; it was maintained by correspondence. But it made an indelible impression upon me, one which has never left me throughout all my work in the Party. I was in exile in Siberia at the time. My knowledge of Lenin's revolutionary activities since the end of the 'nineties, and especially after 1901, after the appearance of *Iskra*, had convinced me that in Lenin we had a man of extraordinary calibre. I did not regard him as a mere leader of the Party, but as its actual founder, for he alone understood the inner essence and urgent needs of our Party. When I compared him with the



other leaders of our Party, it always seemed to me that he was head and shoulders above his colleagues—Plekhanov, Martov, Axelrod and the others; that, compared with them, Lenin was not just one of the leaders, but a leader of the highest rank, a mountain eagle, who knew no fear in the struggle, and who boldly led the Party forward along the unexplored paths of the Russian revolutionary movement. This impression took such a deep hold of me that I felt impelled to write about it to a close friend of mine who was living as a political exile abroad, requesting him to give me his opinion. Some time later, when I was already in exile in Siberia—this was at the end of 1903—I received an enthusiastic letter from my friend and a simple, but profoundly expressive, letter from Lenin, to whom, it appeared, my friend had shown my letter. Lenin's note was comparatively short, but it contained a bold and fearless criticism of the practical work of our Party, and a remarkably clear and concise account of the entire plan of work of the Party in the immediate future. Only Lenin could write of the most intricate things so simply and clearly, so concisely and boldly that every sentence did not so much speak as ring like a rifle shot. This simple and bold letter strengthened my opinion that Lenin was the mountain eagle of our Party. I cannot forgive myself for having, from the habit of an old underground worker, consigned this letter of Lenin's, like many other letters, to the flames.

My acquaintance with Lenin dates from that time.

## MODESTY

I first met Lenin in December 1905 at the Bolshevik conference in Tammerfors (Finland). I was hoping to see the mountain eagle of our Party, the great man, great not only politically, but, if you will, physically, because in my imagination I pictured Lenin as a giant, stately and imposing. What, then, was my disappointment to see a most ordinary-looking man,



FIRST MEETING OF LENIN AND STALIN, TAMMERFORS (FINLAND), DECEMBER 1905

By I. Vepkhvadze



other leaders of our Party, it always seemed to me that he was head and shoulders above his colleagues—Plekhanov, Martov, Axelrod and the others; that, compared with them, Lenin was not just one of the leaders, but a leader of the highest rank, a mountain eagle, who knew no fear in the struggle, and who boldly led the Party forward along the unexplored paths of the Russian revolutionary movement. This impression took such a deep hold of me that I felt impelled to write about it to a close friend of mine who was living as a political exile abroad, requesting him to give me his opinion. Some time later, when I was already in exile in Siberia—this was at the end of 1903—I received an enthusiastic letter from my friend and a simple, but profoundly expressive, letter from Lenin, to whom, it appeared, my friend had shown my letter. Lenin's note was comparatively short, but it contained a bold and fearless criticism of the practical work of our Party, and a remarkably clear and concise account of the entire plan of work of the Party in the immediate future. Only Lenin could write of the most intricate things so simply and clearly, so concisely and boldly that every sentence did not so much speak as ring like a rifle shot. This simple and bold letter strengthened my opinion that Lenin was the mountain eagle of our Party. I cannot forgive myself for having, from the habit of an old underground worker, consigned this letter of Lenin's, like many other letters, to the flames.

My acquaintance with Lenin dates from that time.

## MODESTY

I first met Lenin in December 1905 at the Bolshevik conference in Tammerfors (Finland). I was hoping to see the mountain eagle of our Party, the great man, great not only politically, but, if you will, physically, because in my imagination I pictured Lenin as a giant, stately and imposing. What, then, was my disappointment to see a most ordinary-looking man,



FIRST MEETING OF LENIN AND STALIN, TAMMERFORS (FINLAND), DECEMBER 1905

By I. Vepkhvadze



below average height, in no way, literally in no way, distinguishable from ordinary mortals. . . .

It is accepted as the usual thing for a "great man" to come late to meetings so that the assembly may await his appearance with bated breath; and then, just before the great man enters, the warning whisper goes up: "Hush! . . Silence! . . He's coming." This rite did not seem to me superfluous, because it creates an impression, inspires respect. What, then, was my disappointment to learn that Lenin had arrived at the conference before the delegates, had settled himself somewhere in a corner, and was unassumingly carrying on a conversation, a most ordinary conversation with the most ordinary delegates at the conference. I will not conceal from you that at that time this seemed to me to be rather a violation of certain essential rules.

Only later did I realize that this simplicity and modesty, this striving to remain unobserved, or, at least, not to make himself conspicuous and not to emphasize his high position—that this feature was one of Lenin's strongest points as the new leader of the new masses, of the simple and ordinary masses, of the very "rank and file" of humanity.

## FORCE OF LOGIC

The two speeches Lenin delivered at this conference were remarkable: one was on the political situation and the other on the agrarian question. Unfortunately, they have not been preserved. They were inspired, and they roused the whole conference to a pitch of stormy enthusiasm. The extraordinary power of conviction, the simplicity and clarity of argument, the brief and easily understandable sentences, the absence of affectation, of dizzying gestures and theatrical phrases aiming for effect—all this made Lenin's speech a favourable contrast to the speeches of the usual "parliamentary" orator.

But what captivated me at the time was not these features of Lenin's speeches. I was captivated by that irresistible force of logic in them which,



although somewhat terse, thoroughly overpowered his audience, gradually electrified it, and then, as the saying goes, captivated it completely. I remember that many of the delegates said: "The logic of Lenin's speeches is like a mighty tentacle which seizes you on all sides as in a vise and from whose grip you are powerless to tear yourself away: you must either surrender or make up your mind to utter defeat."

I think that this characteristic of Lenin's speeches was the strongest feature of his art as an orator.

## NO WHINING

The second time I met Lenin was in 1906 at the Stockholm Congress of our Party. You know that the Bolsheviks were in the minority at this congress and suffered defeat. This was the first time I saw Lenin in the role of the vanquished. But he was not a jot like those leaders who whine and lose heart when beaten. On the contrary, defeat transformed Lenin into a spring of compressed energy which inspired his followers for new battles and for future victory. I said that Lenin was defeated. But was it defeat? You had only to look at his opponents, the victors at the Stockholm Congress—Plekhanov, Axelrod, Martov and the rest. They had little of the appearance of real victors, for Lenin's implacable criticism of Menshevism had not left one whole bone in their body, so to speak. I remember that we, the Bolshevik delegates, huddled together in a group, gazing at Lenin and asking his advice. The talk of some of the delegates betrayed a note of weariness and dejection. I recall that Lenin bitingly replied through clenched teeth: "Don't whine, comrades, we are bound to win, for we are right." Hatred of the whining intellectual, faith in our own strength, confidence in victory—that is what Lenin impressed upon us. It was felt that the Bolsheviks' defeat was temporary, that they were bound to win in the early future.

"No whining over defeat"—this was a feature of Lenin's activities that helped him to weld together an army faithful to the end and confident of its strength.

## NO CONCEIT

At the next congress, held in 1907 in London, the Bolsheviks were victorious. This was the first time I saw Lenin in the role of victor. Victory usually turns the heads of leaders and makes them haughty and conceited. They begin in most cases to celebrate their victory and to rest on their laurels. Lenin did not resemble such leaders one jot. On the contrary, it was after a victory that he was most vigilant and cautious. I recall that Lenin insistently impressed on the delegates: "The first thing is not to be carried away by victory, not to grow conceited; the second thing is to consolidate the victory; the third thing is to crush the opponent, for he has been defeated, but by no means crushed." He poured withering scorn on those delegates who frivolously asserted: "It is all over with the Mensheviks now." He had no difficulty in showing that the Mensheviks still had roots in the labour movement, that they had to be fought with skill, and that all overestimation of one's own strength and, especially, all underestimation of the strength of the adversary had to be avoided.

"No conceit in victory"—this was a feature of Lenin's character that helped him soberly to weigh the strength of the enemy and to insure the Party against possible surprises.

## FIDELITY TO PRINCIPLE

Party leaders cannot but prize the opinion of the majority of their party. A majority is a power with which a leader cannot but reckon. Lenin understood this no less than any other party leader. But Lenin never was a captive of the majority, especially when that majority had no basis of principle. There have been times in the history of our Party when the opinion of the majority or the momentary interests of the Party conflicted with the fundamental interests of the proletariat. On such occasions Lenin would never hesitate and resolutely took his stand on principle as against



the majority of the Party. Moreover, he did not fear on such occasions literally to stand alone against all, considering—as he would often say—that “a policy of principle is the only correct policy.”

Particularly characteristic in this respect are the two following facts.

*First fact.* This was in the period 1909-11, when the Party had been smashed by the counter-revolution and was in a state of complete disintegration. It was a period of disbelief in the Party, of wholesale desertion from the Party, not only by the intellectuals, but partly even by the workers; it was a period when the necessity for a secret organization was being denied, a period of liquidationism and collapse. Not only the Mensheviks, but even the Bolsheviks consisted of a number of factions and trends, which for the most part were severed from the working-class movement. We know that it was at this period that the idea arose of completely liquidating the secret party and of organizing the workers into a legally-sanctioned, liberal, Stolypin party. Lenin at that time was the only one not to succumb to the general contagion and to hold aloft the Party banner, assembling the scattered and shattered forces of the Party with astonishing patience and extraordinary persistence, combating each and every anti-Party trend within the working-class movement and defending the Party idea with unusual courage and unparalleled perseverance.

We know that in this fight for the Party idea, Lenin later proved the victor.

*Second fact.* This was the period 1914-17, when the imperialist war was in full swing, and when all, or nearly all, the Social-Democratic and Socialist parties had succumbed to the general patriotic frenzy and placed themselves at the service of the imperialism of their respective countries. It was a period when the Second International had hauled down its colours to capitalism, when even people like Plekhanov, Kautsky, Guesde and the rest were unable to withstand the tide of chauvinism. Lenin at that time was the only one, or nearly the only one, to wage a determined struggle against social-chauvinism and social-pacifism, to denounce the treachery of the Guesdes and Kautskys, and to stigmatize the half-heartedness of the bewixt-and-between “revolutionaries.” Lenin knew that he was backed by only

an insignificant minority, but to him this was not of decisive moment, for he knew that the only correct policy with a future before it was the policy of consistent internationalism, that the only correct policy was one of principle.

We know that in this fight for a new International Lenin proved the victor.

“A policy of principle is the only correct policy”—this was the formula with which Lenin took “impregnable” positions by assault and won over the best elements of the proletariat to revolutionary Marxism.

## FAITH IN THE MASSES

Theoreticians and leaders of parties, men who are acquainted with the history of nations and who have studied the history of revolutions from beginning to end, are sometimes afflicted by an unsavoury disease. This disease is called fear of the masses, disbelief in the creative power of the masses. This sometimes gives rise in the leaders to an aristocratic attitude towards the masses, who although they may not be versed in the history of revolutions are destined to destroy the old order and build the new. This aristocratic attitude is due to a fear that the elements may break loose, that the masses may “destroy too much”; it is due to a desire to play the part of a mentor who tries to teach the masses from books, but who is averse to learning from the masses.

Lenin was the very antithesis of such leaders. I do not know of any revolutionary who had so profound a faith in the creative power of the proletariat and in the revolutionary fitness of its class instinct as Lenin. I do not know of any revolutionary who could scourge the smug critics of the “chaos of revolution” and the “riot of unauthorized actions of the masses” so ruthlessly as Lenin. I recall that when in the course of a conversation one comrade said that “the revolution should be followed by normal order,” Lenin sarcastically remarked: “It is a regrettable thing when people who



would be revolutionaries forget that the most normal order in history is revolutionary order.”

Hence Lenin's contempt for all who superciliously looked down on the masses and tried to teach them from books. And hence Lenin's constant precept: learn from the masses, try to comprehend their actions, carefully study the practical experience of the struggle of the masses.

Faith in the creative power of the masses—this was the feature of Lenin's activities which enabled him to comprehend the elemental forces and to direct their movement into the channel of the proletarian revolution.

## THE GENIUS OF REVOLUTION

Lenin was born for revolution. He was, in truth, the genius of revolutionary outbreaks and a supreme master of the art of revolutionary leadership. Never did he feel so free and happy as in times of revolutionary upheavals. I do not mean by this that Lenin equally approved of all revolutionary upheavals, or that he was in favour of revolutionary outbreaks at all times and under all circumstances. Not at all. What I do mean is that never was Lenin's brilliant insight displayed so fully and conspicuously as in times of revolutionary outbreak. During revolutionary upheavals he literally blossomed forth, became a seer, divined the movement of classes and the probable zigzags of revolution as if they lay in the palm of his hand. It used to be said with good reason in our Party circles: “Lenin swims in the tide of revolution like a fish in water.”

Hence the “amazing” *clarity* of Lenin's tactical slogans and the “astounding” *boldness* of his revolutionary plans.

I recall two facts which are particularly characteristic of this feature of Lenin.

*First fact.* It was in the period just prior to the October Revolution, when millions of workers, peasants and soldiers, driven by the crisis in the rear and at the front, were demanding peace and liberty; when the generals and the bourgeoisie were working for a military dictatorship for the sake



LENIN AND STALIN, MARCH 1919



would be revolutionaries forget that the most normal order in history is revolutionary order."

Hence Lenin's contempt for all who superciliously looked down on the masses and tried to teach them from books. And hence Lenin's constant precept: learn from the masses, try to comprehend their actions, carefully study the practical experience of the struggle of the masses.

Faith in the creative power of the masses—this was the feature of Lenin's activities which enabled him to comprehend the elemental forces and to direct their movement into the channel of the proletarian revolution.

## THE GENIUS OF REVOLUTION

Lenin was born for revolution. He was, in truth, the genius of revolutionary outbreaks and a supreme master of the art of revolutionary leadership. Never did he feel so free and happy as in times of revolutionary upheavals. I do not mean by this that Lenin equally approved of all revolutionary upheavals, or that he was in favour of revolutionary outbreaks at all times and under all circumstances. Not at all. What I do mean is that never was Lenin's brilliant insight displayed so fully and conspicuously as in times of revolutionary outbreak. During revolutionary upheavals he literally blossomed forth, became a seer, divined the movement of classes and the probable zigzags of revolution as if they lay in the palm of his hand. It used to be said with good reason in our Party circles: "Lenin swims in the tide of revolution like a fish in water."

Hence the "amazing" clarity of Lenin's tactical slogans and the "astounding" boldness of his revolutionary plans.

I recall two facts which are particularly characteristic of this feature of Lenin.

*First fact.* It was in the period just prior to the October Revolution, when millions of workers, peasants and soldiers, driven by the crisis in the rear and at the front, were demanding peace and liberty; when the generals and the bourgeoisie were working for a military dictatorship for the sake



LENIN AND STALIN, MARCH 1919



of "war to a finish"; when so-called "public opinion" and the so-called "socialist parties" were inimical to the Bolsheviks and were branding them as "German spies"; when Kerensky was trying—already with some success—to drive the Bolshevik Party underground; and when the still powerful and disciplined armies of the Austro-German coalition stood confronting our weary, disintegrating armies, while the West-European "socialists" lived in blissful alliance with their governments for the sake of "war to a victorious finish." . . .

What did starting an uprising at such a moment mean? Starting an uprising in such a situation meant staking everything. But Lenin did not fear the risk, for he knew, he saw with his prophetic eye, that an uprising was inevitable, that it would win; that an uprising in Russia would pave the way for the termination of the imperialist war, that it would rouse the worn-out masses of the West, that it would transform the imperialist war into a civil war; that the uprising would usher in a Republic of Soviets, and that the Republic of Soviets would serve as a bulwark for the revolutionary movement all over the world.

We know that Lenin's revolutionary foresight was subsequently confirmed with unparalleled fidelity.

*Second fact.* It was in the very first days of the October Revolution, when the Council of People's Commissars was trying to compel General Dukhonin, the mutinous Commander-in-Chief, to terminate hostilities and to start negotiations for an armistice with the Germans. I recall that Lenin, Krylenko (the future Commander-in-Chief) and I went to General Headquarters in Petrograd to negotiate with Dukhonin over the direct wire. It was a ghastly moment. Dukhonin and General Headquarters categorically refused to obey the orders of the Council of People's Commissars. The army officers were completely under the sway of General Headquarters. As for the soldiers, no one could tell what this army of twelve million would say, subordinated as it was to the so-called army organizations, which were hostile to the Soviets. In Petrograd itself, as we know, a mutiny of the military cadets was brewing. Furthermore, Kerensky was marching on Petrograd. I recall that after a pause at the direct wire, Lenin's face suddenly lit up;



it became extraordinarily radiant. Clearly, he had arrived at a decision. "Let's go to the wireless station," he said, "it will stand us in good stead. We will issue a special order dismissing General Dukhonin, appoint Krylenko Commander-in-Chief in his place and appeal to the soldiers over the heads of the officers, calling upon them to surround the generals, to terminate hostilities, to establish contact with the German and Austrian soldiers and take the cause of peace into their own hands."

This was "a leap in the dark." But Lenin did not shrink from this "leap"; on the contrary, he made it eagerly, for he knew that the army wanted peace and would win peace, sweeping every obstacle from its path; he knew that this method of establishing peace was bound to have its effect on the German and Austrian soldiers and would give full rein to the yearning for peace on every front without exception.

We know that here, too, Lenin's revolutionary foresight was subsequently confirmed with the utmost fidelity.

Brilliant insight, the ability rapidly to grasp and divine the inner meaning of impending events, was that quality in Lenin which enabled him to lay down the correct strategy and a clear line of conduct at crucial moments of the revolutionary movement.



it became extraordinarily radiant. Clearly, he had arrived at a decision. "Let's go to the wireless station," he said, "it will stand us in good stead. We will issue a special order dismissing General Dukhonin, appoint Krylenko Commander-in-Chief in his place and appeal to the soldiers over the heads of the officers, calling upon them to surround the generals, to terminate hostilities, to establish contact with the German and Austrian soldiers and take the cause of peace into their own hands."

This was "a leap in the dark." But Lenin did not shrink from this "leap"; on the contrary, he made it eagerly, for he knew that the army wanted peace and would win peace, sweeping every obstacle from its path; he knew that this method of establishing peace was bound to have its effect on the German and Austrian soldiers and would give full rein to the yearning for peace on every front without exception.

We know that here, too, Lenin's revolutionary foresight was subsequently confirmed with the utmost fidelity.

Brilliant insight, the ability rapidly to grasp and divine the inner meaning of impending events, was that quality in Lenin which enabled him to lay down the correct strategy and a clear line of conduct at crucial moments of the revolutionary movement.



LENIN AND STALIN AT THE DIRECT WIRE, 1918

By P. Vasilyev



INTERVIEW GIVEN  
TO THE FIRST  
AMERICAN  
LABOUR DELEGATION

/EXCERPT/

FIRST QUESTION OF THE DELEGATION  
AND STALIN'S ANSWER

*September 9, 1927*







**QUESTION:** *What new principles have Lenin and the Communist Party added to Marxism in practice? Would it be correct to say that Lenin believed in "constructive revolution" whereas Marx was more inclined to wait for the culmination of the development of economic forces?*

**ANSWER:** I think that Lenin "added" no "new principles" to Marxism nor did he abolish any of the "old" principles of Marxism. Lenin was, and remains, the most loyal and consistent pupil of Marx and Engels, and he wholly and entirely based himself on the principles of Marxism. But Lenin did not merely carry out the doctrines of Marx and Engels. He developed these doctrines still further. What does that mean? It means that he developed the doctrines of Marx and Engels in accordance with the new conditions of development, with the new phase of capitalism, with imperialism. This means that in developing the doctrines of Marx in the new conditions of the class struggle, Lenin contributed something new to the general treasury of Marxism as compared with what was contributed by Marx and Engels and with what could be contributed in the pre-imperialist period of capitalism. The new contribution Lenin made to the treasury of Marxism is wholly and entirely based on the principles laid down by Marx and Engels. It is in this sense that we speak of Leninism as Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Here are a few questions to



which Lenin contributed something new in development of the doctrines of Marx.

*First:* the question of monopoly capitalism—of imperialism as the new phase of capitalism. In *Capital* Marx and Engels analysed the foundations of capitalism. But Marx and Engels lived in the period of the domination of pre-monopoly capitalism, in the period of the smooth evolution of capitalism and its “peaceful” expansion all over the world. This old phase of capitalism came to a close towards the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, when Marx and Engels were already dead. Clearly, Marx and Engels could only conjecture the new conditions of development of capitalism that arose out of the new phase of capitalism—which succeeded the old phase—out of the imperialist, monopoly phase of development, when the smooth evolution of capitalism gave way to spasmodic, cataclysmic development, when the unevenness of development and the contradictions of capitalism became particularly pronounced, and when the struggle for markets and spheres for capital export, in view of the extreme unevenness of development, made periodical imperialist wars for periodical redivisions of the world and of spheres of influence inevitable. The service Lenin rendered, and, consequently, his new contribution, was that, on the basis of the main principles enunciated in *Capital*, he made a reasoned Marxist analysis of imperialism as the last phase of capitalism, and exposed its ulcers and the conditions of its inevitable doom. On the basis of this analysis arose Lenin’s well-known principle that the conditions of imperialism made possible the victory of Socialism in individual capitalist countries, taken separately.

*Second:* the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The fundamental idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the political rule of the proletariat and as a method of overthrowing the rule of capital by force was advanced by Marx and Engels. Lenin’s new contribution in this field was a) that he discovered the Soviet form of government as the state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, utilising for this purpose the experience of the Paris Commune and the Russian revolution; b) that he deciphered the formula of the dictatorship of the proletariat from the angle of the problem

of the allies of the proletariat, and defined the dictatorship of the proletariat as a special form of class alliance between the proletariat, as the leader, and the exploited masses of the non-proletarian classes (the peasantry, etc.), as the led; c) that he laid particular emphasis on the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the highest type of democracy in class society, the form of *proletarian* democracy, which expresses the interests of the majority (the exploited), as against *capitalist* democracy, which expresses the interests of the minority (the exploiters).

*Third:* the question of the forms and methods of successfully building Socialism in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the period of transition from capitalism to Socialism, in a country surrounded by capitalist states. Marx and Engels regarded the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a more or less prolonged one, full of revolutionary conflicts and civil wars, in the course of which the proletariat, being in power, would take the economic, political, cultural and organizational measures necessary for creating, in the place of the old, capitalist society, a new, Socialist society, a society without classes and without a state. Lenin wholly and entirely adhered to these fundamental principles of Marx and Engels. Lenin’s new contribution in this field was: a) he proved that a complete Socialist society could be built in a country with a dictatorship of the proletariat surrounded by imperialist states, provided the country were not crushed by the military intervention of the surrounding capitalist states; b) he outlined the specific lines of economic policy (the “New Economic Policy”) by which the proletariat, being in command of the economic key positions (industry, land, transport, the banks, etc.) could link up socialised industry with agriculture (“the bond between industry and peasant farming”) and thus lead the whole national economy towards Socialism; c) he outlined the specific ways of gradually guiding and drawing the basic mass of the peasantry into the channel of Socialist construction through the medium of co-operative societies, which in the hands of the proletarian dictatorship are a powerful instrument for the transformation of small peasant farming and for the re-education of the mass of the peasantry in the spirit of Socialism.


*Fourth:* the question of the hegemony of the proletariat in revolution,



in all popular revolutions, both in a revolution against tsardom and in a revolution against capitalism. Marx and Engels presented the main outlines of the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat. Lenin's new contribution in this field was that he developed and expanded these outlines into a harmonious system of the hegemony of the proletariat, into a harmonious system of proletarian leadership of the working masses in town and country not only as regards the overthrow of tsardom and capitalism, but also as regards the building of Socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat. We know that, thanks to Lenin and his Party, the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat was applied in a masterly fashion in Russia. This incidentally explains why the revolution in Russia brought about the power of the proletariat. In previous revolutions it usually happened that the workers did all the fighting at the barricades, shed their blood and overthrew the old order, but that the power fell into the hands of the bourgeoisie, which then oppressed and exploited the workers. That was the case in England and France. That was the case in Germany. Here, in Russia, however, things took a different turn. In Russia, the workers did not merely represent the shock troops of the revolution. While it represented the shock troops of the revolution, the Russian proletariat at the same time strove for the hegemony, for the political leadership of all the exploited masses of town and country, rallying them around itself, wresting them from the bourgeoisie and politically isolating the bourgeoisie. Being the leader of the exploited masses, the Russian proletariat all the time fought to take the power into its own hands and to utilise it in its own interests against the bourgeoisie, against capitalism. This in fact explains why every powerful outbreak of the revolution in Russia, whether in October 1905 or in February 1917, gave rise to Soviets of Workers' Deputies as the embryo of the new apparatus of power—whose function it is to suppress the bourgeoisie—as against the bourgeois parliament, the old apparatus of power—whose function it is to suppress the proletariat. Twice did the bourgeoisie in Russia try to restore the bourgeois parliament and put an end to the Soviets: in August 1917, at the time of the "Pre-parliament," before the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks, and in January 1918, at the time of the "Consti-



in all popular revolutions, both in a revolution against tsardom and in a revolution against capitalism. Marx and Engels presented the main outlines of the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat. Lenin's new contribution in this field was that he developed and expanded these outlines into a harmonious system of the hegemony of the proletariat, into a harmonious system of proletarian leadership of the working masses in town and country not only as regards the overthrow of tsardom and capitalism, but also as regards the building of Socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat. We know that, thanks to Lenin and his Party, the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat was applied in a masterly fashion in Russia. This incidentally explains why the revolution in Russia brought about the power of the proletariat. In previous revolutions it usually happened that the workers did all the fighting at the barricades, shed their blood and overthrew the old order, but that the power fell into the hands of the bourgeoisie, which then oppressed and exploited the workers. That was the case in England and France. That was the case in Germany. Here, in Russia, however, things took a different turn. In Russia, the workers did not merely represent the shock troops of the revolution. While it represented the shock troops of the revolution, the Russian proletariat at the same time strove for the hegemony, for the political leadership of all the exploited masses of town and country, rallying them around itself, wresting them from the bourgeoisie and politically isolating the bourgeoisie. Being the leader of the exploited masses, the Russian proletariat all the time fought to take the power into its own hands and to utilise it in its own interests against the bourgeoisie, against capitalism. This in fact explains why every powerful outbreak of the revolution in Russia, whether in October 1905 or in February 1917, gave rise to Soviets of Workers' Deputies as the embryo of the new apparatus of power—whose function it is to suppress the bourgeoisie—as against the bourgeois parliament, the old apparatus of power—whose function it is to suppress the proletariat. Twice did the bourgeoisie in Russia try to restore the bourgeois parliament and put an end to the Soviets: in August 1917, at the time of the "Pre-parliament," before the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks, and in January 1918, at the time of the "Consti-



LENIN TALKING TO PEASANTS

By M. Sokolov



tuent Assembly," after the seizure of power by the proletariat. And on both occasions it suffered defeat. Why? Because the bourgeoisie was already politically isolated, the millions of working people regarded the proletariat as the sole leader of the revolution, and because the Soviets had already been tried and tested by the masses as their own workers' government, to exchange which for a bourgeois parliament would have meant suicide for the proletariat. It is not surprising, therefore, that bourgeois parliamentarism did not take root in Russia. That is why the revolution in Russia led to the rule of the proletariat. Such were the results of the application of Lenin's system of the hegemony of the proletariat in revolution.

*Fifth:* the national and colonial question. Analysing in their time the events in Ireland, India, China, the Central European countries, Poland and Hungary, Marx and Engels developed the basic and initial ideas on the national and colonial question. Lenin in his works based himself on these ideas. Lenin's new contribution in this field was: a) that he gathered these ideas into one harmonious system of views on national and colonial revolutions in the epoch of imperialism; b) that he connected the national and colonial question with the overthrow of imperialism; and c) that he declared the national and colonial question to be a component part of the general question of international proletarian revolution.

*Lastly:* the question of the Party of the proletariat. Marx and Engels gave the main outlines of the idea of the Party as the vanguard of the proletariat, without which (the Party) the proletariat could not achieve its emancipation, either in the sense of capturing power or in the sense of reconstructing capitalist society. Lenin's contribution in this field was that he developed these outlines further and applied them to the new conditions of the struggle of the proletariat in the period of imperialism, and showed: a) that the Party is a higher form of class organisation of the proletariat compared with other forms of proletarian organisation (labour unions, co-operative societies, the organisation of state) whose work it is the Party's function to generalise and to direct; b) that the dictatorship of the proletariat can be realised only through the Party, the directing force of the dictatorship; c) that the dictatorship of the proletariat can be complete only



if it is led by one party, the Communist Party, which does not and must not share the leadership with any other party; and d) that unless there is iron discipline in the Party, the task of the dictatorship of the proletariat of suppressing the exploiters and transforming class society into Socialist society cannot be accomplished.

This, in the main, is the new contribution made by Lenin in his works, giving more specific form to and developing Marx's doctrine as applied to the new conditions of the struggle of the proletariat in the period of imperialism.

That is why we say that Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

It is clear from this that Leninism cannot be separated from Marxism; still less can it be contrasted to Marxism.

The question submitted by the delegation goes on to ask: "Would it be correct to say that Lenin believed in 'constructive revolution' whereas Marx was more inclined to wait for the culmination of the development of economic forces?" I think it would be absolutely incorrect to say that. I think that every popular revolution, if it really is a popular revolution, is a constructive revolution, for it breaks up the old system and constructs, creates a new one. Of course, there is nothing constructive in such revolutions—if they may be called that—as take place, say, in Albania, in the form of comic opera "risings" of tribe against tribe. But Marxists never regarded such comic opera "risings" as revolutions. We are obviously not referring to such "risings," but to a mass popular revolution in which the oppressed classes rise up against the oppressing classes. Such a revolution cannot but be constructive. And it was precisely for such a revolution, and only for such a revolution, that Marx and Lenin stood. It goes without saying that such a revolution cannot arise under all conditions, that it can break out only under certain definite, favourable economic and political conditions.

## INTERVIEW GIVEN TO THE GERMAN WRITER EMIL LUDWIG

/EXCERPT/

*December 13, 1931*



EXCERPT  
EMIL LUDWIG  
TO THE GERMAN WRITER  
INTERVIEW GIVEN

LUDWIG: I am very much obliged that you have found it possible to grant me this interview. For more than twenty years I have been studying the lives and deeds of prominent historical personages. I believe I am a good judge of people, but on the other hand, I know nothing about social and economic conditions.

STALIN: You are very modest.

LUDWIG: No, it is a fact. That is why I will put questions that may seem queer to you. Today, here in the Kremlin, I saw certain relics of Peter the Great, and the first question I should like to ask is this: Do you think there is any parallel between yourself and Peter the Great? Do you regard yourself as continuing the cause of Peter the Great?

STALIN: Not in any way. Historical parallels are always dangerous. The one in question is absurd.

LUDWIG: But Peter the Great did a great deal to develop his country and to transplant to Russia the culture of the West.

STALIN: Yes, of course. Peter the Great did a great deal to elevate the landlord class and to develop the rising merchant class. Peter did a great deal to create and strengthen the national state of the landlords and merchants. It should be added that the elevation of the landlord class, the



encouragement of the rising merchant class, and the strengthening of the national state of these classes was effected at the cost of the peasant serf who was bled white. As for myself, I am merely a pupil of Lenin, and my aim is to be a worthy pupil of his. The task to which I have devoted my life is to elevate another class—the working class. That task is, not to strengthen any national state, but to strengthen a Socialist state—and that means an international state. Everything that contributes to strengthening that state helps to strengthen the international working class. If every step in my efforts to elevate the working class and to strengthen the Socialist state of that class were not directed towards strengthening and improving the position of the working class, I should consider my life purposeless.

You see then that your parallel is unsuitable.

As to Lenin and Peter the Great, the latter was but a drop in the sea—Lenin was a whole ocean.

LUDWIG: Marxism denies that personalities play an important role in history. Do you not see any contradiction between the materialist conception of history and the fact that you, after all, do admit the prominent role played by historical personalities?

STALIN: No, there is no contradiction. Marxism does not deny the role of prominent personalities, nor the fact that history is made by people. In *The Poverty of Philosophy* and in other works of Marx you will find it stated that it is people who make history. But of course, people do not make history according to their own fancy or the promptings of their imagination. Every new generation encounters definite conditions already existing, ready-made, when that generation was born. And if great people are worth anything, it is only to the extent that they correctly understand these conditions and know how to alter them. If they fail to understand these conditions and try to change them according to their own fancies, they will put themselves in a quixotic position. So you will see that precisely according to Marx, people must not be contrasted to conditions. It is people who make history, but they make it only to the extent that they correctly understand the conditions they found ready-made, and to the extent that they know how to

change those conditions. That, at least, is the way we Russian Bolsheviks understand Marx. And we have been studying Marx for a good many years.

LUDWIG: Some thirty years ago, when I studied at the university, many German professors, who considered themselves believers in the materialist conception of history, taught us that Marxism denied the role of heroes, the role of heroic personalities in history.

STALIN: They were vulgarisers of Marxism. Marxism never denied the role of heroes. On the contrary, it admits that they play a considerable role, only with the provisos I have just made.

\* \* \*

LUDWIG: Lenin spent many years abroad as an exile. You did not have occasion to be abroad for long periods. Do you regard it as a drawback to yourself; do you believe that greater benefit was brought to the revolution by people who, having been in exile abroad, had the opportunity to make a thorough study of Europe, but who, on the other hand, lost direct contact with the people; or that greater benefit was brought by those revolutionaries who carried on their work here, but who knew little of Europe?

STALIN: Lenin must be excluded from that comparison. Very few of those who remained in Russia were as closely associated with Russian affairs and with the working-class movement in the country as Lenin was, although he spent a long time abroad. Whenever I visited him abroad—in 1907, 1908 and 1912—I saw heaps of letters he had received from militants in Russia. Lenin always knew more than those who stayed in Russia. He always regarded his stay abroad as a burden.

Of course, there are in our Party and its leading bodies far more comrades who have never been abroad than former exiles, and of course they were able to bring more benefit to the revolution than those who were in exile abroad. There are very few former exiles left in our Party. There are about one or two hundred in all, among the two million members of the



Party. Of the seventy members of the Central Committee scarcely more than three or four lived in exile abroad.

As regards knowledge of Europe and a study of Europe, those, of course, who wished to study Europe had a better opportunity to do so while living in Europe. From that point of view, those of us who have not lived long abroad lost something. But living abroad is not essential in order to study European economics, technology, the leading men of the working-class movement and literature—fiction and scientific literature. Other conditions being equal, it is of course easier to study Europe while living in Europe. But the disadvantage of those who have not lived long in Europe is not very great. On the contrary, I know many comrades who were twenty years abroad, lived somewhere in Charlottenburg or in the Latin Quarter, spent years sitting in cafés and consuming beer, and yet did not study Europe and did not understand Europe.

# SPEECH DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF VOTERS OF THE STALIN ELECTORAL AREA, MOSCOW

/EXCERPT/

*December 11, 1937*



Party. Of the seventy members of the Central Committee scarcely more than three or four lived in exile abroad.

As regards knowledge of Europe and a study of Europe, those, of course, who wished to study Europe had a better opportunity to do so while living in Europe. From that point of view, those of us who have not lived long abroad lost something. But living abroad is not essential in order to study European economics, technology, the leading men of the working-class movement and literature—fiction and scientific literature. Other conditions being equal, it is of course easier to study Europe while living in Europe. But the disadvantage of those who have not lived long in Europe is not very great. On the contrary, I know many comrades who were twenty years abroad, lived somewhere in Charlottenburg or in the Latin Quarter, spent years sitting in cafés and consuming beer, and yet did not study Europe and did not understand Europe.

## SPEECH DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF VOTERS OF THE STALIN ELECTORAL AREA, MOSCOW

/EXCERPT/

*December 11, 1937*





This is a wonderful law, comrades. A deputy should know that he is the servant of the people, their emissary in the Supreme Soviet, and that he must follow the line laid down in the mandate given him by the people. If he turns off the road, the electors are entitled to demand new elections, and as to the deputy who turned off the road, they have the right to send him packing. (*Laughter and applause.*) This is a wonderful law. My advice, the advice of a candidate to his electors, is that they remember this electors' right, the right to recall deputies before the expiration of their term of office, that they keep an eye on their deputies, control them and, if they should take it into their heads to turn off the right road, to get rid of them and demand new elections. The government is obliged to appoint new elections. My advice is to remember this law and to take advantage of it should need arise.

And, lastly, one more piece of advice from a candidate to his electors. What in general must one demand of one's deputies, selecting from all possible demands the most elementary?

The electors, the people, must demand that their deputies should remain equal to their tasks, that in their work they should not sink to the level of political philistines, that in their posts they should remain political figures of the Lenin type, that as public figures they should be as clear and definite as Lenin was (*applause*), that they should be as fearless in battle and as merciless towards the enemies of the people as Lenin was (*applause*), that they should be free from all panic, from any semblance of panic, when things begin to get complicated and some danger or other looms on the horizon, that they should be as free from all semblance of panic as Lenin was (*applause*), that they should be as wise and deliberate in deciding complex problems requiring a comprehensive orientation and a comprehensive weighing of all pros and cons as Lenin was (*applause*), that they should be as upright and honest as Lenin was (*applause*), that they should love their people as Lenin did. (*Applause.*)

Can we say that all the candidates are public figures precisely of this kind? I would not say so. There are all sorts of people in the world, there are all sorts of public figures in the world. There are people of whom you

cannot say what they are, whether they are good or bad, courageous or timid, for the people heart and soul or for the enemies of the people. There are such people and there are such public figures. They are also to be found among us, the Bolsheviks. You know yourselves, comrades, there are black sheep in every family. (*Laughter and applause.*) Of people of this indefinite type, people who resemble political philistines rather than political figures, people of this vague, uncertain type, the great Russian writer, Gogol, rather aptly said: "Vague sort of people, says he, neither one thing nor the other, you can't make head or tail of them, they are neither Bogdan in town nor Seliphan in the country." (*Laughter and applause.*) There are also some rather apt popular sayings about such indefinite people and public figures: "A middling sort of man—neither fish nor flesh" (*general laughter and applause*), "neither a candle for god nor a poker for the devil." (*General laughter and applause.*)

I cannot say with absolute certainty that among the candidates (I beg their pardon, of course) and among our public figures there are not people who resemble political philistines more than anything else, who in character and make-up resemble people of the type referred to in the popular saying: "Neither a candle for god nor a poker for the devil." (*Laughter and applause.*)

I would like you, comrades, to exercise systematic influence on your deputies, to impress upon them that they must constantly keep before them the great image of the great Lenin and emulate Lenin in all things. (*Applause.*)

The functions of the electors do not end with the elections. They continue during the whole term of the given Supreme Soviet. I have already mentioned the law which empowers the electors to recall their deputies before the expiration of their term of office if they should turn off the right road. Hence it is the duty and right of the electors to keep their deputies constantly under their control and to impress upon them that they must under no circumstances sink to the level of political philistines, impress upon them that they must be like the great Lenin. (*Applause.*)

Such, comrades, is my second piece of advice to you, the advice of a candidate to his electors. (*Loud and sustained applause and cheers. All rise and turn towards the government box, to which Comrade Stalin proceeds from the platform. Voices: "Hurrah for the great Stalin!" "Hurrah for Comrade Stalin!" "Long live Comrade Stalin!" "Long live the first of the Leninists, candidate for the Soviet of the Union, Comrade Stalin!"*)

# SPEECH DELIVERED AT A RECEPTION IN THE KREMLIN TO HIGHER EDUCATIONAL WORKERS

May 17, 1938







**F**URTHER, comrades, I would like to give you some advice, the advice of a candidate to his electors. If you take capitalist countries you will find that peculiar, I would say, rather strange relations exist there between deputies and voters. As long as the elections are in progress, the deputies flirt with the electors, fawn on them, swear fidelity and make heaps of promises of every kind. It would appear that the deputies are completely dependent on the electors. As soon as the elections are over, and the candidates have become deputies, relations undergo a radical change. Instead of the deputies being dependent on the electors, they become entirely independent. For four or five years, that is, until the next elections, the deputy feels quite free, independent of the people, of his electors. He may pass from one camp to another, he may turn from the right road to the wrong road, he may even become entangled in machinations of a not altogether savoury character, he may turn as many somersaults as he likes—he is independent.

Can such relations be regarded as normal? By no means, comrades. This circumstance was taken into consideration by our Constitution and it made it a law that electors have the right to recall their deputies before the expiration of their term of office if they begin to play tricks, if they turn off the road, or if they forget that they are dependent on the people, on the electors.

This is a wonderful law, comrades. A deputy should know that he is the servant of the people, their emissary in the Supreme Soviet, and that he must follow the line laid down in the mandate given him by the people. If he turns off the road, the electors are entitled to demand new elections, and as to the deputy who turned off the road, they have the right to send him packing. (*Laughter and applause.*) This is a wonderful law. My advice, the advice of a candidate to his electors, is that they remember this electors' right, the right to recall deputies before the expiration of their term of office, that they keep an eye on their deputies, control them and, if they should take it into their heads to turn off the right road, to get rid of them and demand new elections. The government is obliged to appoint new elections. My advice is to remember this law and to take advantage of it should need arise.

And, lastly, one more piece of advice from a candidate to his electors. What in general must one demand of one's deputies, selecting from all possible demands the most elementary?

The electors, the people, must demand that their deputies should remain equal to their tasks, that in their work they should not sink to the level of political philistines, that in their posts they should remain political figures of the Lenin type, that as public figures they should be as clear and definite as Lenin was (*applause*), that they should be as fearless in battle and as merciless towards the enemies of the people as Lenin was (*applause*), that they should be free from all panic, from any semblance of panic, when things begin to get complicated and some danger or other looms on the horizon, that they should be as free from all semblance of panic as Lenin was (*applause*), that they should be as wise and deliberate in deciding complex problems requiring a comprehensive orientation and a comprehensive weighing of all pros and cons as Lenin was (*applause*), that they should be as upright and honest as Lenin was (*applause*), that they should love their people as Lenin did. (*Applause.*)

Can we say that all the candidates are public figures precisely of this kind? I would not say so. There are all sorts of people in the world, there are all sorts of public figures in the world. There are people of whom you

cannot say what they are, whether they are good or bad, courageous or timid, for the people heart and soul or for the enemies of the people. There are such people and there are such public figures. They are also to be found among us, the Bolsheviks. You know yourselves, comrades, there are black sheep in every family. (*Laughter and applause.*) Of people of this indefinite type, people who resemble political philistines rather than political figures, people of this vague, uncertain type, the great Russian writer, Gogol, rather aptly said: "Vague sort of people, says he, neither one thing nor the other, you can't make head or tail of them, they are neither Bogdan in town nor Seliphan in the country." (*Laughter and applause.*) There are also some rather apt popular sayings about such indefinite people and public figures: "A middling sort of man—neither fish nor flesh" (*general laughter and applause*), "neither a candle for god nor a poker for the devil." (*General laughter and applause.*)

I cannot say with absolute certainty that among the candidates (I beg their pardon, of course) and among our public figures there are not people who resemble political philistines more than anything else, who in character and make-up resemble people of the type referred to in the popular saying: "Neither a candle for god nor a poker for the devil." (*Laughter and applause.*)

I would like you, comrades, to exercise systematic influence on your deputies, to impress upon them that they must constantly keep before them the great image of the great Lenin and emulate Lenin in all things. (*Applause.*)

The functions of the electors do not end with the elections. They continue during the whole term of the given Supreme Soviet. I have already mentioned the law which empowers the electors to recall their deputies before the expiration of their term of office if they should turn off the right road. Hence it is the duty and right of the electors to keep their deputies constantly under their control and to impress upon them that they must under no circumstances sink to the level of political philistines, impress upon them that they must be like the great Lenin. (*Applause.*)



Such, comrades, is my second piece of advice to you, the advice of a candidate to his electors. (*Loud and sustained applause and cheers. All rise and turn towards the government box, to which Comrade Stalin proceeds from the platform. Voices: "Hurrah for the great Stalin!" "Hurrah for Comrade Stalin!" "Long live Comrade Stalin!" "Long live the first of the Leninists, candidate for the Soviet of the Union, Comrade Stalin!"*)

# SPEECH DELIVERED AT A RECEPTION IN THE KREMLIN TO HIGHER EDUCATIONAL WORKERS

May 17, 1938





OMRADES, permit me to propose a toast to science and its progress, and to the health of the men of science.

To the progress of science, of that science which does not fence itself off from the people and does not hold aloof from them, but which is prepared to serve the people and to transmit to them all the benefits of science, and which does not serve the people under compulsion, but voluntarily and willingly. (*Applause.*)

To the progress of science, of that science which will not permit its old and recognized leaders smugly to invest themselves in the robe of high priests and monopolists of science; which understands the meaning, significance and omnipotence of an alliance between the old scientists and the young scientists; which voluntarily and willingly throws open every door of science to the young forces of our country, and affords them the opportunity of scaling the peaks of science, and which recognizes that the future belongs to the young scientists. (*Applause.*)

To the progress of science, of that science whose devotees, while understanding the power and significance of the established scientific traditions and ably utilising them in the interests of science, are nevertheless not willing to be slaves of these traditions; the science which has the courage



and determination to smash the old traditions, standards and views when they become antiquated and begin to act as a fetter on progress, and which is able to create new traditions, new standards and new views. (*Applause.*)

In the course of its development science has known not a few courageous men who were able to break down the old and create the new, despite all obstacles, despite everything. Such scientists as Galileo, Darwin—and many others—are widely known. I should like to dwell on one of these eminent men of science, one who at the same time was the greatest man of modern times. I am referring to Lenin, our teacher, our tutor. (*Applause.*) Remember 1917. A scientific analysis of the social development of Russia and of the international situation brought Lenin to the conclusion that the only way out of the situation lay in the victory of Socialism in Russia. This conclusion came as a complete surprise to many men of science of the day. Plekhanov, an outstanding man of science, spoke of Lenin with contempt, and declared that he was “raving.” Other men of science, no less well-known, declared that “Lenin had gone mad,” and that he ought to be put away in a safe place. Scientists of all kinds set up a howl that Lenin was destroying science. But Lenin was not afraid to go against the current, against the force of routine. And Lenin won. (*Applause.*)

Here you have an example of a man of science who boldly fought an antiquated science and laid the road for a new science.

But sometimes it is not well-known men of science who lay the new roads for science and technology, but men entirely unknown in the scientific world, plain, practical men, innovators in their field. Here, sitting at this table, are Comrades Stakhanov and Papanin. They are unknown in the scientific world, they have no scientific degrees, but are just practical men in their field. But who does not know that in their practical work in industry Stakhanov and the Stakhanovites have upset the existing standards, which were established by well-known scientists and technologists, have shown that they were antiquated, and have introduced new standards which conform to the requirements of real science and technology? Who does not know that in their practical work on the drifting ice-floe Papanin and the Papaninites upset the old conception of the Arctic, in passing, as

it were, without any special effort, showed that it was antiquated, and established a new conception which conforms to the demands of real science? Who can deny that Stakhanov and Papanin are innovators in science, men of our advanced science.

There you see what “miracles” are still performed in science!

I have been speaking of science. But there are all kinds of science. The science of which I have been speaking is advanced science.

To the progress of our advanced science!

To the men of advanced science!

To Lenin and Leninism!

To Stakhanov and the Stakhanovites!

To Papanin and the Papaninites! (*Applause.*)