

Stalin, J.W.

Collected Works 16

November 1944 – Oktober 1952



www.MinisterieVanPropaganda.org

Order of the Day
November 29, 1944

Order of the Day, addressed to Marshal Tolbukhin, announces that troops of the Third Ukrainian Front, having gone over to the offensive, have forced the Danube north of the River Drava, broken through the enemy defences on the western bank of the Danube and, advancing to a depth of about 40 kilometres, widened their breakthrough up to 150 kilometres along the front.

During the offensive, troops of the front on the territory of Hungaria, captured the towns and large communications junctions of Pecs, Ba-taszek and Mohacs, and captured in fighting more than 330 other populated places.

The Order mentions 49 commanders of troops, the Yugoslav Corps, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations have distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvoes was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

Order of the Day
November 30, 1944

Order of the Day, addressed to Marshal Mal-inovsky and Col.-Gen. Zakharov, announces that troops of the Second Ukrainian Front, continuing their offensive, on November 30, captured the towns of Eger and Szikszó, district: centres of Hungary, large communications junctions and important strongpoints in the enemy defences.

The Order mentions 21 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations have distinguished themselves.

A salute of 12 salvos was fired from 124 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No.151)

Order of the Day
December 2, 1944

Order of the day, addressed to Marshal Tol-bukhin and Lt.-Gen. Ivanov, announces that, developing their offensive, troops of the Third Ukrainian Front in two days captured the regional and district centres of Hungary - the towns of Szekszard, Kaposvar, Paks, Bonyhad and Dombovar - large communications junctions and important strongpoints of the enemy defences, and also captured in fighting more than 300 other populated places.

The Order mentions 30 commanders of troops, artillerymen, units and ships of the Danube Naval Flotilla, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations have distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvos was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No.151)

Order of the Day
December 3, 1944

Order of the Day, addressed to Army-Gen. Petrov and Lt.-Gen. Korzhenevich, announces that troops of the Fourth Ukrainian Front in coordination with troops of the Second Ukrainian Front on December 3, carried by storm the town of Satoralja Ujhely, regional centre of Hungary, important communications junction and strongpoint of the enemy defences.

The Order mentions 35 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations have distinguished themselves.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No.151)

Order of the Day
December 3, 1944

Order of the Day, addressed to Marshal Mal-inovsky and Col.-Gen. Zakharov, announces that troops of the Second Ukrainian Front as a result of stubborn fighting, on December 3, carried by storm the town of Miskolcz - large communications junction and powerful strongpoint of the enemy defences, a vital centre of war production in Hungary, supplying the German and Hungarian armies.

The Order mentions 39 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations have distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvos was fired from 224 Moscow guns.
("Soviet War News Weekly," No.151)

Order of the Day

December 9, 1944

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the Commander of the troops of the Second Ukrainian Front, Marshal Malinovsky, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col. -Gen. Zakharov

Troops of the Second Ukrainian Front, having pierced the strongly fortified enemy defences north-east of Budapest, widened the breakthrough to 120 kilometres along the front and, advancing to a depth of 60 kilometres, reached the River Danube, north of Budapest.

At the same time troops of the Front south of Budapest forced the Danube, pierced the enemy defences on the western bank of the river, and at Lake Velencez joined up with our troops advancing along the western bank of the Danube towards the north.

During offensive engagements troops of the Front captured the important strongpoints of the enemy defence, the towns of Balassagyarmat, No-grad, Vacz, Aszod and Ercsi, and more than 150 other populated places.

In the fighting for the piercing of the enemy defence and the forcing of the Danube, distinction was won by troops commanded by Col.-Gen. Shumilov, Maj.-Gen. Lukin, Lt.-Gen. Shlemin, Maj.-Gen. Birman, Lt.-Gen. Managarov, Maj.-Gen. Yakovlev, Lt.-Gen. Safiulin, Maj.-Gen. Alekhin, Maj.-Gen. Lazko, Maj.-Gen. Gigorovich, Maj.-Gen. Kolchuk, Maj.-Gen. Kruze, Maj.-Gen. Terentyev, Maj.-Gen. Preobrazhensky, Maj.-Gen. Fedorovsky, Maj.-Gen. Smirnov, Col. Vassilevsky, Col. Korkin, Col. Batluk, Maj.-Gen. Molozhayev, Maj.-Gen. Li-lenkov, Col. Voloshin, Maj.-Gen. Sarayev, Col. Dunayev, Maj.-Gen. Karamyshev, Col. Orlov, Maj. Gen. Losev and Maj.-Gen. Zdanovich.

Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Artillery Formin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Shmakov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Petrov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Alexeyenko, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Zykov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Gusarov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Ivanov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Bobrovnikov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Popovich, Col. Gushkin, Col. Nekrasov, Col. Rodin, Lt.-Col. Lyubimov, Col. Sapozhnikov, Lt.-Col. Kazak, Lt.-Col. Denis-enkov, Lt.-Col. Tronev and Lt.-Col. Kisly.

Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Kurkin, Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Kravchenko, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Stromberg, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Volkov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Savelyev, Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Zhdanov and Col. Brizhinev.

Cavalry commanded by Lt.-Gen. Pliyev, Maj.-Gen. Pichugin, Maj.-Gen. Kjuts, Maj.-Gen. Golovsky, Maj.-Gen. Pavlov, Maj.-Gen. Khrustal-ov, Maj.-Gen. Belousov, Col. Gagua, Col. Niki-forov and Col. Bliznyuk.

Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Goryunov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Seleznev, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Kamanin, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Prostoserdov, Col. Chenpalov, Col. Romanov and Maj. Sushko.

Sappers commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tsirlin, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Plyaskin, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Ignatov, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tupi-chev, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tyulev, Col. Tsepenyuk, Col. Kovalenko, Col. Isayev, Col. Myasnikov, Col. Kalinichenko, Col. Massonov and Lt.-Col. Anzaurov.

Signallers commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Signal Troops Leonov, Lt.-Col. Grachev, Col. Egorov, Col. Makarenko, Col. Shervud, Maj. Shishelov and Col. of State Security Karpov.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting for the piercing of the enemy defence and the forcing of the Danube will be recommended for the award of orders.

Today, December 9, at 20.00 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with 20 artillery salvos from 224 guns our gallant troops of the Second Ukrainian Front which pierced the enemy defence and forced the Danube.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to all the troops under your command which took part in the fighting for the piercing of the enemy defence and the forcing of the Danube. Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the struggle for the freedom and independence of our Motherland! Death to the German invaders!

J. STALIN
Marshal of the Soviet Union,
Supreme Commander-in-Chief

("Soviet War News Weekly," No.152)

Order of the Day December 24, 1944

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the Commander of the troops of the Third Ukrainian Front, Marshal Tollukhin, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Lt. -Gen. Ivanov

Troops of the Third Ukrainian Front, breaking through the strongly fortified enemy defences south-west of Budapest, in three days offensive operations have advanced up to 40 kilometres.

During the offensive, the troops of the front captured by storm the towns of Szekesfejer-var and Bicske - large centres of communications and important strongpoints in the enemy defences - thus cutting the main paths of retreat to the west for the Budapest grouping of German and Hungarian troops.

In the fighting during the breakthrough of the enemy defences and for the liberation of the towns of Szekesfejevvar and Bicske, distinction was won by troops commanded by Army-Gen. Za-kharov, Lt.-Gen. Shlemin, Maj.-Gen. Derevyanko, Maj.-Gen. Birman, Maj.-Gen. Biryukov, Maj.-Gen. Bobruk, Maj.-Gen. Gnedin, Lt.-Gen. Rubanyuk, Maj.-Gen. Kolchuk, Maj.-Gen. Grigorovich, Maj.-Gen. Afonin, Col. Chizhov, Col. Drychkin, Col. Bransburg, Col. Parfenov, Col. Kuska, Maj.-Gen. Gorbachev, Maj.-Gen. Bunyashin, Maj.-Gen. Tsvetkov, Maj.-Gen. Margelov, Maj.-Gen. Kindyukhin, Col. Baldynov, Col. Burik, Col. Dunayev, Maj.-Gen. Karamyshev and Maj.-Gen. Sarayev.

Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Artillery Nedelin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Tsikalo, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Alexeyenko, Lt.-Gen. of Artillery Voznyuk, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Ratov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Bobrovnikov, Col. Mikhail-ov, Col. Trekhnov, Col. Slepakov, Col. Lupakov, Col. Borisenko, Col. Tarasenko, Col. Romanov, Col. Grazhdankin, Col. Leonov, Lt.-Col. Korovin, Lt.-Col. Oleinik and Lt.-Col. Chepurin.

Tankmen commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Tank Troops Sukhoruchkin, Col. Rumantsyev, Lt.-Gen. Sviridov, Maj.-Gen. Goverunenko, Col. Ognev, Lt.-Gen. Gordeyev, Lt.-Col. Rogachev and Lt.-Col. Gayevsky.

Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Sudets, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Korsakov, Lt.-Gen. of Aviation Tolstikov, Col. Ivanov, Col. Sm-irnov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Tishchenko and Col. Terekhov.

Sappers commanded by Col.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Kotlyar, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Ignatov and Col. Pavlov.

Signallers commanded by Lt.-Gen. of Signal Troops Korolev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Morozov, Col. Yegorov and Col. Katkov.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting during the breakthrough of the enemy defences and for the liberation of the towns of Szekesfejevvar and Bicske will be recommended for the award of orders.

Today, December 24, at 20.00 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with 20 artillery salvos from 224 guns the gallant

troops of the Third Ukrainian Front .who broke through the enemy defences and liberated the towns of Szekesfejevvar and Bicske.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to all the troops under your command which took part in the fighting for the breaking through of the enemy defences and the liberation of the towns of Szekesfejevvar and Bicske.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fighting for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Death to the German invaders!

J. STALIN
Marshal of the Soviet Union,
Supreme Commander-in-Chief

("Soviet War News Weekly," No.154)

Marshal Stalin's Thanks
January, 1945

To Dr. Hewlett Johnson, Chairman of Joint Committee for Soviet Aid, London

I thank you, Dr. Johnson, and the members of your Committee, for the warm congratulations and greetings on the occasion of my birthday.

J. STALIN

To Mr. Maclean (Chairman) and Mr. Coates (Secretary), Anglo-Russian Parliamentary Committee, London

I thank you, Mr. Maclean and Mr. Coates, and the Anglo-Russian Parliamentary Committee, for the greetings on the occasion of my birthday.

J. STALIN
("Soviet War News Weekly," No.156)

Order of the Day, No. 223

Addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 1st Byelorussian Front, Marshal Zhukov, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col.-Gen. Malinin

January 17, 1945

TROOPS of the 1st Byelorussian Front, having effected a swift outflanking manoeuvre west of Warsaw, captured the town of Zirardow, cut the roads to Sochaczow, forced the Vistula north of Warsaw and thus, having cut off Warsaw from the west, to-day, January 17, by a combined blow from north, west and south, captured the capital of our Ally Poland, the City of Warsaw-most important. strategic centre of the German defence on the River Vistula, In the fighting for the capture of the City of Warsaw, distinction was won by troops commanded by Maj.-Gen. Perkhovich, Col.-Gen. Belov, Lieut.-Gen. Poplawski of the 1st Polish Army, Lieut.-Gen. Klubnyanchenko, Maj.-Gen. Strazhevski, Lieut.-Gen. Pulko-Dmitriev, Maj.-Gen. Andreyev, Maj.-Gen. Anashkin, Maj.-Gen. Pozdnyak, Maj.-Gen. Chernov, Col. Vadrigan, Maj.-Gen. Zaikin, Col. Solovyev, Col. Pavlovsky, Col. Muzykin, Maj.-Gen. Rotkovich, Col. Sheipak, Maj.-Gen. Bovzyuk, Col. Zaikovsky, Maj.-Gen. Kinovich and Col. Radzivanovich; Artillerymen commanded by Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Kozin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Modzilevsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Platsky, Col. Blonsky, Col. Vikentyev, Col. Skokovsky, Col. Belikhovsky, Col. Kerp, Col. Prokopovich, Col. Grekhov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Lyarsky, Col. Kolokolov, Col. Yalovatsky, Col. Yurgelevich, Col. Vashichev, Lieut.-Col. Mukhachev, Maj. Popovich, Lieut.-Col. Vasilchev and Lieut.-Col. Mikhailovsky; Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Bogdanov, Lieut.-Gen. Radzievsky, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Vedeneyev, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Telyakov, Lieut.-Gen. of Tank Troops Krivoshein, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Kretov, Lieut.-Col. Beloborodov, Lieut.-Col. Korost, Col. Yeremeyev, Col. Malyutin and Lieut.-Col. Tsurychkin; Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Rudenko, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Brayko, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Savitsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Karavatsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Dzusov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Tokarev, Col. Timofeyev, Col. Belousov, Col. Sukhoryabov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Komarov, Col. Rasskazov, Lieut.-Col. Nakonechnik, Col. Sitkin, Col. Buzylev, Col. Berkal, Col. Ivanov, Col. Romeyko, Lieut.-Col. Sherstyuk and Lieut.-Col. Gavrilchenko; Sappers commanded by Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Komarov, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Bordzilovsky, Col. Belsky, Col. Kiselev, Col. Lyubansky, Col. Puzeretsky and Lieut.-Col. Khovratovich ; and Signallers commanded by Col. Solovyev, Col. Suchek, Col. Zarudsky, Col. Smoli, Lieut.-Col. Vakish and Lieut.-Col. Stupachenko.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting for the capture of the City of Warsaw will be recommended for conferment of the name "Warsaw" and award of Orders.

To-day, January 17, at 19 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with 24 salvoes from 324 guns our gallant troops of the 1st Byelorussian Front, including troops of the 1st Polish Army, which captured the capital of Poland, Warsaw.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to all the troops under your Command, including the troops of the 1st Polish Army, which took part in the fighting for the liberation of Warsaw. Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the struggle for the freedom and independence of our Motherland and our Ally Poland!

Death to the German invaders!

J. Stalin
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union
Moscow

Order of the Day, No. 277

Addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Malinovsky, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Colonel-General Zakharov; and to the Commander of the Troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Tolbukhin, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Lieutenant-General Ivanov.

February 13, 1945

TROOPS of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, assisted by troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, after one and a half month's siege and stubborn fighting under the difficult conditions of a large city, to-day, February 13, completed the rout of the encircled enemy grouping in Budapest, and so completely captured the capital of Hungary, the city of Budapest, a strategically important German defence centre on the roads to Vienna.

During the fighting in the city of Budapest troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front took prisoner more than 110,000 enemy officers and men, headed by the German commander of the Budapest troop grouping, Col.-Gen. Pfeffer Wildenbruch, and his staff; they also seized a large quantity of arms and various military supplies.

In the fighting for the capture of Budapest distinction was won by troops commanded by Maj.-Gen. Afonin, Lieut.-Gen. Managarov, Col.-Gen. Shumilov, Lieut.-Gen. Shlemin, Army-Gen. Zakharov, Maj.-Gen. Filippovsky, Maj.-Gen. Lukin, Maj.-Gen. Birman, Maj.Gen. Derevyanko, Maj.-Gen. Kolchuk, Maj.-Gen. Akimenko, Maj.-Gen. Lazko, Lieut.-Gen. Rubanyuk, Maj.-Gen. Grigorovich, Maj.-Gen. Biryukov, Lieut.-Gen. Fomenko, Maj.-Gen. Bobruk, Lieut.-Gen. Petrushevsky, Lieut.-Gen. Gorshkov, Lieut.-Gen. Vostrukhov, Maj.-Gen. Sosedov, Col. Kovtun-Stankevich, Col. Peremanov, Col. Chebotarev, Col. Burik, Col. Zhashko, Maj.-Gen. Frolov, Col. Gushchin, Maj.-Gen. Nekrasov, Col. Baldynov, Maj.-Gen. Lilenkov, Col. Batluk, Maj.-Gen. Podshivalov, Col. Dunayev, Col. Smirnov, Col. Gorobets, Maj.-Gen. Karamyshev, Maj.-Gen. Afonin, Col. Drychkin, Maj.-Gen. Tsvetkov, Col. Moshlyak, Col. Kuks, Col. Parfenov, Col. Bransburg, Col. Derziyan, Maj.-Gen. Bunyashin, Col. Chizhov, Col. Sergeyev, Col. Naidishev, Maj.-Gen. Sokolovsky, Maj.-Gen. Margelov and Col. Lirov; Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Artillery Fomin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Shmakov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Kotikov, Col.-Gen. of Artillery Nedelin, Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Voznyuk, Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Petrov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Alexeyenko, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Tsikalo, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Gusarov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Ivanov, Col. Vorobyev, Col. Novikov, Col. Ponomarov, Col. Trekhnov, Col. Adamchik, Col. Strok, Engineer-Col. Brovarnik, Col. Mironov, Col. Koroteyev, Col. Kryzhevich, Col. Sedash, Col. Pastukh, Col. Bogushevich, Col. Lupakov, Col. Gushchin, Col. Rodin, Col. Motov, Col. Komarov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Ratov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Bobrobnikov, Col. Solovyev, Col. Grishchenko, Col. Leonov, Maj.Gen. of Artillery Danshin, Col. Rashitsky, Col. Gotsak, Col. Salansky, Col. Lupakov, Lieut.-Col. Popolzukhin, Lieut.-Col. Matyukha, Lieut.-Col. Tarasenko, Lieut.-Col. Pavlik, Lieut.-Col. Kozyarenko, Lieut.-Col. Breyev, Maj. Borodin, Lieut.-Col. Tronev, Lieut.-Col. Samchenko, Lieut.-Col. Prokhorov, Lieut.-Col. Borodko, Lieut.Col. Shpek and Maj. Voronov; Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Kurkin, Lieut.-Gen. of Tank Troops Akhmanov, Lieut.-Gen. Sviridov, Lieut.-Gen. Russiyanov, Maj.Gen. of Tank Troops Govorunenkov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Katkov, Col. Rumyantsev, Col. Tyaglov, Maj. Apolovnin, Senior Lieut. Grigoryev, Capt. Lapin and Capt. Kutuzov; Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Goryunov, Col.-Gen. of Aviation Sudets, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Seleznev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Korsakov, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Stepichev, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Podgorny, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Kamanin, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Tolstikov, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation

Tupikov, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Loginov, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Shchetchikov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Lededev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Belitsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Tishchenko, Col. Romanov, Col. Chanpalov, Col. Shuteyev, Col. Chizhikov, Col. Saprykin, Col. Semenenko, Col. Yudakov, Col. Tarenenko, Col. Geibo, Col. Terekhov, Col. Ivanov, Col. Nedosekin, Col. Dementyev, Col. Smirnov and Lieut.-Col. Shatilin ; Sappers commanded by Lieut.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tsirlin, Col.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Kotlyar, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Plyaskin, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Ignatov, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Vasilyev, Maj.-Gen. of Technical Troops Kosenko, Col. Malov, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tyulev, Col. Kovalenko, Col. Pavlov, Col. Nasonov, Col. Zagrebin, Col. Baburin, Col. Kalinichenko, Col. Nominas, Lieut.-Col. Fominykh, Lieut.-Col. Sheludko, Lieut.-Col. Yagodin, Maj. Markov, Engineer Maj. Dyukov, Lieut.-Col. Anzaurov, Maj. Fomenko, Engineer Lieut.-Col. Ragozin and Lieut.-Col. Korneyev; Signallers commanded by Lieut.-Gen. of Signals Troops Leonov, Lieut.-Gen. of Signals Troops Korolev, Col. Borisenko, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Morozov, Lieut.-Col. Reva, Lieut.-Col. Zhits, Lieut.-Col. Agupov, Maj. Tolsty, Col. of State Security Karpov, Col. Yegorov and Col. Kotkov; and by units and ships of the Danube Naval Flotilla commanded by Rear-Admiral Kholostyakov and Captain of the 2nd Rank Derzhavin.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting for the capture of the city of Budapest will be recommended for conferment of the name “Budapest” and for award of Orders.

To-day, February 13, at 21.00 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with 24 artillery salvos from 324 guns the gallant troops of the 2nd and 3rd Ukrainian Fronts which captured the capital of Hungary, the city of Budapest.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to all the troops under your command which took part in the fighting for the capture of Budapest.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fighting for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Death to the German invaders!

J. Stalin
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union
Moscow

Order of the Day, No. 5
February 23, 1945

COMRADES, Red Army men and Red Navy men, sergeants, officers and generals! To-day we are celebrating the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army's existence.

Created by the great Lenin to defend our Motherland from the attack of foreign invaders, and reared by the Bolshevik Party, the Red Army has traversed a glorious path in its development. It has fulfilled with credit its historic destiny and is rightfully the beloved child of the Soviet people. In the years of civil war the Red Army defended the young Soviet State from numerous enemies. In the great battles of the Patriotic War against German invasion the Red Army has saved the peoples of the Soviet Union from German-fascist slavery, upheld the freedom and independence of our Motherland, and helped the peoples of Europe to cast off the German yoke.

Now we are celebrating the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army in the midst of fresh historic victories over the enemy. The Red Army has not only freed its native land of the Hitlerite filth, but also hurled the enemy for many hundreds of kilometres back beyond those lines from which the Germans launched their bandit attack upon our country, carried the war into Germany's territory and now, together with the armies of our Allies, is successfully completing the rout of the German-fascist army.

In January of this year the Red Army brought down upon the enemy a blow of unparalleled force along the entire front from the Baltic to the Carpathians. On a stretch of 1,200 kilometres (750 miles), it broke up the powerful defences of the Germans which they had been building for a number of years. In the course of the offensive the Red Army by its swift and skilful actions has hurled the enemy far back to the West. In stiff fighting the Soviet troops have advanced from the frontiers of East Prussia to the lower reaches of the Vistula—270 kilometres (175 miles), from the Vistula bridgehead south of Warsaw to the lower reaches of the Oder—570 kilometres (355 miles), and from the Sandomir bridgehead into the depth of German Silesia—480 kilometres (300 miles).

The first consequence of the successes of our winter offensive was that they thwarted the Germans' winter offensive in the west, which aimed at the seizure of Belgium and Alsace, and enabled the armies of our Allies in their turn to launch an offensive against the Germans and thus link up their offensive operations in the west with the offensive operations of the Red Army in the east.

In forty days of the offensive in January-February, 1945, our troops have ejected the Germans from 300 towns, captured about 100 war plants, manufacturing tanks, aircraft, armaments and ammunition, occupied over 2,400 railway stations and seized a network of railways totalling over 15,000 kilometres (9,375 miles) in length. Within this short period Germany has lost over 350,000 officers and men in prisoners of war and not less than 800,000 in killed. During the same period the Red Army has destroyed or seized about 3,000 German aircraft, over 4,500 tanks and self-propelled guns and not less than 12,000 guns.

As a result, the Red Army has completely liberated Poland and a considerable part of the territory of Czechoslovakia, occupied Budapest and put out of the war Germany's last ally in Europe, Hungary, captured the greater part of East Prussia and German Silesia and battled its way into Brandenburg, into Pomerania, to the approaches to Berlin.

The Hitlerites boasted that for more than a hundred years not a single enemy soldier had been within Germany's borders, and that the German army had fought and would fight only on foreign soil. Now an end has been put to this German bragging.

Our winter offensive has shown that the Red Army finds more and more strength for the solution of ever more complex and difficult problems. Its glorious soldiers have learned to batter and annihilate the enemy in accordance with all the rules of modern military science. Our soldiers, inspired by the realization of their great mission of liberation, display miracles of heroism and selflessness, and ably combine gallantry and audacity in battle with full utilization of the power and strength of their weapons. The Red Army generals and officers in masterly manner combine massed blows of powerful equipment with skilful and swift manoeuvre. In the fourth year of the war the Red Army has grown stronger and mightier than ever before, its combat equipment has become still more perfect and its fighting mastery many times higher.

Comrades, Red Army men and Red Navy men, sergeants, officers and generals!

Complete victory over the Germans is now already near. But victory never comes of itself—it is won in hard battles and in persistent labour. The doomed enemy hurls his last forces into action, resists desperately in order to escape stern retribution. He grasps and will grasp at the most extreme and base means of struggle. Therefore it should be borne in mind that the nearer our victory, the higher must be our vigilance and the heavier must be our blows at the enemy.

On behalf of the Soviet Government and our glorious Bolshevik Party, I greet and congratulate you upon the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army!

To mark the great victories achieved by the armed forces of the Soviet State in the course of the past year, I order:

To-day, February 23, on the day of the 27th Anniversary of the Red Army, at 20.00 hours (Moscow time) a salute of 20 artillery salvoes shall be fired in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Petrozavodsk, Tallinn, Riga, Vilnius, Kishinev, Tbilisi, Stalingrad, Sevastopol, Odessa and Lvov.

Long live our glorious Red Army Long live our victorious Navy!

Long live our mighty Soviet Motherland!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the struggle for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Death to the German invaders!

J. Stalin
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union
Moscow

**Reply to the message from
Groza and Tatarescu
March 29, 1945**

To the President of the Ministers Council of Rumania, Peter Groza

Copy for the Vice-President of the Ministers Council and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, G. Tatarescu

Mr. President,

The Soviet Government has examined the demand of the Rumanian Government stated in your letter of March 8, concerning the establishment of Rumanian administration in the territory of Transylvania.

Taking into account that the new Rumanian Government, which now ensures the management of the country, takes upon itself the responsibility for necessary order and peace in the territory of Transylvania and the satisfaction of the rights of nationalities, as well as the conditions for the correct working of all local institutions serving the needs of the Front, the Soviet Government has decided to satisfy the request of the Rumanian Government and, conforming to the Agreement on the Armistice of September 12, 1944, to consent to the establishment of the administration of the Rumanian Government in Transylvania.

J. STALIN

President of the Council of Commissaries of the People

("Pravda", 10 March, 1945)

Order of the Day, No. 334

**Addressed to the Commander of the Troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Tolbukhin, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Lieutenant-General Ivanov
April 13, 1945**

TROOPS of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, with the support of troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, after stiff street-fighting to-day, April 13, captured the capital of Austria, the city of Vienna, a strategically important centre of the German defences covering the routes to the southern areas of Germany.

During the course of the fighting for the approaches to Vienna and for the city of Vienna, from March 16 to April 13, the troops of the Front routed 11 German Tank Divisions, including the 6th S.S. Tank army, took prisoner more than 130,000 enemy officers and men, and destroyed or captured 1,345 tanks and self-propelled guns, 2,250 field-guns and much other military equipment.

In the fighting for the capture of the city of Vienna distinction was won by troops commanded by Col.-Gen. Glagolev, Lieut.-Gen. Zakhvatayev, Lieut.-Gen. Petrushevsky, Lieut.-Gen. Tikhonov, Lieut.-Gen. Utvenko, Lieut.-Gen. Mironov, Lieut.-Gen. Bakhtin, Lieut.-Gen. Rubanyuk, Maj.-Gen. Dereyanko, Maj.-Gen. Rozhdstvensky, Maj.-Gen. Biryukov, Maj.-Gen. Kozak, Maj.-Gen. Bobruk, Maj.-Gen. Shkodunovich, Maj.-Gen. Afonin, Maj.Gen. Tsvetkov, Maj.-Gen. Panchenko, Maj.-Gen. Dznakhua, Maj.Gen. Makarenko, Maj.-Gen., Bogdanov, Maj.-Gen. Denissenko, Maj.-Gen. Afonin, Col. Drychkin, Col. Chizhov, Col. Kuks, Col. Bransburg and Col. Vindushev; Ships and units of the Red Banner Danube Flotilla commanded by Rear-Admiral Kholostyakov, Lieut.-Capt. Barbotko and Lieut.-Capt. Veliki; Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Artillery Nedelin, Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Voznyuk, Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Nesteruk, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Tsikalo, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Breshnev, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Gushev, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Ratov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Velikolepov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Alexeyenko, Col. Fedorov, Col. Yeletsky, Col. Slepakov, Col. Borissenko, Col. Pleshakov, Col. Chernov, Col. Prokhotov, Col. Bulakhtik, Col. Leonov, Col. Lupanov, Lieut.Col. Zhkutsky, Maj. Voronov and Maj. Glebov; Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Kravchenko, Lieut.-Gen. of Tank Troops Volkov, Lieut.-Gen. Russyanov, Lieut.-Gen. Sviridov, Lieut.-Gen. of Tank Troops Akhmanov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Pavelkin, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Stromberg, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Savelyev, Maj.-Gen. Govorunenko, Col. Tyaglov, Col. Budnikov, Col. Rumyantsev, Col. Obdalenkov, Col. Ivanov, Col. Sakharov, Lieut.-Col. Savelyev and Lieut.-Col. Siman; Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Sudets, Col.-Gen. of Aviation Goryunov, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Zlatotsvetov, Lieut.Gen. of Aviation Tolstikov, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Seleznev, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Stepichev, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Podgorny, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Korsakov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Belitsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Tishchenko, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Kamanin, Col. Nedosekin, Col. Dementyev, Col. Smirnov, Col. Ivanov, Col. Terekhov and Lieut.-Col. Shatilin; Sappers commanded by Col.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Kotlyar, Col. Malov, Col. Vodovatov, Col. Fadeyev, Col. Pavlov, Col. Zgrebin, Col. Baburin, Col. Nominas, Lieut.-Col. Korneyev, Lieut.-Col. Matuzas and Lieut.-Col. Galukovich; Signallers commanded by Lieut.-Gen. of Signals Troops Korolev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Morozov, Col. Shervud, Col. Kotkov, Col. Yegorov and Lieut.-Col. Sukhikh.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting for the capture of the city of Vienna will be recommended for conferment of the name "Vienna" and award of Orders.

To-day, April 13, at 21.00 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with 24 artillery salvos from 324 guns the gallant troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front which captured the city of Vienna.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to all the troops under your command which took part in the fighting for the liberation of Vienna.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fighting for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Death to the German invaders!

J. Stalin
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union
Moscow

Order of the Day, No. 335
April 13, 1945

Addressed to the Commander of the troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Malinovsky, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col. -Gen. Zakharov

On April 13, troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, continuing their offensive, captured on Czechoslovak territory the town of Hodonin, an important road junction and powerful German defence strongpoint on the western banks of the Morava river.

The Order mentions 37 commanders of troops, cavalrymen, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 12 salvoes was fired from 124 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No.170)

Order of the Day, No. 336
April 15, 1945

Addressed to the Commander of the troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Tolbukhin, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Lt. -Gen. Ivanov.

Troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, continuing their offensive, on April 15 captured on Austrian territory the town of St. Poelten, an important road junction and powerful German defence str-onpoint on the River Traisen.

The Order mentions 37 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 12 salvos was fired from 124 Moscow guns.

Order of the Day, No. 337
April 15, 1945

Addressed to the Commander of the troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Malinovsky, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col. -Gen. Zakharov.

Troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, with the collaboration of troops of the 3rd Ukrainian Front, have surrounded and routed a grouping of German troops which attempted to retreat from Vienna to the north, and have captured the towns of Korneuberg and Florisdorf - powerful German defence strongholds on the left bank of the Danube.

In the fighting, troops of the Front took prisoner more than 3,000 German officers and men, and also captured large quantities of arms and other war material.

The Order mentions 42 commanders of troops, ships and units of the Red Banner Danube Flotilla, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvos was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News Weekly," No.170)

("Soviet War News Weekly," No.170)

Speech of April 21, 1945, on the Occasion of the Signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Collaboration between the U.S.S.R. and the Polish Republic
April 21, 1945

MR. PRESIDENT, Mr. Prime Minister, Gentlemen!

I believe that the Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-war Collaboration between the Soviet Union and Poland which we have just signed is of great, historic importance.

The importance of this Treaty consists in the first place in that it signifies the radical turn of relations between the Soviet Union and Poland towards alliance and friendship, a turn which took shape in the course of the present liberation struggle against Germany and which is now being formally consummated in this Treaty.

It is known that relations between our countries in the course of the past five centuries have abounded in elements of mutual estrangement, unfriendliness, and not infrequently in open military conflicts. Such relations weakened both our countries and strengthened German imperialism.

The importance of the present Treaty consists in that it puts an end to these old relations between our countries, nails down the lid of the coffin over them, and creates a real basis for replacement of the old unfriendly relations by relations of alliance and friendship between the Soviet Union and Poland.

In the course of the last two World Wars the Germans succeeded in making use of the territory of Poland as a corridor for invasion of the East and as a springboard for attack on the Soviet Union. This became possible because at that time there were no friendly allied relations between our countries. The former rulers of Poland did not want to have relations of alliance with the Soviet Union. They preferred a policy of playing about between Germany and the Soviet Union. And of course they played themselves into trouble. . . . Poland was occupied, her independence abolished, and as a result of this whole ruinous policy German troops were enabled to appear at the gates of Moscow.

The importance of the present Treaty consists in that it puts an end to the old and ruinous policy of playing about between Germany and the Soviet Union, and replaces it by a policy of alliance and friendship between Poland and her Eastern neighbour.

Such is the historic importance of the Treaty between Poland and the Soviet Union on Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Collaboration which we have just signed.

No wonder, therefore, that the peoples of our countries impatiently await the signing of this Treaty. They feel that this Treaty is a pledge of the independence of new, democratic Poland, a pledge of her might and her prosperity.

But matters are not confined to that. The present Treaty has also great international significance. As long as there existed no alliance between our countries Germany was able to take advantage of the absence of a united front between us, she could oppose Poland to the Soviet Union and vice versa, and thus beat them one at a time. Things changed radically after

the alliance between our countries took shape. Now it is no longer possible to oppose our countries to each other. Now there exists a united front between our countries from the Baltic to the Carpathians against the common enemy, against German imperialism. Now one may confidently say that German aggression is besieged from the East. Undoubtedly if this barrier in the East is supplemented by a barrier in the West, that is, by alliance between our countries and our Allies in the West, one may safely say that German aggression will be curbed, and that it will not be easy for it to run loose.

No wonder, therefore, that the freedom-loving nations, and in the first place the Slav nations, impatiently await the conclusion of this Treaty, for they see that this Treaty signifies a strengthening of the united front of the United Nations against the common enemy in Europe.

Therefore, I do not doubt that our Allies in the West will welcome this Treaty.

May free, independent, democratic Poland live and prosper!

May her Eastern neighbour—our Soviet Union—live and prosper!

Long live the alliance and friendship between our countries!

Order of the Day, No. 346
April 27, 1945

To the Army on Active Service

The troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front and our Allied British and American troops, striking from the East and West, severed the front of the German troops, and on April 25, at 13.30 hours, effected a junction in the middle of Germany, in the region of Torgau. As a result, the German troops located in North Germany have been cut off from the German troops in the southern regions of Germany.

To mark this victory, and in honour of this historic event, today, April 27, at 19.00 hours, the capital of our country, Moscow, will, on behalf of our country, salute the valiant troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front and our Allied British and American troops with 24 artillery salvos, fired from 324 guns.

Long live the victory of the freedom-loving nations over Germany.

J. STALIN
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union.

("Soviet Calendar 1917 - 1947")

Message Broadcast on the Evening of April 27, 1945, to the Officers and Men of the Red Army and of the Armies of the Allies on the Occasion of their Linking up on German Soil

April 27, 1945

IN the name of the Soviet Government, I address you, commanders and men of the Red Army, and of the armies of our Allies.

The victorious armies of the Allied Powers, waging a war of liberation in Europe, have routed the German troops and linked up on the territory of Germany.

Our task and our duty are to complete the destruction of the enemy, to force him to lay down his arms and surrender unconditionally. The Red Army will fulfil to the end this task and this duty to our people and to all freedom-loving peoples.

I greet the valorous troops of our Allies, which are now standing on the territory of Germany shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet troops, and which are full of determination to carry out their duty to the end.

**To the Editorial Board of "KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA"
May, 1945**

I congratulate the fighting organ of Soviet youth, the paper "Komsomolskaya Pravda", on her twenty years.

During the years of peaceful construction and throughout the days of the Great Patriotic War, "Komsomolskaya Pravda" has educated the Soviet youth in the spirit of unreserved service to the Motherland.

I am sure that in the future, the "Komsomolskaya Pravda" is going to successfully accomplish educational tasks towards the next generation in the devoted spirit to the Leninist Party, to help youth to achieve the realizations of science and culture, to strengthen the forces of the young patriots for battle, with a view to the ultimate flourishing of our great Motherland!

J. STALIN

("Pravda", 24 May, 1945)

Order of the Day, No. 20
May 1, 1945

COMRADES, Red Army men and Red Navy men, sergeants and petty officers, officers of the Army and Navy, generals and admirals!

Working people of the Soviet Union!

To-day our country is celebrating the First of May—the international festival of the working people.

This year, the peoples of our Motherland are celebrating May Day under conditions of the victorious termination of the Great Patriotic War.

The hard times when the Red Army fought back the enemy troops at Moscow and Leningrad, at Grozny and Stalingrad, are gone—never to return. Now our victorious troops are battering the enemy's armed forces in the centre of Germany, far beyond Berlin, on the River Elbe.

Within a short time Poland, Hungary, the greater part of Czechoslovakia, a considerable part of Austria, and her capital Vienna, have been liberated.

At the same time the Red Army has captured East Prussia, home of German imperialism, Pomerania, the greater part of Brandenburg and the main districts of Germany's capital Berlin, having hoisted the banner of victory over Berlin.

As a result of these offensive battles fought by the Red Army, within three to four months the Germans have lost over 800,000 officers and men in prisoners and about one million in killed. During the same period the Red Army troops have captured or destroyed up to 6,000 enemy aircraft, up to 12,000 tanks and self-propelled guns, over 23,000 field guns and enormous quantities of other armaments and equipment.

It should be noted that in these battles Polish, Yugoslav, Czechoslovak, Bulgarian and Rumanian divisions successfully advanced against the common enemy side by side with the Red Army.

As a result of the Red Army's shattering blows, the German Command was compelled to transfer dozens of divisions to the Soviet-German Front, baring whole sectors on other fronts. This circumstance helped the forces of our Allies to develop their successful offensive in the West. Thus by simultaneous blows at the German troops from East and West, the troops of the Allies and the Red Army were able to cut the German forces into two isolated parts and to effect a junction of our troops and the Allied troops in a united front.

There can be no doubt that this circumstance means the end of Hitlerite Germany.

The days of Hitlerite Germany are numbered. More than half of her territory is occupied by the Red Army and by the troops of our Allies. Germany has lost the most important, vital districts. The industry remaining in the Hitlerites' hands cannot supply the German army with sufficient quantities of armaments, ammunition and fuel. The man-power reserves of the German army are depleted. Germany is completely isolated and stands alone, if her ally Japan is not counted. In search of a way out from their hopeless plight, the Hitlerite adventurers

resort to all kinds of tricks, down to flirting with the Allies, in an effort to cause dissension in the Allied camp. These fresh knavish tricks of the Hitlerites are doomed to utter failure. They can only accelerate the disintegration of the German troops.

Mendacious fascist propaganda intimidates the German population by absurd tales, alleging that the Armies of the United Nations wish to exterminate the German people. The United Nations do not set themselves the task of destroying the German people. The United Nations will destroy fascism and German militarism, will severely punish war criminals, and will compel the Germans to compensate damage they have caused to other countries. But the United Nations do not molest and will not molest Germany's civilian population if it honestly fulfils the demands of the Allied military authorities.

The brilliant victories won by the Soviet troops in the Great Patriotic War have demonstrated the colossal might of the Red Army and its high military skill. In the progress of the war our Motherland has come to possess a first-rate regular army, capable of upholding the great Socialist achievements of our people and of securing the State interests of the Soviet Union.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has for nearly four years been waging war on an unparalleled scale demanding colossal expenditures, our Socialist economic system is gaining strength and developing, while the economy of the liberated regions, plundered and ruined by the German invaders, is successfully and swiftly reviving. This is the result of the heroic efforts of the workers and collective farmers, of the Soviet intellectuals, of the women and the youth of our country, inspired and guided by the great Bolshevik Party.

The world war unleashed by the German imperialists is drawing to a close. The collapse of Hitlerite Germany is a matter of the nearest future. The Hitlerite ringleaders, who imagined themselves rulers of the world, have found themselves ruined. The mortally wounded fascist beast is breathing its last. One thing is now rewired—to deal the death-blow to the fascist beast.

Fighting men of the Red Army and Navy!

The last storming of the Hitlerite lair is on. Set new examples of military skill and gallantry in the concluding battles. Smite the enemy harder, skilfully break up his defence, pursue and surround the German invaders, give them no respite until they cease resistance.

Beyond the border of our native land be especially vigilant!

Uphold the honour and dignity of the Soviet soldier as heretofore!

Working people of the Soviet Union!

Increase your all-round assistance to the front by persistent and indefatigable work. Swiftly heal the wounds inflicted on our country by the war, raise still higher the might of our Soviet State!

Comrades, Red Army men and Red Navy men, sergeants and petty officers, officers of the Army and Navy, generals and admirals!

Working people of the Soviet Union!

On behalf of the Soviet' Government and of our Bolshevik Party, I greet and congratulate you upon the First of May.

in honour of the historic victories of the Red Army at the front and of the great achievements of the workers, collective farmers and intellectuals in the rear, to mark the international festival of the working people, I hereby order:

To-day, on May 1, a salute of 20 artillery salvos shall be fired in the capitals of Union Republics—Moscow, Kiev, Minsk, Baku, Tbilisi, Erevan, Ashkabad, Tashkent, Stalinabad, Alma-Ata, Frunze, Petrozavodsk, Kishinev, Vilnius, Riga and Tallinn—as well as in the hero-cities of Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sevastopol and Odessa.

Long live our mighty Soviet Motherland!

Long live the great Soviet people, the people victorious!

Long live the victorious Red Army and Navy!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the battles for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Forward to the final rout of Hitlerite Germany!

J. Stalin
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union
Moscow

Order of the Day, No. 359
Addressed to the Red Army and Navy
May 2, 1945

TROOPS of the 1st Byelorussian Front commanded by Marshal of the Soviet Union Zhukov, with the support of troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front commanded by Marshal of the Soviet Union Koniev, after stiff street-fighting, have completed the rout of the Berlin German troop grouping and, to-day, May 2, completely captured the capital of Germany, Berlin-centre of German imperialism and hotbed of German aggression.

The Berlin garrison which defended the city, with the Chief of the Defence of Berlin, Artillery General Weidling, and his staff at the head, to-day at 3 p.m. ceased resistance, laid down their arms and surrendered.

By 9 p.m. on May 2 our troops had taken prisoner more than 70,330 German officers and men in Berlin.

In the fighting for the capture of Berlin distinction was won by troops commanded by Army-Gen. Sokolovsky, Col.-Gen. Kuznetsov, Col.-Gen. Chuikov, Col.-Gen. Berzarin, Lieut.-Gen. Luchinsky, Lieut.-Gen. Perkhovich, Lieut.-Gen. Lukyanchenko, Col.-Gen. Cherevichenko, Lieut.-Gen. Kazankin, Lieut.-Gen. Glazunov, Lieut.-Gen. Ryzhev, Lieut.-Gen. Zherebin, Lieut.-Gen. Rosly, Lieut.-Gen. Tereshkov, Lieut.-Gen. Andreyev, Maj.-Gen. Bukshtynovich, Maj.-Gen. Belyavsky, Maj.-Gen. Kushchev, Maj.-Gen. Barinov, Maj.-Gen. Perevertkin, Maj.-Gen. Rogachevsky, Maj.-Gen. Batitsky, Maj.-Gen. Shvarev, Maj.-Gen. Firsov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Khetagurov, Maj.-Gen. Shatilov, Maj.-Gen. Shafarenko, Maj.-Gen. Smirnov, Maj.-Gen. Kozin, Maj.-Gen. Karapetyan, Maj.-Gen. Krasilnikov, Maj.-Gen. Shugayev, Maj.-Gen. Zaleznyuk, Maj.-Gen. Stankevsky, Maj.-Gen. Pankov, Maj.-Gen. Glebov, Maj.-Gen. Bakanov, Maj.-Gen. Duka, Maj.-Gen. Seryugin, Maj.-Gen. Gasparyan, Maj.-Gen. Sokolov, Maj.-Gen. Dorofeyev, Maj.-Gen. Syzranov, Maj.-Gen. Galai, Maj.-Gen. Shkrylev, Maj.-Gen. Safaryan, Maj.-Gen. Vydrigan, Maj.-Gen. Bevzyuk, Maj.-Gen. Myshkin, Maj.-Gen. Korchikov, Maj.-Gen. Turchinsky, Maj.-Gen. Vekhin, Col. Antonov, Col. Ivanov, Col. Gervasiyev, Col. Solovyev, Col. Shishkov, Maj.-Gen. Foinishenko, Col. Smolin, Col. Vorobyev, Col. Marchenko, Col. Negoda, Col. Assafov, Col. Shatskov and Col. Rybalko; Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Bogdanov, Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Katukov, Col.-Gen. Rybalko, Col.-Gen. Lelyushenko, Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Novikov, Lieut.-Gen. of Tank Troops Orel, Lieut.-Gen. Radzievsky, Lieut.-Gen. of Tank Troops Krivoshein, Lieut.-Gen. of Tank Troops Sukhov, Lieut.-Gen. of Tank Troops Belov, Lieut.-Gen. Shaun, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Bakhmetyev, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Upman, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Saminov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Stogny, Maj.-Gen. Dremov, Lieut.-Gen. of Tank Troops Kirichenko, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Yushchuk, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Mitrofanov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Vainrub, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Anisimov, Col. Nikolayev and Col. Babadzhanyan; Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Artillery Kazakov, Col.-Gen. of Artillery Varentsov, Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Shamshin, Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Pozharsky, Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Ignatov, Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Romanovich, Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Kozhukhov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Morozov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Kossenko, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Plaskov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Frolov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Likhachev, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Snegurov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Lebedevsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Koznov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Bryukhanov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Shlepin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Bogdan, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Seredin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Kamensky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Polosukhin, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery

Petropavlovsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Nikolsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Mentyukov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Dobrinsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Krasnokutsky, Col. Fantalov, Col. Shrike, Col. Korchagin, Col. Overchenko and Col. Lyubimov; Ships and units of the Red Banner Dnieper Flotilla commanded by Rear-Admiral Grigoryev and Captain of the First Rank Lyalko; Airmen commanded by Chief Marshal of Aviation Novikov, Chief Marshal of Aviation Golovanov, Col.-Gen. of Aviation Rudenko, Col.-Gen. of Aviation Krasovsky, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Savitsky, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Beletsky, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Tupikov, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Loginov, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Shchetchikov, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Nestertsev, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Ryazanov, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Utin, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Tokarev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Krupsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Korevatsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Skok, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Sidnev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Dzusov, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Slyusarev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Babaluyev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Arkhangelsky, Col. Nikishin, Col. Stalin, Col. Pokryshkin, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Komarov and Col. Alexandrovich; Sappers commanded by Col.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Proshlyakov, Col.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Galitsky, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Marin, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Tkachenko, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Furs, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Kharchevin, Maj.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Zhirov, Col. Belsky, Col. Kamenchuk and Col. Poluektov; Signallers commanded by Lieut.-Gen. of Signals Troops Maximenko, Lieut.-Gen. of Signals Troops Bulychev, Maj.-Gen. of Signals Troops Akimov, Col. Cherkasov, Col. Falin, Col. Smoky, Col. Zakharov, Col. Plotkin, Col. Borissov, Col. Ostrenko, Lieut.-Col. of State Security Vakish and Lieut.-Col. of State Security Grib.

To commemorate the victory, the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting for the capture of Berlin will be recommended for conferment of the name “Berlin” and award of Orders.

To-day, May 2, at 23.30 hours (Moscow time), in honour of the historic event of the capture of Berlin by Soviet troops, the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the name of the Motherland, will salute with 24 artillery salvos from 324 guns the gallant troops of the 1st Byelorussian and 1st Ukrainian Fronts.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to the troops of the 1st Byelorussian and 1st Ukrainian Fronts which took part in the fighting for the capture of Berlin.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fighting for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Death to the German invaders!

J. Stalin
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union
Moscow

Order of the Day, No. 364
May 7, 1945

Issued. by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the Commanded of the troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front, Marshal Koniev, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Army-Gen. Petrov
The Order states that on May 7, troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front, as a result of a long siege, completely captured the city and fortress of Breslavl (Breslau).

The German garrison defending the city, headed by the Commandant of the fortress, Infantry General von Niehof and his staff, ceased resistance, laid down their arms and surrendered.

By 19.00 hours (Moscow time) on May 7, the Soviet troops had taken prisoner in Breslavl more than 40,000 German officers and men.

The Order mentions 59 commanders of troops, tankmen, artillerymen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 12 salvoes was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War Mews," No. 1153)

Order of the Day, No. 365
May, 1945

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the Commander of the troops of the 4th Ukrainian Front, Army-Gen. Yeremenko, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col. -Gen. Sandalop

The Order states that on May 8, troops of the 4th Ukrainian Front, continuing their offensive, after stubborn fighting captured the town and large railway junction of Olomouc, an important German defence strongpoint on the Morava River.

The Order mentions 105 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 12 salvos was fired from 124 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News," No. 1153)

Order of the Day, No. 366
May 8, 1945

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the Commander of the troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front, Marshal Koniev, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Army -Gen. Petrov. The Order states that on May 8, troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front, after two days fighting, smashed enemy resistance and captured the city of Dresden, an important road junction and powerful German defence strongpoint in Saxony.

The Order mentions 70 commanders of troops, tankmen, artillerymen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvos was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War News," No. 1153)

Order of the Day, No. 367
May 8, 1945

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the. Commanded of the troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front, Marshal Malinovsky, and the Chief of Staff of the Front, Col. -Gen. Zakharov

The Order states that on May 8, troops of the 2nd Ukrainian Front captured in Czechoslovakia the towns of Jaromerice and Znojmo, and in Austria the towns of Hollabrunn and Stockerau, important communications centres and powerful German defence strongpoints.

The Order mentions 101 commanders of troops, artillerymen, tankmen, airmen, sappers and signallers whose units and formations distinguished themselves.

A salute of 20 salvos was fired from 224 Moscow guns.

("Soviet War Mews," No. 1153)

Order of the Day, No. 368

**Front, Marshal Koniev, and to the Chief of Staff of the Front, Army-General Petrov
May 9, 1945**

TROOPS of the 1st Ukrainian Front, as a result of a vigorous night manoruvre by tank formations and infantry, crushed the enemy's resistance and to-day May 9, liberated from the German invaders the capital of our Ally, Czechoslovakia, Prague.

In the fighting for the liberation of Prague distinction was won by troops commanded by Col.-Gen. Gordov, Col.-Gen. Pukhov, Col.-Gen. Zhadov, Lieut.-Gen. Malandin, Maj.-Gen. Lyamin, Col. Belinsky, Lieut.-Gen. Cherokhmanov, Lieut.-Gen. Puzikov, Maj.-Gen. Bakanov, Col. Ivanov, Maj.-Gen. Orlov, Maj.-Gen. Danilovsky, Maj.-Gen. Volkovich and Maj.-Gen. Krasnov; Tankmen commanded by Col.-Gen. Lelyushenko, Col.-Gen. Rybalko, Col.-Gen. of Tank Troops Novikov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Upman, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Bakhmetyev, Lieut.-Gen. of Tank Troops Belov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Yermakov, Col. Pushkarev, Col. Khmulov, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Mitrofan, Maj.-Gen. of Tank Troops Novikov, Lieut.-Gen. of Tank Troops Sukhov, Lieut.-Col. Karnyushkin, Lieut.-Col. Shcherbak, Col. Selivanchik, and Col. Turkin; Artillerymen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Artillery Varentsov, Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Kozhukov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Dobrinsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Krasnokutsky, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Mentyukov, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Nikolsky, Lieut.-Gen. of Artillery Kubeyev, Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Poluyektov, and Maj.-Gen. of Artillery Dzevulsky; Airmen commanded by Col.-Gen. of Aviation Krassovsky, Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Ryazanov, Col. Nikishin, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Archangelsky, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Zabaluev, Maj.-Gen. of Aviation Slusarev, and Lieut.-Gen. of Aviation Utin; Sappers commanded by Col.-Gen. of Engineering Troops Galitsky, Col. Poluektov, Col. Kamenchuk, Col. Kordyukov, Lieut.-Col. Skorokhod, and Lieut.-Col. Sobolev; and Signallers commanded by Lieut.-Gen. of Signals Troops Bulychev, Maj.-Gen. of Signals Troops Akhremenko, Col. Ostrenko, Col. Borisov, Col. Simkhovich, and Col. Bogomolov.

To commemorate the victory the units and formations which particularly distinguished themselves in the fighting for the liberation of Prague shall be recommended for conferment of the name "Prague" and for award of Orders.

To-day, May 9, at 20.00 hours (Moscow time) the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, on behalf of the Motherland shall salute with 24 artillery salvoes from 324 guns the gallant troops of the 1st Ukrainian Front which liberated the capital of our Ally Czechoslovakia, Prague.

For excellent military operations I express my thanks to. the troops under your command which took part in the fighting for the liberation of Prague.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fighting for the freedom and independence of our Motherland and of the Czechoslovak Republic!

Death to the German invaders!

J. Stalin
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union
Moscow

Order of the Day, No. 369
May 9, 1945

ON May 8, 1945, in Berlin, representatives of the German High Command signed the instrument of unconditional surrender of the German armed forces.

The Great Patriotic War which the Soviet people waged against the German-fascist invaders is victoriously concluded. Germany is utterly routed.

Comrades, Red Army men, Red Navy men, sergeants, petty officers, officers of the army and navy, generals, admirals and marshals, I congratulate you upon the victorious termination of the Great Patriotic War.

To mark complete victory over Germany, to-day, May 9, the day of victory, at 22.00 hours (Moscow time), the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, on behalf of the Motherland, shall salute the gallant troops of the Red Army, the ships and units of the Navy, which have won this brilliant victory, by firing thirty artillery salvoes from one thousand guns.

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fighting for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

Long live the victorious Red Army and Navy!

J. Stalin
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union
Moscow

Victory SpeechA

**Broadcast from Moscow at 20.00 hours (Moscow time) on May 9, 1945
May 9, 1945**

Marshal Josef Stalin

COMRADES! Men and women compatriots!

The great day of victory over Germany has come. Fascist Germany, forced to her knees by the Red Army and the troops of our Allies, has acknowledged herself defeated and declared unconditional surrender.

On May 7 the preliminary protocol on surrender was signed in the city of Rheims. On May 8 representatives of the German High Command, in the presence of representatives of the Supreme Command of the Allied troops and the Supreme Command of the Soviet Troops, signed in Berlin the final act of surrender, the execution of which began at 24.00 hours on May 8.

Being aware of the wolfish habits of the German ringleaders, who regard treaties and agreements as empty scraps of paper, we have no reason to trust their words. However, this morning, in pursuance of the act of surrender, the German troops began to lay down their arms and surrender to our troops en masse. This is no longer an empty scrap of paper. This is actual surrender of Germany's armed forces. True, one group of German troops in the area of Czechoslovakia is still evading surrender. But I trust that the Red Army will be able to bring it to its senses.

Now we can state with full justification that the historic day of the final defeat of Germany, the day of the great victory of our people over German imperialism has come.

The great sacrifices we made in the name of the freedom and independence of our Motherland, the incalculable privations and sufferings experienced by our people in the course of the war, the intense work in the rear and at the front, placed on the altar of the Motherland, have not been in vain, and have been crowned by complete victory over the enemy. The age-long struggle of the Slav peoples for their existence and their independence has ended in victory over the German invaders and German tyranny.

Henceforth the great banner of the freedom of the peoples and peace among peoples will fly over Europe.

Three years ago Hitler declared for all to hear that his aims included the dismemberment of the Soviet Union and the wresting from it of the Caucasus, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Baltic lands and other areas. He declared bluntly: "We will destroy Russia so that she will never be able to rise again." This was three years ago. However, Hitler's crazy ideas were not fated to come true—the progress of the war scattered them to the winds. In actual fact the direct opposite of the Hitlerites' ravings has taken place. Germany is utterly defeated. The German troops are surrendering. The Soviet Union is celebrating Victory, although it does not intend either to dismember or to destroy Germany.

Comrades! The Great Patriotic War has ended in our complete victory. The period of war in Europe is over. The period of peaceful development has begun.

I congratulate you upon victory, my dear men and women compatriots!

Glory to our heroic Red Army, which upheld the independence of our Motherland and won victory over the enemy!

Glory to our great people, the people victorious!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the struggle against the enemy and gave their lives for the freedom and happiness of our people!

**Letter to the
Austrian Chancellor K. Renner
May, 1945**

To His Excellency, Mr. K. Renner,

Thank you very much, Comrade, for your letter of April 15. Do not doubt that your worries about the independence, security and progress of Austria are also my worries.

I am prepared to give any help that is necessary for Austria.

Please excuse my delayed answer.

J. STALIN

("New Germany", No. 205, 2 September, 1945)

Reply to “The Times” Moscow Correspondent’s Question Concerning the 16 Arrested Polish Diversionists
May 18, 1945

Letter from Mr. Ralph Parker, The Times correspondent in Moscow, to the Chairman of the Council of People’s Commissars of the U.S.S.R., J. V. Stalin:

THE foreign Press has printed a report that several Poles who, according to the recent Tass statement, had been arrested on the charge of the organization and carrying out of diversionist actions in the rear of the Red Army, in reality were members of a delegation invited to conduct negotiations with the Soviet authorities. It has also been reported that this group of Poles includes democratic leaders whose opinion on the formation of the future Polish Government would have made a valuable contribution to the formation of such a Government. It has also been reported that by the arrest of these Poles the Soviet Government undermines confidence in the measures adopted in the Crimea, and hinders the formation of a new Polish Provisional Government.

Would you care to make a statement on this question in order to clarify public opinion, which is interested in this question?

Yours respectfully,
Ralph Parker
Moscow
May 11, 1945

J. V. Stalin addressed the following reply to Mr. Parker:

I HAVE somewhat delayed my answer, but this is understandable if one keeps in mind how busy I am.

1. The arrest of the sixteen Poles in Poland headed by the well-known diversionist General Okulicki has no connection with the question of the reconstruction of the Polish Provisional Government. These “gentlemen” were arrested in accordance with the law protecting the Red Army rear from diversionists—a law similar to the British Defence of the Realm Act. The arrests were carried out by Soviet military authorities in accordance with an agreement concluded between the Polish Provisional Government and the Soviet Military Command.

2. It is untrue that the arrested Poles were invited for negotiations with the Soviet authorities. The Soviet authorities do not and will not conduct negotiations with those who break the law on the protection of the Red Army rear.

3. As far as the question of the reorganization of the Polish Provisional Government itself is concerned, it can only be solved on the basis of the Crimea decisions, because no deviation from these decisions can be permitted.

4. I think the Polish question can be solved by agreement between the Allies only if the following elementary conditions are observed:

a.—if in the reconstruction of the Polish Provisional Government the latter is recognized as the basic core of the future Polish Government of National Unity, similar to the case of

Yugoslavia, where the National Liberation Committee was recognized as the basic core of the United Yugoslav Government;

b.—if as a result of the reconstruction a Government is created in Poland which will pursue a policy of friendship with the Soviet Union, and not the policy of the “cordon sanitaire” against the Soviet Union;

c.—if the question of the reconstruction of the Polish Government is resolved together with the Poles who now have ties with the Polish people, and not without them.

Yours respectfully,

J. Stalin

Moscow

May 18, 1945

**Toast to the Russian People at a Reception in Honour of Red Army Commanders Given by the Soviet Government in the Kremlin on Thursday, May 24, 1945
May 24, 1945**

COMRADES! Permit me to propose one more, last toast.

I should like to propose a toast to the health of our Soviet people, and in the first place, the Russian people. (Loud and prolonged applause and shouts of “Hurrah.”)

I drink in the first place to the health of the Russian people because it is the most outstanding nation of all the nations forming the Soviet Union.

I propose a toast to the health of the Russian people because it has won in this war universal recognition as the leading force of the Soviet Union among all the peoples of our country.

I propose a toast to the health of the Russian people not only because it is the leading people, but also because it possesses a clear mind, a staunch character, and patience.

Our Government made not a few errors, we experienced at moments a desperate situation in 1941-1942, when our Army was retreating, abandoning our own villages and towns of the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldavia, the Leningrad Region, the Baltic area and the Karelo-Finnish Republic, abandoning them because there was no other way out. A different people could have said to the Government: “You have failed to justify our expectations. Go away. We shall install another government which will conclude peace with Germany and assure us a quiet life.” The Russian people, however, did not take this path because it trusted the correctness of the policy of its Government, and it made sacrifices to ensure the rout of Germany. This confidence of the Russian people in the Soviet Government proved to be that decisive force which ensured the historic victory over the enemy of humanity—over fascism.

Thanks to it, to the Russian people, for this confidence!

To the health of the Russian people! (Loud and prolonged applause.)

Letter to General De Gaulle
June, 1945

The French regiment, Normandie-Niemen, returns to its country equipped, that is to say, with its aeroplanes fully equipped, and for its itinerary will follow the Elbe in a westerly direction.

I thought it essential to bestow on the regiment the materials which it has courageously utilized, and with much success, on the oriental front. May these materials be a modest present from the Soviet Union aviation to France, and the symbol of the friendship between our two peoples.

I beg you to accept my thanks for the work that this regiment has done on the front in the battle against the German armies.

J. STALIN

("Soviet News," No. 46, Paris. June 1945)

**To the Editorial Staff of the paper
"Pionerskaya Pravda"
June, 1945**

I warmly congratulate the editorial staff, the young correspondents and the readers of the paper for the twenty years of the "Pionerskaya Pravda".

The "Pionerskaya Pravda" helps Soviet children to acquire knowledge, it educates pioneers and school-children in the spiritual precepts of our great educator, Lenin.

I wish "Pionerskaya Pravda" further success in the education of young Leninists in a devoted spirit towards our Motherland.

J. STALIN

("Pravda", 10 June, 1945)

**To the artillery factory in the Urals
June, 1945**

I congratulate you, the collective of men and women workers, technical engineering workers and employees at the Artillery Factory in the Urals, for the great victory in production: the exportation of 30,000 canon; and for this the factory is awarded the Order of the Patriotic War - First Degree.

Thanks to the courageous spirit of innovation and to the putting into effect of an advanced technique of mechanical construction in the production of artillery, the Artillery Factory, “founded in the days of the Patriotic War, has become the chief base for the exportation of artillery armaments far more powerful and elaborate, surpassing the enemy’s technique, with which ‘ our valiant Red Army has ensured the complete victory against fascist Germany.

I wish you in the future, during the period of peaceful construction, further success in the cause of the exportation of artillery armaments and equipment for the coal-mining and oil industries of our country.

J. STALIN

("Pravda", 22 June, 1945)

Order of the Day, No. 370
June 22, 1945

To commemorate the victory over Germany in the Great Patriotic War, I order a parade of troops of the Army in the Field, of the Navy and of the Moscow Garrison—a Victory Parade—to be held in the Red Square in Moscow on June 24, 1945.

The following units are to take part in the parade: combined regiments of the fronts, a combined regiment of the People's Commissariat for Defence, a combined regiment of the Navy, the military academies, military schools and troops of the Moscow Garrison.

The Victory Parade is to be taken by my Deputy, Marshal of the Soviet Union Zhukov.

Marshal of the Soviet Union Rokossovsky will command the Parade.

I entrust the general direction of the organization of the Parade to the Commander of the troops of the Moscow Military Area and Commander of the Moscow Garrison, Col.-Gen. Artemyev.

J. Stalin
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union
Moscow

Speech at a reception in the Kremlin
June 25, 1945

Do not imagine that I am going to tell you anything extraordinary. The toast that I wish to raise is as simple as it is informal. I would like to drink to the health of those on the lower echelons whose conditions are little envied, to those who are considered as the “screws” of the immense machine of the government but without whom, all of us marshals or commanding officers of the fronts or armies wouldn’t be worth, if I may so express it, a jot. Because it requires only for one screw to disappear and all is finished, I drink to the health of simple folk, ordinary and modest, the “screws” which ensure the functioning of our enormous state machine in all its aspects: science, economy, war. They are numerous and their name is legion because they comprise dozens of millions. These are modest people, no-one writes about them, their situation is mediocre and their status is low, but these people support us as the base supports the summit. I drink to the health of these people, our most respected comrades.

J. STALIN

("Pravda", 27 June, 1945)

Order of the Day, No. 371
July 22, 1945

Issued by Marshal Stalin and addressed to the troops of the Red Army and the Red Navy
During the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against fascist Germany, our Red Navy
has been a faithful helper of the Red Army.

In the war against the U.S.S.R., fascist Germany, relying on the suddenness of their attack and
the strength of their well practised army, tried to beat our army and our navy in a shorter time.
It was by combining her army with her air-force and her navy, that Germany wanted to realise
her domination over the seas.

It is well known that the strategy of the Germans on land and at sea went hopelessly wrong.
The Red Army, together with our Allies, routed the Hitlerites and forced them to capitulate.

In both the defensive and offensive fighting of our Red Army, our Navy was a dependable
cover for the flanks of our Red Army pushing through to the sea, blocking the enemy's
merchant shipping and strategically important navigation routes, securing the uninterrupted
functioning of our lines of communication. The fighting action of the Soviet Navy is
illustrated through its self-sacrificing steadfastness and valour, its intense combat activity and
military skill. The submarine men, the sailors, the naval airmen, artillerymen and infantry
have taken over and further developed everything that was so valuable in the hun-
dreds of years of tradition of the Russian Navy.

The Soviet sailors have in the four years of war, on the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea and the
Barents Sea, on the Voly, , the Danube a'nd the Dnieper, added new pages to the glorious
history of the Russian Navy. The Navy has more than fulfilled its duty to the Soviet
Motherland.

Comrades sailors, commanders and officers!

The Soviet people want to see their Navy even stronger and more powerful. Our people will
produce more warships and bases for the Navy. The task of the Navy is to educate
inexperienced marine cadres, to perfect them, to help them to make the fighting experience of
the Patriotic War, and maritime, their own, and to increase even more the discipline and
organization within their ranks.

I congratulate you on this Day of the Red Navy of the U.S.S.R.

Long live the Red Navy of the U.S.S.R. and its heroic men.

J. STALIN
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union.

("On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union," German Edition)

To the Prime Minister of Mongolia
August, 1945

I thank you with all my heart for your congratulations upon our total victory over the Japanese aggressors and in turn, I congratulate you on the victory.

The Soviet Government acknowledges with gratitude that the People's Revolutionary Army of Mongolia, fighting side by side with the Red Army, has brought an invaluable contribution to the communal cause of the defeat of Japanese imperialism.

I am sure that in the future the Soviet Union and the People's Revolutionary Army of independent Mongolia will also go forward hand in hand to the struggle against the enemies of our countries, for the well-being of our peoples.

J. STALIN
Supreme Commander-in-Chief
Marshal of the Soviet Union.

("Pravda," 29 August, 1945)

To Chiang Kai Shek
August 18, 1945

Thank you for your greetings and for the important support you gave the Soviet Union regarding the defeat of the Japanese aggressors. The surrender of Japan together with Germany has terminated the second World War, and proves that humanity is indebted to the close military co-operation of the Allies for the defeat of the . aggressors in the West and in the East. This victory is of historic and global significance in as much as it is a great, enlightened forward step in the progressive development of humanity.

I express the conviction that the friendship and co-operation of our countries with all freedom-loving nations will serve the cause of universal peace and the prosperity of all peoples.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 19 August, 1945)

Stalin's address to the people September 2, 1945

Comrades! Fellow countrymen and countrywomen!

Today, September 2, political and military representatives of Japan signed an act of unconditional surrender. Utterly defeated on sea and land, and completely surrounded by the armed forces of the United Nations, Japan has admitted defeat and has laid down her arms.

Two hotbeds of world fascism and world aggression had been formed on the eve of the present World War: Germany in the West and Japan in the East. It was they who unleashed the Second World War. It was they who brought mankind and civilization to the brink of doom. The hotbed of world aggression in the West was destroyed four months ago and, as a result, Germany was forced to capitulate. Four months later the hotbed of aggression in the East was destroyed and as a result, Japan, Germany's principal ally, was also compelled to sign an act of capitulation.

This signifies the end of the Second World War.

Now we can say that the conditions necessary for peace all over the world have been gained.

It must be observed that the Japanese aggressors inflicted damage not only on our Allies - China, the U.S.A. and Great Britain. They also inflicted extremely grave damage on our country. That is why we have a separate account to settle with Japan.

Japan commenced her aggression against our country as far back as 1904, during the Russo - Japanese War. As we know, in February 1904, when negotiations between Japan and Russia were still proceeding, Japan, taking advantage of the weakness of the tsarist government, suddenly and perfidiously, without declaring war, fell upon our country and attacked the Russian fleet in the region of Port Arthur with the object of putting a number of Russian warships out of action and thereby creating an advantageous position for her fleet. She did, indeed, put out of action three Russian first-class warships. It is characteristic that 37 years later Japan played exactly the same perfidious trick against the United States when, in 1941, she attacked the United States naval base in Pearl Harbour and put a number of American battleships out of action. As we know, in the war against Japan, Russia was defeated. Japan took advantage of the defeat of tsarist Russia to seize from Russia the southern part of Sakhalin and establish herself on the Kuril Islands, thereby putting the lock on all our country's outlets to the ocean in the East, which meant also all outlets to the ports of Soviet Kamchatka and Soviet Chukotka. It was obvious that Japan was aiming to deprive Russia of the whole of her Far East.

But this does not exhaust the list of Japan's aggressive operations against our country. In 1918, after the Soviet system was established in our country, Japan, taking advantage of the hostility then displayed towards the Land of the Soviets by Great Britain, France and the United States, and leaning upon them, again attacked our country, occupied the Far East and for four years tormented our people and looted the Soviet Far East.

Nor is this all. In 1938 Japan attacked our country again, in the region of Lake Hasan, near Vladivostok, with the object of surrounding Vladivostok; and in the following year Japan repeated her attack in another place, in the region of the Mongolian People's Republic, near

Khalkin-gol, with the object of breaking into Soviet territory, severing our Siberian Railway and cutting off the Far East from Russia.

True, Japan's attacks in the regions of Hasan and Khalkin-gol were liquidated by the Soviet troops, to the extreme humiliation of the Japanese. Japanese military intervention in 1918-1922 was liquidated with equal success and Japanese invaders were expelled from our Far Eastern regions. But the defeat of the Russian troops in 1904 during the Russo-Japanese War left bitter memories in the minds of our people. It lay like a black stain on our country. Our people believed in and waited for the day when Japan would be defeated and the stain would be wiped out. We of the older generation waited for this day for forty years, and now this day has arrived. Today Japan admitted defeat and signed an act of unconditional surrender.

This means that the southern part of Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands revert to the Soviet Union and henceforth will serve not as a barrier between the Soviet Union and the ocean and as a base for Japanese attack upon our Far East but as a direct means of communication between the Soviet Union and the ocean and a base for the defence of our country against Japanese aggression.

Our Soviet people spared neither strength nor labour for the sake of victory. We experienced extremely hard years. But now everyone of us can say: We have won. Henceforth we can regard our country as being free from the menace of German invasion in the West and of Japanese invasion in the East. The long awaited peace for the peoples of all the world has come.

I congratulate you, my dear fellow countrymen and country-women, on this great victory, on the successful termination of the war, and on- the ushering in of peace all over the world!

Glory to the armed forces of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, China and Great Britain which achieved victory over Japan!

Glory to our Far Eastern troops and our Pacific Fleet, which upheld the honour and dignity of our country!

Glory to our great people, the victorious people!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell fighting for the honour and victory of our country! May our country flourish and prosper!

("Soviet Calendar 1917 - 1947")

Order of the Day, No. 373
September 3, 1945

On September 2, 1945, in Tokyo, representatives of Japan signed the document of unconditional surrender of the Japanese forces.

The war which the Soviet people together with our allies made against the last aggressor - Japanese imperialism - has ended victoriously. Japan is defeated and has surrendered.

Comrades of the Red Army, sailors of the Red Navy, Sergeants (First Mates), Officers of the Army and the Navy, General, Admirals and Marshals, I congratulate you on the victorious conclusion of the war against Japan.

In appreciation of the victory over Japan, the whole of the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, will today, September 3, the day of the victory over Japan, salute at 21.00 hours, in the name of our country, the glorious troops of the Red Army, the ships and formations of the Navy, which have achieved this victory, with 24 artillery salvos from 324 canons.

To the eternal glory of the heroes who fell in the battle for the honour and victory of our homeland!

To the life and progress of our Red Army and our Navy.

J. STALIN

("On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union," German Edition)

Origin and Character of the Second World War

February 9, 1946

[From a speech to the voters of his district during the elections to the Supreme Soviet, February 9, 1946]

It would be wrong to think that the Second World War was a casual occurrence or the result of mistakes of any particular statesmen, though mistakes undoubtedly were made. Actually, the war was the inevitable result of the development of world economic and political forces on the basis of modern monopoly capitalism. Marxists have declared more than once that the capitalist system of world economy harbors elements of general's crises and armed conflicts and that, hence, the development of capitalism in our time proceeds not in the form of smooth, and even progress but through crises and military catastrophe.

The fact is that the unevenness of development of the capitalist countries usually leads in time to violent disturbance of equilibrium in the world system of capitalism. That group of capitalist countries which considers itself worse provided than others with raw materials and markets usually makes attempts to alter the situation and to repartition the "spheres of influence" in its favor by armed force. The result is a splitting of the capitalist world into two hostile camps and war between them.

Perhaps military catastrophes might be avoided if it were possible for raw materials and markets to be periodically redistributed among the various countries in accordance with their economic importance, by agreement and peaceable settlement. But that is impossible to do under present capitalist conditions of the development of world economy.

Thus the First World War (1914-18) was the result of the first crisis of the capitalist system of world economy, and the Second World War (1939-45) was the result of a second crisis.

That does not mean of course that the Second World War is a copy of the first. On the contrary, the Second World War differs materially from the first in character. It must be borne in mind that before attacking the Allied countries the principal fascist states—Germany, Japan, and Italy—destroyed the last vestiges of bourgeois-democratic liberties at home, established a brutal terrorist regime in their own countries, rode roughshod over the principles of sovereignty and free development of small countries, proclaimed a policy of seizure of alien territories as their own policy, and declared for all to hear that they were out for world domination and the establishment of a fascist regime throughout the world.

Moreover, by the seizure of Czechoslovakia and of the central areas of China, the Axis states showed that they were prepared to carry out their threat of enslaving all freedom-loving nations. In view of this, unlike the First World War, the Second World War against the Axis states from the very outset assumed the character of an anti-fascist war, a war of liberation, one aim of which was also the restoration of democratic liberties. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis states could only enhance, and indeed did enhance, the anti-fascist and liberation character of the Second World War.

It was on this basis that the anti-fascist coalition of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain, and other freedom-loving states came into being—a coalition which subsequently played a decisive part in defeating the armed forces of the Axis states.

That is how matters stand as regards the origin and character of the Second World War.

**Answer to a letter of 30 January,
from Col.-Professor Rasin
On Clausewitz and the questions of war and the art of war
23 February, 1946**

Dear Comrade Rasin,

I have received your letter of 30 January on Clausewitz and your short thesis on war and the art of war.

1. You ask if Lenin's standpoint on the judgement of Clausewitz is no longer valid.

In my opinion the question is wrongly put.

By putting the question in such a way one could believe that Lenin had analyzed the science of war and the works of Clausewitz, judged them from a military viewpoint, and had left us a number of guidelines on military questions. Putting the question in such a way is wrong because there are no such "Theses" of Lenin on Clausewitz's teachings on the art of war.

Unlike Engels, Lenin did not believe himself to be an expert on military matters, - neither before the October Revolution, nor in the period up to the end of the Civil War.

During the Civil War, Lenin abjured us young comrades on the Central Committee to study the art of war thoroughly. He unhesitatingly declared that it was too late for him to become a military expert. This explains why Lenin, in his judgement on Clausewitz and his remarks on Clausewitz's works, does not touch upon solely military aspects such as questions of military strategy and tactics and their relation to each other, the relation between attack and retreat, defence and counter-offensive and so on.

What was Lenin's interest in Clausewitz and why did he acknowledge him?

Lenin acknowledged Clausewitz who was not a Marxist, and who was recognized as an authority in the field of military theory because in his works he confirmed the known Marxist theory that there is a direct relation between war and politics, that politics can engender war and that war is the continuation of politics by force. Here, Lenin needed Clausewitz to prove that Plekhanov, Kautsky and others had fallen once more into social chauvinism and social imperialism. He further acknowledged Clausewitz in that he confirmed the Marxist viewpoint in his works that under certain unfavourable conditions, - retreat is as justifiable a military action as is attack. Lenin needed Clausewitz to disprove the theory of the "left" Communists who denied that retreat could be a justifiable military action.

In this way, not as a military expert, but as a politician, Lenin used the works of Clausewitz, and was mainly interested in those questions in the works of Clausewitz which showed the relation between war and politics.

Thus, as successors of Lenin, there are no restrictions on us in the criticism of the Military doctrine of Clausewitz, as there are no remarks of Lenin that could hinder us in our free criticism.

Thus, your judgement, on the article of Comrade Meshtsherjakov (in "Wojennaja Mysl," No. 6/7, 1945), which criticises the military doctrine of Clausewitz, regarding it as a "Revision" of Lenin's judgement is completely unjustified.

2. Do we have reason at all to criticise the military doctrine of Clausewitz? Yes, we have. In the interests of our cause and the modern science of war, we are obliged not only to criticise Clausewitz, but also Moltke, Schlieffen, Ludendorff, Keitel and other exponents of German military ideology. During the last thirty years Germany has twice forced a bloody war on the rest of the world and twice has suffered defeat. Was this accidental? Of course not. Does this not mean that not only Germany as a whole, but also its military ideology has not stood the test? Obviously. It is well known that the military of the whole world, also our Russian military, looked up to the, German military authorities. Is it not time to put an end to this undeserved respect? Absolutely. So, this can only be done by criticism, especially from our side, especially from the side of those who have won the victory over Germany.

Concerning Clausewitz, as an authority in the field of military authority, he is of course out of date. On the whole, Clausewitz was a representative of the time of manufacture in war, but now we are in the machine age of war. Undoubtedly the machine age of war requires new military ideologies. Thus, it would be ridiculous to follow the teachings of Clausewitz today. One cannot make progress and further science without a critical analysis of the antiquated theories of well known authorities. This applies not only to the authorities in war theory but also to the Marxist classics. Engels once said of the Russian Commanders of 1812, that Gen. Barclay de Tolley was the only one of any relevance. Engels was of course wrong, as Kutusov was of greater importance by far. Nevertheless there are people in our time who did not hesitate to defend this wrong judgement of Engels.

In our criticism we must not be guided by single remarks and judgements from the classics, but must be guided by Lenin's well known guideline :

"We do not regard the theory of Marx as something final and untouchable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has laid the foundations of that science that the Socialists must develop in every direction if they do not want to fall bad behind the times. We are of the opinion that the Russian Socialists must find their own interpretation of Marxism, as this theory gives only general guidelines, the application of which in detail is different in England than in France; in France, different than in Germany; in Germany, different than in Russia." (Lenin Works, Vol. 4. Moscow 1946. Pp 191-192. Russian Ed.)

Such an attitude is for us even more necessary concerning the authorities of war theory.

3. Concerning your short thesis on war and the art of war, I have to restrict myself to general remarks because of their surface character. The thesis contains too much philosophy and abstract statements. The terminology taken from Clausewitz, talking of the grammar and logic of war hurts ones ears. The question of the factional character of war theory is primitively posed. The hymns of praise to Stalin also pain the ears, it hurts to read them. Also, the chapter on counter-offensive (not to be confused with counter-attack) is missing. I am talking of the counter-offensive after a successful but indecisive enemy offensive, during which the defenders assemble their forces to turn to a counter-offensive and strike a decisive blow to the en-, emy and inflict defeat upon him. I am of the opinion that a well organized counter-offensive is a very interesting method of offensive. You, as an historian should be interested in this. The old Parthens were already acquainted with such a counter-offensive when they

lured the Roman Commander Crassus and his army into the interior of their country and, turning to counter-offensive, destroyed him and his troops. Our brilliant Commander, Kutusov, executed this when he destroyed Napoleon and his army by a well prepared counter-offensive.

J. STALIN

("New World," No. 7, April 1947. Pp. 23 - 25)

**Order of the Day of the Commissar of Defence of the U.S.S.R., No. 8
23 February, 1946**

Comrades soldiers and sailors of the Red Army and Red Navy, non-commissioned officers, officers and generals!

Today we are celebrating the twenty-eighth anniversary of the existence of the Red Army. The Red Army commemorates its twenty-eighth anniversary in the glow of the glorious victory over the German and Japanese imperialists. Engaged in a prolonged and arduous war, the Red Army has emerged as a first-class army of the highest morale and fighting force, equipped with modern armaments and cadres of great experience, tempered by battle. In the war against the fascist invaders the Red Army has shown its high quality, and it has shown that it is able to defend the interests of the Soviet state effectively, faithfully and staunchly.

Our soldiers, officers and generals have justified the confidence of the people and have shown their great devotion towards our Motherland. The Red Army has proved to the Soviet people that they can have confidence in it. The people of our country have great trust in their army and its victories, and will keep the sacred memory of their heroes who fell in the battles for the Motherland.

The remarkable victories of the Red Army are explained, above all, by the fact that it is a truly popular army that defends the interests of its people. The Soviet people love their army ardently, and are a constant source of its reinforcement and of its strength. This has been shown especially in the time of the Great Patriotic War. All our people have worked unhesitatingly, day and night, for victory. Without this work, without this self-sacrificing of the workers, peasants and intellectuals, without their material and moral support, the Red Army would not have defeated the enemy.

The victories of the Red Army are also explained by the fact that it was led and educated by the Communist Party. Furthermore, the behests of the great Lenin helped the Soviet people, under the guidance of the Communist Party, to transform our country from a backward land to a land of progress, from an agrarian to an industrial country. On this basis was founded all the material possibilities for the victorious struggle of the Red Army against its enemies. During the Great Patriotic War, the Communist Party united all the countries of the Soviet Union into a single military camp, and has orientated all the efforts of the people and the army towards a single aim - the destruction of the enemy. The Communist Party has educated the Soviet soldier in the sense and aims of the war, it has cultivated love for the Motherland, constantly reinforced their fighting spirit and inspired their staunchness and discipline. All this has created the conditions for our victory.

After the victory over the enemies, the Soviet Union has entered into a new period, into a peaceful period of economic development. The present task of the Soviet people is to assure the conquered positions and to go forward in a new economic effort. We cannot only assure our position as this would mean stagnation; we have to go forward and create the conditions for a new and powerful effort of the national economy. To put it in a word, we have to heal the wounds inflicted on our country by the enemy and reach the pre-war level of the national economy before we can make considerable progress; we have to raise the material well-being of our people and we have to raise the economic and military ability of the Soviet state.

Under these new conditions, the Red Army must vigilantly protect the creative work of the Soviet people, must solidly guarantee the interests of the Soviet Union and protect the borders of our Motherland and make them inaccessible to any enemy.

During the war the main task of the soldiers, officers and generals of the Red Army consisted of attaining the victory, to concentrate all their knowledge and efforts on the total annihilation of the enemy. In these peaceful times the prime task of our soldiers, officers and generals, without exception, consists of perfecting their military and political abilities. All our soldiers and non-commissioned officers of the Red Army have to intensively study military art, have to know their weapons well and perform their duty irreproachably. Now, more than ever, the officers have to be able to educate and instruct their subordinates.

During the war the officers and generals of the Red Army knew well how to lead their troops in battle. Now these officers and generals have to become perfect masters in the education and instruction of their troops in present times.

The Great Patriotic War has introduced much that is new in the military art. The combat experience represents a rich treasure for the instruction and education of the troops. That is why all the instruction of the army should be based on the intelligent application of the experiences of the war. It is also necessary to utilize this experience in all fields for the theoretical instruction of the cadres and officers, for the enriching of Soviet military science. One must ensure that the military art develops constantly and swiftly. The Red Army is obliged not only to follow the development of the military art but to further progress it. The Red Army is equipped with first-class military material which constitutes the basis for its ability in combat. It knows how to handle this equipment perfectly and it treats it as the apple of its eye.

Any successes in the instruction and education of its troops is impossible without discipline and a strict military order, because the effectiveness of an army depends on this. This applies especially to the adjutants and sergeants who are the immediate superiors and direct teachers of the soldiers of the Red Army. The soldiers, officers and generals of the Red Army have great merit with the people and the Motherland. But they must not become complacent and vain about this, they must not rest upon their laurels, - but they must conscientiously carry out their duties and they must devote all their strength and knowledge to the service of the Red Army. That is what is demanded of all Soviet soldiers.

Comrades soldiers and sailors of the Red Army and Red Navy, non-commissioned officers, officers and generals! In the name of the Soviet government and our Communist Party, I greet and congratulate you on the occasion of the twenty-eighth anniversary of the Red Army. To celebrate the day of the Red Army, today, 23 February, I order: A salute of twenty artillery salvos in the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the capitals of the federative republics and in the heroic cities of Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sebastopol and Odessa.

Long live our victorious Red Army!

Long live our victorious sailors of the war!

Long live our glorious Communist Party!

Long live the great Soviet people!

Long live our powerful Motherland!

J. STALIN

People's Commissar of Defence of the U.S.S.R.,
Generalissimo of the Soviet Union

("Pravda," No. 7, 23 February, 1946)

**Declaration of the President of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R.
15 March, 1946**

In relation to the question of the formation of the government of the U.S.S.R., which was submitted to the examination of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., the Council of People's Commissars regards its obligations as terminated and hands over its power to the Supreme Soviet.

The Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. is at the disposal of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

J. STALIN

President of the Council of People's Commissar of the U.S.S.R.

("Zasedanie Verkhovogo Soviets SSSR," P. 82)

**Interview to “Pravda” Correspondent Concerning Mr. Winston Churchill’s Speech at Fulton
March, 1946**

TOWARDS the middle of March, 1946, a “Pravda” correspondent requested J. V. Stalin to clarify a number of questions connected with Mr. Churchill’s speech at Fulton, U.S.A. Below are J. V. Stalin’s replies to the correspondent’s questions.

Question: How do you appraise Mr. Churchill’s latest speech in the United States of America?

Answer: I appraise it as a dangerous act, calculated to sow the seeds of dissension among the Allied States and impede their collaboration.

Question: Can it be considered that Mr. Churchill’s speech is prejudicial to the cause of peace and security?

Answer: Yes, unquestionably. As a matter of fact, Mr. Churchill now takes the stand of the warmongers, and in this Mr. Churchill is not alone. He has friends not only in Britain but in the United States of America as well.

A point to be noted is that in this respect Mr. Churchill and his friends bear a striking resemblance to Hitler and his friends. Hitler began his work of unleashing war by proclaiming a race theory, declaring that only German-speaking people constituted a superior nation. Mr. Churchill sets out to unleash war with a race theory, asserting that only English-speaking nations are superior nations, who are called upon to decide the destinies of the entire world. The German race theory led Hitler and his friends to the conclusion that the Germans, as the only superior nation, should rule over other nations. The English race theory leads Mr. Churchill and his friends to the conclusion that the English-speaking nations, as the only superior nations, should rule over the rest of the nations of the world.

Actually, Mr. Churchill, and his friends in Britain and the United States, present to the non-English speaking nations something in the nature of an ultimatum: “Accept our rule voluntarily, and then all will be well; otherwise war is inevitable.”

But the nations shed their blood in the course of five years’ fierce war for the sake of the liberty and independence of their countries, and not in order to exchange the domination of the Hitlers for the domination of the Churchills. It is quite probable, accordingly, that the non-English-speaking nations, which constitute the vast majority of the population of the world, will not agree to submit to a new slavery.

It is Mr. Churchill’s tragedy that, inveterate Tory that he is, he does not understand this simple and obvious truth.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Churchill’s position is a war position, a call for war on the U.S.S.R. It is also clear that this position of Mr. Churchill’s is incompatible with the Treaty of Alliance existing between Britain and the U.S.S.R. True, Mr. Churchill does say, in passing, in order to confuse his readers, that the term of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance and Collaboration might quite well be extended to 50 years. But how is such a statement on Mr. Churchill’s part to be reconciled with his position of war on the U.S.S.R., with his preaching of War against the U.S.S.R.? Obviously, these things cannot be reconciled by any

means whatever. And if Mr. Churchill, who calls for war on the Soviet Union, at the same time considers it possible to extend the term of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty to 50 years, that means that he regards this Treaty as a mere scrap of paper, which he only needs in order to disguise and camouflage his anti-Soviet position. For this reason, the false statements of Mr. Churchill's friends in Britain, regarding the extension of the term of the Anglo-Soviet treaty to 50 years or more, cannot be taken seriously. Extension of the Treaty term has no point if one of the parties violates the Treaty and converts it into a mere scam of paper.

Question: How do you appraise the part of Mr. Churchill's speech in which he attacks the democratic systems in the European States bordering upon us, and criticises the good-neighbourly relations established between these States and the Soviet Union.

Answer: This part of Mr. Churchill's speech is compounded of elements of slander and elements of discourtesy and tactlessness. Mr. Churchill asserts that "Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, Sofia—all these famous cities and the populations around them lie within the Soviet sphere and are all subject in one form or another not only to Soviet influence, but to a very high and increasing measure of control from Moscow." Mr. Churchill describes all this as "unlimited expansionist tendencies" on the part of the Soviet Union.

It needs no particular effort to show that in this Mr. Churchill grossly and unceremoniously slanders both Moscow, and the above-named States bordering on the U.S.S.R.

In the first place it is quite absurd to speak of exclusive control by the U.S.S.R. in Vienna and Berlin, where there are Allied Control Councils made up of the representatives of four States and where the U.S.S.R. has only one-quarter of the votes. It does happen that some people cannot help in engaging in slander. But still, there is a limit to everything.

Secondly, the following circumstance should not be forgotten. The Germans made their invasion of the U.S.S.R. through Finland, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary. The Germans were able to make their invasion through these countries because, at the time, governments hostile to the Soviet Union existed in these countries. As a result of the German invasion the Soviet Union has lost irretrievably in the fighting against the Germans, and also through the German occupation and the deportation of Soviet citizens to German servitude, a total of about seven million people. In other words, the Soviet Union's loss of life has been several times greater than that of Britain and the United States of America put together. Possibly in some quarters an inclination is felt to forget about these colossal sacrifices of the Soviet people which secured the liberation of Europe from the Hitlerite yoke. But the Soviet Union cannot forget about them. And so what can there be surprising about the fact that the Soviet Union, anxious for its future safety, is trying to see to it that governments loyal in their attitude to the Soviet Union should exist in these countries? How can anyone, who has not taken leave of his wits, describe these peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union as expansionist tendencies on the part of our State?

Mr. Churchill claims further that the "Russian-dominated Polish Government has been encouraged to make enormous, wrongful inroads on Germany."

Every word of this is a gross and insulting calumny. Outstanding men are at the helm in present democratic Poland. They have proved by their deeds that they are capable of upholding the interests and dignity of their country as their predecessors were not. What

grounds has Mr. Churchill to assert that the leaders of present-day Poland can countenance in their country the domination of representatives of any foreign State whatever? Is it not because Mr. Churchill means to sow the seeds of dissension in the relations between Poland and the Soviet Union that he slanders “the Russians” here?

Mr. Churchill is displeased that Poland has faced about in her policy in the direction of friendship and alliance with the U.S.S.R. There was a time when elements of conflict and antagonism predominated in the relations between Poland and the U.S.S.R. This circumstance enabled statesmen like Mr. Churchill to play on these antagonisms, to get control over Poland on the pretext of protecting her from the Russians, to try to scare Russia with the spectre of war between her and Poland, and retain the position of arbiter for themselves. But that time is past and gone, for the enmity between Poland and Russia has given place to friendship between them, and Poland—present-day democratic Poland—does not choose to be a play-ball in foreign hands any longer. It seems to me that it is this fact that irritates Mr. Churchill and makes him indulge in discourteous, tactless sallies against Poland. Just imagine—he is not being allowed to play his game at the expense of others!

As to Mr. Churchill’s attack upon the Soviet Union in connection with the extension of Poland’s Western frontier to include Polish territories which the Germans had seized in the past—here it seems to me he is plainly cheating. As is known, the decision on the Western frontier of Poland was adopted at the Berlin Three-Power Conference on the basis of Poland’s demands. The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that it considers Poland’s demands to be proper and just. It is quite probable that Mr. Churchill is displeased with this decision. But why does Mr. Churchill, while sparing no shots against the Russian position in this matter, conceal from his readers the fact that this decision was passed at the Berlin Conference by unanimous vote—that it was not only the Russians, but the British and Americans as well, that voted for the decision? Why did Mr. Churchill think it necessary to mislead the public?

Further, Mr. Churchill asserts that the Communist Parties, which were previously very small in all these Eastern States of Europe, have been raised to prominence and power far beyond their numbers and seek everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments prevail in nearly every case, and “thus far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy.”

As is known, the Government of the State in Britain at the present time is in the hands of one party, the Labour Party, and the opposition parties are deprived of the right to participate in the Government of Britain. That Mr. Churchill calls true democracy. Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Hungary are administered by blocs of several parties—from four to six parties—and the opposition, if it is more or less loyal, is secured the right of participation in the Government. That Mr. Churchill describes as totalitarianism, tyranny and police rule. Why? On what grounds? Don’t expect a reply from Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill does not understand in what a ridiculous position he puts himself by his outcry about “totalitarianism, tyranny and police rule.”

Mr. Churchill would like Poland to be administered by Sosnkowski and Anders, Yugoslavia by Mikhailovich and Pavelich, Rumania by Prince Stirbey and Radescu, Hungary and Austria by some King of the House of Hapsburg, and so on. Mr. Churchill wants to assure us that these gentlemen from the Fascist backyard can ensure true democracy.

Such is the “democracy” of Mr. Churchill.

Mr. Churchill comes somewhere near the truth when he speaks of the increasing influence of the Communist Parties in Eastern Europe. It must be remarked, however, that he is not quite accurate. The influence of the Communist Parties has grown not only in Eastern Europe, but in nearly all the countries of Europe which were previously under Fascist rule—Italy, Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Finland—or which experienced German, Italian or Hungarian occupation—France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, the Soviet Union and so on.

The increased influence of the Communists cannot be considered fortuitous. It is a perfectly logical thing. The influence of the Communists has grown because, in the years of the rule of Fascism in Europe, the Communists showed themselves trusty, fearless, self-sacrificing fighters against the Fascist regime for the liberty of the peoples. Mr. Churchill in his speeches sometimes recalls the plain people from little homes, slapping them patronisingly on the back and parading as their friend. But these people are not so simple as may at first sight appear. These plain people have views of their own, a policy of their own, and they know how to stand up for themselves. It was they, the millions of these plain people, that defeated Mr. Churchill and his party in Britain by casting their votes for the Labourites. It was they, the millions of these “plain people,” who isolated the reactionaries and advocates of collaboration with Fascism in Europe, and gave their preference to the Left democratic parties. It was they, the millions of these “plain people,” who after testing the Communists in the fires of struggle and resistance to Fascism, came to the conclusion that the Communists were fully deserving of the people’s confidence. That was how the influence of the Communists grew in Europe.

Of course Mr. Churchill does not like this course of development and he sounds the alarm and appeals to force. But neither did he like the birth of the Soviet regime in Russia after the First World War. At that time, too, he sounded the alarm and organised an armed campaign of 14 States against Russia setting himself the goal of turning back the wheel of history. But history proved stronger than the Churchill intervention, and Mr. Churchill’s quixotry led to his unmitigated defeat at that time. I don’t know whether Mr. Churchill and his friends will succeed in organising a new armed campaign against Eastern Europe after the Second World War; but if they do succeed—which is not very probable because millions of plain people stand guard over the cause of peace—it may confidently be said that they will be thrashed, just as they were thrashed once before, 26 years ago.

**Replies to Questions put by Mr. Eddie Gilmore, Associated Press Correspondent
March 22nd, 1946**

The Associated Press correspondent Mr. Eddie Gilmore, addressed a number of questions to Generalissimo Stalin pertaining to the International situation. Below are Mr. Gilmore's questions and Generalissimo Stalin's replies, dated March 22, 1946:—

Question: What importance do you ascribe to the United Nations Organisation as a means of safeguarding world peace?

Answer: I ascribe great importance to the United Nations Organisation inasmuch as it is a serious instrument for maintaining peace and international security. The strength of this international organisation lies in the fact that it is based on the principle of the equality of States and not on the principle of the domination of some over others. If the United Nations Organisation succeeds in the future, too, in maintaining the principle of equality, then it will undoubtedly play a great positive role in guaranteeing universal peace and security.

Question: What in your opinion is the reason for the present war scare which is felt by many people in many countries?

Answer: I am convinced that neither nations nor their armies seek a new war. They want peace, and seek to secure the peace. That means that the present war scare does not come from that direction. I think that the present war scare is aroused by the actions of certain political groups who are engaged in propaganda for a new war and thus sowing the seeds of dissension and uncertainty.

Question: What should the Governments of the freedom-loving countries do at the present time to safeguard peace and tranquillity throughout the world?

Answer: It is necessary that the public and the ruling circles of the States organise widespread counter-propaganda against the propagandists for a new war, as well as for the maintenance of peace; that not a single utterance of the propagandists for a new war gets away without the rebuff it deserves on the part of public opinion and the press; that in this way the war-mongers be promptly exposed and given no opportunity to misuse freedom of speech against the interests of peace.

Reply to a Telegram from Mr. Hugh Baillie
25 March, 1946

Telegram from Mr. Hugh Baillie, President of the United Press Agency, to Generalissimo Stalin, Kremlin, Moscow :

I would like to draw your attention to the declaration made by Winston Churchill to the United Press, which was transmitted by press and radio all over the world.

On this occasion I would like to renew my proposition on behalf of United Press, that you make a declaration on the international' situation. If you want to reply to Churchill's argument on the necessity of rapid action of the Security Council of the United Nations Organization on the Iranian question, United Press would be pleased to transmit your views to the whole world. In the case of you wishing to put other questions concerning Iran or international peace and security, I beg you to utilize our possibilities which we place at your disposal with great pleasure.

Reply to Mr. Hugh Baillie of United Press, New York :

Thank you for your friendly offer. I do not find Mr. Churchill's argument convincing. On the question of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran, that will be decided in a positive way by an agreement between the Soviet government and the government of Iran.

J. STALIN

President of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

("Pravda," 27 March, 1946)

**Reply to a Message from the
Prime Minister of Iran
April, 1946**

I thank Your Excellence for the friendly sentiments expressed in your telegram on the occasion of the successful conclusion of the Soviet-Iranian Treaty, in which you have played an active part personally. I am persuaded that the agreement realized between the U.S.S.R. and Iran in the form of this treaty will serve to develop and deeply strengthen the cooperation and friendship between the peoples of our countries.

Generalissimo Stalin
President of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

("Pravda," 8 April, 1946)

**Order of the Day of the Minister
of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. No. 7
May 1, 1946**

Comrades of the Red Army and Red Navy, Sergeants and Mates!
Comrades Officers, Generals and Admirals!
Working people of the Soviet Union!

For the first time since the victory in the Great Patriotic War we celebrate the First of May, the international holiday of the working, people, under peaceful conditions, which we have reached after hard struggle against the enemy and at the price of great sacrifices and sufferings.

A year ago the Red Army raised the banner of victory over Berlin and finished off the smashing of fascist Germany. Four months after the victory over Germany, imperialist Japan capitulated. The Second World War, prepared by the forces of international reaction and started by the main fascist states, ended in complete victory for the freedom-loving peoples.

The smashing and liquidation of the centres of fascism and world aggression led to a profound change in the political life of the peoples of the world and to a profound growth of the democratic movement of the people. Ripened by the experiences of war, the masses learned that they should not leave the fate of their states in the hands of reactionary leaders who follow limited, self-seeking class interests against the people. Thus, the people who want to change their lives take the fate of their state into their own hands and erect a democratic order and lead an active struggle against the reactionary powers, against the arsonists of a new war.

The peoples of the whole world do not want another war. They struggle desperately for the ensuring of peace and security.

In the vanguard of the struggle for peace and security marches the Soviet Union, which has played a leading role in the smashing of fascism and has fulfilled her high mission of liberation.

The peoples who were liberated by the Soviet Union from the fascist yoke were given the possibility of founding their states on democratic principles and to realize their historical hopes. On this path they receive the fraternal help of the Soviet Union.

The whole world was able to convince itself not only of the power of the Soviet state, but also of the just character of its politics, based on the recognition of the equality of all peoples, based on respect for their freedom and self-determination. There is no reason to doubt that the Soviet Union will, in the future, continue these politics which are the politics of peace and security, equality and friendship of the peoples.

Since the ending of the war, the Soviet Union is progressing in peaceful socialist construction. With great enthusiasm the Soviet people are continuing the peaceful constructive work that was interrupted by the war.

The Five Year Plan for the reconstruction and development of the people's economy of the U.S.S.R., for the years 1946 - 1950, that has been approved by the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, opens new perspectives for the further growth of the productive forces of our

Motherland, the strengthening of its economic power, the raising of its material wealth and its culture.

The Five Year Plan was accepted by the workers, peasants and intelligentsia of our country as a programme entirely meeting their interests. It can be expected that the Soviet people, led by the Communist Party, will spare no effort not only to fulfil this Five Year Plan, but also to over-fulfil it by their endeavours.

While we develop this peaceful socialist construction we must not at any moment forget the machinations of international reaction, its plans for a new war. One must not forget the guidelines of the great Lenin that during the transition to peaceful work one must constantly be alert, and constantly keep an eye on the strength of the armed forces and their ability to defend our country.

The armed forces of the Soviet Union, our army, our airforce and our navy have fulfilled their duty towards our Motherland in the Great Patriotic War. The new task for our armed forces is to be on guard, to protect the peace and the constructive work of the Soviet people, and to safeguard the interests of the Soviet Union.

The successful fulfillment of this honourable task is possible only under the conditions of further development of the military culture and art of war of the fighters and commanders of our army, our navy and our airforce.

The armed forces of the Soviet Union have to raise their standards in the art of war, based on the experiences of war, based on the development of the science and technique of war.

There is no doubt that our army, our fleet and our airforce will honourably fulfil their task.

Comrades of the Red Army and Red Navy,

Sergeants and Mates! Comrade Officers, Mates and Generals!

Comrades working men and women, men and women peasants, intellectuals!

Demobilized fighters of the Red Army!

In the name of the government and the Communist Party, I greet you and congratulate you on the occasion of the First of May, on the occasion of the international holiday of the working people, and I order:

Today, 1 May, in the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the capitals of the Union Republics as well as in Lvov, Königsberg, Chabar-ovsk, Vladivostok, Port-Arthur and in the heroic cities of Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sevastopol and Odessa, a salute of 20 artillery salvos.

Long live our brave armed forces!

Long live our glorious Communist Party!

Long live the great Soviet people!

Long live our powerful Soviet Motherland!

J. STALIN

Minister of the Armed Forces of the U. S. S. R. Generalissimo of the Soviet Union

("Pravda," 1 May, 1946)

**Order of the Day of the Minister
of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. No. 11
May 9, 1946**

Comrades soldiers and sailors of the Red Army and Red Navy! Comrades officers, generals and admirals! Workers of the Soviet Union!

Today we celebrate the first anniversary of the great victory won by our people over fascist Germany, Which attacked the liberty and independence of our Motherland.

In the name of the Soviet government and of our Communist Party, I salute and congratulate you on the occasion of the national celebration, the day of victory over the German fascists.

To celebrate the victory feast, I order: today, 9 May, a salute of thirty artillery salvoes in the capital of our Motherland, Moscow and in the capitals of the federal republics, Lvov, Konigsberg, and in the heroic cities of Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sebastopol and Odessa.

Glory to our armed forces who kept the honour and independence of our Motherland and who won victory over Hitler Germany!

Glory to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, inspirer and organizer of our victory!

Glory to our great people, the victorious-people!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell in the fight for the freedom and independence of our Motherland!

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 9 May, 1946)

**Replies to Questions put by Mr. Alexander Werth, Moscow, Correspondent of the
“Sunday Times”
September 24, 1946**

The following answers were given by J. V. Stalin to questions put by the Moscow correspondent of the “Sunday Times,” Mr. Alexander Werth, in a note addressed to Stalin on September 17, 1946.

Question: Do you believe in a real danger of a “new war” concerning which there is so much irresponsible talk throughout the world today? What steps should be taken to prevent war if such a danger exists?

Answer: I do not believe in a real danger of a “new war.”

Those who are now clamouring about a “new war” are chiefly military-political scouts and their few followers from among the civilian ranks. They need this clamour if only:

(a) to scare certain naive politicians from among their counter-agents with the spectre of war, and thus help their own Governments to wring as many concessions as possible from such counter-agents;

(b) to obstruct for some time the reduction of war budgets in their own countries;

(c) to put a brake on the demobilisation of troops, and thus prevent a rapid growth of unemployment in their own countries.

One must strictly differentiate between the hue and cry about a “new war” which is now taking place, and a real danger of a “new war” which does not exist at present.

Question: Do you believe that Great Britain and the United States of America are consciously placing the Soviet Union in a state of “capitalist encirclement”?

Answer: I do not think that the ruling circles of Great Britain and of the United States of America could create a “capitalist encirclement” of the Soviet Union even if they so desired, which, however, I do not assert.

Question: To quote Mr. Wallace’s recent speech, may Britain, Western Europe and the United States be certain that Soviet policy in Germany will not become an instrument of Russian designs against Western Europe?

Answer: I exclude the use of Germany by the Soviet Union against Western Europe and the United States of America. I consider this out of the question, not only because the Soviet Union is bound with Great Britain and France by the Treaty of Mutual Assistance against German aggression, and with the United States of America by the decisions of the Potsdam Conference of the three Great Powers, but also because a policy of making use of Germany against Western Europe and the United States of America would mean the departure of the Soviet Union from its fundamental national interests.

In short, the policy of the Soviet Union in relation to the German problem reduces itself to the demilitarisation and democratisation of Germany. I believe that the demilitarisation and democratisation of Germany form one of the most important guarantees of the establishment of a stable and lasting peace.

Question: What is your view of the charges that Communist Parties of Western Europe are having their policy “dictated by Moscow”?

Answer: I consider these charges absurd and borrowed from the bankrupt arsenal of Hitler and Goebbels.

Question: Do you believe in the possibility of friendly and lasting co-operation between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies despite the existence of ideological differences, and in the “friendly competition” between the two systems to which Mr. Wallace referred?

Answer: I believe in it absolutely.

Question: During the recent sojourn here of the Labour Party delegation you, as far as I understand, expressed certainty of the possibility of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. What could help in establishing these relations so profoundly desired by the broad masses of the British people?

Answer: I am indeed convinced of the possibility of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. The strengthening of political, commercial and cultural bonds between these countries would considerably contribute to the establishment of such relations.

Question: Do you believe the earliest withdrawal of all American forces in China to be vital for future peace?

Answer: Yes, I do.

Question: Do you believe that virtual monopoly by the U.S.A. of the atom bomb one of the main dangers to peace?

Answer: I do not believe the atom bomb to be as serious a force as certain politicians are inclined to think. Atomic bombs are intended for intimidating the weak-nerved, but they cannot decide the outcome of war, since atom bombs are by no means sufficient for this purpose. Certainly, monopolistic possession of the secret of the atom bomb does create a threat, but at least two remedies exist against it:

(a) Monopolist possession of the atom bomb cannot last long;

(b) Use of the atom bomb will be prohibited.

Question: Do you believe that with the further progress of the Soviet Union towards Communism the possibilities of peaceful co-operation with the outside world will not decrease as far as the Soviet Union is concerned? Is “Communism in one country” possible?

Answer: I do not doubt that the possibilities of peaceful co-operation, far from decreasing, may even grow. "Communism in one country" is perfectly possible, especially in a country like the Soviet Union.

**Replies to Questions put by Mr. Hugh Baillie, President of the U. P. of America
October 28, 1946**

The following answers were given by J. V. Stalin to questions put to him on October 23, 1946, by Mr. Hugh Baillie, President of the United Press of America:—

1. Question: Do you agree with Secretary Byrnes' feeling, as expressed in his radio speech last Friday (October 18th), that there is growing tension between the U.S.S.R. and the United States?

Answer: No.

2. Question: If such an increasing tension exists, could you indicate the reason, or reasons for it, and what are the most essential bases for eliminating it?

Answer: The question does not arise in view of my answer to the preceding question.

3. Question: Do you foresee that the present negotiations will result in peace treaties which will establish amicable relations among the nations which were allies in the war against Fascism, and remove the danger of war on the part of former Fascist sources?

Answer: I hope so.

4. Question: If not, what are the principal obstacles to the establishment of such amicable relations among the nations which were allies in the Great War?

Answer: The question does not arise in view of the answer to the preceding question.

5. Question: What is Russia's attitude with regard to Yugoslavia's decision not to sign the Peace Treaty with Italy?

Answer: Yugoslavia has grounds to be dissatisfied.

6. Question: What, in your opinion, is to-day the worst threat to world peace?

Answer: The instigators of a new war, in the first place Churchill and people of like mind in Britain and the U.S.A.

7. Question: If such a threat should arise, what steps should be taken by the nations of the world to avoid a new war?

Answer: The instigators of a new war should be exposed and curbed.

8. Question: Is the United Nations Organisation a guarantee of the integrity of the small nations?

Answer: It is hard to say so far.

9. Question: Do you think that the four zones of occupation in Germany should in the near future be thrown together, so far as economic administration is concerned, with a view to restoring Germany as a peaceful economic unit and thus lessening the burden of occupation to the four powers?

Answer: Not only the economic but also the political unity of Germany should be restored.

10. Question: Do you feel that it is feasible at this time to create some sort of central administration to be placed in the hands of the Germans themselves, but under Allied control, which will make it possible for the Council of Foreign Ministers to draft a peace treaty for Germany?

Answer: Yes, I do.

11. Question: Do you feel confident, in the light of elections which have been held in the various zones this summer and fall that Germany is developing politically along democratic lines which give hope for its future as a peaceful nation?

Answer: So far I am not certain of it.

12. Question: Do you feel that, as has been suggested in some quarters, the level of permitted industry should be increased above the agreed level, to permit Germany to pay her own way more fully?

Answer: Yes, I do.

13. Question: What should be done beyond the present four-Power programme to prevent Germany from again becoming a world military menace?

Answer: The remnants of Fascism in Germany should be extirpated in fact and she should be democratised to the end.

14. Question: Should the German people be allowed to reconstruct their industry and trade and become self-supporting?

Answer: Yes, they should.

15. Question: Have the provisions of Potsdam, in your opinion, been adhered to? If not, what is needed to make the Potsdam Declaration an effective instrument?

Answer: They are not always adhered to, especially in the sphere of the democratisation of Germany.

16. Question: Do you feel the veto power has been used to excess during the discussions among the four Foreign Ministers and in meetings of the United Nations Council?

Answer: No, I do not.

17. Question: How far does the Kremlin feel the Allied Powers should go hunting down and trying minor war criminals in Germany? Does it feel that the Nuremberg decisions created a sufficiently strong basis for such action?

Answer: The farther they go the better.

18. Question: Does Russia consider the Western frontiers of Poland permanent?

Answer: Yes, she does.

19. Question: How does the U.S.S.R. regard the presence of British troops in Greece? Does it feel that Britain should supply more arms to the present Greek Government?

Answer: As unnecessary.

20. Question: What is the extent of Russian military contingents in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Austria, and how long do you feel that, in the interests of securing peace, these contingents must be maintained?

Answer: In the West, that is in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania and Poland, the Soviet Union has at present in all 60 divisions (infantry and armour together). Most of them are below full complement. There are no Soviet troops in Yugoslavia. In two months, when the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of October 22 of this year on the last stage of demobilisation is put into effect, 40 Soviet divisions will remain in the above-mentioned countries.

21. Question: What is the attitude of the Government of the U.S.S.R. towards the presence of American warships in the Mediterranean?

Answer: Indifferent.

22. Question: What is the present outlook for a commercial agreement between Russia and Norway?

Answer: It is hard to tell, so far.

23. Question: Is it possible for Finland again to become a self-sufficient nation after reparations have been paid, and is there any idea in contemplation of revising the reparations programme so far as to expedite Finland's recovery?

Answer: The question has been put in the wrong way. Finland has been and remains an entirely self-sufficient nation.

24. Question: What will trade agreements with Sweden and other countries mean with regard to reconstruction in the U.S.S.R.? What outside aid do you consider desirable in accomplishing this great task?

Answer: The agreement with Sweden constitutes a contribution to the cause of economic co-operation among the nations.

25. Question: Is Russia still interested in obtaining a loan from the United States?

Answer: She is interested.

26. Question: Has Russia developed its own atom bomb or any similar weapon.

Answer: No.

27. Question: What is your opinion of the atom bomb or similar weapon as an instrument of warfare?

Answer: I have already given my appraisal of the atom bomb in the well-known answer to Mr. Worth.

28. Question: How, in your opinion, can atomic power best be controlled? Should this control be created on an international basis, and to what extent should the powers sacrifice their sovereignty in the interest of making the control effective?

Answer: Strict international control is necessary.

29. Question: How long will it require to rebuild the devastated areas of Western Russia?

Answer: Six to seven years, if not more.

30. Question: Will Russia permit commercial airlines to operate across the Soviet Union? Does Russia intend to extend her own airlines to other continents on a reciprocal basis?

Answer: Under certain conditions this is not excluded.

31. Question: How does your Government view the occupation of Japan? Do you feel it has been a success on the present basis?

Answer: There are some successes, but better successes could have been obtained.

**Telegram to the Slavic Congress Reunion
in Belgrade
December 8, 1946**

I greet the participants of the first Slavic Congress since the war, the representatives of the peace-loving Slavic peoples. I am sure that the Slavic Congress will contribute to and deeply strengthen the friendship and fraternal solidarity of the Slavic peoples and will serve the cause of the development of democracy and the consolidation of peace between the peoples.

J. STALIN

("Slaviane," January 1, 1946, Moscow)

Replies to Questions put by Mr. Elliot Roosevelt, in an Interview December 21, 1946

At an interview with J. V. Stalin in the Kremlin on December 21, 1946 Mr. Elliott Roosevelt put 12 questions. These, together with Stalin's answers, were published in the American Magazine "Look" and then broadcast by Moscow Radio.

1. Question: Do you believe it is possible for a democracy such as the United States to live peaceably side by side in this world with a communistic form of government like the Soviet Union's and with no attempt on the part of either to interfere with the internal political affairs of the other?

Answer: Yes, of course. This is not only possible. It is wise and entirely within the bounds of realisation. In the most strenuous times during the war the differences in government did not prevent our two nations from joining together and vanquishing our foes. Even more so is it possible to continue this relationship in time of peace.

2. Question: Do you believe that the success of the United Nations depends upon agreement as to fundamental policies and aims between the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States?

Answer: Yes, I think so. In many respects the fate of the United Nations as an organisation depends upon a state of harmony being reached by those three powers.

3. Question: Do you believe, Generalissimo Stalin, that an important step toward world peace would be the attainment of economic agreement of broader scope for the interchange of manufactured and raw materials between our two countries?

Answer: Yes, I believe that it would be an important step for the establishment of world peace. Of course, I agree. The expansion of world trade would benefit in many respects the development of good relations between our two countries.

4. Question: Is the Soviet Union in favour of the immediate creation by the United Nations Security Council of an international police force composed of all the United Nations, which would step in immediately wherever armed warfare threatens peace?

Answer: Of course.

5. Question: If you believe that the atomic bomb should be controlled by the United Nations, should not they, through inspection, control all research and manufacturing facilities for armaments of any nature and the peace-time use and development of atomic energy?

(At this point Mr. Elliott Roosevelt parenthetically says: "Stalin shot back at me a quick question: 'In general?' I said, 'Yes, but, especially as to agreement an principle by Russia to such a plan.'")

Answer: Of course. To the principle of equality no exception should be made in the case of Russia. Russia should be subject to the same rules of inspection and control as any other nation must.

(At this point Mr. Elliott Roosevelt parenthetically says: "There was no hesitancy in his answer. And no question of reserving the right of veto was even mentioned.")

6. Question: Do you think it would serve a useful purpose if another Big Three meeting was held for discussion of all international problems at present threatening peace in the world?

Answer: I think there should not be one meeting, but several; they would serve a useful purpose.

(Here Mr. Elliott Roosevelt parenthetically says: "At this point my wife asked whether he thought that such meetings would help towards achieving closer relations at lower levels among officials of the respective Governments. She also asked whether such a result was achieved by the wartime conferences. His answer came with a smile in her direction: 'There is no doubt of that, the wartime meetings and the results achieved greatly helped co-operation at lower levels.'")

7. Question: Sir, I know you are a student of many other political and social problems existing in other countries. And so I should like to ask whether you feel that the elections in the United States last November indicate a swing away, on the part of the people, from belief in the policies of Roosevelt and towards the isolationist policies of his political adversaries?

Answer: I am not so well acquainted with the internal life of the people of the United States, but I would think the election indicated that the present Government was wasting the moral and political capital created by the late President, and thus it facilitated the victory of the Republicans.

(At this point Mr. Elliott Roosevelt parenthetically says: "In answering my next question Generalissimo Stalin became very emphatic.")

8. Question: To what do you ascribe the lessening of friendly relations and understanding between our two countries since the death of Roosevelt?

Answer: I feel that if this question relates to the relations and understanding between the American and Russian peoples, no deterioration has taken place, but on the contrary relations have improved. As to the relations between the two Governments, there have been misunderstandings. A certain deterioration has taken place, and then great noise has been raised that their relations would even deteriorate still further. But I see nothing frightful about this in the sense of violation of peace or military conflict.

Not a single Great Power, even if its Government is anxious to do so, could at present raise a large army to fight another Allied Power, another Great Power, because at present one cannot possibly fight without one's people—and the people are unwilling to fight. They are tired of war.

Moreover, there are no understandable objectives to justify a new war. One would not know for what he had to fight, and therefore I see nothing frightful in the fact that some representatives of the United States Government are talking about deterioration of relations between us.

In view of all these considerations I think the danger of a new war is unreal.

9. Question: Do you favour a broad exchange of cultural and scientific information between our two nations? Also, do you favour exchange of students, artists, scientists and professors?

Answer: of course.

10. Question: Should the United States and the Soviet Union form a common long-term policy of aid to the peoples of the Far East?

Answer: I feel it will be useful if it is possible. In any case our Government is ready to pursue a common policy with the United States in Far Eastern questions.

11. Question: If a system of loans or credits is arranged between the United States and the Soviet Union, would such agreements have lasting benefit to United States economy?

Answer: A system of such credits is of course mutually advantageous both to the United States and to the Soviet Union

(Here Mr. Elliott Roosevelt parenthetically says: "I then asked the question that is creating obvious concern in many countries of Europe.")

12. Question: Does the failure in the American and British zones of occupied Germany to carry out denazification give serious cause for alarm to the Soviet Government?

Answer: No, it has not been a cause for serious alarm, but of course it is unpleasant for the Soviet Union that part of our common programme is not being put into effect.

**Exchange of Messages Between Mr. E. Bevin and J. V. Stalin, Concerning the Anglo-Soviet Treaty
January 19 and January 22, 1947**

On January 18, 1947, Mr. Bevin, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Great Britain, through the medium of the British Ambassador in the U.S.S.R., Sir M. Peterson, conveyed the following message to J. V. Stalin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.:—

I am gratified at the friendly reception which was given to the Chief of the Imperial General Staff in Moscow and am studying with interest the account which he has given me of his conversations with you.

We are however disturbed at the suggestion which you made to him that the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Alliance and Post-War Collaboration might be regarded in London as “suspended in the air” since it might be regarded as superseded by the United Nations Organisation. This view has been attributed to me personally in the most misleading manner by Pravda in an article of January 15, which takes out of its context and misinterprets one sentence in my broadcast of December 22. In fact, I said what all the other major Allies have said, namely, that they based their policy on the United Nations Organisation.

I cannot understand what is behind this line of reasoning, and I am more amazed at the Pravda article since I understand from Field-Marshal Montgomery that you said this was not your own view regarding the Treaty. It is certainly not my view either.

Since Pravda has published this misleading article, I have no alternative but to issue a statement which I should like you to see in advance, making the views of His Majesty’s Government clear once again on this subject. I propose to publish it on the morning of January 20.

On January 23, 1947, J. V. Stalin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., sent to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Great Britain the following message in reply, which was handed to Mr. Bevin by the Soviet Ambassador in London, G. N. Zarubin, on January 23:—

I have received your message of January 18. I must admit that your statement that Great Britain is not tied to anybody except in regard to her obligations arising from the Charter caused me some perplexity.

It seems to me that such a statement without a corresponding explanation can be used by the enemies of Anglo-Soviet friendship. For one it is clear that no matter what reservations there are in the Anglo-Soviet Treaty, and no matter how these reservations weaken the significance of the Treaty in the post-war period, the existence of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty imposes obligations on our countries.

It was just these circumstances that I had in mind when I stated on September 17, 1946, in my interview with Mr. Alexander Worth, that “the Soviet Union is bound with Great Britain by

the Treaty of Mutual Assistance against German aggression” and, that means, has obligations with regard to Great Britain, not counting the obligations arising from the Charter.

However, your message and the statement of the British Government completely explain the affair and do not leave any room for misunderstandings. It is now clear that you and I share the same view-point with regard to the Anglo-Soviet Treaty.

As regards the extension of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty, to which special reference is made in the British Government’s statement, I must say that if one is to speak seriously of such an extension, then, before extending this Treaty, it is necessary to change it, freeing it from the reservations which weaken this Treaty. Only after such a procedure would it be possible to talk seriously of an extension of the Treaty.

**Order of the Day on the Occasion of the
Anniversary of the Soviet Army No. 10
23 February, 1947**

Comrades soldiers, sailors, officers, generals and admirals! Today our country is celebrating the twenty-ninth anniversary of the Soviet Army.

The Soviet Army, founded by the great Lenin, has trodden a glorious path. Its entire history is a living example of freedomSoviet Army in the Great Patriotic War.

The Motherland will never forget the high heroic deeds of its army.

The Soviet Army celebrates its twenty-ninth anniversary at the moment when our people are untiringly accomplishing the tasks set by the devastation of the war, in the re-establishment and development of the national economy.

The workers, peasants and intellectuals of our country, who have successfully fulfilled the quotas of the first year of the new Five Year Plan, struggle heroically for the rapid acceleration of economic activity, for the supplementation of production of consumer goods, for the rapid progress of Soviet science and technology.

The elections to the Supreme Soviets of the Federal Republics, which were held, have resulted in the complete victory of the bloc of Communists and their Party. It shows that the unity of Soviet society is indestructible, that all the Soviet citizens are firmly grouped behind their government and the Communist Party, and are firmly assuring the development of their Motherland.

In times of peace, the Soviet Army must accomplish the task of military preparation which they have been set, march in advance and win new and more important successes in military preparation and political education. The work of consolidating peace and the security of our country is required.

The essential principle of the military preparation of the Soviet armed forces has always consisted, and still consists today, of educating the troops in war conditions. The experience of the last war has proved the high morale and combat quality of the troops, a good military and political preparation, a great mastery of the techniques of combat, coordination and great physical endurance.

The task that now faces our army, navy and airforce is to untiringly perfect, day by day, their military formation, to profitably pursue profound study based on their experience of war.

The generals, admirals and officers must continue to broaden their knowledge of military theory and politics and equally learn the methods of military preparation, which are necessary for training in peace time.

The non-commissioned officers must energetically apply the process of command to become the prime aides of officers in the observance of military discipline and in the instruction and education of soldiers and sailors.

The soldiers and sailors must, with all their might, perfect in detail their preparation from the point of view of mastery of weapons, of special military tactics and political formations; they must acquire the necessary physical strength to take part in combat and be able to surmount all difficulties of battles and combat.

In the instruction and education of their subordinates, all the commanders and chiefs must take it upon themselves to care for their conditions of life, their physical well-being and their equipment, in accordance with the regulations.

Strong military discipline is primarily based on the high conscience and political education of the military and is the preliminary condition of most importance for the combat strength of our armed forces. Also, all the commanders and chiefs must untiringly affirm military discipline and, very necessary, encourage the spirit of patriotism unceasingly in their subordinates, the sense of personal responsibility of every soldier for the defence of the Motherland.

Comrades soldiers, sailors and non-commissioned officers!

Comrades officers, generals and admirals!

I salute and congratulate you on the occasion of the twenty-ninth anniversary of our Soviet Army, in the name of the Soviet government and of our Communist Party.

In honour of the twenty-ninth anniversary of the Soviet Army, I order: today, 23 February, a salute of twenty artillery salvoes in the capital of our Motherland, Moscow, in the capitals of the federative republics, in Koliningrad, Lvov, Khabarovsk, Vladivostok, Port Arthur and in the heroic cities of Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sebastopol and Odessa.

Long live the Soviet Army and the military sailors!

Long live our Soviet government!

Long live our great Communist Party!

Long live our great Soviet people!

("Slaviane," 23 February, 1947)

**Coexistence, American-Soviet Cooperation, Atomic Energy, Europe
April 9, 1947**

[Interview with Harold Stassen, April 9, 1947]

Stassen: Generalissimo Stalin, on this European trip I am particularly interested in studying conditions of an economic nature. In this regard, of course, the relations of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are very important. I realize that we have two economic systems that are very different. The U.S.S.R. with the Communist Party and with its planned economy and socialized collective state, and the United States of America with its free economy and regulated private capitalism are very different. I would be interested to know if you think these two economic systems can exist together in the same modern world in harmony with each other?

Stalin: Of course they can. The difference between them is not important so far as co-operation is concerned. The systems in Germany and the United States are the same but war broke out between them. The U.S. and U.S.S.R. systems are different but we didn't wage war against each other and the U.S.S.R. does not propose to. If during the war they could co-operate, why can't they today in peace, given the wish to co-operate? Of course, if there is no desire to co-operate, even with the same economic system they may fall out as was the case with Germany.

Stassen: I believe, of course, that they can co-operate if they both have the desire to, but there have been many statements about not being able to co-operate. Some of these were made by the Generalissimo himself before the war. But is it possible, now that the fascist axis has been defeated, that the situation has changed?

Stalin: It's not possible that I said that the two economic systems could not co-operate. Co-operation ideas were expressed by Lenin. I might have said that one system was reluctant to co-operate, but that concerned only one side. But as to the possibility of co-operation, I adhere to Lenin who expressed both the possibility and the desire of co-operation. As to the desire of the people to co-operate on the part of the U.S.S.R. and the Party, it is possible—and the two countries could only benefit by this co-operation.

Stassen: That last part is clear. The statements I referred to are those made by you at the Eighteenth Communist Party Congress in 1939 and the plenary session in 1937—statements about capitalist encirclement and monopoly. I assume from your statement now that the defeat of fascist Germany and Japan has not changed that situation.

Stalin: There was not a single Party congress or plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party at which I said or could have said that co-operation between the two systems was impossible. I did say that there existed capitalist encirclement and danger of attack on the U.S.S.R. If one party does not wish to co-operate, then that means there exists a threat of attack. And actually Germany, not wishing to co-operate with the U.S.S.R., attacked the U.S.S.R. Could the U.S.S.R. have co-operated with Germany? Yes, the U.S.S.R. could have cooperated with Germany but the Germans did not wish to co-operate. Otherwise the U.S.S.R. could have co-operated with Germany as with any other country. As you see, this concerns the sphere of desire and not the possibility of co-operating. It is necessary to make a distinction between the possibility; of co-operating and the wish to co-operate. The possibility

of co-operation always exists but there is not always present the wish to co-operate. If one party does not wish to co-operate, then the result will be conflict, war.

Stassen: It must be mutual.

Stalin: Yes. I want to bear testimony to the fact that Russia wants to co-operate.

Stassen: I wish to point out with reference to your earlier statement that there was a great difference between Germany and the United States at the time Germany started the war.

Stalin: There was a difference in government but no difference in the economic systems. The government was a temporary factor.

Stassen: I do not agree. Yes, there was a difference of economic systems too. Imperialism, the development of state monopoly, and the oppression of workers are the evils of capitalism practiced by the Nazis. It seems to me we have been successful in America in preventing the monopoly of capitalism and the imperialistic trend, and that the workers have made greater progress through use of the strength of their vote and their freedom than Karl Marx or Frederick Engels thought they could make-and this regulation of free capital and prevention of monopoly and freedom of workers in America makes the economic situation quite different from that which existed in Germany.

Stalin: Let us not mutually criticize our systems. Everyone has the right to follow the system he wants to maintain. Which one is better will be said by history. We should respect the systems chosen by the people, and whether the system is good or bad is the business of the American people. To co-operate, one does not need the same systems. One should respect the other system when approved by the people. Only on this basis can we secure co-operation. Only, if we criticize, it will lead us too far.

As for Marx and Engels, they were unable to foresee what would happen forty years after their death. But we should adhere to mutual respect of people. Some people call the Soviet system totalitarian. Our people call the American system monopoly capitalism. If we start calling each other names with the words monopolist and totalitarian, it will lead to no co-operation.

We must start from the historical fact that there are two systems approved by the people. Only on that basis is co-operation possible. If we distract each other with criticism, that is propaganda.

As to propaganda, I am not a propagandist but a business-like man. We should not be sectarian. When the people wish to change the systems they will do so. When we met with Roosevelt to discuss the questions of war, we did not call each other names. We established co-operation and succeeded in defeating the enemy.

Stassen: That sort of criticism has been a cause of misunderstanding after the war. Do you look forward in the future to a greater exchange of ideas and news, of students and teachers, of artists, of tourists, if there is co-operation?

Stalin: This will happen inevitably if co-operation is established. For an exchange of goods will lead to an exchange of people. . . .

Stassen: As I see it, then, you think it is possible that there will be co-operation provided there is a will and desire to co-operate. Stalin: That is correct.

Stassen: In the development of the standards of living of the people, mechanization and electrification have been of major significance. The new development of atomic energy is of very great importance to all peoples of the world. I feel that the matter of international inspection, effective controls and outlawing the use for war of atomic energy is of supreme importance to all peoples of the world. Do you feel that there is a reasonable prospect of working out agreements for the long-term future for the peaceful development of atomic energy?

Stalin: I hope for this. There are big differences of views among us, but in the long run I hope we shall come to an understanding. International control and inspection will be established, in any view, and it will be of great importance. The peaceful use of atomic energy will bring great technological changes. It is a very great matter. As for the use of atomic energy for war purposes, this in all probability will be prohibited. It will be a problem in the long run that will be met by the consciences of the people and it will be prohibited.

Stassen: Yes, that is one of our important problems and if solved it can be a great boon—and if not, a great curse to the people of the world.

Stalin: I think we shall succeed in establishing international inspection and control. Things are leading up to it.

Stassen: I appreciate the opportunity of talking with you.

(The interview had now lasted forty minutes and Stassen prepared to take his leave. However, Stalin indicated a willingness to continue the discussion. The remainder of the conversation dealt with prevailing economic conditions in Europe and the United States.—Ed.)

Greetings Message to Moscow **8 September, 1947**

Greetings- to Moscow, the capital of our country, on its 800th anniversary.

The entire country is today celebrating this significant day. It is celebrating it not formally, but with feelings of love and reverence, because of the great services Moscow has rendered our country.

The services which Moscow has rendered are not only that it thrice in the course of the history of our country liberated her from foreign oppression - from the Mongolian yoke, from Polish-Lithuanian invasion and from French incursion. The service Moscow rendered is primarily that it became the basis for uniting disunited Russia into a single state, with a single government and a single leadership. No country in the world can count on preserving its independence, on real economic and cultural growth, if it has not succeeded in liberating itself from feudal disunity and strife among princes. Only a country which is united in a single, centralized state can count on the possibility of real cultural and economic growth, on the possibility of firmly establishing its independence. The historic service which Moscow rendered is that it has been and remains the basis and the initiator in the creation of a centralized state in Russia.

But this is not the only service that Moscow has rendered our country. After Moscow, by the will of our great Lenin, was again proclaimed the capital of our country, it became the banner bearer of the new, Soviet epoch.

Moscow is today not only the inspirer in the building of the new, Soviet social and economic order, which substituted the rule of Labour for the rule of capital and rejected the exploitation of man by man. Moscow is also the herald of the movement for the liberation of toiling mankind from capitalist slavery.

Moscow is today not only the inspirer in the building of the new, Soviet democracy, which rejects all, direct or indirect, inequality of citizens, sexes, races and nations, and ensures the right to work and the right to equal pay for equal work. Moscow is also the banner of the struggle which all the working people in the world, all the oppressed races and nations, are waging to liberate themselves from the rule of plutocracy and imperialism. There can be no doubt that without this policy Moscow could not have become the centre of organization of the friendship of nations and of their fraternal cooperation in our multi-national state.

Moscow is today not only the initiator in the building of the new way of life of the working people of the capital, a life free from want and wretchedness suffered by millions of poor and unemployed. Moscow is also a model for all the capitals in the world in this respect. One of the gravest sores of the large capitals of countries in Europe, Asia and America are the slums in which millions of impoverished working people are doomed to wretchedness and a slow and painful death. The service which Moscow has rendered is that it completely abolished these slums and gave the working people the opportunity to move out of their cellars and hovels into the apartments and houses of the bourgeoisie and into the new comfortable houses which have been built by the Soviet authorities.

Lastly, the service Moscow renders is that it is the herald of the struggle for durable peace and friendship among the nations, the herald of the struggle against the incendiaries of a new war.

For the imperialists, war is the most profitable undertaking. It is not surprising that the agents of imperialism are trying, in 'one way or another, to provoke a new war. The service which Moscow renders is that it unceasingly exposes the incendiaries of a new war and rallies around the banner of peace all the peace-loving nations. It is common knowledge that the peace-loving nations look with hope to Moscow as the capital of the great peace-loving power and as a mighty bulwark of peace.

It is because of these services that our country is today celebrating the 800th anniversary of Moscow with such love and reverence for her capital.

Long live our mighty, beloved, Soviet, Socialist Moscow!

J. STALIN

("Soviet Calkender 1917 - 1947")

**Letter to the State President of Finland, Paasikivi
Proposal of the Soviet government on the conclusion of a Soviet-Finnish
Friendship, Cooperation and Support Treaty
22 February 1948**

Mr. President!

As you know, two out of three of the countries bordering the U.S.S.R., that stood on the side of Germany against the U.S.S.R. during the war, namely Hungary and Rumania, have signed a support treaty against an eventual German aggression with the U.S.S.R.

As is also known, our two countries stood together strongly in sympathy throughout this aggression, in which we, together with you, bear the responsibility before our peoples if we allow the repetition of such an aggression.

I am of the opinion that a support treaty with the U.S.S.R., against an eventual German aggression is of no less, interest for Finland than for Rumania and Hungary.

Out of these considerations and from the wish to create better relations between our countries for the strengthening of peace and security, the Soviet government offers the conclusion of a Soviet-Finnish Friendship, Cooperation and Support Treaty like the Hungarian-Soviet and Rumanian-Soviet treaties.

Should there be no objections from the Finnish side, I would propose that a Finnish delegation be sent to the U.S.S.R. to conclude such a treaty.

Should it be more convenient for you to carry through the negotiations and the conclusion of the treaty in Finland, the Soviet government offers to send their delegation to Helsinki.

Yours respectfully,

J. STALIN
Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

("Daily Review," No. 52, 2 March, 1948)

Speech given at the dinner in honour of the Finish Government Delegation 7 April, 1948

I would like to say a few words about the significance of the Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Help between the Soviet Union and Finland, which was signed yesterday.

This treaty signifies a change in the relations between our countries. As it is known, in the course of 150 years of relations between Russia and Finland there has been mutual distrust. The Finns distrusted the Russians, the Russians distrusted the Finns. From the Soviet side there resulted an attempt in the past to break the distrust that stood between the Russians and the Finns. That was at the time that Lenin, in 1917, proclaimed the independence of Finland. From an historical point of view, that was an outstanding act. But sadly the distrust was not thereby broken - the distrust stayed distrust. The result was two wars between us.

I would like us to go over from the long period of mutual distrust in the course of which we went to war with each other twice, to a new period in our relations: the period of mutual trust.

It is necessary that the conclusion of this treaty breaks this distrust and builds a new basis for relations between our peoples and that it signifies a great change in the relations between our countries . towards trust and . friendship.

We want this acknowledged not only by those present in this hall, but also by those outside this hall, as much in Finland as in the Soviet Union.

One must not believe that the distrust, between our peoples can be removed all at once. That is not done so quickly. For a long time there will be remnants of this distrust, for the abolition of which one must work and struggle hard, and to build and strengthen a tradition of mutual friendship between the U.S.S.R. and Finland.

There are treaties that are based upon equality and some that are not. The Soviet-Finnish treaty is a treaty that is based upon equality, it has been concluded on the basis of full equality of the partners.

Many believe that between a big and little nation there cannot be relations which are based on equality. But we Soviet people are of the opinion that such relations can and should exist. We Soviet people are of the opinion that every nation, great or small, has special- qualities that only they have and no other nation possesses. These peculiarities are their contribution, that every nation should contribute, to the common treasure of the culture of the world. In this sense, all nations, big and small, are in the same situation, and' every nation is as equally important as the next nation.

So the Soviet people are of the opinion that Finland, although a small country, is in this treaty, as equal a partner as the Soviet Union.

You do not find many politicians of the great powers that would regard the small nations as the equals of the larger nations. Most of them look down upon the small nations. They are not disinclined, occasionally, to make a onesided guarantee for a small nation. These politicians do not, in general, conclude treaties which depend on equality, with small nations, as they do not regard small nations as their partners.

I propose a toast to the Soviet-Finnish treaty, and to the change for the better in the relations between our countries that this treaty signifies.

("Pravda," 13 April, 1948)

**Answer to the Open Letter of
Henry Wallace
17 May, 1948**

I believe that among the political documents of recent times, that have the strengthening of peace, the furthering of international cooperation and the securing of democracy as their aims, the open letter of Henry Wallace, the presidential candidate of the Third Party in the U.S.A., is the most important.

The open letter of Wallace cannot be regarded as a mere exposition of the wish to improve the international situation, as an exposition of the wish for a peaceful settlement of the differences of opinion between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A., and the wish to find a way towards such a settlement. The declaration of the government of the U.S.A. of 4 May, and the answer of the Soviet government of 9 May are, therefore, insufficient, because they do not go so far as to declare that the settlement of the Soviet-American differences of opinion is desirable.

The great importance of the open letter lies in the fact that it is not limited just to that, to giving a declaration, but rather exceeds that, - a more important step, an advance, -and proposes a concrete programme for the peaceful settlement of the differences of opinion between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A.

One cannot say that the open letter of Wallace invariably deals with all the differences. One also cannot say that none of the formulas and opinions in the open letter need to be improved. But that is not the important thing at the moment. The important thing is that Wallace, in his letter, makes an open and honest attempt to work out a peaceful programme for a peaceful settlement and gives concrete proposals on all the points of difference between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A.

These proposals are generally known :

General limitation of armaments and the forbidding of atomic weapons. Conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and Japan and the withdrawal of the troops from these countries.

Withdrawal of the troops from China and Korea.

Consideration for the right of nations to self-determination and non-interference in their internal affairs.

Forbidding the building of military bases in the countries that belong to the United Nations.

Development of international trade in every area, with the elimination of all discrimination.

Help and rebuilding within the framework of the United Nations for countries that suffered from the war.

Defence of democracy and the securing of civil rights in all countries, etc.

One can be for or against these proposals; but no statesman that has anything to do with the matter of peace and cooperation of nations can ignore this programme, which reflects the

hopes and longing of the peoples for the strengthening of peace, and which, without doubt, will find the support of millions of the common people.

I do not know whether the government of the U.S.A. acknowledges the programme of Wallace as a basis for understanding between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. As far as the government of the U.S.S.R. is concerned, we believe that the programme of Wallace could be a good and fruitful foundation for such understanding and for the development of international cooperation, because the government of the U.S.S.R. is of the opinion that despite the differences in their economic systems and ideologies, these systems can live side by side and that peaceful settlement of the differences between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. is not only possible, but also absolutely necessary in the interests of general peace.

("Pravda," 18 May, 1948)

**Greetings Telegram from Stalin and
Molotov to the President of the
Czechoslovakian Republic Klement Gottwald
On the occasion of the election of Klement Gottwald as President of the Czechoslovakian
Republic
17 June, 1948**

Accept our sincere good wishes on the victory of people's democracy and on your election as President of the Czechoslovakian Republic.

J. STALIN - V. MOLOTOV

("Daily Review," Berlin Ed., No. 139, 17 June, 1948)

**Telegram to the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of Italy
On the occasion of the criminal attempt on the life of Comrade Togliatti
14 July, 1948**

To the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Italy.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik) is shocked over the criminal attempt by worthless elements on the life of the leader of the working class and all the Italian working people, our beloved Comrade Togliatti.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik) is grieved that the friends of Comrade Togliatti were unsuccessful in protecting him from the treacherous ambush.

In the name of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

J. STALIN

("Pravda" 15 July, 1948)

**Answering letter to the Chairman of the
Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean
People's Democratic Republic Kim Ir Sen
On the question of the establishment of diplomatic and economic relations between
the U.S.S.R. and the Korean People's Democratic Republic
12 October, 1948**

To Mr. Kim Ir Sen, Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean People's Democratic Republic.

I confirm that I have received your letter of 8 October, in which you inform us that the government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic steps towards exercising its duty, and proposes to establish diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R., to exchange ambassadors which also comply with the establishment of economic relations between the two states.

The Soviet government that is unchangeably for the right of the Korean people to commence the building of an united, independent state, greets the establishment of the Korean government and wishes them success in their work for the national rebirth and the democratic development of Korea. The Soviet government declares its readiness to establish diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the Korean People's Democratic Republic, to exchange ambassadors and to immediately establish complementary economic relations.

J. STALIN

("Pravda" 13 October, 1948)

Berlin Crisis, the U.N. and Anglo-American Agressive Policies, Churchill October 28, 1948

[Interview with correspondent of Pravda, October 28, 1948]

Question: How do you regard the results of the discussions in the Security Council on the question of the situation in Berlin and the conduct of the Anglo-American and French representatives in this matter?

Answer: I regard them as a display of the aggressiveness of the policy of Anglo-American and French ruling circles.

Question: Is it true that in August of this year agreement had already been reached among the four powers on the question of Berlin?

Answer: Yes, that is true. Agreement is known to have been reached in Moscow on August 30 last, among the representatives of the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Great Britain, and France regarding the simultaneous implementation of measures for the lifting of transport restrictions, on the one hand, and for the introduction of the German mark of the Soviet zone in Berlin as the sole currency, on the other hand. That agreement does not hurt anyone's prestige. It takes into account the interests of the parties concerned and insures the possibility of further co-operation. But the governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain disavowed their representatives in Moscow and declared the agreement to be null and void, that is, they violated the agreement, having decided to refer the question to the Security Council where the Anglo-Americans have a guaranteed majority.

Question: Is it true that, in Paris during the recent discussions on the question in the Security Council, an agreement on the situation in Berlin had again been reached in unofficial talks even before the question was voted upon in the Security Council?

Answer: Yes. That is true. Dr. Bramuglia, the representative of the Argentine and president of the Security Council, who conducted unofficial talks with Comrade Vishinsky on behalf of the other powers concerned, did have in his hands an agreed-upon draft decision on the question of the situation in Berlin. But the representatives of the U.S.A. and Great Britain once again declared that agreement to be null and void.

Question: What is the matter then? Would you explain?

Answer: The thing is that those in the United States and Great Britain who inspire an aggressive policy do not consider themselves interested in an agreement and in co-operation with the U.S.S.R. What they want is not agreement and co-operation, but talk about agreement and co-operation, so as to put the blame on the U.S.S.R. by preventing agreement and thus to "prove" that co-operation with the U.S.S.R. is impossible. What the war instigators who are striving to unleash a new war fear most of all is the reaching of agreements and co-operation with the U.S.S.R. because a policy of concord with the U.S.S.R. undermines the position of the instigators of war and deprives the aggressive policy of these gentlemen of any purpose.

It is for this reason that they disrupt agreements that have already been reached, that they disavow their representatives who have drawn up such agreements together with the U.S.S.R., and in violation of the United Nations Charter refer the question to the Security Council, where they have a guaranteed majority and where they can “prove” whatever they like. All this is done to “show” that co-operation with the U.S.S.R. is impossible and to “show” the necessity for a new war, and thus to prepare the ground for the unleashing of war. The policy of the present leaders of the U.S.A. and Great Britain is a policy of aggression, a policy of unleashing a new war.

Question: How should one regard the conduct of the representatives of the six states, members of the Security Council: of China, Canada, Belgium, Argentina, Colombia, and Syria?

Answer: Those gentlemen are obviously lending their support to the policy of aggression, to the policy of unleashing a new war.

Question: What can all this end in?

Answer: It can only end in ignominious failure on the part of the instigators of a new war. Churchill, the main instigator of a new war, has already managed to deprive himself of the trust of his own nation and of democratic forces throughout the world. The same fate lies in store for all other instigators of war. The horrors of the recent war are still too fresh in the memory of the peoples; and public forces favoring peace are too strong for Churchill's pupils in aggression to overpower them and to turn them toward a new war.

**Berlin, Disarmament, Stalin-Truman Meeting
January 27, 1949**

[Interview with Kingsbury Smith, representative of International News Service, January 27, 1949]

Question: Would the government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to consider the issuance of a joint declaration with the government of the United States of America, asserting that the respective governments have no intention of resorting to war against one another?

Answer: The Soviet government would be prepared to consider the issuance of such a declaration.

Question: Would the government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to join with the government of the United States of America in measures designed to implement this pact of peace, such as gradual disarmament?

Answer: Naturally, the government of the U.S.S.R. could cooperate with the government of the United States of America in taking measures designed to implement this pact of peace and leading to gradual disarmament.

Question: If the governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and France agreed to postpone the establishment of a separate Western German state, pending a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers to consider the German problem as a whole, would the Government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to remove the restrictions which the Soviet authorities have imposed on communications between Berlin and the Western zones of Germany?

Answer: Provided the United States of America, Great Britain, and France observe the conditions set forth in the third question, the Soviet government sees no obstacles to lifting transport restrictions, on the understanding, however, that transport and trade restrictions introduced by the three Powers should be lifted simultaneously.

Question: Would Your Excellency be prepared to confer with President Truman at a mutually suitable place to discuss the possibility of concluding such a pact of peace?

Answer: I have already stated before that there is no objection to a meeting.

[Smith later sent the following telegram to Stalin]

The official representative of the White House, Charles Ross, stated today that President Truman would be glad to have the opportunity to confer with you in Washington. Would Your Excellency be prepared to go to Washington for this purpose? If not, then where would you be prepared to meet the President?

[The reply was as follows:]

Your telegram of February 1 received. I am grateful to President Truman for the invitation to come to Washington. For a long time it has been my wish to visit Washington, and at one time I mentioned this to President Roosevelt at Yalta, and to President Truman at Potsdam.

Unfortunately, at present I am unable to realize this wish of mine, since doctors strongly object to my undertaking any prolonged journey, especially by sea or air.

The government of the Soviet Union would welcome the President's visit to the U.S.S.R. A conference could be arranged at the President's choice: in Moscow, Leningrad, Kaliningrad, Odessa, or at Yalta, provided, of course, this does not go against the President's consideration of convenience.

However, should this suggestion meet with objection, a meeting could be arranged, at the President's discretion, in Poland or Czechoslovakia.

Answer to Kingsbury Smith
On the question of a meeting with Truman
2 February, 1949

To Mr. Kingsbury Smith, European General Director of the "International News Service" Agency.

I have received your telegram of 1 February.

I thank President Truman for the invitation to Washington. It has long been my wish to travel to Washington, as I formerly said to President Roosevelt in Yalta and to President Truman in Potsdam. Sadly, I do not have the possibility of realizing my wish at present, as the doctor has decided against my making a long journey, especially by sea or air.

The government of the Soviet Union would greet a visit from the President to the U.S.S.R. One could hold a conference in Moscow, Leningrad or in Kaliningrad, Odessa or Yalta, whichever the President chooses, - of course, in so far as it presents no inconvenience.

However, if this proposal meets with objections, one could hold a meeting in Poland or in Czechoslovakia, at the President's convenience.

Respectfully,

J. STALIN

("New World," February 1949. P. 4)

**Answering Telegram to the Minister
President of the Mongolian People's
Republic - Marshal Tshoibalsan
On the occasion of the third. anniversary of the signing of the Friendship and Support
Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and the Mongolian People' s Republic
1 March, 1949**

To the Prime Minister of the Mongolian People's Republic, Marshal Tshoibalsan.

I thank you, and in your person, the government of the Mongolian People's Republic for the warm congratulations on the third anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship and Support concluded between our countries.

I am convinced that because of this treaty the further development of cooperation between our countries will broaden and strengthen the basis of friendship between our peoples and will promote their prosperity.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Berlin Ed., No. 51, 2 March, 1949)

**Telegram to the Minister President
of the People's Republic of Poland
Josef Cyrankiewicz**

**On the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the Soviet-Polish Treaty of Friendship
21 April, 1949**

On the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the Soviet-Polish Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Cooperation after the war, I send you, Mr. Minister President, my sincere best wishes.

Accept my wishes for the further success of the Polish people and for the thriving of the Polish People's Republic, for the strengthening of the friendship and alliance between our countries.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Berlin Ed., No. 93, 22 April, 1949)

**Telegram to the Chairman of the
Council of Ministers of the People's
Republic of Bulgaria - Vassil Kolaroff
On the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria
September, 1949**

I greet the government of the Bulgarian People's Republic, and you personally, on the national holiday celebrating the fifth anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria. I send best wishes to the fraternal Bulgarian people.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 213, 10 September, 1949)

**Greetings Telegram to
Comrade Marcel Cachin
On the occasion of his 80th Birthday
20 September, 1949**

To Comrade Cachin,

Dear Comrade Cachin,

Permit me, on your 80th birthday, to congratulate you, as the founder of the Communist Party of France, as the faithful son of the French people and as the eminent leader of the international workers movement.

I wish you health and long life, for the well-being of the French people and the people of all the world.

With fraternal greetings.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 24 September, 1949)

Peace in Europe
October 13, 1949

[Greetings to the President and Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic, October 13, 1949]

Allow me to congratulate you and, in your persons, the German people, on the creation of the German Democratic Republic and the election of the former to the presidency and the latter as Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic.

The formation of the peace-loving German Democratic Republic is a turning point in the history of Europe. There can be no doubt that the existence of a peace-loving democratic Germany side by side with the existence of the peace-loving Soviet Union excludes the possibility of new wars in Europe, puts an end to bloodshed in Europe, and makes impossible the enslaving of European countries by the world imperialists.

The experience of the recent war showed that the biggest sacrifices in this war were borne by the German and Soviet peoples, and that these two peoples possess the greatest potentialities in Europe for accomplishing great actions of world importance. If these two peoples display determination to fight for peace, straining their energies to the same extent as they did to wage war, peace in Europe may then be considered as secured.

Thus laying the foundation for a unified, democratic, and peace-loving Germany, you simultaneously perform a great deed for all of Europe, guaranteeing her lasting peace.

You need not doubt that in advancing along this road and promoting the cause of peace you will find great sympathy and active support among all the peoples of the world, including the American, British, French, Polish, Czechoslovak, and Italian peoples, let alone the peace-loving Soviet people. I wish you success on this new and glorious road. May unified, independent, democratic, peace-loving Germany live and prosper!

**Answering Telegram to the Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean
People's Democratic Republic Kim Ir Sen
On the occasion of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and
the Korean People's Democratic Republic
14 October, 1949**

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your expression of friendship and good wishes on the anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the U.S.S.R.

I wish the Korean people further success in the building of their People's Democratic Republic.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 234, 16 October, 1949)

**Greetings Telegram to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Czechoslovakian Republic Antonin Zapotocky
On the occasion of the thirty-first anniversary of the founding of the Czechoslovakian Republic
28 October, 1949**

I send the government of the Czechoslovakian Republic and the fraternal people of Czechoslovakia friendly greetings and also wishes for their further success.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," No. 254, 29 October, 1949)

**Telegram of Thanks to the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Otto Grotewohl
On the occasion of the thirty-second anniversary of the Great Socialist October Revolution
November, 1949**

I thank you and, through you, the Provisional government of the German Democratic Republic, on behalf of the Soviet government and myself, for the congratulations on the anniversary of the Socialist October Revolution.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," No. 275, 24 November, 1949)

**Telegram to the Chairman of Ministers of the Czechoslovakian Republic,
Antonin Zapotocky
On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship and
Mutual Support between the U.S.S.R. and the Czechoslovakian Republic
13 December, 1949**

To Mr. A. Zapotocky, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Czechoslovakian Republic.

On the sixth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Assistance between the U.S.S.R. and the Czechoslovakian Republic, please accept, Mr. Prime Minister, my friendly greetings to the people of the Czechoslovakian Republic, to your government and to you personally.

I wish the Czechoslovakian Republic well and the further strengthening of the alliance and friendship between the Soviet and Czechoslovakian peoples.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 293, 14 December, 1949)

**Open Letter from Stalin and
his Closest Associates to the
District Election Commissions**

**On the occasion of the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. of 12 March, 1950
17 February, 1950**

Open letter to the District Election Commissions

All of the undersigned have received telegrams from different works, kolkhozes and election councils of electors of the different areas and districts, about our nominations as deputy candidates to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. in a whole series of election districts.

We thank all the electors that nominated us as candidates for giving us their trust.

We hold it necessary, however, to declare that, by law, each of us may stand for election in only one election district; we, as Communists and members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik), have got to follow the directives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik). The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik) has instructed us to withdraw our candidature in other districts and to stand for election in the following election districts:

Andreyev, A.A. - for the Union Soviet in the election district of Aschhabad, Turkmenian S.S.R.

Beria, L.P. - for the Union Soviet in the Stalin electoral district of the city of Tsibilisk, Georgian S.S.R.

Budyonny, S.M. - for the Union Soviet in the electoral district of Shepetovka, Ukrainian S.S.R.

Bulganin, N.A. - for the National Soviet in the Moscow city electoral district.

Voroshilov, K.E. - for the Union Soviet in the Minsk city electoral district, Byelorussian S.S.R.

Kaganovitch, L.M. - for the Union Soviet in the Lenin electoral district of the city of Tashkent, Usbek S.S.R.

Kosygin, A.N. - for the National Soviet in the Invanovo election district.

Malenkov, G.M. - for the Union Soviet in the Leningrad election district of the city of Moscow.

Mikoyan, A.J. - for the National Soviet in the Stalin electoral district of Yerevan, Armenian S.S.R.

Mikhailov, N.A. - for the National Soviet in the Stavropoli electoral district.

Molotov, W.M. - for the Union Soviet in the Molotov electoral district in the city of Moscow.

Ponomarenko, P.K. - for the Union Soviet in the Minsk-Land electoral district, Byelorussian S.S.R.

Stalin, J.V. - for the Union Soviet in the Stalin electoral district in the city of Moscow,

Suslov, M.A. - for the Union Soviet in the Lenin electoral district in the city of Saratov.

Krushchev, N.S. - for the Union Soviet in the Kalinin electoral district of the city of Moscow.

Shvernik, N.M. - for the National Soviet in the Sverdlovsk electoral district.

Shkiryatov, M.F. - for the National Soviet in the Tula-Ryasan electoral district.

We follow these directives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik).

We ask the appropriate electoral districts to take notice of this declaration and to take it into consideration in their documents of registration of deputy candidates. Andreyev, A.A., Beria, L.P., Budyonny, S.M., Bul-ganin, N.A., Voroshilov, K.E., Kaganovitch, L.M., Kosygin, A.N., Malenkov, G.M., Mikoyan, A.J., Mikhailov, N.A., Molotov, W.M., Ponomarenko, P.K., Stalin, J.V., Suslov, M.A., Krushchev, N.S., Shvernik, N.M., Shkiryatov, M.F.

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 43, 19 February 1950)

**Telegram to the Minister President of the Rumanian People's Republic Petru Groza
On the occasion of the second anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Rumanian Treaty
of Friendship and Mutual Assistance
March, 1950**

Please accept, Mr. Minister President, my thanks for your good wishes on the second anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Rumanian Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Assistance. I am convinced that this treaty will continue to strengthen the alliance and friendship between the peoples of our countries.

Please accept my best wishes for you and for the Rumanian government.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 59, 10 March, 1950)

**Telegram of Thanks to the Central Committee of the Hungarian Workers' Party and
the Hungarian Government
and to the Presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic
April, 1950**

I ask the Central Committee of the Hungarian Workers' Party, the Council of Ministers and the Presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic to accept my sincere thanks for your friendly greetings on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the liberation of Hungary by the Soviet army.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 86, 13 April, 1950)

Telegram to Comrade Maurice Thorez
On the occasion of his 50th Birthday
28 April, 1950

To Comrade Maurice Thorez

Dear Comrade Thorez!

Allow me to greet and congratulate you on your 50th birthday.

All the peoples of the world, the workers of all countries know and treasure you as the tested and true leader of the French Communists, as the leader of the French workers and working peasants in their mutual struggle for the strengthening of peace, the victory of democracy and socialism all over the world.

The Soviet people know and love you as their friend and as the steadfast fighter for the friendship and alliance of the peoples of France and the Soviet Union.

I wish you further success in your work for the well-being of the French people and for all the working people of the world.

Fraternal greetings.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 100, 29 April, 1950)

**Telegram to the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic
Otto Grotewohl
On the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the liberation of the
German people from the fascist tyranny
11 May, 1950**

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Otto Grotewohl.

I thank, you and, through you, the government of the German Democratic Republic, for your message of greetings on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the liberation of the German people from the fascist tyranny.

I am convinced that the friendly relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union will further develop successfully for the well-being of our peoples and in the interests of the peace and cooperation of all peace-loving countries.

J. STALIN

("New World," May 1950. P. 1)

**Letter to the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic
Otto Grotewohl
On the reduction of Germany's reparation payments
15 May, 1950**

Dear Mr. Minister President,

The Soviet government has examined the request of the government of the German Democratic Republic on the reduction of the reparation sum to be paid by Germany.

The Soviet government has, at the same time, borne in mind that the German Democratic Republic has been conscientious and regular in their fulfilment of their reparation obligation, which is charged as high as 10 billion dollars, and that by the end of 1950 an important part of this obligation, as much as 3658 million dollars, will have been realized.

Led by the wish to ease the efforts of the German people in the reconstruction and development of the people's economy in Germany, and bearing in mind the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet government has decided, with the agreement of the government of the Polish Republic, to reduce the remaining sum of 'the reparation bill by 50%, to 3171 million dollars.

In agreement with the declaration of the government of the U.S.S.R. at the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers in March 1947, and the settlement of a twenty year term for the payment of reparation, the Soviet government has further decided to accept payment of the remaining part of the reparation bill in German goods (as much as 3171 million dollars) out of the production of fifteen years running, starting with the year 1951 up to the year 1965, inclusive

With deep esteem,

J. STALIN
Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

("Daily Review" No. 113, 17 May, 1950)

**Telegram to the Central Council
of the Free German Youth
2 June, 1950**

To the Central Council of the Free German Youth.

I thank the young German peace fighters, members of the All-German Youth Conference, for their greetings.

I wish the German youth, the active builders of an united, democratic and peace-loving Germany, success in this great work.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 125, 2 June, 1950)

Marxism and Problems of Linguistics

First Published: Published in the June 20, July 4, and August 2, 1950 issues of Pravda

Concerning Marxism in Linguistics

A group of younger comrades have asked me to give my opinion in the press on problems relating to linguistics, particularly in reference to Marxism in linguistics. I am not a linguistic expert and, of course, cannot fully satisfy the request of the comrades. As to Marxism in linguistics, as in other social sciences, this is something directly in my field. I have therefore consented to answer a number of questions put by the comrades.

QUESTION: Is it true that language is a superstructure on the base?

ANSWER: No, it is not true.

The base is the economic structure of society at the given stage of its development. The superstructure is the political, legal, religious, artistic, philosophical views of society and the political, legal and other institutions corresponding to them.

Every base has its own corresponding superstructure. The base of the feudal system has its superstructure, its political, legal and other views, and the corresponding institutions; the capitalist base has its own superstructure, so has the socialist base. If the base changes or is eliminated, then, following this, its superstructure changes or is eliminated; if a new base arises, then, following this, a superstructure arises corresponding to it.

In this respect language radically differs from the superstructure. Take, for example, Russian society and the Russian language. In the course of the past thirty years the old, capitalist base has been eliminated in Russia and a new, socialist base has been built. Correspondingly, the superstructure on the capitalist base has been eliminated and a new superstructure created corresponding to the socialist base. The old political, legal and other institutions, consequently, have been supplanted by new, socialist institutions. But in spite of this the Russian language has remained basically what it was before the October Revolution.

What has changed in the Russian language in this period? To a certain extent the vocabulary of the Russian language has changed, in the sense that it has been replenished with a considerable number of new words and expressions, which have arisen in connection with the rise of the new socialist production, the appearance of a new state, a new socialist culture, new social relations and morals, and, lastly, in connection with the development of technology and science; a number of words and expressions have changed their meaning, have acquired a new signification; a number of obsolete words have dropped out of the vocabulary. As to the basic stock of words and the grammatical system of the Russian language, which constitute the foundation of a language, they, after the elimination of the capitalist base, far from having been eliminated and supplanted by a new basic word stock and a new grammatical system of the language, have been preserved in their entirety and have not undergone any serious changes -- they have been preserved precisely as the foundation of the modern Russian language.

Further, the superstructure is a product of the base, but this by no means implies that it merely reflects the base, that it is passive, neutral, indifferent to the fate of its base, to the fate of the

classes, to the character of the system. On the contrary, having come into being, it becomes an exceedingly active force, actively assisting its base to take shape and consolidate itself, and doing its utmost to help the new system to finish off and eliminate the old base and the old classes.

It cannot be otherwise. The superstructure is created by the base precisely in order to serve it, to actively help it to take shape and consolidate itself, to actively fight for the elimination of the old, moribund base together with its old superstructure. The superstructure has only to renounce this role of auxiliary, it has only to pass from a position of active defense of its base to one of indifference towards it, to adopt an equal attitude to all classes, and it loses its virtue and ceases to be a superstructure.

In this respect language radically differs from the superstructure. Language is not a product of one or another base, old or new, within the given society, but of the whole course of the history of the society and of the history of the bases for many centuries. It was created not by some one class, but by the entire society, by all the classes of the society, by the efforts of hundreds of generations. It was created for the satisfaction of the needs not of one particular class, but of the entire society, of all the classes of the society. Precisely for this reason it was created as a single language for the society, common to all members of that society, as the common language of the whole people. Hence the functional role of language, as a means of intercourse between people, consists not in serving one class to the detriment of other classes, but in equally serving the entire society, all the classes of society. This in fact explains why a language may equally serve both the old, moribund system and the new, rising system; both the old base and the new base; both the exploiters and the exploited.

It is no secret to anyone that the Russian language served Russian capitalism and Russian bourgeois culture before the October Revolution just as well as it now serves the socialist system and socialist culture of Russian society.

The same must be said of the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Uzbek, Kazakh, Georgian, Armenian, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Moldavian, Tatar, Azerbaijanian, Bashkirian, Turkmenian and other languages of the Soviet nations; they served the old, bourgeois system of these nations just as well as they serve the new, socialist system.

It cannot be otherwise. Language exists, language has been created precisely in order to serve society as a whole, as a means of intercourse between people, in order to be common to the members of society and constitute the single language of society, serving members of society equally, irrespective of their class status. A language has only to depart from this position of being a language common to the whole people, it has only to give preference and support to some one social group to the detriment of other social groups of the society, and it loses its virtue, ceases to be a means of intercourse between the people of the society, and becomes the jargon of some social group, degenerates and is doomed to disappear.

In this respect, while it differs in principle from the superstructure, language does not differ from instruments of production, from machines, let us say, which are as indifferent to classes as is language and may, like it, equally serve a capitalist system and a socialist system.

Further, the superstructure is the product of one epoch, the epoch in which the given economic base exists and operates. The superstructure is therefore short-lived; it is eliminated and disappears with the elimination and disappearance of the given base.

Language, on the contrary, is the product of a whole number of epochs, in the course of which it takes shape, is enriched, develops and is smoothened. A language therefore lives immeasurably longer than any base or any superstructure. This in fact explains why the rise and elimination not only of one base and its superstructure, but of several bases and their corresponding superstructures, have not led in history to the elimination of a given language, to the elimination of its structure and the rise of a new language with a new stock of words and a new grammatical system.

It is more than a hundred years since Pushkin died. In this period the feudal system and the capitalist system were eliminated in Russia, and a third, a socialist system has arisen. Hence two bases, with their superstructures, were eliminated, and a new, socialist base has arisen, with its new superstructure. Yet, if we take the Russian language, for example, it has not in this long span of time undergone any fundamental change, and the modern Russian language differs very little in structure from the language of Pushkin.

What has changed in the Russian language in this period? The Russian vocabulary has in this period been greatly replenished; a large number of obsolete words have dropped out of the vocabulary; the meaning of a great many words has changed; the grammatical system of the language has improved. As to the structure of Pushkin's language, with its grammatical system and its basic stock of words, in all essentials it has remained as the basis of modern Russian.

And this is quite understandable. Indeed, what necessity is there, after every revolution, for the existing structure of the language, its grammatical system and basic stock of words to be destroyed and supplanted by new ones, as is usually the case with the superstructure? What object would there be in calling "water," "earth," "mountain," "forest," "fish," "man," "to walk," "to do," "to produce," "to trade," etc., not water, earth, mountain, etc., but something else? What object would there be in having the modification of words in a language and the combination of words in sentences follow not the existing grammar, but some entirely different grammar? What would the revolution gain from such an upheaval in language? History in general never does anything of any importance without some special necessity for it. What, one asks, can be the necessity for such a linguistic revolution, if it has been demonstrated that the existing language and its structure are fundamentally quite suited to the needs of the new system? The old superstructure can and should be destroyed and replaced by a new one in the course of a few years, in order to give free scope for the development of the productive forces of society; but how can an existing language be destroyed and a new one built in its place in the course of a few years without causing anarchy in social life and without creating the threat of the disintegration of society? Who but a Don Quixote could set himself such a task?

Lastly, one other radical distinction between the superstructure and language. The superstructure is not directly connected with production, with man's productive activity. It is connected with production only indirectly, through the economy, through the base. The superstructure therefore reflects changes in the level of development of the productive forces not immediately and not directly, but only after changes in the base, through the prism of the changes wrought in the base by the changes in production. This means that the sphere of action of the superstructure is narrow and restricted.

Language, on the contrary, is connected with man's productive activity directly, and not only with man's productive activity, but with all his other activity in all his spheres of work, from

production to the base, and from the base to the superstructure. For this reason language reflects changes in production immediately and directly, without waiting for changes in the base. For this reason the sphere of action of language, which embraces all fields of man's activity, is far broader and more comprehensive than the sphere of action of the superstructure. More, it is practically unlimited.

It is this that primarily explains why language, or rather its vocabulary, is in a state of almost constant change. The continuous development of industry and agriculture, of trade and transport, of technology and science, demands that language should replenish its vocabulary with new words and expressions needed for their functioning. And language, directly reflecting these needs, does replenish its vocabulary with new words, and perfects its grammatical system.

Hence:

a) A Marxist cannot regard language as a superstructure on the base; b) To confuse language and superstructure is to commit a serious error.

QUESTION: Is it true that language always was and is class language, that there is no such thing as language which is the single and common language of a society, a non-class language common to the whole people.

ANSWER: No, it is not true.

It is not difficult to understand that in a society which has no classes there can be no such thing as a class language. There were no classes in the primitive communal clan system, and consequently there could be no class language -- the language was then the single and common language of the whole community. The objection that the concept class should be taken as covering every human community, including the primitive communal community, is not an objection but a playing with words that is not worth refuting.

As to the subsequent development from clan languages to tribal languages, from tribal languages to the languages of nationalities, and from the languages of nationalities to national languages -- everywhere and at all stages of development, language, as a means of intercourse between the people of a society, was the common and single language of that society, serving its members equally, irrespective of their social status.

I am not referring here to the empires of the slave and mediaeval periods, the empires of Cyrus or Alexander the Great, let us say, or of Caesar or Charles the Great, which had no economic foundations of their own and were transient and unstable military and administrative associations. Not only did these empires not have, they could not have had a single language common to the whole empire and understood by all the members of the empire. They were conglomerations of tribes and nationalities, each of which lived its own life and had its own language. Consequently, it is not these or similar empires I have in mind, but the tribes and nationalities composing them, which had their own economic foundations and their own languages, evolved in the distant past. History tells us that the languages of these tribes and nationalities were not class languages, but languages common to the whole of a tribe or nationality, and understood by all its people.

Side by side with this, there were, of course, dialects, local vernaculars, but they were dominated by and subordinated to the single and common language of the tribe or nationality.

Later, with the appearance of capitalism, the elimination of feudal division and the formation of national markets, nationalities developed into nations, and the languages of nationalities into national languages. History shows that national languages are not class, but common languages, common to all the members of each nation and constituting the single language of that nation.

It has been said above that language, as a means of intercourse between the people of a society, serves all classes of society equally, and in this respect displays what may be called an indifference to classes. But people, the various social groups, the classes, are far from being indifferent to language. They strive to utilize the language in their own interests, to impose their own special lingo, their own special terms, their own special expressions upon it. The upper strata of the propertied classes, who have divorced themselves from and detest the people -- the aristocratic nobility, the upper strata of the bourgeoisie -- particularly distinguish themselves in this respect. "Class" dialects, jargons, high-society "languages" are created. These dialects and jargons are often incorrectly referred to in literature as languages -- the "aristocratic language" or the "bourgeois language" in contradistinction to the "proletarian language" or the "peasant language." For this reason, strange as it may seem, some of our comrades have come to the conclusion that national language is a fiction, and that only class languages exist in reality.

There is nothing, I think, more erroneous than this conclusion. Can These dialects and jargons be regarded as languages? Certainly not. They cannot, firstly, because these dialects and jargons have no grammatical systems or basic word stocks of their own -- they borrow them from the national language. They cannot, secondly, because these dialects and jargons are confined to a narrow sphere, are current only among the upper strata of a given class and are entirely unsuitable as a means of human intercourse for society as a whole. What, then, have they? They have a collection of specific words reflecting the specific tastes of the aristocracy or the upper strata of the bourgeoisie; a certain number of expressions and turns of phrase distinguished by refinement and gallantry and free of the "coarse" expressions and turns of phrase of the national language; lastly, a certain number of foreign words. But all the fundamentals, that is, the overwhelming majority of the words and the grammatical system, are borrowed from the common, national language. Dialects and jargons are therefore offshoots of the common national language, devoid of all linguistic independence and doomed to stagnation. To believe that dialects and jargons can develop into independent languages capable of ousting and supplanting the national language means losing one's sense of historical perspective and abandoning the Marxist position.

References are made to Marx, and the passage from his article St. Max is quoted which says that the bourgeois have "their own language," that this language "is a product of the bourgeoisie" [2] that it is permeated with the spirit of mercantilism and huckstering. Certain comrades cite this passage with the idea of proving that Marx believed in the "class character" of language and denied the existence of a single national language. If these comrades were impartial, they should have cited another passage from this same article St. Max, where Marx, touching on the ways single national languages arose, speaks of "the concentration of dialects into a single national language resulting from economic and political concentration." [3]

Marx, consequently, did recognize the necessity of a single national language, as a higher form, to which dialects, as lower forms, are subordinate.

What, then, can this bourgeois language be which Marx says "is a product of the bourgeoisie"? Did Marx consider it as much a language as the national language, with a specific linguistic structure of its own? Could he have considered it such a language? Of course, not. Marx merely wanted to say that the bourgeois had polluted the single national language with their hucksters' lingo, that the bourgeois, in other words, have their hucksters' jargon.

It thus appears that these comrades have misrepresented Marx. And they misrepresented him because they quoted Marx not like Marxists but like dogmatists, without delving into the essence of the matter.

References are made to Engels, and the words from his *The Condition of the Working Class in England* are cited where he says that in Britain "...the working class has gradually become a race wholly apart from the English bourgeoisie," that "the workers speak other dialects, have other thoughts and ideals, other customs and moral principles, a different religion and other politics than those of the bourgeoisie." [4] Certain comrades conclude from this passage that Engels denied the necessity of a common, national language, that he believed, consequently, in the "class character" of language. True, Engels speaks here of dialects, not languages, fully realizing that, being an offshoot of the national language, a dialect cannot supplant the national language. But apparently, These comrades regard the existence of a difference between a language and a dialect with no particular enthusiasm.

It is obvious that the quotation is inappropriate, because Engels here speaks not of "class languages" but chiefly of class thoughts, ideals, customs, moral principles, religion, politics. It is perfectly true that the thoughts, ideals, customs, moral principles, religion and politics of bourgeois and proletarians are directly antithetical. But what has this to do with national language, or the "class character" of language? Can the existence of class antagonisms in society serve as an argument in favor of the "class character" of language, or against the necessity of a single national language? Marxism says that a common language is one of the cardinal earmarks of a nation, although knowing very well that there are class antagonisms within the nation. Do the comrades referred to recognize this Marxist thesis?

References are made to Lafargue, [5] and it is said that in his pamphlet *The French Language Before and After the Revolution* he recognizes the "class character" of language and denies the necessity of a national language common to the whole people. That is not true. Lafargue does indeed speak of a "noble" or "aristocratic language" and of the "jargons" of various strata of society. But these comrades forget that Lafargue, who was not interested in the difference between languages and jargons and referred to dialects now as "artificial languages," now as "jargons," definitely says in this pamphlet that "the artificial language which distinguished the aristocracy . . . arose out of the language common to the whole people, which was spoken both by bourgeois and artisan, by town and country."

Consequently, Lafargue recognizes the existence and necessity of a common language of the whole people, and fully realizes that the "aristocratic language" and other dialects and jargons are subordinate to and dependent on the language common to the whole people.

It follows that the reference to Lafargue is wide of the mark.

References are made to the fact that at one time in England the feudal lords spoke "for centuries" in French, while the English people spoke English, and this is alleged to be an argument in favor of the "class character" of language and against the necessity of a language common to the whole people. But this is not an argument, it is rather an anecdote. Firstly, not all the feudal lords spoke French at that time, but only a small upper stratum of English feudal lords attached to the court and at county seats. Secondly, it was not some "class language" they spoke, but the ordinary language common to all the French people. Thirdly, we know that in the course of time this French language fad disappeared without a trace, yielding place to the English language common to the whole people. Do these comrades think that the English feudal lords "for centuries" held intercourse with the English people through interpreters, that they did not use the English language, that there was no language common to all the English at that time, and that the French language in England was then anything more than the language of high society, current only in the restricted circle of the upper English aristocracy? How can one possibly deny the existence and the necessity of a language common to the whole people on the basis of anecdote "arguments" like these?

There was a time when Russian aristocrats at the tsar's court and in high society also made a fad of the French language. They prided themselves on the fact that when they spoke Russian they often lapsed into French, that they could only speak Russian with a French accent. Does this mean that there was no Russian language common to the whole people at that time in Russia, that a language common to the whole people was a fiction, and "class languages" a reality?

Our comrades are here committing at least two mistakes.

The first mistake is that they confuse language with superstructure. They think that since the superstructure has a class character, language too must be a class language, and not a language common to the whole people. But I have already said that language and superstructure are two different concepts, and that a Marxist must not confuse them.

The second mistake of these comrades is that they conceive the opposition of interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the fierce class struggle between them, as meaning the disintegration of society, as a break of all ties between the hostile classes. They believe that, since society has disintegrated and there is no longer a single society, but only classes, a single language of society, a national language, is unnecessary. If society has disintegrated and there is no longer a language common to the whole people, a national language, what remains? There remain classes and "class languages." Naturally, every "class language" will have its "class" grammar -- a "proletarian" grammar or a "bourgeois" grammar. True, such grammars do not exist anywhere. But that does not worry these comrades: they believe that such grammars will appear in due course.

At one time there were "Marxists" in our country who asserted that the railways left to us after the October Revolution were bourgeois railways, that it would be unseemly for us Marxists to use them, that they should be torn up and new, "proletarian" railways built. For this they were nicknamed "troglydites".

It goes without saying that such a primitive-anarchist view of society, of classes, of language has nothing in common with Marxism. But it undoubtedly exists and continues to prevail in the minds of certain of our muddled comrades.

It is of course wrong to say that, because of the existence of a fierce class struggle, society has split up into classes which are no longer economically connected with one another in one society. On the contrary, as long as capitalism exists, the bourgeois and the proletarians will be bound together by every economic thread as parts of a single capitalist society. The bourgeois cannot live and enrich themselves unless they have wage-laborers at their command; the proletarians cannot survive unless they hire themselves to the capitalists. If all economic ties between them were to cease, it would mean the cessation of all production, and the cessation of all production would mean the doom of society, the doom of the classes themselves. Naturally, no class wants to incur self-destruction. Consequently, however sharp the class struggle may be, it cannot lead to the disintegration of society. Only ignorance of Marxism and complete failure to understand the nature of language could have suggested to some of our comrades the fairy-tale about the disintegration of society, about "class" languages, and "class" grammars.

Reference is further made to Lenin, and it is pointed out that Lenin recognized the existence of two cultures under capitalism -- bourgeois and proletarian -- and that the slogan of national culture under capitalism is a nationalist slogan. All this is true and Lenin is absolutely right here. But what has this to do with the "class character" of language? When these comrades refer to what Lenin said about two cultures under capitalism, it is evidently with the idea of suggesting to the reader that the existence of two cultures, bourgeois and proletarian, in society means that there must also be two languages, inasmuch as language is linked with culture -- and, consequently, that Lenin denies the necessity of a single national language, and, consequently, that Lenin believes in "class" languages. The mistake these comrades make here is that they identify and confuse language with culture. But culture and language are two different things. Culture may be bourgeois or socialist, but language, as a means of intercourse, is always a language common to the whole people and can serve both bourgeois and socialist culture. Is it not a fact that the Russian, the Ukrainian, the Uzbek languages are now serving the socialist culture of these nations just as well as they served their bourgeois cultures before the October Revolution? Consequently, these comrades are profoundly mistaken when they assert that the existence of two different cultures leads to the formation of two different languages and to the negation of the necessity of a single language.

When Lenin spoke of two cultures, he proceeded precisely from the thesis that the existence of two cultures cannot lend to the negation of a single language and to the formation of two languages, that there must be a single language. When the Bundists [6] accused Lenin of denying the necessity of a national language and of regarding culture as "non-national," Lenin, as we know, vigorously protested and declared that he was fighting against bourgeois culture, and not against national languages, the necessity of which he regarded as indisputable. It is strange that some of our comrades should be trailing in the footsteps of the Bundists.

As to a single language, the necessity of which Lenin is alleged to deny, it would be well to pay heed to the following words of Lenin:

"Language is the most important means of human intercourse. Unity of language and its unimpeded development form one of the most important conditions for genuinely free and extensive commercial intercourse appropriate to modern capitalism, for a free and broad grouping of the population in all its separate classes." [7]

It follows that our highly respected comrades have misrepresented the views of Lenin.

Reference, lastly, is made to Stalin. The passage from Stalin is quoted which says that "the bourgeoisie and its nationalist parties were and remain in this period the chief directing force of such nations." 8 This is all true. The bourgeoisie and its nationalist party really do direct bourgeois culture, just as the proletariat and its internationalist party direct proletarian culture. But what has this to do with the "class character" of language? Do not these comrades know that national language is a form of national culture, that a national language may serve both bourgeois and socialist culture? Are our comrades unaware of the well-known formula of the Marxists that the present Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian and other cultures are socialist in content and national in form, i.e., in language? Do they agree with this Marxist formula?

The mistake our comrades commit here is that they do not see the difference between culture and language, and do not understand that culture changes in content with every new period in the development of society, whereas language remains basically the same through a number of periods, equally serving both the new culture and the old.

Hence:

a) Language, as a means of intercourse, always was and remains the single language of a society, common to all its members; b) The existence of dialects and jargons does not negate but confirms the existence of a language common to the whole of the given people, of which they are offshoots and to which they are subordinate; c) The "class character" of language formula is erroneous and non-Marxist.

QUESTION: What are the characteristic features of language?

ANSWER: Language is one of those social phenomena which operate throughout the existence of a society. It arises and develops with the rise and development of a society. It dies when the society dies. Apart from society there is no language. Accordingly, language and its laws of development can be understood only if studied in inseparable connection with the history of society, with the history of the people to whom the language under study belongs, and who are its creators and repositories.

Language is a medium, an instrument with the help of which people communicate with one another, exchange thoughts and understand each other. Being directly connected with thinking, language registers and fixes in words, and in words combined into sentences, the results of the process of thinking and achievements of man's cognitive activity, and thus makes possible the exchange of thoughts in human society.

Exchange of thoughts is a constant and vital necessity, for without it, it is impossible to coordinate the joint actions of people in the struggle against the forces of nature, in the struggle to produce the necessary material values; without it, it is impossible to ensure the success of society's productive activity, and, hence, the very existence of social production becomes impossible. Consequently, without a language understood by a society and common to all its members, that society must cease to produce, must disintegrate and cease to exist as a society. In this sense, language, while it is a medium of intercourse, is at the same time an instrument of struggle and development of society.

As we know, all the words in a language taken together constitute what is known as its vocabulary. The chief thing in the vocabulary of a language is its basic stock of words, which includes also all the root words, as its kernel. It is far less extensive than the language's

vocabulary, but it persists for a very long time, for centuries, and provides the language with a basis for the formation of new words. The vocabulary reflects the state of the language: the richer and more diversified the vocabulary, the richer and more developed the language.

However, by itself, the vocabulary does not constitute the language -- it is rather the building material of the language. Just as in construction work the building materials do not constitute the building, although the latter cannot be constructed without them, so too the vocabulary of a language does not constitute the language itself, although no language is conceivable without it. But the vocabulary of a language assumes tremendous importance when it comes under the control of grammar, which defines the rules governing the modification of words and the combination of words into sentences, and thus makes the language a coherent and significant function. Grammar (morphology, syntax) is the collection of rules governing the modification of words and their combination into sentences. It is therefore thanks to grammar that it becomes possible for language to invest man's thoughts in a material linguistic integument.

The distinguishing feature of grammar is that it gives rules for the modification of words not in reference to concrete words, but to words in general, not taken concretely; that it gives rules for the formation of sentences not in reference to particular concrete sentences -- with, let us say, a concrete subject, a concrete predicate, etc. -- but to all sentences in general, irrespective of the concrete form of any sentence in particular. Hence, abstracting itself, as regards both words and sentences, from the particular and concrete, grammar takes that which is common and basic in the modification of words and their combination into sentences and builds it into grammatical rules, grammatical laws. Grammar is the outcome of a process of abstraction performed by the human mind over a long period of time; it is an indication of the tremendous achievement of thought.

In this respect grammar resembles geometry, which in giving its laws abstracts itself from concrete objects, regarding objects as bodies devoid of concreteness, and defining the relations between them not as the concrete relations of concrete objects but as the relations of bodies in general, devoid of all concreteness.

Unlike the superstructure, which is connected with production not directly, but through the economy, language is directly connected with man's productive activity, as well as with all his other activity in all his spheres of work without exception. That is why the vocabulary of a language, being the most sensitive to change, is in a state of almost constant change, and, unlike the superstructure, language does not have to wait until the base is eliminated, but makes changes in its vocabulary before the base is eliminated and irrespective of the state of the base.

However, the vocabulary of a language does not change in the way the superstructure does, that is, by abolishing the old and building something new, but by replenishing the existing vocabulary with new words which arise with changes in the social system, with the development of production, of culture, science, etc. Moreover, although a certain number of obsolete words usually drop out of the vocabulary of a language, a far larger number of new words are added. As to the basic word stock, it is preserved in all its fundamentals and is used as the basis for the vocabulary of the language.

This is quite understandable. There is no necessity to destroy the basic word stock when it can be effectively used through the course of several historical periods; not to speak of the fact

that, it being impossible to create a new basic word stock in a short time, the destruction of the basic word stock accumulated in the course of centuries would result in paralysis of the language, in the complete disruption of intercourse between people.

The grammatical system of a language changes even more slowly than its basic word stock. Elaborated in the course of epochs, and having become part of the flesh and blood of the language, the grammatical system changes still more slowly than the basic word stock. With the lapse of time it, of course, undergoes changes, becomes more perfected, improves its rules, makes them more specific and acquires new rules; but the fundamentals of the grammatical system are preserved for a very long time, since, as history shows, they are able to serve society effectively through a succession of epochs.

Hence, grammatical system and basic word stock constitute the foundation of language, the essence of its specific character.

History shows that languages possess great stability and a tremendous power of resistance to forcible assimilation. Some historians, instead of explaining this phenomenon, confine themselves to expressing their surprise at it. But there is no reason for surprise whatsoever. Languages owe their stability to the stability of their grammatical systems and basic word stocks. The Turkish assimilators strove for hundreds of years to mutilate, shatter and destroy the languages of the Balkan peoples. During this period the vocabulary of the Balkan languages underwent considerable change; quite a few Turkish words and expressions were absorbed; there were "convergencies" and "divergencies." Nevertheless, the Balkan languages held their own and survived. Why? Because their grammatical systems and basic word stocks were in the main preserved.

It follows from all this that a language, its structure, cannot be regarded as the product of some one epoch. The structure of a language, its grammatical system and basic word stock, is the product of a number of epochs.

We may assume that the rudiments of modern language already existed in hoary antiquity, before the epoch of slavery. It was a rather simple language, with a very meager stock of words, but with a grammatical system of its own -- true, a primitive one, but a grammatical system nonetheless.

The further development of production, the appearance of classes, the introduction of writing, the rise of the state, which needed a more or less well-regulated correspondence for its administration, the development of trade, which needed a well-regulated correspondence still more, the appearance of the printing press, the development of literature -- all this caused big changes in the development of language. During this time, tribes and nationalities broke up and scattered, intermingled and intercrossed; later there arose national languages and states, revolutions took place, and old social systems were replaced by new ones. All this caused even greater changes in language and its development.

However, it would be a profound mistake to think that language developed in the way the superstructure developed -- by the destruction of that which existed and the building of something new. In point of fact, languages did not develop by the destruction of existing languages and the creation of new ones, but by extending and perfecting the basic elements of existing languages. And the transition of the language from one quality to another did not take the form of an explosion, of the destruction at one blow of the old and the creation of the new,

but of the gradual and long-continued accumulation of the elements of the new quality, of the new linguistic structure, and the gradual dying away of the elements of the old quality.

It is said that the theory that languages develop by stages is a Marxist theory, since it recognizes the necessity of sudden explosions as a condition for the transition of a language from an old quality to a new. This is of course untrue, for it is difficult to find anything resembling Marxism in this theory.

And if the theory of stages really does recognize sudden explosions in the history of the development of languages, so much the worse for that theory. Marxism does not recognize sudden explosions in the development of languages, the sudden death of an existing language and the sudden erection of a new language. Lafargue was wrong when he spoke of a "sudden linguistic revolution which took place between 1789 and 1794" in France (see Lafargue's pamphlet *The French Language Before and After the Revolution*). There was no linguistic revolution, let alone a sudden one, in France at that time. True enough, during that period the vocabulary of the French language was replenished with new words and expressions, a certain number of obsolete words dropped out of it, and the meaning of certain words changed -- but that was all. Changes of this nature, however, by no means determine the destiny of a language. The chief thing in a language is its grammatical system and basic word stock. But far from disappearing in the period of the French bourgeois revolution, the grammatical system and basic word stock of the French language were preserved without substantial change, and not only were they preserved, but they continue to exist in the French language of to-day. I need hardly say that five or six years is a ridiculously small period for the elimination of an existing language and the building of a new national language ("a sudden linguistic revolution"! -- centuries are needed for this.

Marxism holds that the transition of a language from an old quality to a new does not take place by way of an explosion, of the destruction of an existing language and the creation of a new one, but by the gradual accumulation of the elements of the new quality, and hence by the gradual dying away of the elements of the old quality.

It should be said in general for the benefit of comrades who have an infatuation for explosions that the law of transition from an old quality to a new by means of an explosion is inapplicable not only to the history of the development of languages; it is not always applicable to other social phenomena of a basis or superstructural character. It applies of necessity to a society divided into hostile classes. But it does not necessarily apply to a society which has no hostile classes. In a period of eight to ten years we effected a transition in the agriculture of our country from the bourgeois, individual-peasant system to the socialist, collective-farm system. This was a revolution which eliminated the old bourgeois economic system in the countryside and created a new, socialist system. But that revolution did not take place by means of an explosion, that is, by the overthrow of the existing government power and the creation of a new power, but by a gradual transition from the old bourgeois system in the countryside to a new system. And it was possible to do that because it was a revolution from above, because the revolution was accomplished on the initiative of the existing power with the support of the bulk of the peasantry.

It is said that the numerous instances of linguistic crossing in past history furnish reason to believe that when languages cross a new language is formed by means of an explosion, by a sudden transition from an old quality to a new. This is quite wrong.

Linguistic crossing cannot be regarded as the single impact of a decisive blow which produces its results within a few years. Linguistic crossing is a prolonged process which continues for hundreds of years. There can therefore be no question of explosion here.

Further, it would be quite wrong to think that the crossing of, say, two languages results in a new, third language which does not resemble either of the languages crossed and differs qualitatively from both of them. As a matter of fact one of the languages usually emerges victorious from the cross retains its grammatical system and its basic word stock and continues to develop in accordance with its inherent laws of development, while the other language gradually loses its quality and gradually dies away.

Consequently, a cross does not result in some new, third language; one of the languages persists, retains its grammatical system and basic word stock and is able to develop in accordance with its inherent laws of development.

True, in the process the vocabulary of the victorious language is somewhat enriched from the vanquished language, but this strengthens rather than weakens it.

Such was the case, for instance, with the Russian language, with which, in the course of historical development, the languages of a number of other peoples crossed and which always emerged the victor.

Of course, in the process the vocabulary of the Russian language was enlarged at the expense of the vocabularies of the other languages, but far from weakening, this enriched and strengthened the Russian language.

As to the specific national individuality of the Russian language, it did not suffer in the slightest, because the Russian language preserved its grammatical system and basic word stock and continued to advance and perfect itself in accordance with its inherent laws of development.

There can be no doubt that the crossing theory has little or no value for Soviet linguistics. If it is true that the chief task of linguistics is to study the inherent laws of language development, it has to be admitted that the crossing theory does not even set itself this task, let alone accomplish it -- it simply does not notice it, or does not understand it.

QUESTION: Did Pravda act rightly in starting an open discussion on problems of linguistics?

ANSWER: Yes, it did.

Along what lines the problems of linguistics will be settled, will become clear at the conclusion of the discussion. But it may be said already that the discussion has been very useful.

It has brought out, in the first place, that in linguistic bodies both in the center and in the republics a regime has prevailed which is alien to science and men of science. The slightest criticism of the state of affairs in Soviet linguistics, even the most timid attempt to criticize the so-called "new doctrine" in linguistics, was persecuted and suppressed by the leading linguistic circles. Valuable workers and researchers in linguistics were dismissed from their posts or demoted for being critical of N. Y. Marr's heritage or expressing the slightest

disapproval of his teachings. Linguistic scholars were appointed to leading posts not on their merits, but because of their unqualified acceptance of N. Y. Marr's theories.

It is generally recognized that no science can develop and flourish without a battle of opinions, without freedom of criticism. But this generally recognized rule was ignored and flouted in the most unceremonious fashion. There arose a close group of infallible leaders, who, having secured themselves against any possible criticism, became a law unto themselves and did whatever they pleased.

To give one example: the so-called "Baku Course" (lectures delivered by N. Y. Marr in Baku), which the author himself had rejected and forbidden to be republished, was republished nevertheless by order of this leading caste (Comrade Meshchaninov calls them "disciples" of N. Y. Marr) and included without any reservations in the list of text-books recommended to students. This means that the students were deceived a rejected "Course" being suggested to them as a sound textbook. If I were not convinced of the integrity of Comrade Meshchaninov and the other linguistic leaders, I would say that such conduct is tantamount to sabotage.

How could this have happened? It happened because the Arakcheyev regime [9] established in linguistics cultivates irresponsibility and encourages such arbitrary actions.

The discussion has proved to be very useful first of all because it brought this Arakcheyev regime into the light of day and smashed it to smithereens.

But the usefulness of the discussion does not end there. It not only smashed the old regime in linguistics but also brought out the incredible confusion of ideas on cardinal questions of linguistics which prevails among the leading circles in this branch of science. Until the discussion began the "disciples" of N. Y. Marr kept silence and glossed over the unsatisfactory state of affairs in linguistics. But when the discussion started silence became impossible, and they were compelled to express their opinion in the press. And what did we find? It turned out that in N. Y. Marr's teachings there are a whole number of defects, errors, ill-defined problems and sketchy propositions. Why, one asks, have N. Y. Marr's "disciples" begun to talk about this only now, after the discussion opened? Why did they not see to it before? Why did they not speak about it in due time openly and honestly, as befits scientists?

Having admitted "some" errors of N. Y. Marr, his "disciples," it appears, think that Soviet linguistics can only be advanced on the basis of a "rectified" version of N. Y. Marr's theory, which they consider a Marxist one. No, save us from N. Y. Marr's "Marxism"! N. Y. Marr did indeed want to be, and endeavored to be, a Marxist, but he failed to become one. He was nothing but a simplifier and vulgarizer of Marxism, similar to the "proletcultists" or the "Rappists."

N. Y. Marr introduced into linguistics the incorrect, non-Marxist formula that language is a superstructure, and got himself into a muddle and put linguistics into a muddle. Soviet linguistics cannot be advanced on the basis of an incorrect formula.

N. Y. Marr introduced into linguistics another and also incorrect and non-Marxist formula, regarding the "class character" of language, and got himself into a muddle and put linguistics into a muddle. Soviet linguistics cannot be advanced on the basis of an incorrect formula which is contrary to the whole course of the history of peoples and languages.

. Y. Marr introduced into linguistics an immodest, boastful, arrogant tone alien to Marxism and tending towards a bald and off-hand negation of everything done in linguistics prior to N. Y. Marr.

N. Y. Marr shrilly abused the comparative-historical method as "idealistic." Yet it must be said that, despite its serious shortcomings, the comparative-historical method is nevertheless better than N. Y. Marr's really idealistic four-element analysis, [10] because the former gives a stimulus to work, to a study of languages, while the latter only gives a stimulus to loll in one's arm-chair and tell fortunes in the tea-cup of the celebrated four elements.

N. Y. Marr haughtily discountenanced every attempt to study groups (families) of languages on the grounds that it was a manifestation of the "proto-language" theory. [11] Yet it cannot be denied that the linguistic affinity of nations like the Slav nations, say, is beyond question, and that a study of the linguistic affinity of these nations might be of great value to linguistics in the study of the laws of language development. The "proto-language" theory, I need hardly say, has nothing to do with it.

To listen to N. Y. Marr, and especially to his "disciples," one might think that prior to N. Y. Marr there was no such thing as the science of language, that the science of language appeared with the "new doctrine" of N. Y. Marr. Marx and Engels were much more modest: they held that their dialectical materialism was a product of the development of the sciences, including philosophy, in earlier periods.

Thus, the discussion was useful also because it brought to light ideological shortcomings in Soviet linguistics.

I think that the sooner our linguistics rids itself of N. Y. Marr's errors, the sooner will it be possible to extricate it from its present crisis.

Elimination of the Arakcheyev regime in linguistics, rejection of N. Y. Marr's errors, and the introduction of Marxism into linguistics -- that, in my opinion, is the way in which Soviet linguistics could be put on a sound basis.

Pravda, June 20, 1950

Concerning Certain Problems of Linguistics
Reply to Comrade E. Krasheninnikova
Comrade Krasheninnikova,

I am answering your questions.

QUESTION: Your article convincingly shows that language is neither the base nor the superstructure. Would it be right to regard language as a phenomenon characteristic of both the base and the superstructure, or would it be more correct to regard language as an intermediate phenomenon?

ANSWER: Of course, characteristic of language, as a social phenomenon, is that common feature which is inherent in all social phenomena, including the base and the superstructure, namely: it serves society just as society is served by all other social phenomena, including the base and the superstructure. But this, properly speaking, exhausts that common feature which

is inherent in all social phenomena. Beyond this, important distinctions begin between social phenomena.

The point is that social phenomena have, in addition to this common feature, their own specific features which distinguish them from each other and which are of primary importance for science. The specific features of the base consist in that it serves society economically. The specific features of the superstructure consist in that it serves society by means of political, legal, aesthetic and other ideas and provides society with corresponding political, legal and other institutions. What then are the specific features of language, distinguishing it from other social phenomena? They consist in that language serves society as a means of intercourse between people, as a means for exchanging thoughts in society, as a means enabling people to understand one another and to co-ordinate joint work in all spheres of human activity, both in the sphere of production and in the sphere of economic relations, both in the sphere of politics and in the sphere of culture, both in social life and in everyday life. These specific features are characteristic only of language, and precisely because they are characteristic only of language, language is the object of study by an independent science -- linguistics. If there were no such specific features of language, linguistics would lose its right to independent existence.

In brief: language cannot be included either in the category of bases or in the category of superstructures.

Nor can it be included in the category of "intermediate" phenomena between the base and the superstructure, for such "intermediate" phenomena do not exist.

But perhaps language could be included in the category of the productive forces of society, in the category, say, of instruments of production? Indeed, there does exist a certain analogy between language and instruments of production: instruments of production manifest, just as language does, a kind of indifference towards classes and can serve equally different classes of society, both old and new. Does this circumstance provide ground for including language in the category of instruments of production? No, it does not.

At one time, N. Y. Marr, seeing that his formula -- "language is a superstructure on the base" - - encountered objections, decided to "reshape" it and announced that "language is an instrument of production." Was N. Y. Marr right in including language in the category of instruments of production? No, he certainly was not.

The point is that the similarity between language and instruments of production ends with the analogy I have just mentioned. But, on the other hand, there is a radical difference between language and instruments of production. This difference lies in the fact that whereas instruments of production produce material wealth, language produces nothing or "produces" words only. To put it more plainly, people possessing instruments of production can produce material wealth, but those very same people, if they possess a language but not instruments of production, cannot produce material wealth. It is not difficult to see that were language capable of producing material wealth, wind-bags would be the richest men on earth.

QUESTION: Marx and Engels define language as "the immediate reality of thought," as "practical,... actual consciousness." [12] "Ideas," Marx says, "do not exist divorced from language." In what measure, in your opinion, should linguistics occupy itself with the

semantic aspect of language, semantics, historical semasiology, and stylistics, or should form alone be the subject of linguistics?

ANSWER: Semantics (semasiology) is one of the important branches of linguistics. The semantic aspect of words and expressions is of serious importance in the study of language. Hence, semantics (semasiology) must be assured its due place in linguistics.

However, in working on problems of semantics and in utilizing its data, its significance must in no way be overestimated, and still less must it be abused. I have in mind certain philologists who, having an excessive passion for semantics, disregard language as "the immediate reality of thought" inseparably connected with thinking, divorce thinking from language and maintain that language is outliving its age and that it is possible to do without language.

Listen to what N. Y. Marr says:

"Language exists only inasmuch as it is expressed in sounds; the action of thinking occurs also without being expressed.... Language (spoken) has already begun to surrender its functions to the latest inventions which are unreservedly conquering space, while thinking is on the up-grade, departing from its unutilized accumulations in the past and its new acquisitions, and is to oust and fully replace language. The language of the future is thinking which will be developing in technique free of natural matter. No language, even the spoken language, which is all the same connected with the standards of nature, will be able to withstand it" (see Selected Works by N. Y. Marr).

If we interpret this "labor-magic" gibberish into simple human language, the conclusion may be drawn that:

a) N. Y. Marr divorces thinking from language; b) N. Y. Marr considers that communication between people can be realized without language, with the help of thinking itself, which is free of the "natural matter" of language, free of the "standards of nature"; c) divorcing thinking from language and "having freed" it from the "natural matter," of language, N. Y. Marr lands into the swamp of idealism.

It is said that thoughts arise in the mind of man prior to their being expressed in speech, that they arise without linguistic material, without linguistic integument, in, so to say, a naked form. But that is absolutely wrong. Whatever thoughts arise in the human mind and at whatever moment, they can arise and exist only on the basis of the linguistic material, on the basis of language terms and phrases. Bare thoughts, free of the linguistic material, free of the "natural matter" of language, do not exist. "Language is the immediate reality of thought" (Marx). The reality of thought is manifested in language. Only idealists can speak of thinking not being connected with "the natural matter" of language, of thinking without language.

In brief: over-estimation of semantics and abuse of it led N. Y. Marr to idealism.

Consequently, if semantics (semasiology) is safeguarded against exaggerations and abuses of the kind committed by N. Y. Marr and some of his "disciples," semantics can be of great benefit to linguistics.

QUESTION: You quite justly say that the ideas, concepts, customs and moral principles of the bourgeoisie and those of the proletariat are directly antithetical. The class character of these phenomena is certainly reflected in the semantic aspect of language (and sometimes in its form -- in the vocabulary -- as is correctly pointed out in your article). In analyzing concrete linguistic material and, in the first place, the semantic aspect of language, can we speak of the class essence of the concepts expressed by language, particularly in those cases when language expresses not only the thought of man but also his attitude towards reality, where his class affinity manifests itself with especial clarity?

ANSWER: Putting it more briefly, you want to know whether classes influence language, whether they introduce into language their specific words and expressions, whether there are cases when people attach a different meaning to one and the same word or expression depending on their class affinity?

Yes, classes influence language, introduce into the language their own specific words and expressions and sometimes understand one and the same word or expression differently. There is no doubt about that.

However, it does not follow that specific words and expressions, as well as difference in semantics, can be of serious importance for the development of a single language common to the whole people, that they are capable of detracting from its significance or of changing its character.

Firstly, such specific words and expressions, as well as cases of difference in semantics, are so few in language that they hardly make up even one per cent of the entire linguistic material. Consequently, all the remaining overwhelming mass of words and expressions, as well as their semantics, are common to all classes of society.

Secondly, specific words and expressions with a class tinge are used in speech not according to rules of some sort of "class" grammar, which does not exist, but according to the grammatical rules of the existing language common to the whole people.

Hence, the existence of specific words and expressions and the facts of differences in the semantics of language do not refute, but, on the contrary, confirm the existence and necessity of a single language common to the whole people.

QUESTION: In your article you quite correctly appraise Marr as a vulgarizer of Marxism. Does this mean that the linguists, including us, the young linguists, should reject the whole linguistic heritage of Marr, who all the same has to his credit a number of valuable linguistic researches (Comrades Chikobava, Sanzheyev and others wrote about them during the discussion)? Approaching Marr critically, cannot we take from him what is useful and valuable?

ANSWER: Of course, the works of N. Y. Marr do not consist solely of errors. N. Y. Marr made very gross mistakes when he introduced into linguistics elements of Marxism in a distorted form, when he tried to create an independent theory of language. But N. Y. Marr has certain good and ably written works, in which he, forgetting his theoretical claims, conscientiously and, one must say, skillfully investigates individual languages. In these works one can find not a little that is valuable and instructive. Clearly, these valuable and instructive things should be taken from N. Y. Marr and utilized.

QUESTION: Many linguists consider formalism one of the main causes of the stagnation in Soviet linguistics. We should very much like to know your opinion as to what formalism in linguistics consists in and how it should be overcome.

ANSWER: N. Y. Marr and his "disciples" accuse of "formalism" all linguists who do not accept the "new doctrine" of N. Y. Marr. This of course is not serious or clever.

N. Y. Marr considered that grammar is an empty "formality," and that people who regard the grammatical system as the foundation of language are formalists. This is altogether foolish.

I think that "formalism" was invented by the authors of the "new doctrine" to facilitate their struggle against their opponents in linguistics.

The cause of the stagnation in Soviet linguistics is not the "formalism" invented by N. Y. Marr and his "disciples," but the Arakcheyev regime and the theoretical gaps in linguistics. The Arakcheyev regime was set up by the "disciples" of N. Y. Marr. Theoretical confusion was brought into linguistics by N. Y. Marr and his closest colleagues. To put an end to stagnation, both the one and the other must be eliminated. The removal of these plague spots will put Soviet linguistics on a sound basis, will lead it out on to the broad highway and enable Soviet linguistics to occupy first place in world linguistics.

Pravda, July 4, 1950

Concerning Certain Problems of Linguistics

June 29, 1950

Reply to Comrade Sanzheyev

Esteemed Comrade Sanzheyev,

I am replying to your letter with considerable delay, for it was only yesterday forwarded to me from the apparatus of the Central Committee.

Your interpretation of my standpoint on the question of dialects is absolutely correct.

"Class" dialects, which it would be more correct to call jargons, do not serve the mass of the people, but a narrow social upper crust. Moreover, they do not have a grammatical system or basic word stock of their own. In view of this, they cannot possibly develop into independent languages.

Local ("territorial") dialects, on the other hand, serve the mass of the people and have a grammatical system and basic word stock of their own. In view of this, some local dialects, in the process of formation of nations, may become the basis of national languages and develop into independent national languages. This was the case, for instance, with the Kursk-Orel dialect (the Kursk-Orel "speech") of the Russian language, which formed the basis of the Russian national language. The same must be said of the Poltava-Kiev dialect of the Ukrainian language, which formed the basis of the Ukrainian national language. As for the other dialects of such languages, they lose their originality, merge with those languages and disappear in them.

Reverse processes also occur, when the single language of a nationality, which has not yet become a nation owing to the absence of the necessary economic conditions of development,

collapses as a result of the disintegration of the state of that nationality, and the local dialects, which have not yet had time to be fully uniformized in the single language, revive and give rise to the formation of separate independent languages. Possibly, this was the case, for example, with the single Mongolian language.

Pravda, August 2, 1950

Concerning Certain Problems of Linguistics

To Comrades D. Belkin and S. Furer

July 11, 1950

I have received your letters.

Your mistake is that you have confused two different things and substituted another subject for that examined in my reply to Comrade Krashennikova.

In that reply I criticized N. Y. Marr who, dealing with language (spoken) and thought, divorces language from thought and thus lapses into idealism. Therefore, I referred in my reply to normal human beings possessing the faculty of speech. I maintained, moreover, that with such human beings thoughts can arise only on the basis of linguistic material, that bare thoughts unconnected with linguistic material do not exist among people, who possess the faculty of speech.

Instead of accepting or rejecting this thesis, you introduce anomalous human beings, people without language, deaf-mutes, who have no language at their disposal and whose thoughts, of course, cannot arise on the basis of linguistic material. As you see, this is an entirely different subject which I did not touch upon and could not have touched upon, since linguistics concerns itself with normal human beings possessing the faculty of speech and not with anomalous deaf-mutes who do not possess the faculty of speech.

You have substituted for the subject under discussion another subject that was not discussed.

From Comrade Belkin's letter it is evident that he places on a par the "language of words" (spoken language) and "gesture language" ("hand" language, according to N. Y. Marr). He seems to think that gesture language and the language of words are of equal significance, that at one time human society had no language of words, that "hand" language at that time played the part of the language of words which appeared later.

But if Comrade Belkin really thinks so, he is committing a serious error. Spoken language or the language of words has always been the sole language of human society capable of serving as an adequate means of intercourse between people. History does not know of a single human society, be it the most backward, that did not have its own spoken language. Ethnography does not know of a single backward tribe, be it as primitive or even more primitive than, say, the Australians or the Tierra del Fuegians of the last century, which did not have its own spoken language. In the history of mankind, spoken language has been one of the forces which helped human beings to emerge from the animal world, unite into communities, develop their faculty of thinking, organize social production, wage a successful struggle against the forces of nature and attain the stage of progress we have to-day.

In this respect, the significance of the so-called gesture language, in view of its extreme poverty and limitations, is negligible. Properly speaking, this is not a language, and not even a

linguistic substitute that could in one way or another replace spoken language, but an auxiliary means of extremely limited possibilities to which man sometimes resorts to emphasize this or that point in his speech. Gesture language and spoken language are just as incomparable as are the primitive wooden hoe and the modern caterpillar tractor with its five-furrow plow or tractor row drill.

Apparently, you are primarily interested in the deaf-mutes, and only secondarily in problems of linguistics. Evidently, it was precisely this circumstance that prompted you to put a number of questions to me. Well, if you insist, I am not averse to granting your request. How do matters stand with regard to deaf-mutes? Do they possess the faculty of thinking? Do thoughts arise with them? Yes, they possess the faculty of thinking and thoughts arise with them. Clearly, since deaf-mutes are deprived of the faculty of speech, their thoughts cannot arise on the basis of linguistic material. Can this be taken to mean that the thoughts of deaf-mutes are naked, are not connected with the "standards of nature" (N. Y. Marr's expression)? No, it cannot. The thoughts of deaf-mutes arise and can exist only on the basis of the images, sensations and conceptions they form in every-day life on the objects of the outside world and their relations among themselves, thanks to the senses of sight, of touch, taste, and smell. Apart from these images, sensations and conceptions, thought is empty, is deprived of all content, that is, it does not exist.

To Comrade A. Kholopov
July 28, 1950
I have received your letter.

Pressure of work has somewhat delayed my reply.

Your letter tacitly proceeds from two premises: from the premise that it is permissible to quote the work of this or that author apart from the historical period of which the quotation treats, and secondly, from the premise that this or that conclusion or formula of Marxism, derived as a result of studying one of the periods of historical development, holds good for all periods of development and therefore must remain invariable.

I must say that both these premises are deeply mistaken.

A few examples.

In the forties of the past century when there was no monopoly capitalism as yet, when capitalism was developing more or less smoothly along an ascending line, spreading to new territories it had not yet occupied, and the law of uneven development could not yet fully operate, Marx and Engels concluded that a socialist revolution could not be victorious in one particular country, that it could be victorious only as a result of a joint blow in all, or in most, civilized countries. This conclusion subsequently became a guiding principle for all Marxists.

However, at the beginning of the twentieth century, especially in the period of the first world war, when it became clear to everyone that pre-monopoly capitalism had definitely developed into monopoly capitalism, when rising capitalism had become dying capitalism, when the war had revealed the incurable weaknesses of the world imperialist front, and the law of uneven development predetermined that the proletarian revolution would mature in different countries at different times, Lenin, proceeding from Marxist theory, came to the conclusion that in the new conditions of development, the socialist revolution could fully prove victorious in one

country taken separately, that the simultaneous victory of the socialist revolution in all countries, or in a majority of civilized countries, was impossible owing to the uneven maturing of the revolution in those countries, that the old formula of Marx and Engels no longer corresponded to the new historical conditions.

It is evident that here we have two different conclusions on the question of the victory of socialism, which not only contradict, but exclude each other.

Some textualists and Talmudists who quote mechanically without delving into the essence of the matter, and apart from historical conditions, may say that one of these conclusions should be discarded as being absolutely incorrect, while the other conclusion, as the absolutely correct one, should be applied to all periods of development. Marxists, however, cannot but know that the textualists and Talmudists are mistaken, they cannot but know that both of these conclusions are correct, though not absolutely, each being correct for its own time: Marx's and Engels' conclusion -- for the period of pre-monopoly capitalism; and Lenin's conclusion -- for the period of monopoly capitalism.

Engels in his *Anti-Dühring* said that after the victory of the socialist revolution, the state is bound to wither away. On these grounds, after the victory of the socialist revolution in our country, textualists and Talmudists in our Party began demanding that the Party should take steps to ensure the speedy withering away of our state, to disband state organs, to give up a standing army.

However, the study of the world situation of our time led Soviet Marxists to the conclusion that in the conditions of capitalist encirclement, when the socialist revolution has been victorious only in one country, and capitalism reigns in all other countries, the land of the victorious revolution should not weaken, but in every way strengthen its state, state organs, intelligence organs and army, if that land does not want to be crushed by the capitalist encirclement. Russian Marxists came to the conclusion that Engels' formula has in view the victory of socialism in all, or in most, countries, that it cannot be applied in the case where socialism is victorious in one country taken separately and capitalism reigns in all the other countries.

Evidently, we have here two different formulas regarding the destiny of the socialist state, each formula excluding the other.

The textualists and Talmudists may say that this circumstance creates an intolerable situation, that one of these formulas must be discarded as being absolutely erroneous, and the other -- as the absolutely correct one -- must be applied to all periods of development of the socialist state. Marxists, however, cannot but know that the textualists and Talmudists are mistaken, for both these formulas are correct though not absolutely, each being correct for its time: the formula of Soviet Marxists -- for the period of the victory of socialism in one or several countries; and the formula of Engels -- for the period when the consecutive victory of socialism in separate countries will lead to the victory of socialism in the majority of countries and when the necessary conditions will thus have been created for the application of Engels' formula.

The number of such examples could be multiplied.

The same must be said of the two different formulas on the question of language, taken from various works of Stalin and cited by Comrade Kholopov in his letter.

Comrade Kholopov refers to Stalin's work Concerning Marxism in Linguistics, where the conclusion is drawn that, as a result of the crossing, say, of two languages, one of them usually emerges victorious, while the other dies away, that, consequently, crossing does not produce some new, third language, but preserves one of the languages. He refers further to another conclusion, taken from Stalin's report to the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.), where it is said that in the period of the victory of socialism on a world scale, when socialism is consolidated and becomes part of every-day life, national languages will inevitably merge into one common language which, of course, will be neither Great Russian nor German, but something new. Comparing these two formulas and seeing that, far from coinciding, they exclude each other, Comrade Kholopov falls into despair. "From your article," he writes in his letter, "I understood that the crossing of languages can never produce come new language, whereas prior to your article I was firmly convinced, in conformity with your speech at the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.), that under communism, languages would merge into one common language."

Evidently, having discovered a contradiction between these two formulas and being deeply convinced that the contradiction must be removed, Comrade Kholopov considers it necessary to get rid of one of these formulas as incorrect and to clutch at the other as being correct for all periods and countries; but which formula to clutch at -- he does not know. The result is something in the nature of a hopeless situation. Comrade Kholopov does not even suspect that both formulas can be correct -- each for its own time.

That is always the case with textualists and Talmudists who do not delve into the essence of the matter, quote mechanically and irrespective of the historical conditions of which the quotations treat, and invariably find themselves in a hopeless situation.

Yet if one examines the essence of the matter, there are no grounds for considering the situation hopeless. The fact is that Stalin's pamphlet Concerning Marxism in Linguistics, and Stalin's speech at the Sixteenth Party Congress, refer to two entirely different epochs, owing to which the formulas, too, prove to be different.

The formula given by Stalin in his pamphlet, in the part where it speaks of the crossing of languages, refers to the epoch prior to the victory of socialism on a world scale, when the exploiting classes are the dominant power in the world; when national and colonial oppression remains in force; when national isolation and mutual distrust among nations are consolidated by differences between states; when, as yet there is no national equality of rights; when the crossing of languages takes place as a struggle for the domination of one of the languages; when the conditions necessary for the peaceful and friendly co-operation of nations and languages are as yet lacking; when it is not the co-operation and mutual enrichment of languages that are on the order of the day, but the assimilation of some and the victory of other languages. It is clear that in such conditions there can be only victorious and defeated languages. It is precisely these conditions that Stalin's formula has in view when it says that the crossing, say, of two languages, results not in the formation of a new language, but in the victory of one of the languages and the defeat of the other.

As regards the other formula by Stalin, taken from his speech at the Sixteenth Party Congress, in the part that touches on the merging of languages into one common language, it has in view

another epoch, namely, the epoch after the victory of socialism on a world scale, when world imperialism no longer exists; when the exploiting classes are overthrown and national and colonial oppression is eradicated; when national isolation and mutual distrust among nations is replaced by mutual confidence and rapprochement between nations; when national equality has been put into practice; when the policy of suppressing and assimilating languages is abolished; when the co-operation of nations has been established, and it is possible for national languages freely to enrich one another through their co-operation. It is clear that in these conditions there can be no question of the suppression and defeat of some languages, and the victory of others. Here we shall have not two languages, one of which is to suffer defeat, while the other is to emerge from the struggle victorious, but hundreds of national languages, out of which, as a result of a prolonged economic, political and cultural co-operation of nations, there will first appear most enriched unified zonal languages, and subsequently the zonal languages will merge into a single international language, which, of course, will be neither German, nor Russian, nor English, but a new language that has absorbed the best elements of the national and zonal languages.

Consequently, the two different formulas correspond to two different epochs in the development of society, and precisely because they correspond to them, both formulas are correct -- each for its epoch.

To demand that these formulas should not be at variance with each other, that they should not exclude each other, is just as absurd as it would be to demand that the epoch of the domination of capitalism should not be at variance with the epoch of the domination of socialism, that socialism and capitalism should not exclude each other.

The textualists and Talmudists regard Marxism and separate conclusions and formulas of Marxism as a collection of dogmas, which "never" change, notwithstanding changes in the conditions of the development of society. They believe that if they learn these conclusions and formulas by heart and start citing them at random, they will be able to solve any problem, reckoning that the memorized conclusions and formulas will serve them for all times and countries, for all occasions in life. But this can be the conviction only of people who see the letter of Marxism, but not its essence, who learn by rote the texts of conclusions and formulas of Marxism, but do not understand their meaning.

Marxism is the science of the laws governing the development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of socialism in all countries, the science of building communist society. As a science, Marxism cannot stand still, it develops and is perfected. In its development, Marxism cannot but be enriched by new experience, new knowledge -- consequently some of its formulas and conclusions cannot but change in the course of time, cannot but be replaced by new formulas and conclusions, corresponding to the new historical tasks. Marxism does not recognize invariable conclusions and formulas, obligatory for all epochs and periods. Marxism is the enemy of all dogmatism.

NOTES

[1] Stalin's essay Marxism and Problems of Linguistics was published in Pravda on June 20, 1950. Prior to this, there had already been discussion on Soviet linguistic problems in Pravda. This essay by Comrade Stalin is in reply to questions put to him by a group of Soviet students in connection with the discussion, and to essays published in Pravda's columns. The titles of

these latter were "On the Path of Materialist Linguistics" by member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences Bulakhovsky, "The History of Russian Linguistics and Marr's Theory" by Nikiforov, "On the Problem of the Class Character of Language" by Kudriavtsev and others. p 1.

[2] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Works, Ger. ed., Berlin, 1958, Vol. 3, p. 212 p. 13

[3] Ibid., pp. 411-12. p. 13

[4] Ibid., 1957, Vol. 2, p. 351. p. 14

[5] Paul Lafargue (1842-1911), well-known activist of French and international workers' movements, and outstanding Marxist propagandist and publicist. He was one of the founders of the French workers' Party, student and comrade-in-arms of Marx and Engels, and husband of Marx's daughter Laura. p. 14

[6] Bund, General Jewish workers' Union of Lithuania, Poland and Russia, was a Jewish petty-bourgeois opportunist organization founded at a congress held in Vilna in October, 1897, which worked mainly among Jewish handicraftsmen. At the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party's First Congress in 1898, Bund joined the R.S.D.L.P. as "an independent autonomous organization concerned only with the special problems of the Jewish proletariat." Once it joined the Party, however, it propagated nationalism and separatism in the Russian working-class movement. The Bundist bourgeois-nationalist standpoint was sternly repudiated by Iskra newspaper founded by Lenin. p. 18

[7] V. I. Lenin, "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination " Selected Works in Two Volumes, Eng. ed., Moscow, 1952, Vol. I, Part 2 pp. 318-19. p. 19

[8] J. V. Stalin, "The National Question and Leninism," Works, Eng. ed. Moscow, 1954, Vol. 11 p. 353. p. 19

[9] Arakcheyev regime, named after the reactionary politician Count Arakcheyev, was an unrestrained dictatorial police state, warlord despotism and brutal rule enforced in Russia in the first quarter of the 19th century. Stalin uses the term here to indicate Marr's overriding domination in Soviet linguistic circles. p. 30

[10] Four-element analysis -- Marr asserted that pronunciation of mankind's primitive language was evolved from the four syllables sal, ber, yon and rosh. P. 31

[11] "Proto-language" theory -- the doctrine of the Indo-European school which holds that a linguistic family consists of a group of patois (dialects), split from a common primitive "parent language." For example, modern Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese and Romanian are sister languages derived from Latin, and were originally only different patois. However, as there is no documentary evidence for the existence of a "parent language" of most of the dialects or languages, the Indo-European scholars have worked out a hypothetical "parent language," their main aim being to facilitate explanation of the rules of phonetic changes, but there is no way to prove the extent of the truth. p. 32

[12] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Works, Ger. ed., Berlin, 1958, Vol. 3, pp. 432 and 430. p. 35

Peace in Korea
July 15, 1950

[Reply to Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in connection with his proposals for seating the representatives of the People's Government of China on the Security Council of the U.N. and the "cessation of the conflict" in Korea, July 15, 1950]

I welcome your peaceable initiative. I fully share your point of view as regards the expediency of peaceful regulation of the Korean question through the Security Council with the obligatory participation of representatives of the five great Powers, including the People's Government of China. I believe that for speedy settlement of the Korean question it would be expedient to hear in the Security Council representatives of the Korean people.

**Telegram to the Minister President of the
People's Republic of Poland
Josef Cyrankiewicz
On the occasion of the Polish National Holiday
22 July, 1950**

On the occasion of the national holiday, - the anniversary of the rebirth of the Polish Republic, - please accept, Mr. Minister, my sincere greetings to the Polish people, to the government of the Polish Republic and to you personally.

The Soviet people wish the fraternal Polish people further success in their efforts to build a democratic people's Poland.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 169, 23 July, 1950)

**Greetings Message to the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the
Chinese People's Republic Mao Tse Tung
On the occasion of the twenty-third anniversary of the
People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China
1 August, 1950**

Please accept my sincere greetings and best wishes on the occasion of the twenty-third anniversary of the People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 178, 1 August, 1950)

**Greetings Telegram to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Bulgarian
People's Republic Wylko Tshervenkov
On the occasion of his 50th Birthday
6 September, 1950**

I congratulate you wholeheartedly on your 50th birthday. I send you my best wishes for good health and wish you strength for your fruitful work for the well-being of the Bulgarian people and the fraternal alliance between our countries.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 208, 6 September, 1950)

Telegram to the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic Mao Tse Tung
On the occasion of the first anniversary of the foundation of the People's Republic of China
1 October, 1950

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Mao Tse Tung.

On the occasion of the first anniversary of the foundation of the People's Republic of China, please accept, Mr. Chairman, my fraternal greetings. I wish the great Chinese people, and you personally, further success in the building of an independent people's democratic China.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 230, 1 October, 1950)

**Telegram to the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic
Otto Grotewohl
On the occasion of the first anniversary of the foundation of the German Democratic
Republic
7 October, 1950**

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Otto Grotewohl.

Please accept, Mr. Minister President, on the occasion of the national holiday, - Republic Day, - my sincere good wishes for the German people, for the government of the Republic and for you personally; and my wishes for success in the building of an united, independent, democratic, peace-loving Germany.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 235, 7 October, 1950)

**Telegram to the Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean People's Republic,
Kim Ir Sen
On the occasion of the second anniversary of the establishment: of diplomatic relations
between the U.S.S.R. and the Korean People's Democratic Republic
12 October, 1950**

To the Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean People's Democratic Republic,
Mr. Kim Ir Sen.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your expression of friendly feelings and good wishes on the second anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the People's Republic of Korea and the U.S.S.R.

I wish the Korean people, heroic defenders of the independence of their country, a successful termination of their years long fight for the creation of an united, independent, democratic Korea.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 12 October, 1950)

Telegram of Thanks to the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Otto Grotewohl
On the occasion of the thirty-third anniversary of the Great Socialist October Revolution
November, 1950

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Otto Grotewohl.

Please accept, Mr. Minister President, my thanks for your congratulation; and good wishes on the occasion of the thirty-third anniversary of the Great Socialist October Revolution.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," No. 272, 19 November, 1950)

Telegram to the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic Mao Tse Tung
On the occasion of the first anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Support
14 February, 1951

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic,
Comrade Mao Tse Tung.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, my sincere good wishes on the occasion of the first anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Support.

I do not doubt that our treaty, and the friendly alliance of the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, will continue in the future to strengthen the peace of the entire world.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 14 February, 1951)

**Interview with a "Pravda" Correspondent
17 February, 1951**

Q. How do you, evaluate the last declaration of the British Prime Minister Attlee, in the House of Commons, that since the end of the war, the Soviet Union has not disarmed; that is, they have not demobilized their troops; that the Soviet Union has since then even further increased their forces?

A. I evaluate this declaration of Prime Minister Attlee as a slander on the Soviet Union.

The whole world knows that the Soviet Union has demobilized its troops after the war. As it is known, the demobilization was carried out in three phases: the first and second phases in the year 1945, and the third phase from May to September, 1946. In addition, in the years 1946 and 1947, the demobilization of older age groups of the Soviet army was carried through and, starting in 1948, the rest of the older age groups were demobilized.

That is a generally known fact.

If Prime Minister Attlee was conversant with finance and economy he would be able to understand, without difficulty, that no one state, also not the Soviet Union, is in the position to completely develop the volume of their peace industry, - even more, - dozens of billions of the state expenditure is required for the purpose of building, such as the hydro-power works on the Volga, Dnieper and Amu-Darya; to introduce the policy of a systematic reduction in the price of consumer goods. Likewise, dozens of billions of the state expenditure is needed to immediately add to the hundreds of billions for the reconstruction of the economy demolished by the German occupation, to expand the people's economy and at the same time to increase their military forces and develop their war industry. It is not difficult to understand that such a foolish policy would lead to state bankruptcy. Prime Minister Attlee must, from his own experience as well as, from the experience of the U.S.A., know that the increasing of the military forces of countries and the development of the arms race would lead to a limitation of the peace industry, to a close-down of great civic building, to a raising of tax and to a raising of the price of consumer goods. It is understandable that, if the Soviet Union does not limit the peace industry but, on the contrary, furthers it, then new building, greater hydro-power works and water systems will not be suspended but, on the contrary, developed, the policy of reducing prices will not be suspended but, on the contrary, continued, they could not at the same time develop their war industry and increase their military strength without thereby taking the risk of bankruptcy.

And if Prime Minister Attlee, despite all these facts and economic considerations, nevertheless holds it possible to openly insult the Soviet Union and its peaceful politics, one can only declare that, by slandering the Soviet Union, the present Labour government in England wants to justify carrying on their own arms race.

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

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

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

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

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

Q. What do you think about the intervention in Korea? How can that end?

A. If England and the United States of America finally decline the proposals of the People's Government of China for peace, then the war in Korea can only end in defeat of the interventionists.

Q. Why? Are then, the American and English generals and officers worse than the Chinese and Korean?

A. No, not worse. The American and English generals and officers are not worse than the generals and officers of any other country you like to name. Where the soldiers of the U.S.A. and England are concerned, in the war against Hitler-Germany and militaristic Japan, they proved to be the best side, as is known. Where, then, lies the difference? In that the soldiers in the war against Korea and China do not consider it as just, whereas in the war against Hitler-Germany and militaristic Japan, they considered it absolutely just. It also lies in that this war is extremely unpopular among the American and English soldiers.

In this case it is difficult to convince the soldiers that China, who threatened neither England nor America, from whom the Americans stole the island of Taiwan, are aggressors, and that the U.S.A., having stolen the island of Taiwan and led their troops straight to the borders of China, is the defending side. It is therefore difficult to convince the troops that the U.S.A. is right to defend its security on Korean territory and on the borders of China, and that China and Korea are not right to defend their security on their own territory or on the borders of their states. That is why the war is unpopular among the American and English soldiers.

It is understandable that experienced generals and officers will suffer a defeat if their soldiers are forced into a war which they consider totally unjust, and if they believe their duties at the front to be formal, without believing in the justice of their mission, without feeling enthusiasm.

Q. How do you evaluate the decision of the United Nations Organization to declare the Chinese People's Republic as the aggressors?

A. I regard it as a scandalous decision.

Really, one must have lost what was left of conscience to maintain that the United States of America, which has stolen Chinese territory, the island of Taiwan, and fallen upon China's borders in Korea, is the defensive side; and on the other hand, to declare that the Chinese People's "Republic which has defended its borders and striven to take back the island of Taiwan, stolen by the Americans, is the aggressor.

The United Nations Organization, which was created as a bulwark for keeping peace, has been transformed into an instrument of war, a means to unleash a new world war. The aggressive core of the United Nations Organization have formed the aggressive North Atlantic pact from ten member states (the U.S.A., England, France, Belgium, Canada, Holland, Luxemburg, Denmark, Norway, Iceland) and twenty Latin-American countries (Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Equador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruquay, Venezuela.) And the representatives of these countries now make the decisions in the United Nations Organization about war and peace. It was these that have, in the United Nations Organizations, carried through the scandalous decision about the aggression of the Chinese People's Republic.

It is typical of the present situation in the United Nations Organization, that, for example, the little Dominican Republic in America that has a population figure of scarcely two million, has today the same weight in the United Nations Organization as India has, and a much greater weight than the Chinese People's Republic, which has been robbed of a voice in the United Nations Organization.

Thus, the United Nations Organization, from being a world organization of nations with equal rights, has changed into an instrument of a war of aggression. In reality, the United Nations Organization is now not so much a world organization as an organization for the Americans and treats American aggression as acceptable. Not only the United States of America and Canada are striving to unleash a new war, but on this path you also find the twenty Latin-American countries; their landowners and merch.ants long for a new war somewhere in Europe or Asia, to sell their goods to the countries at inflated prices, and to make millions out of this bloody business. The fact is not a secret -to anybody that the representatives of the twenty Latin-American countries represent the strongest supporters and the willing army of the United States of America in the United Nations Organization.

The United Nations Organization treads, in this manner, the inglorious path of the League of Nations. Thereby they bury their moral authority and fall into decay.

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

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

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

They, the aggressive powers, hold the reactionary governments in their hands and guide them. But at the same time they are afraid of their people who do not want a new war and are for the keeping of peace. Therefore they take the trouble of using the reactionary governments to

ensnare their people with lies, to deceive them, to represent a new war as a war of defence, and the peaceful politics of peace-loving countries as aggressive. They take the trouble to deceive the people, to force them and draw them into a new war with their aggressive plans.

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

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

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

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

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

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

J. STALIN

("For lasting Peace, for People's Democracy!" No. 8, 23 February - 1 March, 1951)

**Telegram to the Minister President of the Hungarian People's Republic Istvan Dobi
On the occasion of the third anniversary of the signing of the
Soviet-Hungarian Treaty of Friendship and Support
February, 1951**

Please accept, Mr. Minister President, my greetings and best wishes on the occasion of the third anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Hungarian Treaty of Friendship and Support.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," No. 44, 21 February, 1951)

Greetings and Good Wishes Telegram to the Kirov-Works Collective
On the occasion of the 150th Jubilee of the Kirov-Works and on its award of the Order of Lenin
3 April, 1951

To the Director of the Works, Comrade Smirnov,

To the Chief Engineer of the Works, Comrade Sacharyin,

To the Party Organizer of the C.C., C.P.-S.U.(B.), Comrade Smirnov,

To the Chairman of the Management Committee, Comrade Bogdanov,

To the Comsomol Organizer of the C.C. of the Comsomol, Comrade Korssakov.

I congratulate and greet the Collective of men and women workers, engineers, technicians and employees on the 150th Jubilee of the Kirov-Works, formerly the Putilov-Works, and on its award of the Order of Lenin.

As one of the oldest factories in the country, the Kirov-Works has played an historic role in the revolutionary struggle of the Russian working class to build Soviet power and in the strengthening of the economy and the defence of our Motherland.

After the Great Patriotic War, the Collective has achieved great successes in the reconstruction of the Works and the resumption of production for the economy.

I wish you, Comrades Kirov-workers, further success in your work and in the fulfilment of the task entrusted to you by the Party and the government.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 3 April, 1951)

**Greetings Telegram to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian
People's Republic Istvan Dobi
On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of Hungary by the Soviet army
April, 1951**

On the occasion of the national day of celebration of the Hungarian People's Republic, please accept my greetings and best wishes for the further success of the Hungarian people.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," No. 80, 7 April, 1951)

Greetings to the Minister President of the People's Republic of Poland,
Josef Cyrankiewicz

**On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Polish Treaty of
friendship and Support
April, 1951**

Please accept my sincere congratulations and best wishes on the sixth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship and Support between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Poland.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 95, 24 April, 1951)

**Greetings Telegram to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Czechoslovakian Republic Antonin Zapotocky
On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of
Czechoslovakia from the fascist occupation
May, 1951**

Please accept my congratulations to the Czechoslovakian government and to you personally on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of Czechoslovakia from the fascist occupation, and also my wishes for the further success in the political, economic and cultural building of the Czechoslovakian Republic.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 105, 10 May, 1951)

Telegram to the Representative of the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic Walter Ulbricht
On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of Germany from the fascist yoke
17 May, 1951

To the Representative of the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic,
Comrade Walter Ulbricht.

I sincerely thank the government of the German Democratic Republic, and you personally, for the friendly letter on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the liberation of Germany from the fascist yoke. I wish the German people and the government of the German Democratic Republic further success in uniting the democratic forces of Germany and in the securing of peace.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 111, 18 May, 1951)

**Telegram to the State President of the People's Republic of Poland Boleslaw Bierut
On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Poland
July, 1951**

Please accept, Comrade President, the sincere greetings and best wishes of the Praesid-ium of the U.S.S.R., and myself, on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Poland.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 169, 24 July, 1951)

**Telegram to the Minister President of the People's Republic of Poland
Josef Cyrankiewicz
On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Poland
July, 1951**

Please accept, Comrade Minister President, on the occasion of the national day of celebration of the Polish Republic, my friendly greetings to the Polish people, to the government of the Republic of Poland and to you personally, and also my wishes for new success in the further development of the democratic people's Poland.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 169, 24 July, 1951)

Telegram to the Minister President of the Rumanian People's Republic Petru Groza

**On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Rumania
August, 1951**

On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Rumania, the government of the U.S.S.R. and I myself, congratulate the government of the Rumanian People's Republic and wish further success to the Rumanian people.

J. STALIN

("New-Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 195, 24 August, 1951)

**Answering Telegram to the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic Mao Tse Tung
On the occasion of the sixth anniversary of victory over the Japanese imperialists
2 September, 1951**

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic,
Comrade Mao Tse Tung.

I thank you, Comrade Chairman, for the high estimation of the role which the Soviet Union and its fighting power played in the smashing of Japanese aggression.

The Chinese people, and their liberation army have played a great role, despite the machinations of the Kuomintang, in the liquidation of Japanese imperialism. The struggle of the Chinese people and their liberation army has helped the smashing of the Japanese aggression profoundly.

It cannot be doubted that the unbreakable friendship of the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic serves and will serve to guarantee peace in the far East against all and every aggressor and arsonist of war.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, the good wishes of the Soviet Union and its fighting forces on the sixth anniversary of the liberation of East Asia from the yoke of Japanese imperialism.

Long live the great friendship of the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union!

Long live the Chinese People's Liberation Army!

J. STALIN

Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.,

("New Times," No. 36, 5 September, 1951. P. 1)

Prohibition of Atomic Weapons October 6, 1951

[Interview with correspondent of Pravda, October 6, 1951]

Question: What is your opinion of the hubbub raised recently in the foreign press in connection with the test of an atom bomb in the Soviet Union?

Answer: Indeed, one of the types of atom bombs was recently tested in our country. Tests of atom bombs of different calibers will be conducted in the future as well, in accordance with the plan for the defense of our country from attack by the Anglo-American aggressive bloc.

Question: In connection with the test of the atom bomb, various personages in the United States are raising alarm and shouting about the threat to the security of the United States. Are there any grounds for such alarm?

Answer: There are no grounds whatever for such alarm. Personages in the United States cannot but know that the Soviet Union is not only opposed to the employment of the atomic weapon, but that it also stands for its prohibition and for the termination of its production. It is known that the Soviet Union has several times demanded the prohibition of the atomic weapon, but each time this has been refused by the Atlantic bloc powers. This means that, in the event of an attack by the United States on our country, the ruling circles of the United States will use the atom bomb. It is this circumstance that has compelled the Soviet Union to have the atomic weapon in order to meet the aggressors fully prepared. Of course the aggressors want the Soviet Union to be unarmed in the event of their attack upon it. The Soviet Union, however, does not agree to this, and it thinks that it should be fully prepared to meet the aggressor. Consequently, if the United States has no intention of attacking the Soviet Union, the alarm of the personages in the United States should be considered as pointless and false, because the Soviet Union does not contemplate ever attacking the United States or any other country.

Personages in the United States are vexed because the secret of the atom bomb is possessed not only by the United States but also by other countries, the Soviet Union primarily. They would like the United States to be the monopolist of the production of the atom bomb. They would like the United States to have unlimited power to intimidate and blackmail other countries. But on what grounds do they think so? By what right do the interests of preserving peace require such monopoly? Would it not be more correct to say that matters are directly the opposite, that it is the interests of preserving peace that require first of all the liquidation of such a monopoly and then the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon too? I think that the proponents of the atom bomb may agree to the prohibition of the atomic weapon only if they see that they are no longer monopolists.

Question: What is your opinion regarding international control of the atomic weapon?

Answer: The Soviet Union stands for prohibiting the atomic weapon and terminating the production of the atomic weapon. The Soviet Union stands for the establishment of international control over the fully exact and conscientious implementation of the decision to prohibit the atomic weapon, to terminate the production of the atomic weapon and utilize the already produced atom bombs solely for civilian purposes. The Soviet Union stands for

precisely this kind of international control. American personages also speak of control, but their control presupposes not the termination of the production of the atomic weapon, but the continuation of such production in quantities conforming to the amounts of raw material at the disposal of different countries. Consequently, the American control presupposes not prohibiting the atomic weapon, but making it legal and lawful. Thereby the right of the warmongers to annihilate tens and hundreds of thousands of peaceful inhabitants with the help of the atomic weapon is made lawful. It is not difficult to understand that this is not control but a mockery of control and a deception of the peaceful aspirations of the peoples. It is clear that such control cannot satisfy the peace-loving peoples who demand the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the termination of its production.

**Telegram to the Minister President
of the German Democratic Republic
Otto Grotewohl**

**On the occasion of the second anniversary of the foundation of the German Democratic
Republic
7 October, 1951**

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Comrade Otto Grotewohl.

On the national day of celebration - the second anniversary of the foundation of the German Democratic Republic - please accept, Comrade Minister President, my congratulations. I wish the German people, the government and you personally, further success in the building of an united, independent, democratic, peace-loving German state.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 234, 7 October, 1951)

**Answering Telegram to the Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean
Democratic Republic Kim Ir Sen
On the occasion of the third anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic and
economic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the Korean People's Democratic Republic
20 October, 1951**

Comrade Chairman, in the name of the government of the Soviet Union and myself, please accept our thanks for your greetings and good wishes on the occasion of the third anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between our countries.

I wish the brave Korean people success in their heroic struggle for the freedom and independence of their homeland.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," Vol. 2, No. 246, 21 October, 1951)

**Telegram to the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic
Otto Grotewohl
On the occasion of the thirty-fourth anniversary of the Great Socialist October
Revolution
November, 1951**

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Comrade Otto Grotewohl.

Please accept, Comrade Minister President, the thanks of the Soviet government and myself for your congratulations and good wishes on the thirtyfourth anniversary of the Great Socialist October Revolution.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 270, 20 November, 1951)

**Greetings Telegram to the President of the Czechoslovakian Republic
Klement Gottwald
On the occasion of his 55th Birthday
23 November, 1951**

Dear Comrade Gottwald,

I send you sincere congratulations on your birthday and wish you success in your work for the well-being of the fraternal Czechoslovakian people.

J. STALIN

("Daily Review," vol. 2, No. 275, 25 November, 1951)

**New Year Message to the Japanese People
31 December, 1951**

To the Chief Editor of the Kyodo Agency, Mr. Kiishi Iwamoto

Dear Mr. Iwamoto! I have received your request to send the Japanese people a message for New Year.

It is not a tradition of Soviet statesmen to send greetings to the people of another state. But the great sympathy that the people of the Soviet Union have for the Japanese people, who have suffered misery through foreign occupation, leads me to make an exception to the rule and to accede to your request.

I ask you to convey to the Japanese people my wishes for their freedom and happiness, as well as success in their courageous struggle for the independence of their homeland.

The people of the Soviet Union have in the past, learnt to know themselves, the terror of foreign occupation, in which the Japanese imperialists took part. Therefore, they fully understand the sorrow of the Japanese people, have great sympathy for them and believe that the rebirth and independence of their homeland will be achieved, even as it was by the people of the Soviet Union.

I wish the Japanese workers liberation from unemployment, from poor wages, the abolition of high prices for consumer goods and success in the struggle for keeping peace.

I wish the Japanese peasants . liberation from landlessness and poverty, the abolition of high taxes and success in the struggle for keeping peace.

I wish the entire Japanese people and their intelligentsia, complete victory of the democratic forces of Japan, the revival and prosperity of the economic life of the country, a blossoming of national culture, knowledge and art as well as success in the struggle for keeping peace.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 2, 3 January, 1952)

**Telegram of Thanks to the
Central Committee of the
Socialist Unity Party of Germany
3 January, 1952**

To the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Wilhelm Pieck, Otto Grotewohl, Walter Ulbricht.

I thank you and, through you, the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, for your congratulations and good wishes.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 2, 3 January, 1952)

**Telegram of Thanks to the Representative of the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic Walter Ulbricht
3 January, 1952**

To the Representative of the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic,
Comrade Walter Ulbricht.

I thank you, Comrade Deputy of the Minister President, for your congratulations on my birthday.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 2, 3 January, 1952)

**Telegram of Thanks to the Party Director of the Communist Party of Germany
January, 1952**

To the Party Director of the Communist Party of Germany, Max Reimann.

I sincerely thank you and, through you, the Party Directorate of the Communist Party of Germany, for your congratulations and good wishes.

J. STALIN

("Socialist People's Newspaper," 7 January, 1952)

**Telegram to the Workers of the Magnitorsker Steel Works Combine
On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the opening of the Combine
31 January, 1952**

To the Magnitorsker Steelworks Combine. To the Director of the Combine, Comrade Borissov.

To the Chief Engineer of the Combine, Comrade Voronov.

To the Party Organizer of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.), Comrade Svetiov.

To the Chairman of the Trade Union, Comrade Pliskanos.

To the Comsomol Organizer of the C.C. of the Comsomol, Comrade Pankov.

I greet and congratulate the men and women workers, engineers, technicians and employees of the Magnitorsker Steelworks Combine and the "Magnitostroj" Trust on the twentieth anniversary of the opening of the Combine, the mighty metallurgic basis of the country.

The steel workers of Magnitorsk have, as upright sons and daughters of our Motherland, throughout the years, honestly and devotedly worked for the development of the production capacity of the Combine, successfully applied the new technology, continued the unbroken production of metal and honourably fulfilled the task set by the Party and the government to supply our country with metal.

I wholeheartedly wish you, Comrades, new success in your work.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 31 January, 1952)

**Economic Problems of the USSR
Remarks on Economic Questions
Connected with the November 1951 Discussion**

C O N T E N T S

Remarks on Economic Questions Connected with the November 1951 Discussion

1. Character of Economic Laws Under Socialism
2. Commodity Production Under Socialism
3. The Law of Value Under Socialism
4. Abolition of the Antithesis Between Town and Country, and Between Mental and Physical Labour, and Elimination of Distinctions Between Them
5. Disintegration of the Single World Market and Deepening of the Crisis of the World Capitalist System
6. Inevitability of Wars Between Capitalist Countries
7. The Basic Economic Laws of Modern Capitalism and of Socialism
8. Other Questions
9. International Importance of a Marxist Textbook on Political Economy
10. Ways of Improving the Draft Textbook on Political Economy

Reply to Comrade Alexander Ilyich Notkin

Concerning the Errors of Comrade L.D. Yaroshenko

- I. Comrade Yaroshenko's Chief Error
- II. Other Errors of Comrade Yaroshenko

Reply to Comrades A.V. Sanina and V.G. Venzher

1. Character of the Economic Laws of Socialism
2. Measures for Elevating Collective-Farm Property to the Level of Public Property

1. The present English translation of J. V. Stalin's Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. is a reprint of the text given in the English pamphlet by the same name, published in Moscow, 1952. Changes have been made according to other English translations of the pamphlet. The notes at the end of the book have been translated from the Chinese edition published by the People's Publishing House, Peking, March 1971.

To the Participants in the Economic Discussion:

I have received all the materials on the economic discussion arranged to assess the draft textbook on political economy. The material received includes the "Proposals for the

Improvement of the Draft Textbook on Political Economy," "Proposals for the Elimination of Mistakes and Inaccuracies" in the draft, and the "Memorandum on Disputed Issues." On all these materials, as well as on the draft textbook, I consider it necessary to make the following remarks.

1. Character of Economic Laws Under Socialism

Some comrades deny the objective character of laws of science, and of laws of political economy particularly, under socialism. They deny that the laws of political economy reflect law-governed processes which operate independently of the will of man. They believe that in view of the specific role assigned to the Soviet state by history, the Soviet state and its leaders can abolish existing laws of political economy and can "form," "create," new laws.

These comrades are profoundly mistaken. It is evident that they confuse laws of science, which reflect objective processes in nature or society, processes which take place independently of the will of man, with the laws which are issued by governments, which are made by the will of man, and which have only juridical validity. But they must not be confused.

Marxism regards laws of science — whether they be laws of natural science or laws of political economy — as the reflection of objective processes which take place independently of the will of man. Man may discover these laws, get to know them, study them, reckon with them in his activities and utilize them in the interests of society, but he cannot change or abolish them. Still less can he form or create new laws of science.

Does this mean, for instance, that the results of the action of the laws of nature, the results of the action of the forces of nature, are generally inavertible, that the destructive action of the forces of nature always and everywhere proceeds with an elemental and inexorable power that does not yield to the influence of man? No, it does not. Leaving aside astronomical, geological and other similar processes, which man really is powerless to influence, even if he has come to know the laws of their development, in many other cases man is very far from powerless, in the sense of being able to influence the processes of nature. In all such cases, having come to know the laws of nature, reckoning with them and relying on them, and intelligently applying and utilizing them, man can restrict their sphere of action, and can impart a different direction to the destructive forces of nature and convert them to the use of society.

To take one of numerous examples. In olden times the overflow of big rivers, floods, and the resulting destruction of homes and crops, was considered an inavertible calamity, against which man was powerless. But with the lapse of time and the development of human knowledge, when man had learned to build dams and hydro-electric stations, it became possible to protect society from the calamity of flood which had formerly seemed to be inavertible. More, man learned to curb the destructive forces of nature, to harness them, so to speak, to convert the force of water to the use of society and to utilize it for the irrigation of fields and the generation of power.

Does this mean that man has thereby abolished laws of nature, laws of science, and has created new laws of nature, new laws of science? No, it does not. The fact is that all this procedure of averting the action of the destructive forces of water and of utilizing them in the interests of society takes place without any violation, alteration or abolition of scientific laws or the creation of new scientific laws. On the contrary, all this procedure is effected in precise

conformity with the laws of nature and the laws of science, since any violation, even the slightest, of the laws of nature would only upset matters and render the procedure futile.

The same must be said of the laws of economic development, the laws of political economy — whether in the period of capitalism or in the period of socialism. Here, too, the laws of economic development, as in the case of natural science, are objective laws, reflecting processes of economic development which take place independently of the will of man. Man may discover these laws, get to know them and, relying upon them, utilize them in the interests of society, impart a different direction to the destructive action of some of the laws, restrict their sphere of action, and allow fuller scope to other laws that are forcing their way to the fore-front; but he cannot destroy them or create new economic laws.

One of the distinguishing features of political economy is that its laws, unlike those of natural science, are impermanent, that they, or at least the majority of them, operate for a definite historical period, after which they give place to new laws. However, these laws are not abolished, but lose their validity owing to the new economic conditions and depart from the scene in order to give place to new laws, laws which are not created by the will of man, but which arise from the new economic conditions.

Reference is made to Engels' Anti-Duhring, to his formula which says that, with the abolition of capitalism and the socialization of the means of production, man will obtain control of his means of production, that he will be set free from the yoke of social and economic relations and become the "master" of his social life. Engels calls this freedom "appreciation of necessity." And what can this "appreciation of necessity"(1) mean? It means that, having come to know objective laws ("necessity"), man will apply them with full consciousness in the interests of society. That is why Engels says in the same book:

"The laws of his own social action, hitherto standing face to face with man as laws of nature foreign to, and dominating him, will then be used with full understanding, and so mastered by him."(2)

As we see, Engels' formula does not speak at all in favour of those who think that under socialism existing economic laws can be abolished and new ones created. On the contrary, it demands, not the abolition, but the understanding of economic laws and their intelligent application.

It is said that economic laws are elemental in character, that their action is inavertible and that society is powerless against them. That is not true. It is making a fetish of laws, and oneself the slave of laws. It has been demonstrated that society is not powerless against laws, that, having come to know economic laws and relying upon them, society can restrict their sphere of action, utilize them in the interests of society and "harness" them, just as in the case of the forces of nature and their laws, just as in the case of the overflow of big rivers cited in the illustration above.

Reference is made to the specific role of Soviet government in building socialism, which allegedly enables it to abolish existing laws of economic development and to "form" new ones. That also is untrue.

The specific role of Soviet government was due to two circumstances: first, that what Soviet government had to do was not to replace one form of exploitation by another, as was the case

in earlier revolutions, but to abolish exploitation altogether; second, that in view of the absence in the country of any ready-made rudiments of a socialist economy, it had to create new, socialist forms of economy, "starting from scratch," so to speak.

That was undoubtedly a difficult, complex and unprecedented task. Nevertheless, the Soviet government accomplished this task with credit. But it accomplished it not because it supposedly destroyed the existing economic laws and "formed" new ones, but only because it relied on the economic law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces. The productive forces of our country, especially in industry, were social in character, the form of ownership, on the other hand, was private, capitalistic. Relying on the economic law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces, the Soviet government socialized the means of production, made them the property of the whole people, and thereby abolished the exploiting system and created socialist forms of economy. Had it not been for this law, and had the Soviet government not relied upon it, it could not have accomplished its mission.

The economic law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces has long been forcing its way to the forefront in the capitalist countries. If it has failed so far to force its way into the open, it is because it is encountering powerful resistance on the part of obsolescent forces of society. Here we have another distinguishing feature of economic laws. Unlike the laws of natural science, where the discovery and application of a new law proceeds more or less smoothly, the discovery and application of a new law in the economic field, affecting as it does the interests of obsolescent forces of society, meets with the most powerful resistance on their part. A force, a social force, capable of overcoming this resistance, is therefore necessary. In our country, such a force was the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, who represented the overwhelming majority of society. There is no such force yet in other, capitalist countries. This explains the secret why the Soviet government was able to smash the old forces of society, and why in our country the economic law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces received full scope.

It is said that the necessity for balanced (proportionate) development of the national economy in our country enables the Soviet government to abolish existing economic laws and to create new ones. That is absolutely untrue. Our yearly and five-yearly plans must not be confused with the objective economic law of balanced, proportionate development of the national economy. The law of balanced development of the national economy arose in opposition to the law of competition and anarchy of production under capitalism. It arose from the socialization of the means of production, after the law of competition and anarchy of production had lost its validity. It became operative because a socialist economy can be conducted only on the basis of the economic law of balanced development of the national economy. That means that the law of balanced development of the national economy makes it possible for our planning bodies to plan social production correctly. But possibility must not be confused with actuality. They are two different things. In order to turn the possibility into actuality, it is necessary to study this economic law, to master it, to learn to apply it with full understanding, and to compile such plans as fully reflect the requirements of this law. It cannot be said that the requirements of this economic law are fully reflected by our yearly and five-yearly plans.

It is said that some of the economic laws operating in our country under socialism, including the law of value, have been "transformed," or even "radically transformed," on the basis of

planned economy. That is likewise untrue. Laws cannot be "transformed," still less "radically" transformed. If they can be transformed, then they can be abolished and replaced by other laws. The thesis that laws can be "transformed" is a relic of the incorrect formula that laws can be "abolished" or "formed." Although the formula that economic laws can be transformed has already been current in our country for a long time, it must be abandoned for the sake of accuracy. The sphere of action of this or that economic law may be restricted, its destructive action — that is, of course, if it is liable to be destructive — may be averted, but it cannot be "transformed" or "abolished."

Consequently, when we speak of "subjugating" natural forces or economic forces, of "dominating" them, etc., this does not mean that man can "abolish" or "form" scientific laws. On the contrary, it only means that man can discover laws, get to know them and master them, learn to apply them with full understanding, utilize them in the interests of society, and thus subjugate them, secure mastery over them.

Hence, the laws of political economy under socialism are objective laws, which reflect the fact that the processes of economic life are law-governed and operate independently of our will. People who deny this postulate are in point of fact denying science, and, by denying science, they are denying all possibility of prognostication — and, consequently, are denying the possibility of directing economic activity.

It may be said that all this is correct and generally known; but that there is nothing new in it, and that it is therefore not worth spending time reiterating generally-known truths. Of course, there really is nothing new in this; but it would be a mistake to think that it is not worth spending time reiterating certain truths that are well known to us. The fact is that we, the leading core, are joined every year by thousands of new and young forces who are ardently desirous of assisting us and ardently desirous of proving their worth, but who do not possess an adequate Marxist education, are unfamiliar with many truths that are well known to us, and are therefore compelled to grope in the darkness. They are staggered by the colossal achievements of Soviet government, they are dazzled by the extraordinary successes of the Soviet system, and they begin to imagine that Soviet government can "do anything," that "nothing is beyond it," that it can abolish scientific laws and form new ones. What are we to do with these comrades? How are we to educate them in Marxism-Leninism? I think that systematic reiteration and patient explanation of so-called "generally-known" truths is one of the best methods of educating these comrades in Marxism.

1. Frederick Engels, *Anti-Duhring*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, p. 158.

2. *Ibid* pp 392-93.

2. Commodity Production Under Socialism

Certain comrades affirm that the Party acted wrongly in preserving commodity production after it had assumed power and nationalized the means of production in our country. They consider that the Party should have banished commodity production there and then. In this connection they cite Engels, who says:

"With the seizing of the means of production by society, production of commodities is done away with, and, simultaneously, the mastery of the product over the producer".

.(1)

These comrades are profoundly mistaken.

Let us examine Engels' formula. Engels' formula cannot be considered fully clear and precise, because it does not indicate whether it is referring to the seizure by society of all or only part of the means of production, that is, whether all or only part of the means of production are converted into public property. Hence, this formula of Engels' may be understood either way.

Elsewhere in Anti-Duhring Engels speaks of mastering "all the means of production," of taking possession of "all means of production." Hence, in this formula Engels has in mind the nationalization not of part, but of all the means of production, that is, the conversion into public property of the means of production not only of industry, but also of agriculture.

It follows from this that Engels has in mind countries where capitalism and the concentration of production have advanced far enough both in industry and in agriculture to permit the expropriation of all the means of production in the country and their conversion into public property. Engels, consequently, considers that in such countries, parallel with the socialization of all the means of production, commodity production should be put an end to. And that, of course, is correct.

There was only one such country at the close of the last century, when Anti-Duhring was published - Britain. There the development of capitalism and the concentration of production both in industry and in agriculture had reached such a point that it would have been possible, in the event of the assumption of power by the proletariat, to convert all the country's means of production into public property and to put an end to commodity production.

I leave aside in this instance the question of the importance of foreign trade to Britain and the vast part it plays in her national economy. I think that only after an investigation of this question can it be finally decided what would be the future of commodity production in Britain after the proletariat had assumed power and all the means of production had been nationalized.

However, not only at the close of the last century, but today too, no country has attained such a degree of development of capitalism and concentration of production in agriculture as is to be observed in Britain. As to the other countries, notwithstanding the development of capitalism in the countryside, they still have a fairly numerous class of small and medium rural owner-producers, whose future would have to be decided if the proletariat should assume power.

But here is a question: what are the proletariat and its party to do in countries, ours being a case in point, where the conditions are favourable for the assumption of power by the proletariat and the overthrow of capitalism, where capitalism has so concentrated the means of production in industry that they may be expropriated and made the property of society, but where agriculture, notwithstanding the growth of capitalism, is divided up among numerous small and medium owner-producers to such an extent as to make it impossible to consider the expropriation of these producers?

To this question Engels' formula does not furnish an answer. Incidentally, it was not supposed to furnish an answer, since the formula arose from another question, namely, what should be the fate of commodity production after all the means of production had been socialized.

And so, what is to be done if not all, but only part of the means of production have been socialized, yet the conditions are favourable for the assumption of power by the proletariat - should the proletariat assume power and should commodity production be abolished immediately thereafter?

We cannot, of course, regard as an answer the opinion of certain half-baked Marxists who believe that under such conditions the thing to do is to refrain from taking power and to wait until capitalism has succeeded in ruining the millions of small and medium producers and converting them into farm labourers and in concentrating the means of production in agriculture, and that only after this would it be possible to consider the assumption of power by the proletariat and the socialization of all the means of production. Naturally, this is a "solution" which Marxists cannot accept if they do not want to disgrace themselves completely.

Nor can we regard as an answer the opinion of other half-baked Marxists, who think that the thing to do would be to assume power and to expropriate the small and medium rural producers and to socialize their means of production. Marxists cannot adopt this senseless and criminal course either, because it would destroy all chances of victory for the proletarian revolution, and would throw the peasantry into the camp of the enemies of the proletariat for a long time.

The answer to this question was given by Lenin in his writings on the "tax in kind" and in his celebrated "cooperative plan."

Lenin's answer may be briefly summed up as follows:

- a) Favourable conditions for the assumption of power should not be missed - the proletariat should assume power without waiting until capitalism has succeeded in ruining the millions of small and medium individual producers;
- b) The means of production in industry should be expropriated and converted into public property;
- c) As to the small and medium individual producers, they should be gradually united in producers' cooperatives, i.e., in large agricultural enterprises, collective farms;
- d) Industry should be developed to the utmost and the collective farms should be placed on the modern technical basis of large-scale production, not expropriating them, but on the contrary generously supplying them with first-class tractors and other machines;
- e) In order to ensure an economic bond between town and country, between industry and agriculture, commodity production (exchange through purchase and sale) should be preserved for a certain period, it being the form of economic tie with the town which is alone acceptable to the peasants, and Soviet trade - state, cooperative, and collective-farm - should be developed to the full and the capitalists of all types and descriptions ousted from trading activity.

The history of socialist construction in our country has shown that this path of development, mapped out by Lenin, has fully justified itself.

There can be no doubt that in the case of all capitalist countries with a more or less numerous class of small and medium producers, this path of development is the only possible and expedient one for the victory of socialism.

It is said that commodity production must lead, is bound to lead, to capitalism all the same, under all conditions. That is not true. Not always and not under all conditions! Commodity production must not be identified with capitalist production. They are two different things. Capitalist production is the highest form of commodity production. Commodity production leads to capitalism only if there is private ownership of the means of production, if labour power appears in the market as a commodity which can be bought by the capitalist and exploited in the process of production, and if, consequently, the system of exploitation of wageworkers by capitalists exists in the country. Capitalist production begins when the means of production are concentrated in private hands, and when the workers are bereft of means of production and are compelled to sell their labour power as a commodity. Without this there is no such thing as capitalist production.

Well, and what is to be done if the conditions for the conversion of commodity production into capitalist production do not exist, if the means of production are no longer private but socialist property, if the system of wage labour no longer exists and labour power is no longer a commodity, and if the system of exploitation has long been abolished - can it be considered then that commodity production will lead to capitalism all the same? No, it cannot. Yet ours is precisely such a society, a society where private ownership of the means of production, the system of wage labour, and the system of exploitation have long ceased to exist.

Commodity production must not be regarded as something sufficient unto itself, something independent of the surrounding economic conditions. Commodity production is older than capitalist production. It existed in slave-owning society, and served it, but did not lead to capitalism. It existed in feudal society and served it, yet, although it prepared some of the conditions for capitalist production, it did not lead to capitalism. Why then, one asks, cannot commodity production similarly serve our socialist society for a certain period without leading to capitalism, bearing in mind that in our country commodity production is not so boundless and all-embracing as it is under capitalist conditions, being confined within strict bounds thanks to such decisive economic conditions as social ownership of the means of production, the abolition of the system of wage labour, and the elimination of the system of exploitation?

It is said that, since the domination of social ownership of the means of production has been established in our country, and the system of wage labour and exploitation has been abolished, commodity production has lost all meaning and should therefore be done away with.

That is also untrue. Today there are two basic forms of socialist production in our country: state, or publicly-owned production, and collective-farm production, which cannot be said to be publicly owned. In the state enterprises, the means of production and the product of production are national property. In the collective farm, although the means of production (land, machines) do belong to the state, the product of production is the property of the different collective farms, since the labour, as well as the seed, is their own, while the land, which has been turned over to the collective farms in perpetual tenure, is used by them virtually as their own property, in spite of the fact that they cannot sell, buy, lease or mortgage it.

The effect of this is that the state disposes only of the product of the state enterprises, while the product of the collective farms, being their property, is disposed of only by them. But the collective farms are unwilling to alienate their products except in the form of commodities, in exchange for which they desire to receive the commodities they need. At present the collective farms will not recognize any other economic relation with the town except the commodity relation - exchange through purchase and sale. Because of this, commodity production and trade are as much a necessity with us today as they were, say, thirty years ago, when Lenin spoke of the necessity of developing trade to the utmost.

Of course, when instead of the two basic production sectors, the state sector and the collective-farm sector, there will be only one all-embracing production sector, with the right to dispose of all the consumer goods produced in the country, commodity circulation, with its "money economy," will disappear, as being an unnecessary element in the national economy. But so long as this is not the case, so long as the two basic production sectors remain, commodity production and commodity circulation must remain in force, as a necessary and very useful element in our system of national economy. How the formation of a single and united sector will come about, whether simply by the swallowing up of the collective-farm sector by the state sector - which is hardly likely (because that would be looked upon as the expropriation of the collective farms) - or by the setting up of a single national economic body (comprising representatives of state industry and of the collective farms), with the right at first to keep account of all consumer product in the country, and eventually also to distribute it, by way, say, of products-exchange - is a special question which requires separate discussion.

Consequently, our commodity production is not of the ordinary type, but is a special kind of commodity production, commodity production without capitalists, which is concerned mainly with the goods of associated socialist producers (the state, the collective farms, the cooperatives), the sphere of action of which is confined to items of personal consumption, which obviously cannot possibly develop into capitalist production, and which, together with its "money economy," is designed to serve the development and consolidation of socialist production.

Absolutely mistaken, therefore, are those comrades who allege that, since socialist society has not abolished commodity forms of production, we are bound to have the reappearance of all the economic categories characteristic of capitalism: labour power as a commodity, surplus value, capital, capitalist profit, the average rate of profit, etc. These comrades confuse commodity production with capitalist production, and believe that once there is commodity production there must also be capitalist production. They do not realize that our commodity production radically differs from commodity production under capitalism.

Further, I think that we must also discard certain other concepts taken from Marx's Capital - where Marx was concerned with an analysis of capitalism - and artificially applied to our socialist relations. I am referring to such concepts, among others, as "necessary" and "surplus" labour, "necessary" and "surplus" product, "necessary" and "surplus" time. Marx analyzed capitalism in order to elucidate the source of exploitation of the working class - surplus value - and to arm the working class, which was bereft of means of production, with an intellectual weapon for the overthrow of capitalism. It is natural that Marx used concepts (categories) which fully corresponded to capitalist relations. But it is strange, to say the least, to use these concepts now, when the working class is not only not bereft of power and means of production, but, on the contrary, is in possession of the power and controls the means of production. Talk of labour power being a commodity, and of "hiring" of workers sounds

rather absurd now, under our system: as though the working class, which possesses means of production, hires itself and sells its labour power to itself. It is just as strange to speak now of "necessary" and "surplus" labour: as though, under our conditions, the labour contributed by the workers to society for the extension of production, the promotion of education and public health, the organization of defence, etc., is not just as necessary to the working class, now in power, as the labour expended to supply the personal needs of the worker and his family.

It should be remarked that in his Critique of the Gotha Program, where it is no longer capitalism that he is investigating, but, among other things, the first phase of communist society, Marx recognizes labour contributed to society for extension of production, for education and public health, for administrative expenses, for building up reserves, etc., to be just as necessary as the labour expended to supply the consumption requirements of the working class.

I think that our economists should put an end to this in-congruity between the old concepts and the new state of affairs in our socialist country, by replacing the old concepts with new ones that correspond to the new situation.

We could tolerate this incongruity for a certain period, but the time has come to put an end to it.

1. Ibid., p. 392.

3. The Law of Value Under Socialism

It is sometimes asked whether the law of value exists and operates in our country, under the socialist system.

Yes, it does exist and does operate. Wherever commodities and commodity production exist, there the law of value must also exist.

In our country, the sphere of operation of the law of value extends, first of all, to commodity circulation, to the ex-change of commodities through purchase and sale, the ex-change, chiefly, of articles of personal consumption. Here, in this sphere, the law of value preserves, within certain limits, of course, the function of a regulator.

But the operation of the law of value is not confined to the sphere of commodity circulation. It also extends to production. True, the law of value has no regulating function in our socialist production, but it nevertheless influences production, and this fact cannot be ignored when directing production. As a matter of fact, consumer goods, which are needed to compensate the labour power expended in the process of production, are produced and realized in our country as commodities coming under the operation of the law of value. It is precisely here that the law of value exercises its influence on production. In this connection, such things as cost accounting and profitability, production costs, prices, etc., are of actual importance in our enterprises. Consequently, our enterprises cannot, and must not, function without taking the law of value into account.

Is this a good thing? It is not a bad thing. Under present conditions, it really is not a bad thing, since it trains our business executives to conduct production on rational lines and disciplines them. It is not a bad thing because it teaches our executives to count production magnitudes, to count them accurately, and also to calculate the real things in production precisely, and not

to talk nonsense about "approximate figures," spun out of thin air. It is not a bad thing because it teaches our executives to look for, find and utilize hidden reserves latent in production, and not to trample them under-foot. It is not a bad thing because it teaches our executives systematically to improve methods of production, to lower production costs, to practise cost accounting, and to make their enterprises pay. It is a good practical school which accelerates the development of our executive personnel and their growth into genuine leaders of socialist production at the present stage of development.

The trouble is not that production in our country is influenced by the law of value. The trouble is that our business executives and planners, with few exceptions, are poorly acquainted with the operations of the law of value, do not study them, and are unable to take account of them in their computations. This, in fact, explains the confusion that still reigns in the sphere of price-fixing policy. Here is one of many examples. Some time ago it was decided to adjust the prices of cotton and grain in the interest of cotton growing, to establish more accurate prices for grain sold to the cotton growers, and to raise the prices of cotton delivered to the state. Our business executives and planners submitted a proposal on this score which could not but astound the members of the Central Committee, since it suggested fixing the price of a ton of grain at practically the same level as a ton of cotton, and, moreover, the price of a ton of grain was taken as equivalent to that of a ton of baked bread. In reply to the remarks of members of the Central Committee that the price of a ton of bread must be higher than that of a ton of grain, because of the additional expense of milling and baking, and that cotton was generally much dearer than grain, as was also borne out by their prices in the world market, the authors of the proposal could find nothing coherent to say. The Central Committee was therefore obliged to take the matter into its own hands and to lower the prices of grain and raise the prices of cotton. What would have happened if the proposal of these comrades had received legal force? We should have ruined the cotton growers and would have found ourselves without cotton.

But does this mean that the operation of the law of value has as much scope with us as it has under capitalism, and that it is the regulator of production in our country too? No, it does not. Actually, the sphere of operation of the law of value under our economic system is strictly limited and placed within definite bounds. It has already been said that the sphere of operation of commodity production is restricted and placed within definite bounds by our system. The same must be said of the sphere of operation of the law of value. Undoubtedly, the fact that private ownership of the means of production does not exist, and that the means of production both in town and country are socialized, cannot but restrict the sphere of operation of the law of value and the extent of its influence on production.

In this same direction operates the law of balanced (proportionate) development of the national economy, which has superseded the law of competition and anarchy of production.

In this same direction, too, operate our yearly and five-yearly plans and our economic policy generally, which are based on the requirements of the law of balanced development of the national economy.

The effect of all this, taken together, is that the sphere of operation of the law of value in our country is strictly limited, and that the law of value cannot under our system function as the regulator of production.

This, indeed, explains the "striking" fact that whereas in our country the law of value, in spite of the steady and rapid expansion of our socialist production, does not lead to crises of overproduction, in the capitalist countries this same law, whose sphere of operation is very wide under capitalism, does lead, in spite of the low rate of expansion of production, to periodical crises of overproduction.

It is said that the law of value is a permanent law, binding upon all periods of historical development, and that if it does lose its function as a regulator of exchange relations in the second phase of communist society, it retains at this phase of development its function as a regulator of the relations between the various branches of production, as a regulator of the distribution of labour among them.

That is quite untrue. Value, like the law of value, is a historical category connected with the existence of commodity production. With the disappearance of commodity production, value and its forms and the law of value also disappear.

In the second phase of communist society, the amount of labour expended on the production of goods will be measured not in a roundabout way, not through value and its forms, as is the case under commodity production, but directly and immediately - by the amount of time, the number of hours, expended on the production of goods. As to the distribution of labour, its distribution among the branches of production will be regulated not by the law of value, which will have ceased to function by that time, but by the growth of society's demand for goods. It will be a society in which production will be regulated by the requirements of society, and computation of the requirements of society will acquire paramount importance for the planning bodies.

Totally incorrect, too, is the assertion that under our present economic system, in the first phase of development of communist society, the law of value regulates the "proportions" of labour distributed among the various branches of production.

If this were true, it would be incomprehensible why our light industries, which are the most profitable, are not being developed to the utmost, and why preference is given to our heavy industries, which are often less profitable, and some-times altogether unprofitable.

If this were true, it would be incomprehensible why a number of our heavy industry plants which are still unprofitable and where the labour of the worker does not yield the "proper returns," are not closed down, and why new light industry plants, which would certainly be profitable and where the labour of the workers might yield "big returns," are not opened.

If this were true, it would be incomprehensible why workers are not transferred from plants that are less profitable, but very necessary to our national economy, to plants which are more profitable - in accordance with the law of value, which supposedly regulates the "proportions" of labour distributed among the branches of production.

Obviously, if we were to follow the lead of these comrades, we should have to cease giving primacy to the production of means of production in favour of the production of articles of consumption. And what would be the effect of ceasing to give primacy to the production of the means of production? The effect would be to destroy the possibility of the continuous expansion of our national economy, because the national economy cannot be continuously expanded with-out giving primacy to the production of means of production.

These comrades forget that the law of value can be a regulator of production only under capitalism, with private ownership of the means of production, and competition, anarchy of production, and crises of overproduction. They forget that in our country the sphere of operation of the law of value is limited by the social ownership of the means of production, and by the law of balanced development of the national economy, and is consequently also limited by our yearly and five-yearly plans, which are an approximate reflection of the requirements of this law.

Some comrades draw the conclusion from this that the law of balanced development of the national economy and economic planning annul the principle of profitability of production. That is quite untrue. It is just the other way round. If profitability is considered not from the stand-point of individual plants or industries, and not over a period of one year, but from the standpoint of the entire national economy and over a period of, say, ten or fifteen years, which is the only correct approach to the question, then the temporary and unstable profitability of some plants or industries is beneath all comparison with that higher form of stable and permanent profitability which we get from the operation of the law of balanced development of the national economy and from economic planning, which save us from periodical economic crises disruptive to the national economy and causing tremendous material damage to society, and which ensure a continuous and high rate of expansion of our national economy.

In brief, there can be no doubt that under our present socialist conditions of production, the law of value cannot be a "regulator of the proportions" of labour distributed among the various branches of production.

4 Abolition of the Antithesis Between Town and Country, and Between Mental and Physical Labour, and Elimination of Distinctions Between Them

This heading covers a number of problems which essentially differ from one another. I combine them in one section, not in order to lump them together, but solely for brevity of exposition.

Abolition of the antithesis between town and country, between industry and agriculture, is a well-known problem which was discussed long ago by Marx and Engels. The economic basis of this antithesis is the exploitation of the country by the town, the expropriation of the peasantry and the ruin of the majority of the rural population by the whole course of development of industry, trade and credit under capitalism. Hence, the antithesis between town and country under capitalism must be regarded as an antagonism of interests. This it was that gave rise to the hostile attitude of the country towards the town and towards "townfolk" in general.

Undoubtedly, with the abolition of capitalism and the exploiting system in our country, and with the consolidation of the socialist system, the antagonism of interests between town and country, between industry and agriculture, was also bound to disappear. And that is what happened. The immense assistance rendered by the socialist town, by our working class, to our peasantry in eliminating the landlords and kulaks strengthened the foundation for the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, while the systematic supply of first-class tractors and other machines to the peasantry and its collective farms converted the alliance between the working class and the peasantry into friendship between them. Of course, the workers and the collective-farm peasantry do represent two classes differing from one another in status. But this difference does not weaken their friendship in any way. On the

contrary, their interests lie along one common line, that of strengthening the socialist system and attaining the victory of communism. It is not surprising, therefore, that not a trace remains of the former distrust, not to speak of the former hatred, of the country for the town.

All this means that the ground for the antithesis between town and country, between industry and agriculture, has already been eliminated by our present socialist system.

This, of course, does not mean that the effect of the abolition of the antithesis between town and country will be that "the great towns will perish" (1). Not only will the great towns not perish, but new great towns will appear as centres of the maximum development of culture, and as centres not only of large-scale industry, but also of the processing of agricultural produce and of powerful development of all branches of the food industry. This will facilitate the cultural progress of the nation and will tend to even up conditions of life in town and country.

We have a similar situation as regards the problem of the abolition of the antithesis between mental and physical labour. This too is a well-known problem which was discussed by Marx and Engels long ago. The economic basis of the antithesis between mental and physical labour is the exploitation of the physical workers by the mental workers. Everyone is familiar with the gulf which under capitalism divided the physical workers of enterprises from the managerial personnel. We know that this gulf gave rise to a hostile attitude on the part of the workers towards managers, foremen, engineers and other members of the technical staff, whom the workers regarded as their enemies. Naturally, with the abolition of capitalism and the exploiting system, the antagonism of interests between physical and mental labour was also bound to disappear. And it really has disappeared in our present socialist system. Today, the physical workers and the managerial personnel are not enemies, but comrades and friends, members of a single collective body of producers who are vitally interested in the progress and improvement of production. Not a trace remains of the former enmity between them.

Of quite a different character is the problem of the disappearance of distinctions between town (industry) and country (agriculture), and between physical and mental labour. This problem was not discussed in the Marxist classics. It is a new problem, one that has been raised practically by our socialist construction.

Is this problem an imaginary one? Has it any practical or theoretical importance for us? No, this problem cannot be considered an imaginary one. On the contrary, it is for us a problem of the greatest seriousness.

Take, for instance, the distinction between agriculture and industry. In our country it consists not only in the fact that the conditions of labour in agriculture differ from those in industry, but, mainly and chiefly, in the fact that whereas in industry we have public ownership of the means of production and of the product of industry, in agriculture we have not public, but group, collective-farm ownership. It has already been said that this fact leads to the preservation of commodity circulation, and that only when this distinction between industry and agriculture disappears, can commodity production with all its attendant consequences also disappear. It therefore cannot be denied that the disappearance of this essential distinction between agriculture and industry must be a matter of paramount importance for us.

The same must be said of the problem of the abolition of the essential distinction between mental labour and physical labour. It, too, is a problem of paramount importance for us.

Before the socialist emulation movement assumed mass proportions, the growth of our industry proceeded very haltingly, and many comrades even suggested that the rate of industrial development should be retarded. This was due chiefly to the fact that the cultural and technical level of the workers was too low and lagged far behind that of the technical personnel. But the situation changed radically when the socialist emulation movement assumed a mass character. It was from that moment on that industry began to advance at accelerated speed. Why did socialist emulation assume the character of a mass movement? Because among the workers whole groups of comrades came to the fore who had not only mastered the minimum requirements of technical knowledge, but had gone further and risen to the level of the technical personnel; they began to correct technicians and engineers, to break down the existing norms as antiquated, to introduce new and more up-to-date norms, and so on. What should we have had if not only isolated groups, but the majority of the workers had raised their cultural and technical level to that of the engineering and technical personnel? Our industry would have risen to a height unattainable by industry in other countries. It therefore cannot be denied that the abolition of the essential distinction between mental and physical labour by raising the cultural and technical level of the workers to that of the technical personnel cannot but be of paramount importance for us.

Some comrades assert that in the course of time not only will the essential distinction between industry and agriculture, and between physical and mental labour, disappear, but so will all distinction between them. That is not true. Abolition of the essential distinction between industry and agriculture cannot lead to the abolition of all distinction between them. Some distinction, even if inessential, will certainly remain, owing to the difference between the conditions of work in industry and in agriculture. Even in industry the conditions of labour are not the same in all its branches: the conditions of labour, for example, of coal miners differ from those of the workers of a mechanized shoe factory, and the conditions of labour of ore miners from those of engineering workers. If that is so, then all the more must a certain distinction remain between industry and agriculture.

The same must be said of the distinction between mental and physical labour. The essential distinction between them, the difference in their cultural and technical levels, will certainly disappear. But some distinction, even if inessential, will remain, if only because the conditions of labour of the managerial staffs and those of the workers are not identical.

The comrades who assert the contrary do so presumably on the basis of the formulation given in some of my statements, which speaks of the abolition of the distinction between industry and agriculture, and between mental and physical labour, without any reservation to the effect that what is meant is the abolition of the essential distinction, not of all distinction. That is exactly how the comrades understood my formulation, assuming that it implied the abolition of all distinction. But this indicates that the formulation was unprecise, unsatisfactory. It must be discarded and replaced by another formulation, one that speaks of the abolition of essential distinctions and the persistence of inessential distinctions between industry and agriculture, and between mental and physical labour.

1.4. Ibid., . 412.

5. Disintegration of the Single World Market and Deepening of the Crisis of the World Capitalist System

The disintegration of the single, all-embracing world market must be regarded as the most important economic sequel of the Second World War and of its economic consequences. It has had the effect of further deepening the general crisis of the world capitalist system.

The Second World War was itself a product of this crisis. Each of the two capitalist coalitions which locked horns in the war calculated on defeating its adversary and gaining world supremacy. It was in this that they sought a way out of the crisis. The United States of America hoped to put its most dangerous competitors, Germany and Japan, out of action, seize foreign markets and the world's raw material resources, and establish its world supremacy.

But the war did not justify these hopes. It is true that Germany and Japan were put out of action as competitors of the three major capitalist countries: the U.S.A., Great Britain and France. But at the same time China and other, European, people's democracies broke away from the capitalist system and, together with the Soviet Union, formed a united and powerful socialist camp confronting the camp of capitalism. The economic consequence of the existence of two opposite camps was that the single all-embracing world market disintegrated, so that now we have two parallel world markets, also confronting one another.

It should be observed that the USA, and Great Britain and France, themselves contributed - without themselves desiring it, of course - to the formation and consolidation of the new, parallel world market. They imposed an economic blockade on the U.S.S.R., China and the European people's democracies, which did not join the "Marshall plan" system, thinking thereby to strangle them. The effect, how-ever, was not to strangle, but to strengthen the new world market.

But the fundamental thing, of course, is not the economic blockade, but the fact that since the war these countries have joined together economically and established economic cooperation and mutual assistance. The experience of this cooperation shows that not a single capitalist country could have rendered such effective and technically competent assistance to the people's democracies as the Soviet Union is rendering them. The point is not only that this assistance is the cheapest possible and technically superb. The chief point is that at the bottom of this cooperation lies a sincere desire to help one another and to promote the economic progress of all. The result is a fast pace of industrial development in these countries. It may be confidently said that, with this pace of industrial development, it will soon come to pass that these countries will not only be in no need of imports from capitalist countries, but will themselves feel the necessity of finding an outside market for their surplus products.

But it follows from this that the sphere of exploitation of the world's resources by the major capitalist countries (U.S.A., Britain, France) will not expand, but contract; that their opportunities for sale in the world market will deteriorate, and that their industries will be operating more and more below capacity. That, in fact, is what is meant by the deepening of the general crisis of the world capitalist system in connection with the disintegration of the world market.

This is felt by the capitalists themselves, for it would be difficult for them not to feel the loss of such markets as the U.S.S.R. and China. They are trying to offset these difficulties with the "Marshall plan," the war in Korea, frantic rearmament, and industrial militarization. But that is very much like a drowning man clutching at a straw.

This state of affairs has confronted the economists with two questions:

a) Can it be affirmed that the thesis expounded by Stalin before the Second World War regarding the relative stability of markets in the period of the general crisis of capitalism is still valid?

b) Can it be affirmed that the thesis expounded by Lenin in the spring of 1916 - namely, that, in spite of the decay of capitalism, "on the whole, capitalism is growing far more rapidly than before" (1) — is still valid?

I think that it cannot. In view of the new conditions to which the Second World War has given rise, both these theses must be regarded as having lost their validity.

1. V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1969, p. 151.

6. Inevitability of Wars Between Capitalist Countries

Some comrades hold that, owing to the development of new international conditions since the Second World War, wars between capitalist countries have ceased to be inevitable. They consider that the contradictions between the socialist camp and the capitalist camp are more acute than the contradictions among the capitalist countries; that the U.S.A. has brought the other capitalist countries sufficiently under its sway to be able to prevent them going to war among themselves and weakening one another; that the fore-most capitalist minds have been sufficiently taught by the two world wars and the severe damage they caused to the whole capitalist world not to venture to involve the capitalist countries in war with one another again - and that, because of all this, wars between capitalist countries are no longer inevitable.

These comrades are mistaken. They see the outward phenomena that come and go on the surface, but they do not see those profound forces which, although they are so far operating imperceptibly, will nevertheless determine the course of developments.

Outwardly, everything would seem to be "going well": the U.S.A. has put Western Europe, Japan and other capitalist countries on rations; Germany (Western), Britain, France, Italy and Japan have fallen into the clutches of the U.S.A. and are meekly obeying its commands. But it would be mistaken to think that things can continue to "go well" for "all eternity," that these countries will tolerate the domination and oppression of the United States endlessly, that they will not endeavour to tear loose from American bondage and take the path of independent development.

Take, first of all, Britain and France. Undoubtedly, they are imperialist countries. Undoubtedly, cheap raw materials and secure markets are of paramount importance to them. Can it be assumed that they will endlessly tolerate the present situation, in which, under the guise of "Marshall plan aid," Americans are penetrating into the economies of Britain and France and trying to convert them into adjuncts of the economy, and American capital is seizing rawmaterials in the British and French colonies and thereby plotting disaster for the high profits of the British and French capitalists? Would it not be truer to say that capitalist Britain, and, after her, capitalist France, will be compelled in the end to break from the embrace of the U.S.A. and enter into conflict with it in order to secure an independent position and, of course, high profits?

Let us pass to the major vanquished countries, Germany (Western) and Japan. These countries are now languishing in misery under the jackboot of American imperialism. Their industry

and agriculture, their trade, their foreign and home policies, and their whole life are fettered by the American occupation "regime." Yet only yesterday these countries were great imperialist powers and were shaking the foundations of the domination of Britain, the U.S.A. and France in Europe and Asia. To think that these countries will not try to get on their feet again, will not try to smash the U.S. "regime," and force their way to independent development, is to believe in miracles.

It is said that the contradictions between capitalism and socialism are stronger than the contradictions among the capitalist countries. Theoretically, of course, that is true. It is not only true now, today; it was true before the Second World War. And it was more or less realized by the leaders of the capitalist countries. Yet the Second World War began not as a war with the U.S.S.R., but as a war between capitalist countries. Why? Firstly, because war with the U.S.S.R., as a socialist land, is more dangerous to capitalism than war between capitalist countries; for whereas war between capitalist countries puts in question only the supremacy of certain capitalist countries over others, war with the U.S.S.R. must certainly put in question the existence of capitalism itself. Secondly, because the capitalists, although they clamour, for "propaganda" purposes, about the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union, do not themselves believe that it is aggressive, because they are aware of the Soviet Union's peaceful policy and know that it will not itself attack capitalist countries.

After the First World War it was similarly believed that Germany had been definitely put out of action, just as certain comrades now believe that Japan and Germany have been definitely put out of action. Then, too, it was said and clamoured in the press that the United States had put Europe on rations; that Germany would never rise to her feet again, and that there would be no more wars between capitalist countries. In spite of this, Germany rose to her feet again as a great power within the space of some fifteen or twenty years after her defeat, having broken out of bondage and taken the path of independent development. And it is significant that it was none other than Britain and the United States that helped Germany to recover economically and to enhance her economic war potential. Of course, when the United States and Britain assisted Germany's economic recovery, they did so with a view to setting a recovered Germany against the Soviet Union, to utilizing her against the land of socialism. But Germany directed her forces in the first place against the Anglo-French-American bloc. And when Hitler Germany declared war on the Soviet Union, the Anglo-French-American bloc, far from joining with Hitler Germany, was compelled to enter into a coalition with the U.S.S.R. against Hitler Germany.

Consequently, the struggle of the capitalist countries for markets and their desire to crush their competitors proved in practice to be stronger than the contradictions between the capitalist camp and the socialist camp.

What guarantee is there, then, that Germany and Japan will not rise to their feet again, will not attempt to break out of American bondage and live their own independent lives? I think there is no such guarantee.

But it follows from this that the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries remains in force.

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

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

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

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

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

7. The Basic Economic Laws of Modern Capitalism and of Socialism

As you know, the question of the basic economic laws of capitalism and of socialism arose several times in the course of the discussion. Various views were expressed on this score, even the most fantastic. True, the majority of the participants in the discussion reacted feebly to the matter, and no decision on the point was indicated. However, none of the participants denied that such laws exist.

Is there a basic economic law of capitalism? Yes, there is. What is this law, and what are its characteristic features? The basic economic law of capitalism is such a law as determines not some particular aspect or particular processes of the development of capitalist production, but all the principal aspects and all the principal processes of its development - one, consequently, which determines the essence of capitalist production, its essential nature.

Is the law of value the basic economic law of capitalism? No. The law of value is primarily a law of commodity production. It existed before capitalism, and, like commodity production, will continue to exist after the overthrow of capitalism, as it does, for instance, in our country, although, it is true, with a restricted sphere of operation. Having a wide sphere of operation in capitalist conditions, the law of value, of course, plays a big part in the development of capitalist production. But not only does it not determine the essence of capitalist production and the principles of capitalist profit; it does not even pose these problems. Therefore, it cannot be the basic economic law of modern capitalism.

For the same reasons, the law of competition and anarchy of production, or the law of uneven development of capitalism in the various countries cannot be the basic economic law of capitalism either.

It is said that the law of the average rate of profit is the basic economic law of modern capitalism. That is not true. Modern capitalism, monopoly capitalism, cannot content it-self with the average profit, which moreover has a tendency to decline, in view of the increasing organic composition of capital. It is not the average profit, but the maximum profit that modern monopoly capitalism demands, which it needs for more or less regular extended reproduction.

Most appropriate to the concept of a basic economic law of capitalism is the law of surplus value, the law of the origin and growth of capitalist profit. It really does determine the basic features of capitalist production. But the law of surplus value is too general a law; it does not cover the problem of the highest rate of profit, the securing of which is a condition for the development of monopoly capitalism. In order to fill this hiatus, the law of surplus value must be made more concrete and developed further in adaptation to the conditions of monopoly capitalism, at the same time bearing in mind that monopoly capitalism demands not any sort of profit, but precisely the maximum profit. That will be the basic economic law of modern capitalism.

The main features and requirements of the basic economic law of modern capitalism might be formulated roughly, in this way: the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and, lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits.

It is said that the average profit might nevertheless be regarded as quite sufficient for capitalist development under modern conditions. That is not true. The average profit is the lowest point of profitableness, below which capitalist production becomes impossible. But it would be absurd to think that, in seizing colonies, subjugating peoples and engineering wars, the magnates of modern monopoly capital-ism are striving to secure only the average profit. No, it is not the average profit, nor yet super-profit - which, as a rule, represents only a slight addition to the average profit - but precisely the maximum profit that is the motor of monopoly capitalism. It is precisely the necessity of securing the maximum profits that drives monopoly capital-ism to such risky undertakings as the enslavement and systematic plunder of colonies and other backward countries, the conversion of a number of independent countries into dependent countries, the organization of new wars - which to the magnates of modern capitalism is the "business" best adapted to the extraction of the maximum profit - and, lastly, attempts to win world economic supremacy.

The importance of the basic economic law of capitalism consists, among other things, in the circumstance that, since it determines all the major phenomena in the development of the capitalist mode of production, its booms and crises, its victories and defeats, its merits and demerits - the whole process of its contradictory development - it enables us to understand and explain them.

Here is one of many "striking" examples.

We are all acquainted with facts from the history and practice of capitalism illustrative of the rapid development of technology under capitalism, when the capitalists appear as the standard-bearers of the most advanced techniques, as revolutionaries in the development of the technique of production. But we are also familiar with facts of a different kind, illustrative

of a halt in technical development under capitalism, when the capitalists appear as reactionaries in the development of new techniques and not infrequently resort to hand labour.

How is this howling contradiction to be explained? It can only be explained by the basic economic law of modern capitalism, that is, by the necessity of obtaining the maximum profit. Capitalism is in favour of new techniques when they promise it the highest profit. Capitalism is against new techniques, and for resort to hand labour, when the new techniques do not promise the highest profit.

That is how matters stand with the basic economic law of modern capitalism.

Is there a basic economic law of socialism? Yes, there is. What are the essential features and requirements of this law? The essential features and requirements of the basic law of socialism might be formulated roughly in this way: the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques.

Consequently: instead of maximum profits - maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of society; instead of development of production with breaks in continuity from boom to crisis and from crisis to boom - unbroken expansion of production; instead of periodic breaks in technical development, accompanied by destruction of the productive forces of society - an unbroken process of perfecting production on the basis of higher techniques.

It is said that the law of the balanced, proportionate development of the national economy is the basic economic law of socialism. That is not true. Balanced development of the national economy, and, hence, economic planning, which is a more or less faithful reflection of this law, can yield nothing by themselves, if it is not known for what purpose economic development is planned, or if that purpose is not clear. The law of balanced development of the national economy can yield the desired result only if there is a purpose for the sake of which economic development is planned. This purpose the law of balanced development of the national economy cannot itself provide. Still less can economic planning provide it. This purpose is inherent in the basic economic law of socialism, in the shape of its requirements, as expounded above. Consequently, the law of balanced development of the national economy can operate to its full scope only if its operation rests on the basic economic law of socialism.

As to economic planning, it can achieve positive results only if two conditions are observed : a) it correctly reflects the requirements of the law of balanced development of the national economy, and b) if it conforms in every way to the requirements of the basic economic law of socialism.

8. Other Questions

1) Extra-economic coercion under feudalism.

Of course, extra-economic coercion did play a part in strengthening the economic power of the feudal landlords; however, not it, but feudal ownership of the land was the basis of feudalism.

2) Personal property of the collective-farm household.

It would be wrong to say, as the draft textbook does, that "every household in a collective farm has in personal use a cow, small livestock and poultry." Actually, as we know, it is not in personal use, but as personal property that the collective-farm household has its cow, small livestock, poultry, etc. The expression "in personal use" has evidently been taken from the Model Rules of the Agricultural Artel. But a mistake was made in the Model Rules of the Agricultural Artel. The Constitution of the U.S.S.R., which was drafted more carefully, puts it differently, viz.:

"Every household in a collective farm . . . has as its personal property a subsidiary husbandry on the plot, a dwelling house, livestock, poultry and minor agricultural implements."

That, of course, is correct.

It would be well, in addition, to state more particularly that every collective farmer has as his personal property from one to so many cows, depending on local conditions, so many sheep, goats, pigs (the number also depending on local conditions), and an unlimited quantity of poultry (ducks, geese, hens, turkeys).

Such detailed particulars are of great importance for our comrades abroad, who want to know what exactly has remained as the personal property of the collective-farm household now that agriculture in our country has been collectivized.

3) Total rent paid by the peasants to the landlords; also total expenditure on the purchase of land.

The draft textbook says that as a result of the nationalization of the land, "the peasantry were released from paying rent to the landlords to a total of about 500 million rubles annually" (it should be "gold" rubles). This figure should be verified, because it seems to me that it does not include the rent paid over the whole of Russia, but only in a majority of the Russian gubernias. It should also be borne in mind that in some of the border regions of Russia rent was paid in kind, a fact which the authors of the draft text-book have evidently overlooked. Furthermore, it should be remembered that the peasants were released not only from the payment of rent, but also from annual expenditure for the purchase of land. Was this taken into account in the draft textbook? It seems to me that it was not; but it should have been.

4) Coalescence of the monopolies with the state machine.

The word "coalescence" is not appropriate. It superficially and descriptively notes the process of merging of the monopolies with the state, but it does not reveal the economic import of this process. The fact of the matter is that the merging process is not simply a process of coalescence, but the subjugation of the state machine to the monopolies. The word "coalescence" should therefore be discarded and replaced by the words "subjugation of the state machine to the monopolies."

5) Use of machines in the U.S.S.R.

The draft textbook says that "in the U.S.S.R. machines are used in all cases when they economize the labour of society." That is by no means what should be said. In the first place, machines in the U.S.S.R. always economize the labour of society, and we accordingly do not know of any cases in the U.S.S.R. where they have not economized the labour of society. In

the second place, machines not only economize labour; they also lighten the labour of the worker, and accordingly, in our conditions, in contradistinction to the conditions of capitalism, the workers use machines in the processes of labour with the greatest eagerness.

It should therefore be said that nowhere are machines used so willingly as in the U.S.S.R., because they economize the labour of society and lighten the labour of the worker, and, as there is no unemployment in the U.S.S.R., the workers use machines in the national economy with the greatest eagerness.

6) Living standards of the working class in capitalist countries.

Usually, when speaking of the living standards of the working class, what is meant is only the standards of employed workers, and not of what is known as the reserve army of unemployed. Is such an attitude to the question of the living standards of the working class correct? I think it is not. If there is a reserve army of unemployed, whose members cannot live except by the sale of their labour power, then the unemployed must necessarily form part of the working class; and if they do form part of the working class, then their destitute condition cannot but influence the living standards of the workers engaged in production. I therefore think that when describing the living standards of the working class in capitalist countries, the condition of the reserve army of unemployed workers should also be taken into account.

7) National income. I think it absolutely necessary to add a chapter on national income to the draft textbook.

8) Should there be a special chapter in the textbook on Lenin and Stalin as the founders of the political economy of socialism?

I think that the chapter, "The Marxist Theory of Socialism. Founding of the Political Economy of Socialism by V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin," should be excluded from the textbook. It is entirely unnecessary, since it adds nothing, and only colourlessly reiterates what has already been said in greater detail in earlier chapters of the textbook.

As regards the other questions, I have no remarks to make on the "Proposals" of Comrades Ostrovityanov, Leontyev, Shepilov, Gatovsky, etc.

9. International Importance of a Marxist Textbook on Political Economy

I think that the comrades do not appreciate the importance of a Marxist textbook on political economy as fully as they should. It is needed not only by our Soviet youth. It is particularly needed by Communists and communist sympathizers in all countries. Our comrades abroad want to know how we broke out of capitalist slavery; how we rebuilt the economy of our country on socialist lines; how we secured the friendship of the peasantry; how we managed to convert a country which was only so recently poverty-stricken and weak into a rich and mighty country; what are the collective farms; why, although the means of production are socialized, we do not abolish commodity production, money, trade, etc. They want to know all this, and much else, not out of mere curiosity, but in order to learn from us and to utilize our experience in their own countries. Consequently, the appearance of a good Marxist textbook on political economy is not only of political importance at home, but also of great international importance.

What is needed, therefore, is a textbook which might serve as a reference book for the revolutionary youth not only at home, but also abroad. It must not be too bulky, because an over-bulky textbook cannot be a reference book and is difficult to assimilate, to master. But it must contain everything fundamental relating both to the economy of our country and to the economy of capitalism and the colonial system.

During the discussion, some comrades proposed the inclusion in the textbook of a number of additional chapters: the historians — on history, the political scientists — on politics, the philosophers — on philosophy, the economists — on economics. But the effect of this would be to swell the text-book to unwieldy dimensions. That, of course, must not be done. The textbook employs the historical method to illustrate problems of political economy, but that does not mean that we must turn a textbook on political economy into a history of economic relations.

What we need is a textbook of 500 pages, 600 at most, no more. This would be a reference book on Marxist political economy — and an excellent gift to the young Communists of all countries.

Incidentally, in view of the inadequate level of Marxist development of the majority of the Communist Parties abroad, such a textbook might also be of great use to communist cadres abroad who are no longer young.

10. Ways of Improving the Draft Textbook on Political Economy

During the discussion some comrades "ran down" the draft textbook much too assiduously, berated its authors for errors and oversights, and claimed that the draft was a failure. That is unfair. Of course, there are errors and oversights in the textbook — they are to be found in practically every big undertaking. Be that as it may, the overwhelming majority of the participants in the discussion were nevertheless of the opinion that the draft might serve as a basis for the future textbook and only needed certain corrections and additions. Indeed, one has only to compare the draft with the textbooks on political economy already in circulation to see that the draft stands head and shoulders above them. For that the authors of the draft deserve great credit.

I think that in order to improve the draft textbook, it would be well to appoint a small committee which would include not only the authors of the textbook, and not only supporters, but also opponents of the majority of the participants in the discussion, out-and-out critics of the draft textbook.

It would also be well to include in the committee a competent statistician to verify the figures and to supply additional statistical material for the draft, as well as a competent jurist to verify the accuracy of the formulations.

The members of the committee should be temporarily relieved of all other work and should be well provided for, so that they might devote themselves entirely to the textbook.

Furthermore, it would be well to appoint an editorial committee, of say three persons, to take care of the final editing of the textbook. This is necessary also in order to achieve unity of style, which, unfortunately, the draft text-book lacks.

Time limit for presentation of the finished textbook to the Central Committee — one year.

J. Stalin February 1, 1952

Economic Problems of the USSR

Reply to Comrade Alexander Ilyich Notkin
Comrade Notkin,

I was in no hurry to reply, because I saw no urgency in the questions you raised. All the more so because there are other questions which are urgent, and which naturally deflected attention from your letter.

I shall answer point by point.

The first point.

There is a statement in the "Remarks" to the effect that society is not powerless against the laws of science, that man, having come to know economic laws, can utilize them in the interests of society. You assert that this postulate cannot be extended to other social formations, that it holds good only under socialism and communism, that the elemental character of the economic processes under capitalism, for example, makes it impossible for society to utilize economic laws in the interests of society.

That is not true. At the time of the bourgeois revolution in France, for instance, the bourgeoisie utilized against feudalism the law that relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces, over-threw the feudal relations of production, created new, bourgeois relations of production, and brought them into conformity with the character of the productive forces which had arisen in the bosom of the feudal system. The bourgeoisie did this not because of any particular abilities it possessed, but because it was vitally interested in doing so. The feudal lords put up resistance to this not from stupidity, but because they were vitally interested in preventing this law from becoming effective.

The same must be said of the socialist revolution in our country. The working class utilized the law that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the productive forces, overthrew the bourgeois relations of production, created new, socialist relations of production and brought them into conformity with the character of the productive forces. It was able to do so not because of any particular abilities it possessed, but because it was vitally interested in doing so. The bourgeoisie, which from an advanced force at the dawn of the bourgeois revolution had already become a counter-revolutionary force, offered every resistance to the implementation of this law - and it did so not because it lacked organization, and not because the elemental nature of economic processes drove it to resist, but chiefly because it was to its vital interest that the law should not become operative.

Consequently:

1. Economic processes, economic laws are in one degree or another utilized in the interests of society not only under socialism and communism, but under other formations as well;
2. The utilization of economic laws in class society always and everywhere has a class background, and, moreover, always and everywhere the champion of the utilization of economic laws in the interests of society is the advanced class, while the obsolescent classes resist it.

The difference in this matter between the proletariat and the other classes which at any time in the course of history revolutionized the relations of production consists in the fact that the class interests of the proletariat merge with the interests of the overwhelming majority of society, because proletarian revolution implies the abolition not of one or another form of exploitation, but of all exploitation, while the revolutions of other classes, which abolished only one or another form of exploitation, were confined within the limits of their narrow class interests, which conflicted with the interests of the majority of society.

The "Remarks" speak of the class background of the utilization of economic laws in the interests of society. It is stated there that "unlike the laws of natural science, where the discovery and application of a new law proceeds more or less smoothly, the discovery and application of a new law in the economic field, affecting as it does the interests of obsolescent forces of society, meets with the most powerful resistance on their part." (1) This point you missed.

The second point.

You assert that complete conformity of the relations of production with the character of the productive forces can be achieved only under socialism and communism, and that under other formations the conformity can only be partial.

This is not true. In the epoch following the bourgeois revolution, when the bourgeoisie had shattered the feudal relations of production and established bourgeois relations of production, there undoubtedly were periods when the bourgeois production relations did fully conform with the character of the productive forces. Otherwise, capitalism could not have developed as swiftly as it did after the bourgeois revolution.

Further, the words "full conformity" must not be understood in the absolute sense. They must not be understood as meaning that there is altogether no lagging of the relations of production behind the growth of the productive forces under socialism. The productive forces are the most mobile and revolutionary forces of production. They undeniably move in advance of the relations of production even under socialism. Only after a certain lapse of time do the relations of production change in line with the character of the productive forces.

How, then, are the words "full conformity" to be understood? They are to be understood as meaning that under socialism things do not usually go to the length of a conflict between the relations of production and the productive forces, that society is in a position to take timely steps to bring the lagging relations of production into conformity with the character of the productive forces. Socialist society is in a position to do so because it does not include the obsolescent classes that might organize resistance. Of course, even under socialism there will be backward, inert forces that do not realize the necessity for changing the relations of production; but they, of course, will not be difficult to overcome without bringing matters to a conflict.

The third point.

It appears from your argument that you regard the means of production, and, in the first place, the implements of production produced by our nationalized enterprises, as commodities.

Can means of production be regarded as commodities in our socialist system? In my opinion they certainly cannot.

A commodity is a product which may be sold to any purchaser, and when its owner sells it, he loses ownership of it and the purchaser becomes the owner of the commodity, which he may resell, pledge or allow to rot. Do means of production come within this category? They obviously do not. In the first place, means of production are not "sold" to any purchaser, they are not "sold" even to collective farms; they are only allocated by the state to its enterprises. In the second place, when transferring means of production to any enterprise, their owner - the state - does not at all lose the ownership of them; on the contrary, it retains it fully. In the third place, directors of enterprises who receive means of production from the Soviet state, far from becoming their owners, are deemed to be the agents of the state in the utilization of the means of production in accordance with the plans established by the state.

It will be seen, then, that under our system means of production can certainly not be classed in the category of commodities.

Why, in that case, do we speak of the value of means of production, their cost of production, their price, etc.?

For two reasons.

Firstly, this is needed for purposes of calculation and settlement, for determining whether enterprises are paying or running at a loss, for checking and controlling the enterprises. But that is only the formal aspect of the matter.

Secondly, it is needed in order, in the interests of our foreign trade, to conduct sales of means of production to foreign countries. Here, in the sphere of foreign trade, but only in this sphere, our means of production really are commodities, and really are sold (in the direct meaning of the term).

It therefore follows that in the sphere of foreign trade the means of production produced by our enterprises retain the properties of commodities both essentially and formally, but that in the sphere of domestic economic circulation, means of production lose the properties of commodities, cease to be commodities and pass out of the sphere of operation of the law of value, retaining only the outward integument of commodities (calculation, etc.).

How is this peculiarity to be explained?

The fact of the matter is that in our socialist conditions economic development proceeds not by way of upheavals, but by way of gradual changes, the old not simply being abolished out of hand, but changing its nature in adaptation to the new, and retaining only its form; while the new does not simply destroy the old, but infiltrates into it, changes its nature and its functions, without smashing its form, but utilizing it for the development of the new. This, in our economic circulation, is true not only of commodities, but also of money, as well as of banks, which, while they lose their old functions and acquire new ones, preserve their old form, which is utilized by the socialist system.

If the matter is approached from the formal angle, from the angle of the processes taking place on the surface of phenomena, one may arrive at the incorrect conclusion that the categories of

capitalism retain their validity under our economy. If, however, the matter is approached from the standpoint of Marxist analysis, which strictly distinguishes between the substance of an economic process and its form, between the deep processes of development and the surface phenomena, one comes to the only correct conclusion, namely, that it is chiefly the form, the outward appearance, of the old categories of capitalism that have remained in our country, but that their essence has radically changed in adaptation to the requirements of the development of the socialist economy.

The fourth point.

You assert that the law of value exercises a regulating influence on the prices of the "means of production" produced by agriculture and delivered to the state at the procurement prices. You refer to such "means of production" as raw materials - cotton, for instance. You might have added flax, wool and other agricultural raw materials.

It should first of all be observed that in this case it is not "means of production" that agriculture produces, but only one of the means of production - raw materials. The words "means of production" should not be juggled with. When Marxists speak of the production of means of production, what they primarily have in mind is the production of implements of production, what Marx calls "the instruments of labour, those of a mechanical nature, which, taken as a whole, we may call the bone and muscles of production," which constitute the "characteristics of a given epoch of production." (2) To equate a part of the means of production (raw materials) with the means of production, including the implements of production, is to sin against Marxism, because Marxism considers that the implements of production play a decisive role compared with all other means of production. Everyone knows that, by themselves, raw materials cannot produce implements of production, although certain kinds of raw material are necessary for the production of implements of production, while no raw material can be produced without implements of production.

Further: is the influence of the law of value on the price of raw materials produced by agriculture a regulating influence, as you, Comrade Notkin, claim? It would be a regulating one, if prices of agricultural raw materials had "free" play in our country, if the law of competition and anarchy of production prevailed, if we did not have a planned economy, and if the production of raw materials were not regulated by plan. But since all these "ifs" are missing in our economic system, the influence of the law of value on the price of agricultural raw materials cannot be a regulating one. In the first place, in our country prices of agricultural raw materials are fixed, established by plan, and are not "free." In the second place, the quantities of agricultural raw materials produced are not determined spontaneously or by chance elements, but by plan. In the third place, the implements of production needed for the producing of agricultural raw materials are concentrated not in the hands of individuals, or groups of individuals, but in the hands of the state. What then, after this, remains of the regulating function of the law of value? It appears that the law of value is itself regulated by the above-mentioned factors characteristic of socialist production.

Consequently, it cannot be denied that the law of value does influence the formation of prices of agricultural raw materials, that it is one of the factors in this process. But still less can it be denied that its influence is not, and cannot be, a regulating one.

The fifth point.

When speaking, in my "Remarks," of the profitableness of the socialist national economy, I was controverting certain comrades who allege that, by not giving great preference to profitable enterprises, and by tolerating the existence side by side with them of unprofitable enterprises, our planned economy is killing the very principle of profitableness of economic undertakings. The "Remarks" say that profitableness considered from the standpoint of individual plants or industries is beneath all comparison with that higher form of profitableness which we get from our socialist mode of production, which saves us from crises of overproduction and ensures us a continuous expansion of production.

But it would be mistaken to conclude from this that the profitableness of individual plants and industries is of no particular value and is not deserving of serious attention. That, of course, is not true. The profitableness of individual plants and industries is of immense value for the development of our industry. It must be taken into account both when planning construction and when planning production. It is an elementary requirement of our economic activity at the present stage of development.

The sixth point.

It is not clear how your words "extended production in strongly deformed guise" in reference to capitalism are to be understood. It should be said that such production, and extended production at that, does not occur in nature.

It is evident that, after the world market has split, and the sphere of exploitation of the world's resources by the major capitalist countries (U.S.A., Britain, France) has begun to contract, the cyclical character of the development of capitalism - expansion and contraction of production - must continue to operate. However, expansion of production in these countries will proceed on a narrower basis, since the volume of production in these countries will diminish.

The seventh point.

The general crisis of the world capitalist system began in the period of the First World War, particularly due to the falling away of the Soviet Union from the capitalist system. That was the first stage in the general crisis. A second stage in the general crisis developed in the period of the Second World War, especially after the European and Asian people's democracies fell away from the capitalist system. The first crisis, in the period of the First World War, and the second crisis, in the period of the Second World War, must not be regarded as separate, unconnected and independent crises, but as stages in the development of the general crisis of the world capitalist system.

Is the general crisis of world capitalism only a political, or only an economic crisis? Neither the one, nor the other. It is a general, i.e., all-round crisis of the world capitalist system, embracing both the economic and the political spheres. And it is clear that at the bottom of it lies the ever-increasing decay of the world capitalist economic system, on the one hand, and the growing economic might of the countries which have fallen away from capitalism — the U.S.S.R., China and the other people's democracies — on the other.

J. Stalin

April 21, 1952

1. See p. 6 of this book.
2. Karl Marx, Capital, Eng. ed., Vol. I, Chapter 5. Section I.

Concerning the Errors of Comrade L. D. Yaroshenko

Some time ago the members of the Political Bureau of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.) received a letter from Comrade Yaroshenko, dated March 20, 1952, on a number of economic questions which were debated at the November discussion. The author of the letter complains that the basic documents summing up the discussion, and Comrade Stalin's "Remarks," "contain no reflection whatever of the opinion" of Comrade Yaroshenko. Comrade Yaroshenko also suggests in his note that he should be allowed to write a "Political Economy of Socialism," to be completed in a year or a year and a half, and that he should be given two assistants to help him in the work.

I think that both Comrade Yaroshenko's complaint and his proposal need to be examined on their merits.

Let us begin with the complaint.

Well, then, what is the "opinion" of Comrade Yaroshenko which has received no reflection whatever in the above-mentioned documents?

I. Comrade Yaroshenko's Chief Error

To describe Comrade Yaroshenko's opinion in a couple of words, it should be said that it is un-Marxist - and, hence, profoundly erroneous.

Comrade Yaroshenko's chief error is that he forsakes the Marxist position on the question of the role of the productive forces and of the relations of production in the development of society, that he inordinately overrates the role of the productive forces, and just as inordinately underrates the role of the relations of production, and ends up by declaring that under socialism the relations of production are a component part of the productive forces.

Comrade Yaroshenko is prepared to grant the relations of production a certain role under the conditions of "antagonistic class contradictions," inasmuch as there the relations of production "run counter to the development of the productive forces." But he confines it to a purely negative role, the role of a factor which retards the development of the productive forces, which fetters their development. Any other functions, positive functions, of the relations of production, Comrade Yaroshenko fails to see.

As to the socialist system, where "antagonistic class contradictions" no longer exist, and where the relations of production "no longer run counter to the development of the productive forces," here, according to Comrade Yaroshenko, the relations of production lose every vestige of an independent role, they cease to be a serious factor of development, and are absorbed by the productive forces, becoming a component part of them. Under socialism, Comrade Yaroshenko says, "men's production relations become part of the organization of the productive forces, as a means, an element of their organization." (1)

If that is so, what is the chief task of the "Political Economy of Socialism"? Comrade Yaroshenko replies: "The chief problem of the Political Economy of Socialism, therefore, is not to investigate the relations of production of the members of socialist society; it is to

elaborate and develop a scientific theory of the organization of the productive forces in social production, a theory of the planning of economic development." (2)

That, in fact, explains why Comrade Yaroshenko is not interested in such economic questions of the socialist system as the existence of different forms of property in our economy, commodity circulation, the law of value, etc., which he believes to be minor questions that only give rise to scholastic disputes. He plainly declares that in his Political Economy of Socialism "disputes as to the role of any particular category of socialist political economy - value, commodity, money, credit, etc., - which very often with us are of a scholastic character, are replaced by a healthy discussion of the rational organization of the productive forces in social production, by a scientific demonstration of the validity of such organization."(3)

In short, political economy without economic problems.

Comrade Yaroshenko thinks that it is enough to arrange a "rational organization of the productive forces," and the transition from socialism to communism will take place without any particular difficulty. He considers that this is quite sufficient for the transition to communism. He plainly declares that "under socialism, the basic struggle for the building of a communist society reduces itself to a struggle for the proper organization of the productive forces and their rational utilization in social production." Comrade Yaroshenko solemnly proclaims that "Communism is the highest scientific organization of the productive forces in social production." (4)

It appears, then, that the essence of the communist system begins and ends with the "rational organization of the productive forces."

From all this, Comrade Yaroshenko concludes that there cannot be a single political economy for all social formations, that there must be two political economies: one for pre-socialist social formations, the subject of investigation of which is men's relations of production, and the other for the socialist system, the subject of investigation of which should be not the production, i.e., the economic, relations, but the rational organization of the productive forces.

Such is the opinion of Comrade Yaroshenko.

What can be said of this opinion?

It is not true, in the first place, that the role of the relations of production in the history of society has been confined to that of a brake, a fetter on the development of the productive forces. When Marxists speak of the retarding role of the relations of production, it is not all relations of production they have in mind, but only the old relations of production, which no longer conform to the growth of the productive forces and, consequently, retard their development. But, as we know, besides the old, there are also new relations of production, which supersede the old. Can it be said that the role of the new relations of production is that of a brake on the productive forces? No, it cannot. On the contrary, the new relations of production are the chief and decisive force, the one which in fact determines the further, and, moreover, powerful, development of the productive forces, and without which the latter would be doomed to stagnation, as is the case today in the capitalist countries.

Nobody can deny that the development of the productive forces of our Soviet industry has made tremendous strides in the period of the five-year plans. But this development would not

have occurred if we had not, in October 1917, re-placed the old, capitalist relations of production by new, socialist relations of production. Without this revolution in the production, the economic, relations of our country, our productive forces would have stagnated, just as they are stagnating today in the capitalist countries.

Nobody can deny that the development of the productive forces of our agriculture has made tremendous strides in the past twenty or twenty-five years. But this development would not have occurred if we had not in the 'thirties re-placed the old, capitalist production relations in the country-side by new, collectivist production relations. Without this revolution in production, the productive forces of our agriculture would have stagnated, just as they are stagnating today in the capitalist countries.

Of course, new relations of production cannot, and do not, remain new forever; they begin to grow old and to run counter to the further development of the productive forces; they begin to lose their role of principal mainspring of the productive forces, and become a brake on them. At this point, in place of these production relations which have become antiquated, new production relations appear whose role it is to be the principal mainspring spurring the further development of the productive forces.

This peculiar development of the relations of production from the role of a brake on the productive forces to that of the principal mainspring impelling them forward, and from the role of principal mainspring to that of a brake on the productive forces, constitutes one of the chief elements of the Marxist materialist dialectics. Every novice in Marxism knows that nowadays. But Comrade Yaroshenko, it appears, does not know it.

It is not true, in the second place, that the production, i.e., the economic, relations lose their independent role under socialism, that they are absorbed by the productive forces, that social production under socialism is reduced to the organization of the productive forces. Marxism regards social production as an integral whole which has two inseparable sides: the productive forces of society (the relation of society to the forces of nature, in contest with which it secures the material values it needs), and the relations of production (the relations of men to one another in the process of production). These are two different sides of social production, although they are inseparably connected with one another. And just because they constitute different sides of social production, they are able to influence one another. To assert that one of these sides may be absorbed by the other and be converted into its component part, is to commit a very grave sin against Marxism.

Marx said:

In production, men not only act on nature but also on one another. They produce only by cooperating in a certain way and mutually exchanging their activities. In order to produce, they enter into definite connections and relations with one another and only within these social connections and relations does their action on nature, does production, take place." (5)

Consequently, social production consists of two sides, which, although they are inseparably connected, reflect two different categories of relations: the relations of men to nature (productive forces), and the relations of men to one another in the process of production (production relations). Only when both sides of production are present do we have social production, whether it be under the socialist system or under any other social formation.

Comrade Yaroshenko, evidently, is not quite in agreement with Marx. He considers that this postulate of Marx is not applicable to the socialist system. Precisely for this reason he reduces the problem of the Political Economy of Socialism to the rational organization of the productive forces, discarding the production, the economic, relations and severing the productive forces from them.

If we followed Comrade Yaroshenko, therefore, what we would get is, instead of a Marxist political economy, some-thing in the nature of Bogdanov's "Universal Organizing Science."

Hence, starting from the right idea that the productive forces are the most mobile and revolutionary forces of production, Comrade Yaroshenko reduces the idea to an absurdity, to the point of denying the role of the production, the economic, relations under socialism; and instead of a full-blooded social production, what he gets is a lopsided and scraggy technology of production - something in the nature of Bukharin's "technique of social organization."

Marx says:

In the social production of their life [that is, in the production of the material values necessary to the life of men - J. St.], men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political super-structure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. (6)

This means that every social formation, socialist society not excluded, has its economic foundation, consisting of the sum total of men's relations of production. What, one asks, happens to the economic foundation of the socialist system with Comrade Yaroshenko? As we know, Comrade Yaroshenko has already done away with relations of production under socialism as a more or less independent sphere, and has included the little that remains of them in the organization of the productive forces. Has the socialist system, one asks, its own economic foundation? Obviously, seeing that the relations of production have disappeared as a more or less independent factor under socialism, the socialist system is left without an economic foundation.

In short, a socialist system without an economic foundation. A rather funny situation. . . .

Is a social system without an economic foundation possible at all? Comrade Yaroshenko evidently believes that it is. Marxism, however, believes that such social systems do not occur in nature.

It is not true, lastly, that communism means the rational organization of the productive forces, that the rational organization of the productive forces is the beginning and end of the communist system, that it is only necessary to organize the productive forces rationally, and the transition to communism will take place without particular difficulty. There is in our literature another definition, another formula of communism - Lenin's formula: "Communism is Soviet rule plus the electrification of the whole country." (7) Lenin's formula is evidently not to Comrade Yaroshenko's liking, and he replaces it with his own homemade formula: "Communism is the highest scientific organization of the productive forces in social production."

In the first place, nobody knows what this "higher scientific" or "rational" organization of the productive forces which Comrade Yaroshenko advertises represents, what its concrete import is. In his speeches at the Plenum and in the working panels of the discussion, and in his letter to the members of the Political Bureau, Comrade Yaroshenko reiterates this mythical formula dozens of times, but nowhere does he say a single word to explain how the "rational organization" of the productive forces, which supposedly constitutes the beginning and end of the essence of the communist system, should be understood.

In the second place, if a choice must be made between the two formulas, then it is not Lenin's formula, which is the only correct one, that should be discarded, but Comrade Yaroshenko's pseudo formula, which is so obviously chimerical and un-Marxist, and is borrowed from the arsenal of Bogdanov, from his "Universal Organizing Science."

Comrade Yaroshenko thinks that we have only to ensure a rational organization of the productive forces, and we shall be able to obtain an abundance of products and to pass to communism, to pass from the formula, "to each according to his work," to the formula, "to each according to his needs." That is a profound error, and reveals a complete lack of understanding of the laws of economic development of socialism. Comrade Yaroshenko's conception of the conditions for the transition from socialism to communism is far too rudimentary and puerile. He does not understand that neither an abundance of products, capable of covering all the requirements of society, nor the transition to the formula, "to each according to his needs," can be brought about if such economic factors as collective farm, group, property, commodity circulation, etc., remain in force. Comrade Yaroshenko does not understand that before we can pass to the formula, "to each according to his needs," we shall have to pass through a number of stages of economic and cultural re-education of society, in the course of which work will be transformed in the eyes of society from only a means of supporting life into life's prime want, and social property into the sacred and inviolable basis of the existence of society.

In order to pave the way for a real, and not declaratory transition to communism, at least three main preliminary conditions have to be satisfied.

1. It is necessary, in the first place, to ensure, not a mythical "rational organization" of the productive forces, but a continuous expansion of all social production, with a relatively higher rate of expansion of the production of means of production. The relatively higher rate of expansion of production of means of production is necessary not only because it has to provide the equipment both for its own plants and for all the other branches of the national economy, but also because reproduction on an extended scale becomes altogether impossible without it.

2. . It is necessary, in the second place, by means of gradual transitions carried out to the advantage of the collective farms, and, hence, of all society, to raise collective-farm property to the level of public property, and, also by means of gradual transitions, to replace commodity circulation by a system of products-exchange, under which the central government, or some other social-economic centre, might control the whole product of social production in the interests of society.

Comrade Yaroshenko is mistaken when he asserts that there is no contradiction between the relations of production and the productive forces of society under socialism. Of course, our present relations of production are in a period when they fully conform to the growth of the

productive forces and help to advance them at seven-league strides. But it would be wrong to rest easy at that and to think that there are no contradictions between our productive forces and the relations of production. There certainly are, and will be, contradictions, seeing that the development of the relations of production lags, and will lag, behind the development of the productive forces. Given a correct policy on the part of the directing bodies, these contradictions cannot grow into antagonisms, and there is no chance of matters coming to a conflict between the relations of production and the productive forces of society. It would be a different matter if we were to conduct a wrong policy, such as that which Comrade Yaroshenko recommends. In that case conflict would be inevitable, and our relations of production might become a serious brake on the further development of the productive forces.

The task of the directing bodies is therefore promptly to discern incipient contradictions, and to take timely measures to resolve them by adapting the relations of production to the growth of the productive forces. This, above all, concerns such economic factors as group, or collective-farm, property and commodity circulation. At present, of course, these factors are being successfully utilized by us for the promotion of the socialist economy, and they are of undeniable benefit to our society. It is undeniable, too, that they will be of benefit also in the near future. But it would be unpardonable blindness not to see at the same time that these factors are already beginning to hamper the powerful development of our productive forces, since they create obstacles to the full extension of government planning to the whole of the national economy, especially agriculture. There is no doubt that these factors will hamper the continued growth of the productive forces of our country more and more as time goes on. The task, therefore, is to eliminate these contradictions by gradually converting collective-farm property into public property, and by introducing - also gradually - products-exchange in place of commodity circulation.

3. It is necessary, in the third place, to ensure such a cultural advancement of society as will secure for all members of society the all-round development of their physical and mental abilities, so that the members of society may be in a position to receive an education sufficient to enable them to be active agents of social development, and in a position freely to choose their occupations and not be tied all their lives, owing to the existing division of labour, to some one occupation.

What is required for this?

It would be wrong to think that such a substantial advance in the cultural standard of the members of society can be brought about without substantial changes in the present status of labour. For this, it is necessary, first of all, to shorten the working day at least to six, and subsequently to five hours. This is needed in order that the members of society might have the necessary free time to receive an all-round education. It is necessary, further, to introduce universal compulsory polytechnical education, which is required in order that the members of society might be able freely to choose their occupations and not be tied to some one occupation all their lives. It is likewise necessary that housing conditions should be radically improved, and that real wages of workers and employees should be at least doubled, if not more, both by means of direct increases of wages and salaries, and, more especially, by further systematic reductions of prices for consumer goods.

These are the basic conditions required to pave the way for the transition to communism.

Only after all these preliminary conditions are satisfied in their entirety may it be hoped that work will be converted in the eyes of the members of society from a nuisance into "life's prime want" (Marx), (8) that "labour will become a pleasure instead of being a burden" (Engels), (9) and that social property will be regarded by all members of society as the sacred and inviolable basis of the existence of society.

Only after all these preliminary conditions have been satisfied in their entirety will it be possible to pass from the socialist formula, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work," to the communist formula, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

This will be a radical transition from one form of economy, the economy of socialism, to another, higher form of economy, the economy of communism.

As we see, the transition from socialism to communism is not such a simple matter as Comrade Yaroshenko imagines.

To attempt to reduce this complex and multiform process, which demands deep-going economic changes, to the "rational organization of the productive forces," as Comrade Yaroshenko does, is to substitute Bogdanovism for Marxism.

II. Other Errors of Comrade Yaroshenko

1. From his incorrect opinion, Comrade Yaroshenko draws incorrect conclusions relative to the character and province of political economy.

Comrade Yaroshenko denies the necessity for a single political economy for all social formations, on the grounds that every social formation has its specific economic laws. But he is absolutely wrong there, and is at variance with such Marxists as Engels and Lenin.

Engels says that political economy is "the science of the conditions and forms under which the various human societies have produced and exchanged and on this basis have distributed their products.(10) Hence, political economy investigates the laws of economic development not of any one social formation, but of the various social formations.

With this, as we know, Lenin was in full agreement. In his critical comments on Bukharin's *Economics of the Transition Period*, he said that Bukharin was wrong in restricting the province of political economy to commodity production, and above all to capitalist production, observing that in doing so Bukharin was taking "a step backward from Engels.' (11)

Fully in conformity with this is the definition of political economy given in the draft textbook, when it says that political economy is the science which studies "the laws of the social production and distribution of material values at the various stages of development of human society."

That is understandable. The various social formations are governed in their economic development not only by their own specific economic laws, but also by the economic laws that are common to all formations, such as, for instance, the law that the productive forces and the relations of production are united in one integral social production, and the law governing the relations between the productive forces and the relations of production in the process of

development of all social formations. Hence, social formations are not only divided from one another by their own specific laws, but also connected with one another by the economic laws common to all formations.

+

Engels was quite right when he said:

In order to carry out this critique of bourgeois economy completely, an acquaintance with the capitalist form of production, exchange and distribution did not suffice. The forms which had preceded it or those which still exist alongside it in less developed countries had also, at least in their main features, to be examined and compared.(12)"

It is obvious that here, on this question, Comrade Yaroshenko is in tune with Bukharin.

Further, Comrade Yaroshenko declares that in his "Political Economy of Socialism," "the categories of political economy - value, commodity, money, credit, etc., - are replaced by a healthy discussion of the rational organization of the productive forces in social production," that, consequently, the subject of investigation of this political economy will not be the production relations of socialism, but "the elaboration and development of a scientific theory of the organization of the productive forces, theory of economic planning, etc.," and that, under socialism, the relations of production lose their independent significance and are absorbed by the productive forces as a component part of them.

It must be said that never before has any retrograde "Marxist" delivered himself of such unholy twaddle. Just imagine a political economy of socialism without economic, production problems! Does such a political economy exist anywhere in creation? What is the effect, in a political economy of socialism, of replacing economic problems by problems of organization of the productive forces? The effect is to abolish the political economy of socialism. And that is just what Comrade Yaroshenko does - he abolishes the political economy of socialism. In this, his position fully gibes with that of Bukharin. Bukharin said that with the elimination of capitalism, political economy would also be eliminated. Comrade Yaroshenko does not say this, but he does it; he does abolish the political economy of socialism. True, he pretends that he is not in full agreement with Bukharin; but that is only a trick, and a cheap trick at that. In actual fact he is doing what Bukharin preached and what Lenin rose up in arms against. Comrade Yaroshenko is following in the footsteps of Bukharin.

Further, Comrade Yaroshenko reduces the problems of the political economy of socialism to problems of the rational organization of the productive forces, to problems of economic planning, etc. But he is profoundly in error. The rational organization of the productive forces, economic planning, etc., are not problems of political economy, but problems of the economic policy of the directing bodies. They are two different provinces, which must not be confused. Comrade Yaroshenko has confused these two different things, and has made a terrible mess of it. Political economy investigates the laws of development of men's relations of production. Economic policy draws practical conclusions from this, gives them concrete shape, and builds its day-to-day work on them. To foist upon political economy problems of economic policy is to kill it as a science.

The province of political economy is the production, the economic, relations of men. It includes: a) the forms of ownership of the means of production; b) the status of the various social groups in production and their inter-relations that follow from these forms, or what

Marx calls: "they exchange their activities"; (13) the forms of distribution of products, which are entirely determined by them. All these together constitute the province of political economy.

This definition does not contain the word "exchange," which figures in Engels' definition. It is omitted because "exchange" is usually understood by many to mean exchange of commodities, which is characteristic not of all, but only of some social formations, and this sometimes gives rise to misunderstanding, even though the word "exchange" with Engels did not mean only commodity exchange. As will be seen, however, that which Engels meant by the word "ex-change" has been included, as a component part, in the above definition. Hence, this definition of the province of political economy fully coincides in content with Engels' definition.

2. When speaking of the basic economic law of some particular social formation, the presumption usually is that the latter cannot have several basic economic laws, that it can have only some one basic economic law, which precisely for that reason is the basic law. Otherwise we should have several basic economic laws for each social formation, which would be contrary to the very concept of a basic law. But Comrade Yaroshenko does not agree with this. He thinks that it is possible to have not one, but several basic economic laws of socialism. It is incredible, but a fact. At the Plenary Discussion, he said:

"

The magnitudes and correlations of the material funds of social production and reproduction are determined by the available labour power engaged in social production and its prospective increase. This is the basic economic law of socialist society, and it determines the structure of socialist social production and reproduction."

That is one basic economic law of socialism.

In this same speech Comrade Yaroshenko declared:

In socialist society, the correlations between Departments I and II are determined by the fact that production must have means of production in quantities sufficient to enlist all the able-bodied members of the population in social production. This is the basic economic law of socialism, and it is at the same time a demand of our Constitution, following from the right to work enjoyed by Soviet citizens."

That, so to speak, is a second basic economic law of socialism.

Lastly, in his letter to the members of the Political Bureau, Comrade Yaroshenko declares:

Accordingly, the essential features and requirements of the basic economic law of socialism may, it seems to me, be roughly formulated as follows: the continuous expansion and perfection of the production of the material and cultural conditions of life of society."

Here we have a third basic economic law of socialism.

Whether all these laws are basic economic laws of socialism, or only one of them, and if only one of them, which exactly - to these questions Comrade Yaroshenko gives no answer in his last letter addressed to the members of the Political Bureau. When formulating the basic

economic law of socialism in his letter to the members of the Political Bureau he "forgot," it is to be presumed, that in his speech at the Plenary Discussion three months earlier he had already formulated two other basic economic laws of socialism, evidently believing that nobody would notice this dubious manoeuvre, to say the least of it. But, as we see, he miscalculated.

Let us assume that the first two basic economic laws of socialism formulated by Comrade Yaroshenko no longer exist, and that from now on he regards as the basic economic law of socialism the third one, which he formulated in his letter to the members of the Political Bureau. Let us turn to this letter.

Comrade Yaroshenko says in this letter that he does not agree with the definition of the basic economic law of socialism which Comrade Stalin gave in his "Remarks." He says:

The chief thing in this definition is 'the securing of the maximum satisfaction of . . . the requirements of the whole of society.' Production is presented here as the means of attaining this principal aim - satisfaction of requirements. Such a definition furnishes grounds for assuming that the basic economic law of socialism formulated by you is based not on the primacy of production, but on the primacy of consumption."

It is evident that Comrade Yaroshenko has completely failed to understand the essence of the problem, and does not see that talk about the primacy of consumption or of production has absolutely nothing to do with the case. When speaking of the primacy of any social process over another, it is usually assumed that the two processes are more or less homogeneous in character. One may, and should, speak of the primacy of the production of means of production over the production of means of consumption, because production is involved in both cases, and they are therefore more or less homogeneous. But one cannot speak, and it would be wrong to speak, of the primacy of consumption over production, or of production over consumption, because production and consumption are two entirely different spheres, which, it is true, are connected with one another, but which are different spheres all the same. Comrade Yaroshenko obviously fails to realize that what we are speaking of here is not the primacy of consumption or of production, but of what aim society sets social production, to what purpose it subordinates social production, say under socialism. So that when Comrade Yaroshenko says that "the basis of the life of socialist society, as of all other society, is production," it is entirely beside the point. Comrade Yaroshenko forgets that men produce not for production's sake, but in order to satisfy their needs. He forgets that production divorced from the satisfaction of the needs of society withers and dies.

Can we speak in general of the aims of capitalist or socialist production, of the purposes to which capitalist or socialist production are subordinated? I think that we can and should.

Marx says:

The direct aim of capitalist production is not the production of goods, but the production of surplus value, or of profit in its developed form; not the product, but the surplus product. From this standpoint, labour itself is productive only in so far as it creates profit or surplus product for capital. In so far as the worker does not create it, his labour is unproductive. Consequently, the sum-total of applied productive labour is of interest to capital only to the extent that through it - or in relation to it - the sum-total of surplus labour increases. Only to

that extent is what is called necessary labour time necessary. To the extent that it does not produce this result, it is superfluous and has to be discontinued.

It is the constant aim of capitalist production to produce the maximum surplus value or surplus product with the minimum of capital advanced; in so far as this result is not attained by overworking the labourer, it is a tendency of capital to seek to produce a given product with the least expenditure - economizing labour power and costs. . . .

The labourers themselves figure in this conception as what they actually are in capitalist production - only means of production; not an aim in themselves and not the aim of production." (14)

These words of Marx are remarkable not only because they define the aim of capitalist production concisely and precisely, but also because they indicate the basic aim, the principal purpose, which should be set for socialist production.

Hence, the aim of capitalist production is profit-making. As to consumption, capitalism needs it only in so far as it ensures the making of profit. Outside of this, consumption means nothing to capitalism. Man and his needs disappear from its field of vision.

What is the aim of socialist production? What is that main purpose to which social production should be subordinated under socialism?

The aim of socialist production is not profit, but man and his needs, that is, the satisfaction of his material and cultural requirements. As is stated in Comrade Stalin's "Re-marks," the aim of socialist production is "the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society." (15)

Comrade Yaroshenko thinks that what he is confronted with here is the "primacy" of consumption over production. That, of course, is a misapprehension. Actually, what we have here is not the primacy of consumption, but the subordination of socialist production to its principal aim of securing the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society.

Consequently, maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society is the aim of socialist production; continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques is the means for the achievement of the aim.

Such is the basic economic law of socialism.

Desiring to preserve what he calls the "primacy" of production over consumption, Comrade Yaroshenko claims that the "basic economic law of socialism" consists in "the continuous expansion and perfection of the production of the material and cultural conditions of society." That is absolutely wrong. Comrade Yaroshenko grossly distorts and vitiates the formula given in Comrade Stalin's "Remarks." With him, production is converted from a means into an end, and the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of society is thrown out. What we get is expansion of production for the sake of expansion of production, production as an aim in itself; man and his requirements disappear from Comrade Yaroshenko's field of vision.

It is therefore not surprising that, with the disappearance of man as the aim of socialist production, every vestige of Marxism disappears from Comrade Yaroshenko's "conception."

And so, what Comrade Yaroshenko arrives at is not the "primacy" of production over consumption, but something like the "primacy" of bourgeois ideology over Marxist ideology.

3. A question by itself is Marx's theory of reproduction.

Comrade Yaroshenko asserts that the Marxist theory of re-production is a theory of capitalist reproduction only, that it contains nothing that might have validity for other social formations, the socialist social formation in particular. He says:

The extension of Marx's scheme of reproduction, which he elaborated for the capitalist economy, to socialist social production is the fruit of a dogmatic understanding of Marx's theory and runs counter to the essence of his theory. (16)

He further asserts:

Marx's scheme of reproduction does not correspond to the economic laws of socialist society and cannot serve as a basis in the investigation of socialist reproduction." (17)

Concerning Marx's theory of simple reproduction, which establishes a definite correlation between the production of means of production (Department I) and the production of means of consumption (Department II), Comrade Yaroshenko? says:

In socialist society, the correlation between Departments I and II is not determined by Marx's formula $v+m$ of Department I and c of Department II.(18) There should be no such interconnection in development between Departments I and H under socialist conditions." (19)

He asserts:

The theory of the correlation between Departments I and II worked out by Marx is not applicable in our socialist conditions, since Marx's theory is based on capitalist economy and its laws."(20)

That is how Comrade Yaroshenko makes mincemeat of Marx's theory of reproduction.

Of course, Marx's theory of reproduction, which was the fruit of an investigation of the laws of the capitalist mode of production, reflects the specific character of the latter, and, naturally, is clothed in the form of capitalist-commodity value relations. It could not have been otherwise. But he who sees in Marx's theory of reproduction only its form, and does not observe its fundamentals, its essential substance, which holds good not only for the capitalist social formation alone, has no understanding whatever of this theory. If Comrade Yaroshenko had any understanding at all of the matter, he would have realized the self-evident truth that Marx's scheme of reproduction does not begin and end with a reflection of the specific character of the capitalist mode of production, that it at the same time contains a whole number of fundamental tenets on the subject of reproduction which hold good for all social formations, particularly and especially for the socialist social formation. Such fundamental tenets of the Marxist theory of reproduction as the division of social production into the

production of means of production and the production of means of consumption; the relatively greater increase of production of means of production in reproduction on an extended scale; the correlation between Departments I and II; surplus product as the sole source of accumulation; the formation and designation of the social funds; accumulation as the sole source of reproduction on an extended scale - all these fundamental tenets of the Marxist theory of reproduction are at the same time tenets which hold good not only for the capitalist formation, and which no socialist society can dispense with in the planning of its national economy. It is significant that Comrade Yaroshenko himself, who snorts so haughtily at Marx's "schemes of reproduction," is obliged every now and again to call in the help of these "schemes" when discussing problems of socialist reproduction.

And how did Lenin and Marx view the matter?

Everyone is familiar with Lenin's critical comments on Bukharin's Economics of the Transition Period. In these remarks, as we know, Lenin recognized that Marx's formula of the correlation between Departments I and II, against which Comrade Yaroshenko rises in arms, holds true both for socialism and for "pure communism," that is, for the second phase of communism.

As to Marx, he, as we know, did not like to digress from his investigation of the laws of capitalist production, and did not, in his Capital, discuss the applicability of his schemes of reproduction to socialism. However, in Chapter XX, Vol. II of Capital, in the section, "The Constant Capital of Department I," where he examines the exchange of Department I products within this department, Marx, as though in passing, observes that under socialism the exchange of products within this department would proceed with the same regularity as under the capitalist mode of production. He says:

If production were socialized, instead of capitalistic, it is evident that these products of Department I would just as regularly be redistributed as means of production to the various lines of production of this department, for purposes of reproduction, one portion remaining directly in that sphere of production which created it, another passing over to other lines of production of the same department, thereby entertaining a constant mutual exchange between the various lines of production of this department."(21)

Consequently, Marx by no means considered that his theory of reproduction was valid only for the capitalist mode of production, although it was the laws of the capitalist mode of production he was investigating. We see, on the contrary, that he held that his theory of reproduction might be valid also for the socialist mode of production.

It should be remarked that, when analyzing the economics of socialism and of the transitional period to communism in his Critique of the Gotha Program, Marx proceeds from the fundamental tenets of his theory of reproduction, evidently regarding them as obligatory for the communist system.

It should also be remarked that when Engels, in his Anti-Duhring, criticizes Duhring's "socialitarian system" and discusses the economics of the socialist system, he likewise proceeds from the fundamental tenets of Marx's theory of reproduction, regarding them as obligatory for the communist system.

Such are the facts.

It appears, then, that here too, in the question of reproduction, Comrade Yaroshenko, despite his sneering attitude towards Marx's "schemes," has again landed on the shoals.

4. Comrade Yaroshenko concludes his letter to the members of the Political Bureau with the proposal that the compilation of the "Political Economy of Socialism" be entrusted to him. He writes: "On the basis of the definition of the province of the political-economic science of socialism outlined by me at the plenary meeting, in the working panel, and in the present letter, and utilizing the Marxist dialectical method, I could, with the help of two assistants, work out in the space of one year, or a year and a half at most, the theoretical solution of the basic problems of the political economy of socialism, that is, expound the Marxist, Leninist-Stalinist theory of the political economy of socialism, a theory which would convert this science into an effective weapon of the struggle of the people for communism."

It must be confessed that modesty is not one of Comrade Yaroshenko's failings - "even the other way round," it might be said, borrowing the style of some of our writers.

It has already been pointed out above that Comrade Yaroshenko confuses the political economy of socialism with the economic policy of the directing bodies. That which he considers the province of the political economy of socialism - rational organization of the productive forces, economic planning, formation of social funds, etc. - is the province of the economic policy of the directing bodies, and not of the political economy of socialism.

I say nothing of the fact that the serious blunders committed by Comrade Yaroshenko, and his un-Marxist "opinion" do not incline one to entrust him with such a task.

Conclusions:

- i) The complaint Comrade Yaroshenko levels at the managers of the discussion is untenable, since they, being Marxists, could not in their summarizing documents reflect his un-Marxist "opinion";
- 2) Comrade Yaroshenko's request to be entrusted with the writing of the political economy of socialism cannot be taken seriously, if only because it reeks of Khlestakovism. (22)

J. Stalin

May 22, 1952

1. Comrade Yaroshenko's letter to the Political Bureau of the Central Committee.
2. Comrade Yaroshenko's speech in the Plenary Discussion.
3. Comrade Yaroshenko's speech at the Discussion Working Panel.
4. Comrade Yaroshenko's speech in the Plenary Discussion.
5. Karl Marx, "Wage Labour and Capital", Selected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1951. Vol. I, p. 83.

6. Karl Marx, "Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy", Selected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1951, Vol. I, pp. 328-29.
7. V.I. Lenin, "Our Foreign and Domestic Position and the Tasks of the Party", Collected Works, Russian ed., Vol. 31.
8. Karl Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Program", Selected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1951, Vol. 2, p.23. P. 71
9. Frederick Engels, Anti-Duhring, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1954, p. 408. P. 71
10. Ibid., p. 208.
11. V. I. Lenin, Critical Comments on Bukharin's "Economics of the Transition Period", Russian ed.
12. Frederick Engels, Anti-Duhring, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1954, p. 209.
13. Karl Marx, "Wage Labour and Capital", Selected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 195r, Vol. I, p. 83.
14. Karl Marx, "Theory of Surplus Value", Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Works, German ed., Vol. 26, Part 2, Chapter 18.
15. See pp. 40-41 of this book. p
16. Comrade Yaroshenko's speech in the Plenary Discussion.
17. Ibid.
18. Here "V" stands for varied capital, "M" for surplus value and "C" for constant capital. For the formula, see Karl Marx, Capital, Eng.ed., Vol. 2, Chapter 20.
19. Comrade Yaroshenko's speech in the Plenary Discussion.
20. Comrade Yaroshenko's letter to the Members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee.
21. Karl Marx, Capital, Eng. ed., Vol. 2, Chapter 20, Section 6.
22. After the central figure, Khlestakov, in the play The Inspector General by Nikolai Gogol, meaning an impostor and a braggart.

Reply to Comrades A.V. Sanina and V.G. Venzher

I have received your letters. It can be seen from them that their authors are making a profound and serious study of the economic problems of our country. There are quite a number of correct formulations and interesting arguments in the letters. But alongside of these, there are some grave theoretical errors. It is on these errors that I propose to dwell in this reply.

1. Character of the Economic Laws of Socialism

Comrades Sanina and Venzher claim that "only because of the conscious action of the Soviet citizens engaged in material production do the economic laws of socialism arise." This opinion is absolutely incorrect.

Do the laws of economic development exist objectively, outside of us, independently of the will and consciousness of man? Marxism answers this question in the affirmative. Marxism holds that the laws of the political economy of socialism are a reflection in the minds of men of objective laws existing outside of us. But Comrades Sanina's and Venzher's formula answers this question in the negative. That means that these comrades are adopting the position of an incorrect theory which asserts that under socialism the laws of economic development are "created," "transformed" by the directing bodies of society. In other words, they are breaking with Marxism and taking the stand of subjective idealism.

Of course, men can discover these objective laws, come to know them and, relying upon them, utilize them in the interests of society. But they cannot "create" them, nor can they "transform" them. Suppose for a moment that we accepted this incorrect theory which denies the existence of objective laws of economic activity under socialism, and which proclaims the possibility of "creating" and "transforming" economic laws. Where would it lead us? It would lead us into the realm of chaos and chance, we should find ourselves in slavish dependence on chances, and we should be forfeiting the possibility not only of understanding, but of simply finding our way about in this chaos of chances.

The effect would be that we should be destroying political economy as a science, because science cannot exist and develop unless it recognizes the existence of objective laws, and studies them. And by destroying science, we should be forfeiting the possibility of foreseeing the course of developments in the economic life of the country, in other words, we should be forfeiting the possibility of providing even the most elementary economic leadership.

In the end we should find ourselves at the mercy of "economic" adventurers who are ready to "destroy" the laws of economic development and to "create" new laws without any understanding of, or consideration for objective law.

Everyone is familiar with the classic formulation of the Marxist position on this question given by Engels in his *Anti-Dühring* :

Active social forces work exactly like natural forces: blindly, forcibly, destructively, so long as we do not understand, and reckon with, them. But when once we understand them, when once we grasp their action, their direction, their effects, it depends only upon ourselves to subject them more and more to our own will, and by means of them to reach our own ends. And this holds quite especially of the mighty productive forces of today. As long as we obstinately refuse to understand the nature and the character of these productive forces — and this understanding goes against the grain of the capitalist mode of production and its defenders — so long these forces are at work in spite of us, in opposition to us, so long they

master us, as we have shown above in detail. But when once their nature is understood, they can, in the hands of the producers working together, be transformed from master demons into willing servants. The difference is as that between the destructive force of electricity in the lightning of the storm, and electricity under command in the telegraph and the voltaic arc; the difference between a conflagration, and fire working in the service of man. With this recognition, at last, of the real nature of the productive forces of today, the social anarchy of production gives place to a social regulation of production upon a definite plan, according to the needs of the community and of each individual. Then the capitalist mode of appropriation, in which the product enslaves first the producer and then the appropriator, is replaced by the mode of appropriation of the products that is based upon the nature of the modern means of production; upon the one hand, direct social appropriation, as means to the maintenance and extension of production — on the other, direct individual appropriation, as means of subsistence and of enjoyment."(1)

2. Measures for Elevating Collective-Farm Property to the Level of Public Property

What measures are necessary to raise collective-farm property, which, of course, is not public property, to the level of public ("national") property?

Some comrades think that the thing to do is simply to nationalize collective-farm property, to proclaim it public property, in the way that was done in the past in the case of capitalist property. Such a proposal would be absolutely wrong and quite unacceptable. Collective-farm property is socialist property, and we simply cannot treat it in the same way as capitalist property. From the fact that collective-farm property is not public property, it by no means follows that it is not socialist property.

These comrades believe that the conversion of the property of individuals or groups of individuals into state property is the only, or at any rate the best, form of nationalization. That is not true. The fact is that conversion into state property is not the only, or even the best, form of nationalization, but the initial form of nationalization, as Engels quite rightly says in *Anti-Dühring*. Unquestionably, so long as the state exists, conversion into state property is the most natural initial form of nationalization. But the state will not exist forever. With the extension of the sphere of operation of socialism in the majority of the countries of the world the state will die away, and, of course, the conversion of the property of individuals or groups of individuals into state property will consequently lose its meaning. The state will have died away, but society will remain. Hence, the heir of the public property will then be not the state, which will have died away, but society itself, in the shape of a central, directing economic body.

That being so, what must be done to raise collective-farm property to the level of public property?

The proposal made by Comrades Sanina and Venzher as the chief means of achieving such an elevation of collective-farm property is to sell the basic implements of production concentrated in the machine and tractor stations to the collective farms as their property, thus releasing the state from the necessity of making capital investments in agriculture, and to make the collective farms themselves responsible for the maintenance and development of the machine and tractor stations. They say:

It is wrong to believe that collective-farm investments must be used chiefly for the cultural needs of the collective-farm village, while the greater bulk of the investments for the needs of

agricultural production must continue as hitherto to be borne by the state. Would it not be more correct to relieve the state of this burden, seeing that the collective farms are capable of taking it entirely upon themselves? The state will have plenty of undertakings in which to invest its funds with a view to creating an abundance of articles of consumption in the country."

The authors advance several arguments in support of their proposal.

First. Referring to Stalin's statement that means of production are not sold even to the collective farms, the authors of the proposal cast doubt on this statement of Stalin's by declaring that the state, after all, does sell means of production to the collective farms, such as minor implements, like scythes and sickles, small power engines, etc. They consider that if the state can sell such means of production to the collective farms, it might also sell them other means of production, such as the machines of the machine and tractor stations.

This argument is untenable. The state, of course, does sell minor implements to the collective farms, as, indeed, it has to in compliance with the Rules of the Agricultural Artel and the Constitution. But can we lump in one category minor implements and such basic agricultural means of production as the machines of the machine and tractor stations, or, let us say, the land, which, after all, is also one of the basic means of production in agriculture? Obviously not. They cannot be lumped in one category because minor implements do not in any degree decide the fate of collective-farm production, whereas such means of production as the machines of the machine and tractor stations and the land entirely decide the fate of agriculture in our present-day conditions.

It should not be difficult to understand that when Stalin said that means of production are not sold to the collective farms, it was not minor implements he had in mind, but the basic means of agricultural production: the machines of the machine and tractor stations, the land. The authors are playing with the words "means of production" and are confusing two different things, without observing that they are getting into a mess.

Second. Comrades Sanina and Venzher further refer to the fact that in the early period of the mass collective-farm movement — end of 1929 and beginning of 1930 — the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.) was itself in favour of transferring the machine and tractor stations to the collective farms as their property, requiring them to pay off the cost of the machine and tractor stations over a period of three years. They consider that although nothing came of this at the time, "in view of the poverty" of the collective farms, now that they have become wealthy it might be expedient to return to this policy, namely, the sale of the machine and tractor stations to the collective farms.

This argument is likewise untenable. A decision really was adopted by the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.) in the early part of 1930 to sell the machine and tractor stations to the collective farms. It was adopted at the suggestion of a group of collective-farm shock workers as an experiment, as a trial, with the idea of reverting to the question at an early date and re-examining it. But the first trial demonstrated the inadvisability of this decision, and a few months later, namely, at the close of 1930, it was rescinded.

The subsequent spread of the collective-farm movement and the development of collective-farm construction definitely convinced both the collective farmers and the leading officials that concentration of the basic implements of agricultural production in the hands of the state,

in the hands of the machine and tractor stations, was the only way of ensuring a high rate of expansion of collective-farm production.

We are all gratified by the tremendous strides agricultural production in our country is making, by the increasing output of grain, cotton, flax, sugar beet, etc. What is the source of this increase? It is the increase of up-to-date technical equipment, the numerous up-to-date machines which are serving all branches of production. It is not a question of machinery generally; the question is that machinery cannot remain at a standstill, it must be perfected all the time, old machinery being scrapped and replaced by new, and the new by newer still. Without this, the onward march of our socialist agriculture would be impossible; big harvests and an abundance of agricultural produce would be out of the question. But what is involved in scrapping hundreds of thousands of wheel tractors and replacing them by caterpillar tractors, in replacing tens of thousands of obsolete harvester-combines by more up-to-date ones, in creating new machines, say, for industrial crops? It involves an expenditure of billions of rubles which can be recouped only after the lapse of six or eight years. Are our collective farms capable of bearing such an expense, even though their incomes may run into the millions? No, they are not, since they are not in the position to undertake the expenditure of billions of rubles which may be recouped only after a period of six or eight years. Such expenditures can be borne only by the state, for it, and it alone, is in the position to bear the loss involved by the scrapping of old machines and replacing them by new; because it, and it alone, is in a position to bear such losses for six or eight years and only then recover the outlays.

What, in view of this, would be the effect of selling the machine and tractor stations to the collective farms as their property? The effect would be to involve the collective farms in heavy loss and to ruin them, to undermine the mechanization of agriculture, and to slow up the development of collective-farm production.

The conclusion therefore is that, in proposing that the machine and tractor stations should be sold to the collective farms as their property, Comrades Sanina and Venzher are suggesting a step in reversion to the old backwardness and are trying to turn back the wheel of history.

Assuming for a moment that we accepted Comrades Sanina's and Venzher's proposal and began to sell the basic implements of production, the machine and tractor stations, to the collective farms as their property. What would be the outcome?

The outcome would be, first, that the collective farms would become the owners of the basic instruments of production; that is, their status would be an exceptional one, such as is not shared by any other enterprise in our country, for, as we know, even the nationalized enterprises do not own their instruments of production. How, by what considerations of progress and advancement, could this exceptional status of the collective farms be justified? Can it be said that such a status would facilitate the elevation of collective-farm property to the level of public property, that it would expedite the transition of our society from socialism to communism? Would it not be truer to say that such a status could only dig a deeper gulf between collective-farm property and public property, and would not bring us any nearer to communism, but, on the contrary, remove us farther from it?

The outcome would be, secondly, an extension of the sphere of operation of commodity circulation, because a gigantic quantity of instruments of agricultural production would come within its orbit. What do Comrades Sanina and Venzher think — is the extension of the

sphere of commodity circulation calculated to promote our advance towards communism? Would it not be truer to say that our advance towards communism would only be retarded by it?

Comrades Sanina's and Venzher's basic error lies in the fact that they do not understand the role and significance of commodity circulation under socialism; that they do not understand that commodity circulation is incompatible with the prospective transition from socialism to communism. They evidently think that the transition from socialism to communism is possible even with commodity circulation, that commodity circulation can be no obstacle to this. That is a profound error, arising from an inadequate grasp of Marxism.

Criticizing Duhring's "economic commune," which functions in the conditions of commodity circulation, Engels, in his *Anti-Dühring*, convincingly shows that the existence of commodity circulation was inevitably bound to lead Duhring's so-called "economic communes" to the regeneration of capitalism. Comrades Sanina and Venzher evidently do not agree with this. All the worse for them. But we, Marxists, adhere to the Marxist view that the transition from socialism to communism and the communist principle of distribution of products according to needs preclude all commodity exchange, and, hence, preclude the conversion of products into commodities, and, with it, their conversion into value.

So much for the proposal and arguments of Comrades Sanina and Venzher.

But what, then, should be done to elevate collective-farm property to the level of public property?

The collective farm is an unusual kind of enterprise. It operates on land, and cultivates land which has long been public, and not collective-farm property. Consequently, the collective farm is not the owner of the land it cultivates.

Further, the collective farm operates with basic implements of production which are public, not collective-farm property. Consequently, the collective farm is not the owner of its basic implements of production.

Further, the collective farm is a cooperative enterprise: it utilizes the labour of its members, and it distributes its income among its members on the basis of workday units; it owns its seed, which is renewed every year and goes into production.

What, then, does the collective farm own? Where is the collective-farm property which it disposes of quite freely, at its own discretion? This property of the collective farm is its product, the product of collective farming: grain, meat, butter, vegetables, cotton, sugar beet, flax, etc., not counting the buildings and the personal husbandry of the collective farmers on their household plots. The fact is that a considerable part of this product, the surplus collective-farm output, goes into the market and is thus included in the system of commodity circulation. It is precisely this circumstance which now prevents the elevation of collective-farm property to the level of public property. It is therefore precisely from this end that the work of elevating collective-farm property to the level of public property must be tackled.

In order to raise collective-farm property to the level of public property, the surplus collective-farm output must be excluded from the system of commodity circulation and

included in the system of products-exchange between state industry and the collective farms. That is the point.

We still have no developed system of products-exchange, but the rudiments of such a system exist in the shape of the "merchandising" of agricultural products. For quite a long time already, as we know, the products of the cotton-growing, flax-growing, beet-growing and other collective farms are "merchandised." They are not "merchandised" in full, it is true, but only partly, still they are "merchandised." Be it mentioned in passing that "merchandising" is not a happy word, and should be replaced by "products-exchange." The task is to extend these rudiments of products-exchange to all branches of agriculture and to develop them into a broad system, under which the collective farms would receive for their products not only money, but also and chiefly the manufactures they need. Such a system would require an immense increase in the goods allocated by the town to the country, and it would therefore have to be introduced without any particular hurry, and only as the products of the town multiply. But it must be introduced unswervingly and unhesitatingly, step by step contracting the sphere of operation of commodity circulation and widening the sphere of operation of products-exchange.

Such a system, by contracting the sphere of operation of commodity circulation, will facilitate the transition from socialism to communism. Moreover, it will make it possible to include the basic property of the collective farms, the product of collective farming, in the general system of national planning.

That will be a real and effective means of raising collective-farm property to the level of public property under our present-day conditions.

Will such a system be advantageous to the collective-farm peasantry? It undoubtedly will. It will, because the collective-farm peasantry will receive far more products from the state than under commodity circulation, and at much cheaper prices. Everyone knows that the collective farms which have products-exchange ("merchandising") contracts with the government receive incomparably greater advantages than the collective farms which have no such contracts. If the products-exchange system is extended to all the collective farms in the country, these advantages will become available to all our collective-farm peasantry.

J. Stalin September 28, 1952

1. Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1954, PP. 387-88.

**Telegram to the Chairman of the
Council of Ministers of the Rumanian
People's Republic, Petru Groza
On the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Rumanian Treaty
of Friendship, Alliance and Support
February 1952**

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Rumanian People's Republic, Petru Groza.

On the fourth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Support between the Soviet Union and the Rumanian People's Republic, I send you, Comrade Chairman, the government of the Rumanian People's Republic and the Rumanian people, my congratulations.

J. STALIN

("New Way," — Organ of the German Anti-fascist Committee in the Rumanian People's Republic, No. 884, 5 February, 1952)

Telegram to the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic, Mao Tse Tung
On the occasion of the second anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Support
14 February 1952

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic,
Comrade Mao Tse Tung.

On the occasion of the second anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Support, please accept, Comrade Chairman, my sincere congratulations and wishes for the further strengthening of the alliance and cooperation between the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union, in the interests of world peace.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 39, 15 February, 1952)

**Answers to Four Questions from a Group of Editors of American Newspapers
31 March, 1952**

Q. Is a third world war presently as near as two or three years away?

A. No, it is not.

Q. Would a meeting of heads of state of the great powers be useful?

A. Possibly, it would be useful.

Q. Are you of the opinion that the present times are appropriate for Germany's unification?

A. Yes, I am of that opinion.

Q. On what basis is it possible for capitalism and communism to live side by side?

A. It is possible for capitalism and communism to live side by side if both sides wish to cooperate and the readiness to do so exists, to fulfil the duties they have taken on themselves, if its basis is complete equality and noninterference in the internal "affairs of other states.

J. STALIN

("Unity," 5 May, 1952, P. 417)

**Telegram to the Minister President of the Hungarian People's Republic, Istvan Dobi
On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of Hungary by the Soviet
Army
April, 1952**

I ask the government of the People's Republic of Hungary and you, Comrade Minister President, to accept my sincere congratulations on the occasion of your national day of celebration. I wish the Hungarian people further success in the building of a new, free Hungary.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 82, 5 April, 1952)

**Telegram to the President of the People's Republic of Poland, Boleslaw Bierut
On the occasion of his 60th Birthday
18 April, 1952**

To the President of the Republic of Poland, Comrade Boleslaw Bierut.

Permit me to greet you on your 60th birthday, Comrade President, as the great builder and leader of a new, united, independent, Polish people's democracy.

I wish you good health and success in your labour for the well-being of the fraternal Polish people and in the further strengthening of the friendship between the Polish Republic and the Soviet Union, in the interests of world peace.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 93, 20 April, 1952)

**Telegram to the Minister President
of the People's Republic of Poland,
Josef Cyrankiewicz**

**On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the Soviet-Polish Treaty of Friendship
April, 1952**

I ask the government of the Polish Republic and you, Comrade Minister President, on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Polish Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Help and Cooperation after the war, to accept my greetings and sincere wishes for your future success.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 95, 23 April, 1952)

**Telegram to the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic,
Otto Grotewohl
On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the
liberation of the German people from the fascist tyranny
8 May, 1952**

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Comrade Otto Grotewohl.

I ask the government of the German Democratic Republic and you personally, Comrade Minister President, to accept my thanks for your friendly greetings on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of the German people from the fascist tyranny.

I wish the German people and the government of the German Democratic Republic, success in the struggle for an united, independent, democratic and peace-loving Germany, for the immediate conclusion of a peace treaty and the departure of the occupying forces from Germany in the interests of Germany and of world peace.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 109, May, 1952)

Telegram to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Rumanian People's Republic, Petru Groza, and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party, Gheorgiudej
On the occasion of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the proclamation of an independent Rumanian state
10 May, 1952

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Rumanian People's Republic, Comrade Petru Groza, and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party, Comrade Gheorgiu-Dej.

I ask the government of the Rumanian People's Republic, the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party and you personally to accept my thanks for your friendly greetings on the occasion of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the proclamation of an independent Rumanian state.

I wish the Rumanian people, the government of the People's Republic of Rumania and the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party, further success in-the building of a new, free Rumanian people's democracy.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 111, 11 May, 1952)

**Telegram to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Czechoslovak Republic,
Antonin Zapotocky
On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the
liberation of the Czechoslovakian Republic by the Soviet Army
10 May, 1952**

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Czechoslovakian Republic, Comrade Antonin Zapotocky.

On the occasion of the Czechoslovakian national day of celebration, - the seventh anniversary of the liberation from the Hitler occupation, - please accept, Comrade Chairman, my friendly congratulations and wishes for the future success of the Czechoslovakian people in the building of a new Czechoslovakian people's democracy.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 111, 11 May, 1952)

**Greetings Letter to the Young Pioneers
of the Soviet Union
On the occasion of thirty years of excellence of the
V. I. Lenin Pioneer Organization of the Soviet Union
20 May, 1952**

To the Young Pioneers of the Soviet Union.

I wholeheartedly greet the Young Pioneers and pupils on the thirty years of existence of the V.I. Lenin Pioneer Organization.

I wish the Pioneers and pupils health and success in their studies, in their work and in their social endeavours.

May the Pioneer Organization continue in the future to educate the Pioneers and become true sons of Lenin and our great Motherland.

J. STALIN

("Pravda," 20 May, 1952)

**Greetings Letter to the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the
Chinese People's Republic, Mao Tse Tung
On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the
founding of the Chinese People's Liberation Army
1 August, 1952**

Comrade Chairman, please accept my sincere greetings on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Chinese People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China. In the interests of peace and security, I wish the further strengthening of the Chinese People's Army.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 179, 1 August, 1952)

Greetings Telegram to the Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Kim Ir Sen
On the occasion of the national day of celebration of the Korean People's democratic Republic
15 August, 1952

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Korean People's Democratic Republic,
Kim Ir Sen.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, on the national day of celebration of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, my sincere congratulations, together with the wish for the further success of the Korean people in their struggle for the freedom and independence of their homeland.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 192, 15 August, 1952)

**Decision of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.(B.)
to call the 19th Party Congress of the
C.P.S.U.(B.) on 5 October, 1952
20 August, 1952**

On Wednesday, 20 August, 1952, "Pravda" published the following message
To all Organizations of the C.P.S.U.(B.) :

Today in Moscow there was a Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (B.).
The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.) has decided to call the 19th Party Congress of the
C.P.S.U.(B.) on 5 October, 1952.

Agenda for the 19th Party Congress :

I. Report of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.). Report to be given by Comrade
Malenkov.

II. Report of the Central Revision Commission of the C.P.S.U.(B.). Report to be given by
the Chairman of the Revision Commission, Comrade Moskatov.

III. Guidelines of the 19th Party Congress for the fifth Five-Year Plan for the development
of the U.S.S.R. in the years 1951 - 1955. Report to be given by the Chairman of the State
Planning Commission, Comrade Saburov.

IV. Alterations in the Statutes of the C.P.S.U.(B.). Report to be given by the Secretary of the
Central Committee, Comrade Krushchev.

V. Elections to the Central Party Organs. Rules for the procedure of election of delegates to
the Party Congress:

1. One delegate with a deciding vote for every 5000 Party members.

2. One delegate with an advisory vote for every 5000 Party candidates.

3. That delegates to the 19th Party Congress in agreement with the Party statutes, are elected
by secret ballot.

4. The Party Organizations of the Russian, Socialist, Federative, Soviet Republics to elect
delegates to the Party Congress from areas, provinces and autonomous Republics. In the
remaining Soviet Republics, the delegates to be elected on the judgement of the Communist
Parties of the Union Republics at regional conferences, or on Party Congresses of the
Communist Parties of the Union Republics.

5. The Communists in the Party Organizations of the Soviet Army, Navy and the Border
Units of the Ministry of State Security to elect their delegates to the 19th Party Congress with
the rest of the Party Organizations of the areas, respectively district Party conferences or at
the Party Congresses of the Communist Parties of the Union Republics.

J. STALIN

Secretary of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B).

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 196, 21 August, 1952)

**Telegram to the Chairman of the
Council of Ministers of the Rumanian People's Republic, Gheorgiu-Dej
On the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the liberation of Rumania from the fascist
yoke
23 August, 1952**

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Rumanian People's Republic, Comrade
Gheorgiu-Dej.

On the occasion of the national day of celebration, - Liberation Day, - please accept, Comrade
Chairman, and the government of the Rumanian People's Republic, my sincere
congratulations and friendly wishes for new success of the Rumanian people in the building
of a Rumanian people's democracy.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 199, 24 August, 1952)

**Answering Telegram to the Chairman
of the Central People's Government of the
Chinese People's Republic, Mao Tse Tung
On the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the victory over Japanese imperialism
2 September, 1952**

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic,
Comrade Mao Tse Tung.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, my thanks for the expression of your feelings on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the victory over Japanese imperialism by the Soviet people and the Soviet Army.

In this historic victory, the Chinese people and their People's Liberation Army played a great role by their heroism and sacrifices in the smashing of Japanese aggression.

The great friendship between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic is a sure guarantee against the danger of a new aggression, a mighty bulwark of peace in the far East and in the whole world.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the liberation of the Chinese people from the yoke of Japanese imperialism, the good wishes of the Soviet Union.

Long live the unbreakable friendship between the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union!

Long live the People's Liberation Army of the Chinese People's Republic!

J. STALIN
Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 208, 4 September, 1952)

Telegram to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Wylko Tshervenkov
On the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria
9 September, 1952

To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Comrade Wylko Tshervenkov.

On the national day of celebration of the Bulgarian People's Republic, please accept, Comrade Chairman, my sincere greetings and wishes for the further success of the fraternal Bulgarian people in the building of a new Bulgarian people's democracy.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 213, 10 September, 1952)

**Telegram to the Chairman of the
Central People's Government of the
Chinese People's Republic, Mao Tse Tung
On the occasion of the third anniversary of the proclamation of the Chinese People's
Republic
1 October, 1952**

To the Chairman of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic,
Comrade Mao Tse Tung.

Please accept, Comrade Chairman, my sincere congratulations on the occasion of the third
anniversary of the proclamation of the Chinese People's Republic.

I wish the great Chinese people, the government of the Chinese People's Republic and you
personally, new success in the building of a mighty, people's democratic Chinese state.

May the great friendship between the Chinese People's Republic and the U.S.S.R., the firm
bulwark of peace and security in the far East and in the whole world, thrive and grow
stronger.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 231, 1 October, 1952)

**Telegram to the Minister President
of the German Democratic Republic,
Otto Grotewohl**

**On the occasion of the third anniversary of the founding of the German Democratic
Republic
7 October, 1952**

To the Minister President of the German Democratic Republic, Comrade Otto Grotewohl.

On the occasion of the national day of celebration, - the third anniversary of the founding of the German Democratic Republic, - I send the German people, the government and you personally, Comrade Minister President, my congratulations. Please accept my wishes for further success in the great work of creating an united, independent, democratic, peace-loving Germany.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 236, 7 October, 1952)

Telegram to the Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Kim Ir Sen
On the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R and the Korean People's Democratic Republic
October, 1952

To the Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Korean People's Democratic Republic,
Comrade Kim Ir Sen.

Comrade Chairman, please accept the thanks of the Soviet government and myself for your friendly congratulations and good wishes on the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the U.S.S.R.

I wish the Korean people, who courageously defend their national rights, success in their struggle for the freedom and independence of their homeland.

J. STALIN

("New Germany," Berlin Ed., No. 41, 13 October, 1952)

Speech of the 19th Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union 14 October, 1952

Comrades!

Permit me, in the name of our Party Congress, to express our thanks to all fraternal parties and organizations whose representatives have honoured our Party Congress by their presence, or who have sent our Party Congress greetings of friendship, for their wishes for our further success and for their confidence. (Stormy, prolonged applause that became an ovation.)

For us, this trust is especially valuable as it signifies their readiness to support our Party in its struggle for a better future for the people, in its struggle against war, in its struggle to keep peace. (Stormy, prolonged applause.)

It would be a mistake to believe that our Party, which has become a mighty power, does not need more support. That would be wrong. Our Party and our country need the continuous trust, sympathy and support of fraternal peoples outside our borders, and will always need it.

The special quality of this support lies in that every support of the peace endeavours of our Party by each fraternal party, simultaneously signifies the support of their own people in their struggle to keep peace. As the English workers in the years 1918-1919, during the armed attack of the English bourgeoisie on the Soviet Union, organized their struggle against the war under the slogan "Hands off Russia!", was a support, it was above all a support of the struggle of their own people for peace, and then, also, a support of the Soviet Union. If Comrade Thorez or Comrade Togliatti declare that their people do not want to be led into a war against the people of the Soviet Union, (stormy applause), - then that is a support, above all a support for the French and Italian workers and peasants who struggle for peace, and then, also, a support of the peace endeavours of the Soviet Union. The special quality of the present support is thus explained, that the interests of our Party are not only not against the interests of the peace-loving people, but on the contrary, blend with them. (Stormy applause.) Where the Soviet Union is concerned, its interest in the matter of world peace cannot be separated from the cause of peace in the whole world.

It is understood that our Party must do its duty by its fraternal parties and support them and their peoples in the struggle for liberation and in their struggle for keeping peace. This is what the Party does. (Stormy applause.) After the seizure of power by our Party in 1917, and after our Party took real measures to eliminate the yoke of capitalists and landlords, the representatives of the fraternal parties, inspired by our daring and the success of our Party, gave it the name "Shock Brigade" of the revolutionary movement and the workers' movement of the world. Thereby they expressed the hope that the success of the "Shock Brigade" would alleviate the sufferings of the people in the situation of being under the capitalist yoke. I think that our Party has fulfilled these hopes, especially in the time of the second world war, as the Soviet Union smashed the German and Japanese fascist tyranny and liberated the European and Asian peoples from the danger of fascist slavery. (Stormy applause.)

Of course it was very difficult to fulfil this honourable task as long as there was only one "Shock Brigade," as long as it stood alone, the avant-garde in the fulfillment of this task. But that is in the past. Now it is completely different. Now, from China and Korea to Czechoslovakia and Hungary, new "Shock Brigades" have appeared on the map, in the form

of people's democracies; now the struggle has been eased for our Party and also the work proceeds better. (Stormy, prolonged applause.)

Special attention must be paid to the communist, democratic or worker and peasant parties that are not yet in power and which must carry out their work under the yoke of strict, bourgeois rule. Of course their work is more difficult. But their work is not so difficult as it was for us Russian Communists in the time of the Tsar, as the smallest step forward was declared a serious crime. The Russian Communists nevertheless held firm, did not retreat from difficulties and came to victory. The same will be the case with these parties.

Why is it that these parties do not have such difficult work as the Russian Communists had in the times of Tsarism?

Because, first of all, they have the example of the struggle and success, as in the Soviet Union and in the people's democratic countries, before them. Consequently, they can learn from the mistakes and successes of these countries and thus ease their work.

Because, secondly, the bourgeoisie itself, the arch-enemy of the freedom movement, has become different, has essentially changed, has become more reactionary, has lost the cooperation of the people and thus has been weakened. It is understood that these circumstances must likewise ease the work of the revolutionary and democratic parties. (Stormy applause.)

Earlier, the bourgeoisie presented themselves as liberal, they were for bourgeois democratic freedom and in that way gained popularity with the people. Now there is not one remaining trace of liberalism. There is no such thing as "freedom of personality" any more, - personal rights are now only acknowledged by them, the owners of capital, - all the other citizens are regarded as raw materials, that are only for exploitation. The principle of equal rights for people and nations is trodden in the dust and it is replaced by the principle of Full rights for the exploiting minority and the lack of rights of the exploited majority of the citizens. The banner of bourgeois democratic freedom has been flung overboard. I think that you, the representatives of communist and democratic parties must pick up this banner and carry it forward if you want to gain the majority of the people. There is nobody else to raise it. (Stormy applause.)

Earlier, the bourgeoisie, as the heads of nations, were for the rights and independence of nations and put that "above all." Now there is no trace left of this "national principle." Now the bourgeoisie sell the rights and independence of their nations for dollars. The banner of national independence and national sovereignty has been thrown overboard. Without doubt, you, the representatives of the communist and democratic parties must raise this banner and carry it forward if you want to be patriots of your countries, if you want to be the leading powers of the nations. There is nobody else to raise it. (Stormy applause.)

That is how matters stand at present.

It is understood that all these circumstances must ease the work of the communist and democratic parties that are not yet in power.

Consequently, there is every ground for the success and victory of the fraternal parties in the lands of capitalist rule. (Stormy applause.)

Long live our fraternal parties! (Prolonged applause.)

Long life and health to the leaders of the fraternal parties! (Prolonged applause.)

Long live the peace between the peoples!

(Prolonged applause.)

Down with the arsonists of war! (Everyone stood up. Stormy, prolonged applause that became an ovation. There were shouts of "Long live Comrade Stalin!" "Long live the great leader of the working people of the world, Comrade Stalin!" "The, great Stalin!" "Long live peace between the peoples!")

(Speech at the 19th Party Congress of the C.P.S.U., Dietz Press, Berlin 1952, Pp. 5 - 15)