
PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements

1-1-1933

Technocracy and Marxism

William Z. Foster

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Foster, William Z., "Technocracy and Marxism" (1933). *PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements*. 282.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism/282>

TECHNOCRACY

and

MARXISM

By

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER
EARL BROWDER

Together With

THE TECHNICAL INTELLIGENTSIA
AND SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

By

V. M. MOLOTOV

Price 5 Cents

Introduction

The publication of this pamphlet by Comrades Foster and Browder, **TECHNOCRACY AND MARXISM**, is very timely. The capitalist press is giving unlimited publicity to the writings and ideas of Technocracy. Why is this done? Because of the intense mass interest for a way out of the crisis the capitalists are using Technocracy as a decoy which seems "radical" and which appears to be attacking capitalism. The following quotation taken from the ultra-reactionary *New York Evening Post* of December 31, 1932, shows that the capitalist class understands full well what it is doing by giving such wide publicity to the doctrines of Technocracy:

"It (i.e. Technocracy) leaves them offering mathematical formulae and a semblance of realism about the machine civilization in which we live, without the ugly necessity of handing over that civilization to the uncouth working class."

This pamphlet **TECHNOCRACY AND MARXISM** explains why, now, the ideas of Technocracy, which were developed years ago by some bourgeois liberal economists, have gained such prominence and headway.

"Technocracy is only one of the symptoms of the crisis of capitalism and contributes nothing to the solution of this crisis. It represents only the dreams and illusions of a baffled unemployed mass of technicians who have been deprived of their functions by the decay of capitalism, but who hope to re-establish themselves and capitalism through some change in the super-structure which does not violate the sacred principle of private property."

Herein, we have in a nut-shell, the reasons for the movement, its meaning and purpose.

In the theory of Marxism we find the clearest and simplest refutation of ideas of Technocracy. The pamphlet in a simple manner presents some of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism which refute the ideas of Technocracy.

The pamphlet finally appeals to those intelligentsia whose economic position and faith in capitalism are shaken by the present crisis, to accept Marxist working-class philosophy and join hands with all oppressed toilers against capitalism.

The publishing in the same pamphlet of Comrade Molotov's recent speech, on the "Technical Intelligentsia and Socialist Construction" fits in well with the whole subject of Marxism and Technocracy. In this speech of Comrade Molotov, many of the American technical intelligentsia will find an answer to the question on what side of the barricades they should fight. Let the American technical intelligentsia look to the Soviet Union as a way out of the capitalist crisis.

Technocracy and Marxism

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER and EARL BROWDER

The emergence of "Technocracy" as the latest seven-day wonder seems to require the establishment of a judgment on the part of each school of thought dealing with the questions involved in the present crisis. This is all the more true inasmuch as "Technocracy" apparently challenges and dismisses all existing theories on the question. Howard Scott, in *Harper's Magazine*, January, 1933, sums this up in the statement:

"We need look for no help from Republicans, Democrats, Socialists, Fascists or Communists, for each group in its way is devoted to price also."

Let us examine the ideas of Technocracy from the point of view of Marxism, that is, the point of view of the Communist Party (Marxism as developed in the modern imperialist era in the teachings of Lenin and Stalin.)

Hundreds of columns are being devoted by the press to refuting particular examples, brought forward by Technocracy as illustrations of the insoluble contradictions within the present social system. With all of these criticisms against Technocracy, the Communist viewpoint has nothing in common. Exaggerations of inaccuracies that may be contained in the statements of Technocracy are only incidental and do not touch the essence of the question. The fundamental trend of technological advance, and the incompatibility of this growth of productive forces with the juridical frame-work within which it is forced to operate, is unquestionably the basic factor in the crisis and is more or less accurately portrayed in the facts brought forward by Howard Scott and his associates.

We Communists, therefore, have no quarrel with Scott regarding the facts which he brings forward. We are quite content to leave the precise measuring of the degree of development of these fundamental tendencies to the experts in this field. We find in all the facts brought forward by Technocracy, however, the full confirmation of the analysis of capitalism by Karl Marx. We, therefore, have the sharpest difference with Scott and his friends on the theoretical understanding of these

facts. While Scott thinks that the Marxists are "things of the past" along with "bankers, industrialists, fascists, economists," etc., we Marxists on the contrary find precisely this irreconcilable conflict between the forces of production, on the one hand and their enclosing shell of social-economic institutions, on the other hand, as the final guarantee that the future belongs to the Marxists.

Our examination of Technocracy can, therefore, assume the provisional correctness of the described facts of technological advance and confine our critical examination to the interpretation, to the theoretical understanding of the significance of these facts, and the conclusions to be drawn therefrom.

WHAT IS THE "PRICE" SYSTEM?

Technocracy takes as its point of attack what it calls "the price system." It finds the source of the crisis in the mechanism of the circulation of commodities. It assumes without investigation that production relationships are sound and healthy, except to the extent that they are disturbed from without by the intrusion of the disruptive elements contained in the mechanism of prices as the means of distributing and circulating the products. This is the basic error which stultifies every attempt of Scott and his associates to draw theoretical conclusions from their facts. This error is also the cause of their exceptional sterility in practical programmatic conclusions.

This formula of "the price system," furnishes the basis for Scott's rejection of Marxism, for his dismissal of the new Socialist economy in the Soviet Union as without significance for a solution of the crisis, on the grounds that the new system being built by the Communists also carries on distribution under a modified form of prices.

This error of Technocracy is only the latest and outstanding example of what Karl Marx called "the fetishism of commodities." This fetishism sees only the relations between the products of man's industry, the relation of commodity to commodity in exchange. Behind this relation of commodities in exchange, however, there is concealed the basic relationships of men in production.*

* "A commodity is therefore a mysterious thing, simply because in it the social character of men's labour appears to them as an objective character stamped upon the product of that labor; because the relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labor is presented to them as a social relation, existing not between themselves, but between the products of their labor." *Capital*, Volume I, Chapter I p. 83

"The existence of things qua commodities, and the value relation between the products

What Scott achieves by this approach to the problem is the avoidance of the basic factor which is at the root of the crisis. Without facing this factor all the attempts to find a way out of the crisis are doomed to failure. That factor is the division between the small class that owns the machinery of production and the large class that operates this machinery, i. e., the class division between capitalists and workers. The value of this "achievement" of ignoring such a basic fact, is that it enables Scott to ignore in his argument the class struggle, but only at the expense of the scientific validity of his argument.

What is actually happening, however, is not a crisis in the mechanism of exchange ("the price system"), but rather what Engels described as "the mode of production rising in rebellion against the form of exchange." (*Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, p. 138). The productive forces have grown so great that they can no longer be contained within the social institutions which are based upon capitalist ownership of the means of production.

IS THE WORKING CLASS DISAPPEARING?

Scott supports his view that the worker-capitalist contradiction can be ignored by indicating that after all the working class is not important because it is being abolished by the progress of technology. On the same basis he rejects the labor-time theory of value and proposes to

of labor which stamps them as commodities, have absolutely no connection with their physical properties and with the material relations arising therefrom. There it is a definite social relation between men, that assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of a relation between things. In order, therefore, to find an analogy, we must have recourse to the mist-enveloped religions of the religious world. In that world the productions of the human brain appear as independent beings endowed with life, and entering into relations both with one another and the human race. So it is in the world of commodities with the products of men's hands. This I call the fetishism which attaches itself to the products of labor so soon as they are produced as commodities, and which is therefore inseparable from the production of commodities.

"This fetishism of commodities has its origin, as the foregoing analysis has already shown, in the peculiar social character of the labor that produces them." (p. 83)

"Since the producers do not come into social contact with each other until they exchange their products . . . the relations connecting the labor of one individual with that of the rest appear, not as direct social relations between individuals at work, but as what they really are, material relations between persons and social relations between things . . . To them, their own social action takes the form of the action of objects, which rule the producers instead of being ruled by them . . . The determination of the magnitude of value by labor-time is therefore a secret, hidden under the apparent fluctuations in the relative value of commodities." *Capital*, Volume I, Chapter I, p. 84-86)

substitute for it some supposed objective measurement of mechanical energy; instead of man-hours as the basic factor in production, he would use an arbitrary unit of measurement of mechanical energy which he calls "erg." By thus substituting one unit of measurement for another, he thinks to escape the contradictions which have brought industry to collapse, but all he has succeeded in doing is to ignore the basic contradictions.

Scott has himself given us an example of the unscientific character of his proposed change in measurement. When he desires to give us an understandable picture of the progress of technology in the flour-milling, steel and automobile industries, he finds it necessary to desert his own pet product, the "erg" and fall back upon the "obsolete" man-hour unit of measure. When he tells us that in 1900 it required 70 man-hours to produce a ton of steel, while in 1929 only 13 man-hours were necessary, he gives us a very important fact upon which can be based definite programmatic conclusions, which will lead toward a solution of the crisis. Similarly when he tells us that the number of man-hours required to produce an automobile declined in the ten years from 1919 to 1929, from 313 to 92, this means something. If he had given us the equivalent information in terms of his "ergs" of mechanical energy, this would have been purely academic. It would be valueless from the point of view of finding the solution to the problem of how to fully release again all of the forces of production which have been choked by the crisis.

Is the working class really disappearing, as Scott thinks? The only evidence which he brings is the growth of unemployment and the increasing misery of the working class. What is new in this phenomenon is merely the maturity of the contradictions of capitalism, which have risen to the point requiring a violent solution. The working class remains the basic productive force. What is being destroyed is not the working class as a class, but rather all those ties which bound the workers to the old capitalist system. Far from being destroyed by the crisis, the working class, despite the destruction of large numbers of workers, is being recreated in a higher form, is acquiring class consciousness and understanding of its historic role as the successor to the bourgeoisie and the creator of a new classless society. As Karl Marx expressed it many years ago:

"Along with the constantly diminishing number of magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolize all the advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing

in numbers, and disciplined, united, organized by the very process of capitalist production itself.

"The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production which has sprung up and flourished along with it and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated." (*Capital*, Volume I, Chapter XXXII)

When the technocrats dismiss the working class as a diminishing and negligible factor, this only means that the general direction of their theories is toward fascism, that is, toward evolving new props to the collapsing capitalist system while intensifying the violent suppression of the force capable of rescuing society from destruction, the revolutionary working class.

TECHNOCRATS IGNORANT OF THE LAWS OF CAPITALISM

The shallowness of the theories of Technocracy is not confined to its failure to see the forces of social revolution and reconstruction. Mr. Scott and his associates are also inexcusably ignorant of the normal laws of operation of capitalism itself. Thus he brings forward as a startling new discovery (which he even expects to be generally challenged!), "*the appalling facts that for years our debts have been increasing at a rate faster than production, and both of them faster than rate of population!*" (Scott's emphasis).

This fact may be appalling, but certainly it is no more so than the whole capitalist system, for it is one of the inevitable laws of capitalist production. Nor is it a new discovery of Mr. Scott's. It is a phenomenon many years ago thoroughly analyzed by Karl Marx, who brought out its full significance in the dialectical development of capitalism. No literate economist would think of challenging the existence of this tendency in capitalism. Its true meaning, however is a closed book to the technocrats and all bourgeois economists.

The fact that production was increasing at a rate faster than population is surely not surprising, and needs no special explanation. That debts are increasing faster than production, requires, however, more examination. These debts, as Scott himself clearly points out, are merely a form of the accumulation of capital. They reflect the changes in the organic composition of capital, that is, the growth of that portion of capital invested in machinery and materials of production (constant capital), at the expense of that portion invested in the living productive forces, in wages paid for labor power (variable capital). This change in the

organic composition of capital is constantly accelerated by technical progress, which becomes a necessity enforced by competition, resulting simultaneously in a rising rate of exploitation of the working class and decline in the average rate of profit.

Thus we do, indeed, reveal an "appalling fact"—even more appalling than Mr. Scott understands—the fact that the continued operation of the capitalist system as a whole (not merely "the price system" aspect of capitalist exchange), will inevitably result in the degeneration and destruction of the human race. At the same time, however, we reveal that to which Mr. Scott is entirely blind, the existence of a force created by the dying capitalist system which can and must destroy that system and rebuild society upon an entirely new basis. That revolutionary force is the working class.

TECHNOCRACY A DEGENERATE FORM OF VEBLENISM

Typical of the theoretical sterility of the technical intelligentsia in America, is the fact that Technocracy has not developed its own theoretical weapons. It has taken them ready-made from Thorstein Veblen, himself not an engineer but a college professor, publicist, and commentator on the world-in-general. All that the technocrats have been able to add to Veblen is an accumulation of empirical facts. Insofar as they have theories, these can all be found in Veblen's *The Engineers and the Price System*, originally published in 1919 as a series of magazine articles and reissued in book form in 1921.

While Technocracy has been unable to develop a theoretical arsenal of its own; while further it has even failed to develop Veblen's theories, yet it has not remained upon the foundation given by Veblen. We cannot blame Veblen for all the weaknesses of Technocracy. Veblen himself had a much more penetrating eye, and as well drew much more practical conclusions. However utopian may have been his idea of "a Soviet of Technicians," still he did not leave it suspended in the air as does Technocracy, but tried to give it a setting in the alignment of class forces of modern society. Not only that, Veblen even had some faint understanding of the necessity of basing any project for social reorganization upon one or the other of the two main contending class forces—capitalist class or working class. While he was full of reformist illusions, he at least definitely put forward the working class as the force which alone could carry through the change. He did not understand, perhaps, the political sterility of our modern technicians and thought that they would be capable of becoming the leaders of the working

class. He warned them that "they will be substantially helpless to set up a practicable working organization" unless they secure "a common understanding and a solidarity of sentiment between the technicians and the working forces engaged . . . in the great underlying industries of the system . . . and active adherence to this plan on the part of the trained workmen in the great generality of the mechanical industries."

In justice to Veblen it should also be noted that he always wrote in a vein of irony, tongue-in-cheek, and one may always suspect that he did not have the illusions contained in the proposals he so solemnly put forth. The final word of his book is to assure the "massive body of well-to-do citizens" that there is nothing in his ideas about a rule of the technicians "that should reasonably flutter their sensibilities."

Scott and his associates have departed from Veblen not only in taking themselves seriously, but in omitting from their theoretical scheme that part of Veblen which alone gave some degree of plausibility and coherence to his proposals, namely, the reliance upon "aggressive support of the trained working force." Thus we see that the substance of Technocracy is not even Veblenism at its best, but only in a degenerate form.

HOW CAPITALISM IS ABANDONING THE "PRICE SYSTEM."

It is worth noting that not only the technocrats are seeking to find a way around the imbecilities of capitalism, through some modification or evasion of "the price system." Throughout the world we are witnessing gigantic attempts to overcome the paralysis of international trade by means of reversion to the pre-capitalist system of barter. Within each country, whole communities and single institutions are passing over in a greater or less degree to methods of payment in kind. Especially in dealing with the unemployed masses, capitalism as a whole is exerting all its efforts to remove them from the field of operation of "the price system" by abolishing cash relief and substituting grocery baskets, flop-houses, forced labor under the pseudonym of "self-help," labor camps, etc.

All of these manifestations are symptoms of decay and degeneration of economy under the blows of the capitalist crisis. There is nothing in any of them which points to any way out of the crisis. They have exactly the same economic and political significance as the simultaneous process, on a large scale, in American agriculture of abandonment of tractors, automobiles and higher forms of machine production generally, and the falling back upon the more primitive horse and mule, and the direct application of human labor to the soil.

The same fate awaits every proposal which the technocrats may at some future time find the courage to bring forward on the basis of their theories, which refuse to face the fundamental task of the expropriation of capitalist private property by a revolutionary workers' government.

THE REVOLUTIONARY WAY OUT OF THE CRISIS

Technocracy is only one of the symptoms of the crisis of capitalism and contributes nothing to the solution of this crisis. It represents only the dreams and illusions of a baffled, unemployed mass of technicians who have been deprived of their functions by the decay of capitalism, but who hope to re-establish themselves and capitalism through some change in the superstructure which does not violate the sacred principle of capitalist private property.

The present profound crisis which has shattered the foundations of capitalist society, is by no means an unforeseen catastrophe. It was forecast as long ago as 1847 in the *Communist Manifesto* by Karl Marx and Engels. At the same time the solution of this crisis was outlined with a precision and clarity which holds as good today as when it was written. Today we have realized in its sharpest form those conditions outlined in the *Communist Manifesto* in 1847:

"Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation, had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed; and why? Because there is too much civilization, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions by which they are confined, and as soon as they overcome these limitations, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them . . ."

The bourgeoisie cannot step outside the limits of that capitalist system which developed only through the constant succession of crises and finally produced the present supreme crisis, the collapse of its world system. Only a revolutionary change can lead humanity out of its present chaos. The bearer of this change is thus described in the *Communist Manifesto*:

"Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product . . ."

"All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interests of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the advanced majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air . . .

"The modern laborer . . . instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth. And here it becomes evident that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society, and to impose its condition of existence upon society as an over-riding law. It is unfit to rule, because it is incompetent to insure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him. Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie; in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society . . . The development of modern industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces above all, are its own grave diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."

What is the result of the overthrow of the capitalist power and the establishment of a working class government which takes over all the means of production out of the hands of the capitalist? Let the answer be taken from the words of Engels written in 1883:

"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. Anarchy in social production is replaced by systematic, definite organization. The struggle for individual existence disappears. Then for the first time, man, in a certain sense is finally marked off from the rest of the animal kingdom and emerges from mere animal conditions of existence into really human ones . . . Man's own social organization, hitherto confronting him as a necessity imposed by nature and history, now becomes the result of his own free action . . . Only from that time will man himself, more and more consciously, make his own history—only from that time will the social causes set in movement by him have in the main and in a constantly growing measure, the results intended by him. It is the ascent of man from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom." (*Socialism, Utopian and Scientific.*)

Technocracy sees the separate facts of the collapse of the capitalist system. But it does not understand the cause of this collapse, inherent in the very nature of capitalist production. Therefore, it is blind to the existence of those forces of the working class which alone can find the solution to the crisis. Therefore also, it has no program for the way out of the crisis. Therefore it sets itself to fight Marxism and to oppose the Communist program which alone shows the revolutionary way out of the crisis.

Is this antagonism against Marxism by the technicians a necessary and inevitable thing? By no means. It is unnecessary and unfortunate. Above all in America, the crisis has realized even for the upper strata of the technicians that condition foreseen in 1847 in the *Communist Manifesto* which said:

"Entire sections of the ruling class are, by the advance of industry, precipitated into the proletariat, or are at least threatened in their conditions of existence. These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress.

"The process of dissolution going on within the ruling class . . . assumes such a violent, glaring character that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands . . . and in particular, a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole."

It is clear therefore that from its very foundation the Communist movement, the revolutionary working class, has foreseen and welcomed the accession to their ranks of those elements from the capitalist ruling class, particularly the technicians, who suffer from the destructive effects of capitalism and who finally begin to understand the revolutionary way out.

Particularly today should the technicians understand these questions since they have before their eyes the spectacle of capitalism destroying the very possibilities of technical progress, destroying the profession of the engineers, and destroying the engineers themselves. In New York City, to take a casual example, engineers who designed and constructed the Eighth Avenue Subway, are glad to get jobs in the subway booths changing dimes and quarters into nickels. On the other hand, our technicians have before their eyes the marvelous surge forward of Socialist industrial construction in the Soviet Union, where the workers hold power. Under the workers' rule, the engineering profession is blossoming forth as never before in the history of mankind. For the first time in history, we are beginning to get some limited idea of the marvelous productive powers in man's hands when he finally liberates these powers from the fetters of capitalist private property.

In this respect we recommend to the careful attention of American engineers and technicians the speech delivered on November 26, 1932, by V. M. Molotov, Chairman of the Council of Peoples' Commissars of the Soviet Union, to the Fifth All-Union Conference of Soviet Engineers and Technicians, published as a part of this pamphlet.

Perhaps the extreme political weakness of Technocracy, its close clinging to the skirts of capitalist private property, its repudiation of Marxism, has been to some extent caused by the early experiences of Mr. Scott, the leader of Technocracy. When he first began trying to develop the fundamental ideas of Veblen, along in 1920-21, Mr. Scott tried to develop his ideas in conjunction with the Industrial Workers of the World (I. W. W.). In connection with that organization he established a bureau designed to teach the workers how to run industry after they would have taken it over. This utopian scheme was, of course, doomed to a miserable collapse. Perhaps the resulting disappointment estranged Mr. Scott from the idea of reliance upon the working class. Not only was that scheme utopian; also Mr. Scott was associating himself not with the Marxian vanguard of the working class, but with an off-shoot of the revolutionary movement which had entered upon the blind-alley of anarcho-syndicalism. We may hope that the development of engineers and technicians generally will not follow the same path, but that they will more and more master the understanding of capitalism, given by the teachings of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, and of the revolutionary path to the transformation of society that flows therefrom.

Finally, we would recommend to the technocrats and to the technicians generally, who still have some illusions of the possibility of a planned capitalism, to not only study Marx (which they have seriously neglected), but to study the expanding life of the Soviet Union and the writings of that greatest disciple of Marx and Lenin, Joseph Stalin. Especially we would recommend to them to read Stalin's political report to the Sixteenth Party Congress of the Russian Communist Party. † Within that report we would especially call their attention to that paragraph which said:

"If capitalism could adapt production, not to the acquisition of the maximum of profits, but to the systematic improvement of the material position of the mass of the people, if it could employ its profits not in satisfying the whims of the parasitic classes, not in perfecting methods of exploitation, not in exporting capital, but in the systematic improvement of the material position of the workers and peasants, then there would be no crisis. But then, also, capitalism would not be capitalism. In order to abolish crises, capitalism must be abolished."

† Published by WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS—Price 50 cents.

The Technical Intelligentsia and Socialist Construction

By V. M. MOLOTOV

Speech delivered at the Fifth All-Union Conference of Engineers and Technicians of the Soviet Union on November 26, 1932.

POLITICS, THE MASSES AND THE TECHNICAL INTELLIGENTSIA

Comrades! I should like in the first place to convey to the Conference, and through it to the whole of the engineers and technicians, the fraternal greetings of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party and of the Council of People's Commissars (*Loud applause*).

The present Conference has met at a moment when the working class of our country is summing up the results of the fifteen years existence of the Soviet Power. The question, what these results consist of, is of great political importance; the answer to this question concerns the interests not only of the Soviet Union, but also of all classes in the capitalist countries.

The Fifteenth Anniversary of October is an important date in the history of the international proletarian revolution, in the history of the decisive struggle of Communism against capitalism. For the proletarian, and for the working peasant—no matter in what country he may be living—broad possibilities are now offered of comparing the life of the toiler under present-day capitalism, which is in a state of absolute decay, with the life of the toiler under the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is building up Socialism in the Soviet Republic. There can be no doubt whatever that the worker, and every toiler who is able to consider the fundamental facts and events of the last fifteen years, will know what fundamental conclusion results therefrom for him. This conclusion will inevitably be, that the actual difficulties still confronting the toilers of the Soviet Union can in no way be compared with the situation of the workers and of all toilers under the conditions of the temporary stabilization of capitalism which is now collapsing, under the conditions of the three years of world economic crisis, of enormous unemployment and of the crying need of millions in the countries under the capitalist rule. On the other hand, the growing enthusiasm of the workers and of the masses of collective peasants of the Soviet Union who are building up Socialism is the best reply to the question as to the attitude of the toilers of our country to the October Revolution. It is therefore under-

standable that the broad masses of the working class on the other side of the frontiers of the Soviet Union are becoming more and more convinced that for them a better future is inseparably bound up with the fate of the October Revolution and its international prospects. The facts show that no manoeuvres on the part of the pseudo-socialist parties of Europe and America can hide the growing revolutionary indignation of the masses of the proletarians, who are finally going over to the side of the international Socialist revolution.

All these fundamental questions of politics inevitably confront also the technical intelligentsia. In their circles there of course exists no completely uniform estimate of the results of the October Revolution. This uniformity can by no means be expected, because the social roots of the individual sections of the engineers and technicians greatly vary. A great part of the old specialists were connected in the past with sections of the bourgeoisie. Along with a strong stratum of new specialists from the proletarian youth, there exist among the technical intelligentsia very considerable numbers of technicians who are connected with non-proletarian, petty bourgeois strata. The social composition and the political physiognomy of the technical intelligentsia has changed considerably in the last 18 months. There is no doubt that the majority of their present cadres stand firmly on the basis of October. It must not be forgotten that a political turn in our favor has taken place in the last few years among the old and most highly qualified cadres of engineers and technicians.

We must fight with all the greater energy for a conscious and active support of the Bolshevist policy of the Soviet power by the masses of the technical intelligentsia. Without this support the successful building up of Socialism cannot be assured.

The capitalists in power do not draw the engineers and technicians into politics. Here too there is with them a peculiar division of labor. The capitalists want the working population, including the engineers and technicians, to concern themselves as little as possible with political matters. For this purpose the capitalists have in their service specially trained bourgeois politicians, "specialists" in quieting the revolutionary workers, "specialists" in lulling the class vigilance of the toilers, "specialists" in spreading and strengthening all kinds of political and religious prejudices which are useful for the bourgeoisie for the purpose of preserving their rule. The bourgeoisie assign to the engineers and technicians a limited sphere of activity in the enterprises or institutions, but endeavor with all the means at their disposal to enforce from them faithful service to private capital and definite submission to bour-

geois influence. The bourgeoisie usually succeeds in doing this for a time also in the case of the specialists who come from the working section of the population. The bourgeois parties of all shades, including the radical socialists, social democrats, "independents" etc., do what remains to be done in order to shape the political character of the technical intelligentsia.

That is how matters are in the bourgeois countries. With us the specialists are in quite another situation.

The capitalists cannot get along either in home or in foreign politics without "secret diplomacy," without political secrets, which are hidden from the workers and toilers in general. Therefore they hypocritically tell the workers not to have anything to do with politics, or at the most to be neutral on political questions. The capitalists cannot but fear that the honest scientifically educated engineer, technician or agronomist, who has grasped the essence of political questions, who understands matters which are conducted exclusively by the well-to-do politicians of the bourgeois parties, might come to the conclusion that he cannot support them, or at least cannot associate himself with the policy of the bourgeoisie, with the policy of oppression and predatory exploitation of the workers and peasants, which results in increasing the material wealth and pleasure of the ruling class of the bourgeoisie.

With us there is a different situation, a situation diametrically opposed to that in the capitalist countries.

The Bolsheviks desire the engineers and technicians to be drawn into politics. The Bolsheviks want the engineers, technicians and agronomists to take the conscious and active part in the political fight—of course on the side of the working class and of the toilers, of course in order finally to overcome the bourgeoisie and their last influence. We do not doubt that the more highly developed the political consciousness of the masses of engineers and technicians becomes and the more profoundly they grasp and ponder the results and facts of the proletarian fight against the bourgeoisie and for Socialism, for the future of the whole of humanity, the more actively and successfully they will fight on our side, on the side of the October Revolution, on the front of Socialist construction. Nay more, we directly assert, that without the necessary understanding, without the necessary recognition in regard to politics, no one can really call himself an intelligent, thinking and cultured human being.

The mask of neutrality avails nothing. In the best case it is a sign of profound social backwardness on the part of a man, even if he holds a diploma or possesses a "great name." We remember also that, under the influence of this or that circumstance, there can even now be political

vacillations in the ranks of the technical intelligentsia at the moment of intensification of the class struggles, and that they are even inevitable. From this the Bolsheviks draw the conclusion that they must again turn to the technical intelligentsia, explain to them their political line, submit to them the analysis of the facts of social development and of the class struggle, and must set themselves the task of not ceasing but extending and deepening the political work among the technicians and engineers.

This follows from the vital necessities of the Soviet power, from the fundamental interests of Socialist construction. The Communists regard the question of Socialist construction as a question of Bolshevist education and organization of the masses under the flag of their emancipation from exploitation and intellectual slavery, by means of which the bourgeoisie subjugate the toilers. Therefore, the Bolsheviks again and again put to the vacillating elements of the technical intelligentsia the question of what path they intend to choose, the question of what ruling class they wish to go with; with the proletariat or with the bourgeoisie? "Neutrality" in this question means in reality support of the bourgeoisie—when the capitalists are in power, or in the best case a half-way position between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—when, as at the present time, the last decisive fight of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is proceeding. It is time that those people who have access to books and can study historical facts, understood that there are no more pitiable people than those who, even after the events of the last fifteen years, are not clear regarding the questions of the class struggle which determine the fate of countries and peoples. It is impossible, however, to obtain a true conception of the meaning of the social class struggle without grasping that only one of the two classes—capitalist bourgeoisie, or Socialist proletariat—can be in power. The intermediary strata and classes cannot play an important *leading* role, and are either doomed historically to passivity on the side of the bourgeoisie and of the big landowners, or must become allies of the proletariat that has inscribed on its flag the emancipation fight of all toilers from the yoke of bourgeois exploitation.

We put these politically fundamental questions to the whole mass of engineers and technicians, and strive at the same time to create complete clarity, which the bourgeois system could get along without, but which the country of the Soviets, which is building Socialism, cannot get along without. We regard it as one of our most important tasks to achieve the most rapid and final going over of the whole mass of engineers and technicians to the side of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to active participation in the Socialist re-education of the masses under the leadership of the Bolshevist Party.

We write and speak a good deal about our work of construction, about starting new works and factories going, about the work of the factories which are already functioning. The importance of our work of construction, however, lies not only and not so much in the number of the working, the equipped and the new factories, as in the inner life which is going on in these factories, and the new construction under the proletarian dictatorship. Of decisive importance is the *content* of that work which our Party, the Soviets, the trade unions, the Young Communist League and other organizations are performing in the enterprises and on the new constructions. It must be particularly clear to the old specialists what fundamental changes have taken place in the life of our industrial enterprises since the October Revolution. With all the shortcomings in the work of some of our Party, Soviet, economic, trade union and Young Communist organizations, one must nevertheless see that our factories and pits, that our workshops are living a new life, are breathing another air than the old. These enterprises of ours have become schools of Socialist education of the working people. In them the old workers as well as the new employees, engineers, and finally also the managers, who have only recently come from various strata in the towns and villages, are being re-educated. This great work, the work on the collective farms and Soviet farms included, is proceeding under the leadership of our Bolshevik Party, which gives the political direction and leadership to the whole practical work of the Soviets, trade unions, and also other organizations and institutions. Only the class-consciousness and activity of the masses—of the workers, collective peasants and others—furnishes us with a firm basis for the rapid advance of Socialist construction. The growth of this class-consciousness and activity of the working people is the chief expression of the successes of our work for the Socialist re-education of the masses.

How great our successes are in this respect is to be seen from the fact that the Party has been able to set itself the task, under the second Five-Year Plan, of completely liquidating the capitalist elements, abolishing classes and converting the whole mass of the working people into conscious and active builders of the classless Socialist society. And this task is not a phantastic but a historical task set by the proletariat, the leading force in our country, by the whole course of the fight and events.

The technical intelligentsia occupy advanced positions in the construction of the new society and much, very much, depends upon the growth of their political consciousness and their scientific-technical qualifications, which are so necessary for the management of industry, of agricultural and transport enterprises.

The Soviet Union has great tasks which can never be solved without struggle, without difficulties. We are not advancing along a smooth high road. We have to conduct a big fight, in which individual attempts at organized counter-revolutionary resistance must be overcome and in which elementary obstacles arise at every step, especially in the country. At every stage of the proletarian revolution the serious success of our cause depends upon our pertinacity in the fight, upon our capacity to overcome each and every difficulty. We can already say that we have overcome our main inner difficulties. The Leninist question, "Who will be the victor?" has been finally and irrevocably decided in our favor.

Victory has been achieved thanks to the circumstance that our Party has kept firmly to its Bolshevist position and offered resistance, both in principle and in practice, to all enemies of Leninism in the opportunist camp. There were not a few attacks on these positions and not a few attacks on our work on the part of various bourgeois opposition elements. They were beaten, and the degenerates of all shades were beaten, whilst our Party is growing and increasing in strength. These lessons must not be forgotten now, when the bourgeois-oppositional degenerates have spoken in the language of the open white guardists, in the language of all these Rjutins and their instigators behind the scenes.

The Soviet power has set itself the task of building up the classless society, and this, as is known, is the fundamental idea of the October Revolution. I would be very naive, however, to conclude from this that the realization of the task of establishing the classless society is possible without fierce class struggles. Quite the contrary. In the period when we are undertaking on the whole front an organized advance of the whole of the workers and collective peasants for this cause against the class enemy, this enemy, beaten and subjugated, is making desperate attempts at resistance. As he is incapable of conducting an open fight he is developing a devilish activity and dexterity in secret sabotage, is using poisoned political arrows, and is conducting every fight against Soviet power with methods against which there often does not exist the necessary vigilance in our ranks. But all these desperate and various attempts at anti-Soviet fight are only the miserable remnants of the former power of the bourgeois, anti-Soviet forces. We have enough means at our disposal in order to combat them. Only we must hold these means in constant readiness.

The Soviet Union with its Bolshevist policy, is not afraid of any inner hostile forces. Our policy, is tested by the experience of the many millions on a vast territory with numerous races and peoples, distinguished by a great variety of different technical-production conditions

of economic life, differences of languages and differences of ways of life and habits. The conception of the world-historical power and importance of Leninism will become the more complete, the more clearly we grasp its role in the reshaping and Socialist education of the masses, with all the differences of their past fate, with all the diversity of their present national character.

THE PRACTICAL ORGANIZATIONAL TASKS OF THE VILLAGE AND THE QUESTION OF CADRES

The main political task of the proletarian revolution in the Soviet Union has been accomplished—Socialism is victorious. This does not in any way lessen the importance of the political questions confronting us. It is necessary, however, specially to emphasize the importance of the *organizational-political* tasks under the present conditions. Whilst bearing in mind that the correct political line is the foundation and the elementary precondition of practical work, we must, taking into account the concrete circumstances, persistently concentrate our forces on the organizational side of the matter. In other words, our task consists in bringing politics into our practical work, and thereby raising to a higher level the realization of the actual unity of the political leadership and the practical work in the Soviet Union.

We are faced with tremendous organizational-political tasks in the sphere of industry and transport. It is only necessary to consider how many new industrial and transport enterprises, how many new factories, mines, power works, railways, and water transport services are being opened. In order to secure the proper management of this vast number of state enterprises we must still do much to improve the organization of the whole of the works and their numerous branches. Everybody will understand that here there are many important practical questions regarding the factories and works already functioning as well as those under construction.

The organizational tasks in this sphere, however, are not to be compared with the extraordinary organizational-practical difficulties which we have at present to overcome in the agricultural sphere in the village.

A few years ago, when there were not many collective farms nor a very big network of Soviet farms, our organizational task in the village were considerably simpler. We learned fairly well about five years ago how to organize the village poor, to weld together the poor and middle peasants for the fight against the kulak, and to adopt a number of fundamental state and Party measures. But on the other hand we have acquired very little experience in organizing Socialist forms of economy.

Since then the situation in the village has undergone a thorough change.

In the last three or four years the collective and Soviet farms have acquired a dominating position. It suffices to point out that 80 per cent of the spring sowings this year were carried out by Soviet and collective farms, and only 20 per cent by the individual peasants. This was only due to the fact that there are over 200,000 collective farms and over 5000 Soviet and co-operative farms in the Soviet Union.

It will be obvious to everybody, however, that it is an exceedingly hard task to correctly organize the work on this vast number of Soviet farms and collective farms. It requires above all hundreds of thousands of qualified specialists for the various branches of large-scale agriculture. From where are they to be obtained? These cadres did not exist formerly, unless one reckons the thin strata of the old specialists. For the purpose of organizing Socialist large-scale economy, which is developing on such a broad front, we could not obtain any cadres from the old bourgeois society, not even the inadequate but qualified specialists who existed in industry before the revolution. The many millions of peasants who have joined the collective farms could not wait until we obtained the economic cadres required for mass collectivization. It follows from this that enormous problems have arisen recently in regard to obtaining cadres of specialists for various branches for Socialist large-scale economy, and these cadres must for the greater part come from the collective farming movement itself; they must arise on the basis of successful building up of collective farms, regardless of all the difficulties of organizing the collective farms in the present period.

The cadres of organizers and technical specialists in large-scale agriculture are growing in the process of the fight for the collective farms and for their consolidation. This does not mean, however, that we can close our eyes to the special difficulties of the moment which we have to cope with in building up the collective farms and Soviet farms. And these are not simply organizational difficulties of a technical nature, nor is it simply a question of a lack of agriculture. No, the matter is far more complicated, and at the same time the organizational tasks are closely interconnected with the political.

The kulak, of course, is no longer so strong that he can venture to conduct an open fight. No, he has been forced into the background; he has been beaten and has crept away out of sight. But apart from everything else, there are on the 200,000 new collective farms and on the Soviet farms not a few cracks and fissures which we cannot see here from above, but which offer sufficient opportunity for anti-Soviet elements

from the ranks of the kulaks and merchants who have been beaten by us, from the ranks of the officers, etc., to creep in. And how many there are of those who have not learned anything during the years of the revolution and cannot reconcile themselves to the new system; how many there are in these strata who have maintained their anger, resentment and hostility to the Soviet power and are concealing them until the "suitable" moment arrives. And finally, how many of such enemies have found their way into our factories and institutions, and still more into the collective and Soviet farms in the remote and backward districts.

We cannot expect anything else from these people but fanatical and skilfully concealed resistance to the whole of our difficult work in the village. They will offer this resistance when we work at improving the collective farms, when we fight to increase the yield of the fields of the collective farms, when we organize the sowing campaign, the harvest, the threshing work and the storing up of grain. It not unfrequently happens on the present-day collective farms that people carry on a concealed disruptive anti-Soviet work, at the same time posing as "friends" of the collective peasants in order deliberately to counterpose the interests of the individual peasants to the interests of the collective farm as a whole, skilfully play up to the private property instincts of the collective peasants, by inducing the vacillating part of them to misappropriate the property of the collective farm and thereby organize robbery of the collective farms; sabotage the grain-collecting and other state tasks, under the pretext that the requirements of the collective farm members are not yet covered; push "their" people into the apparatus of the collective farms in order to discredit the idea of collective farming; magnify the shortcomings in the work of managers of collective farms who are not particularly efficient but nevertheless true to the Soviet Power—all this and many other things take place not infrequently on the collective farms. Owing to the weakness of our Party cadres in the village and the existence of politically unstable elements, often also of politically degenerate people among the leading Communists in the village, there are not infrequently great possibilities for anti-Soviet disintegration work on the collective farms and even on the Soviet farms.

From this there arise our chief difficulties in the sowing and harvesting campaigns and the special difficulties in the grain-collection campaign, as it is precisely in the fight for grain that the anti-Soviet forces are endeavoring with their special secret measures to offer the greatest resistance to us. The kulak in particular takes advantage of the fact that in many cases we have not succeeded in managing the collective

farms properly and not yet learned Bolshevistically to educate the collective peasants. We must in any case demand from our functionaries in the village an understanding of the new situation which has arisen in the village. It is precisely this understanding which our comrades in many cases lack.

Cases are still not infrequent in which our Party workers fail to see that in the Socialist background of the collective farms at the present stage there exist inevitable social and political differences among the collective peasants. They therefore do not grasp the simple Bolshevik truth, that it is possible to strengthen the collective farm, to promote it economically and really improve the position of the collective peasants, only if on the collective farm itself there is conducted a persistent inexorable fight for organizing a strong cadre of collective farmers, for mobilizing the main mass of the collective peasants round these cadres against sabotage carried on on the collective farms, against anti-Soviet elements who have managed to creep in, against the slackers on the collective farms, against those who waste the collective farm property, against those who sabotage the grain collecting and other state tasks. The whole mass of collective peasants, not to speak of Communists, must realize that these tasks rank first. From this it naturally follows that the solution of the main tasks regarding the strengthening of the collective farms consists in the main in solving the question of the economic and technical management. In order to cope with the economic-technical tasks, one must of course understand the new political circumstances which have arisen in the village.

In the sphere of strengthening the collective farms we are faced with a number of big and urgent tasks, the extent and newness of which renders their solution difficult. But for this reason the success of every honest functionary who is engaged in organizing Soviet farms and collective farms into model Socialist farms, is such an important and congenial task that it attracts all the really class-conscious intellectuals who are devoted to the cause of our people.

Our practical organizers, our economic and technical leaders on the collective farms and Soviet farms, whose ranks must be daily reinforced, must bear in mind that they occupy one of the most decisive sectors of the front of Socialist construction. We have established thousands of collective farms, but we are not yet so far advanced that *all* these farms are *our* collective farms. It must be realized that the collective farms which are not controlled and managed by us are controlled and managed by anti-Soviet elements. Here, too, there is no neutrality. We and especially our comrades in the villages, will only be able to master the task of

building up collective farms and making ourselves their real leaders when we conduct the fight against the hostile class elements who are carrying on a persistent anti-Soviet undermining activity on the collective farms in order to frustrate the realization of the state tasks, when we fight for the strengthening of the collective farms and Soviet farms on the basis of common fraternal work for increasing the harvest yield, for the Socialist re-education of the masses of the collective peasants.

The main political task of the proletarian revolution in the village has been solved—the collective farms have triumphed in the main. Precisely therefore there have arisen enormous organizational practical tasks the solution of which demands prolonged and strenuous work. It demands the corresponding transformation of the village, a whole army of new specialists and organizers for agriculture of the new Socialist type. We can and must now energetically tackle these organizational-practical questions of agriculture, and our revolutionary experience is a guarantee that we shall solve them in spite of all the difficulties.

We can assert this with such confidence because we already have a firm material basis in the national economy, and before all in the industry which has developed in the last few years.

THE SUCCESSES OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN, THE PRODUCTIVITY OF LABOR AND THE TECHNICAL INTELLIGENTSIA

The Bolshevist policy of industrialization, which was successfully carried out by the working class in the years of so-called "peaceful construction," has already shown great results. It is not for nothing that we fought for the Bolshevist tempo of industrialization in the Soviet Union. Thanks to this fight we have achieved great successes in promoting the national economy and have created the pre-conditions for further and still greater successes of its development.

The Bolshevist tempo of industrialization found its fullest expression in the successful realization of the Five-Year Plan. The bourgeoisie and its press right from the first day yapped about the impossibility of fulfilling the the Five-Year Plan, about the inevitability of its collapse. In reply to that there arose among the working masses of the Soviet Union a greater struggle for for the accelerated carrying out of the Five-Year Plan. We see now that in the main the Five-Year Plan has been successfully realized in four years. (*Applause.*)

The tempo of our Five-Year Plan was not invented by the Bolsheviks. It was a historical necessity for the proletarian state, which is building Socialism in hostile capitalist surroundings. We would not have been Bolsheviks if we had not understood our obligations to use

to the utmost every year of peaceful existence of the Soviet Union and the support which we are getting in this respect from the workers abroad for the greater development of our industry and the growth of the working class cadres. He who forgets the international conditions in which our work of construction goes on, does not take into account the great difficulties and the main danger which exists for the cause of the working class in the country and for the cause of the whole world proletariat.

We can already speak of the fundamental results of the first Five-Year Plan.

These results consist first of all in the fact that the Socialist economic forms have triumphed in the Soviet Union and have acquired the dominating position in the whole national economy. It follows from this that our chief work at present lies in solving practical organizational questions.

The most important result of the first Five-Year Plan consists in the fact that, by developing heavy industry we have created our own Soviet basis for carrying out the technical reconstruction of all branches of our national economy. This in no way means, however, that we can rest satisfied with the results we have already achieved.

There are a number of weak spots in our heavy industry which hamper our economy. Whilst we have a tremendous growth of machine construction, there are a number of cases in which we have not learned really to master the technique of production. Some branches of our light industry are lagging behind, a thing which is impermissible, especially in the period of intensified struggle of the working class to increase the production of articles of daily use. No one, however, can deny the fact that there has been created in the Soviet Union the material basis for technically re-equipping industry itself (heavy and light industry) and transport, which is very much behind-hand in technical reconstruction, and finally also agriculture, where the tasks of technical reconstruction are tremendous.

Comrades, we must technically re-equip our whole economy not only by raising it to the level which has been reached by the technically advanced capitalist countries, but also by considerably surpassing the present technical achievements of these countries. We are already successfully advancing on this path, but we must and can do incomparably more than we have done hitherto.

By introducing the production of complicated machines, the most modern methods of production and organization in a number of new branches of production, we are—in spite of the numerous faults in the

work of various organs, institutions and enterprises—paving the way to the complete mastery of all the fundamental achievements of international technique. We are making decided progress towards the solution of the tremendous tasks set by Comrade Stalin to the whole Party—the task of mastering technique.

Of course, to acquire all these achievements has been no easy task. But there are no limits and no insuperable difficulties for the growing enthusiasm of the builders of Socialism in our country, who under real Bolshevik leadership are devotedly performing their work in the factories, in the mines, on the Soviet farms and collective farms, on the new constructions and in the enterprises which are running.

The best indication of the possibilities we have in this sphere is the following: we have already been able to prove by facts that there is now no task in the sphere of technique the difficulties of which our scientists and engineers cannot vanquish and overcome. (*Applause.*)

We pay tribute to the foreign specialists who are honestly working in our enterprises and on our new constructions. We shall make use of their services also in the future. Apart from all else this is in accordance with our international principles. But as internationalists we are confident that the time will come when the workers and toilers of other countries will make good use of our experiences, and will apply our Soviet experience not only in the sphere of technique but also in regard to Socialist revolution. (*Loud applause.*)

Whilst paying due recognition to the foreign specialists, and without coming into contradiction with our principles of internationalism I can nevertheless maintain that what has been achieved in the Soviet Republic, what is growing and increasing to the advantage of all toilers and to the terror of our enemy, is the achievement of *our* Soviet workers, technicians and engineers. (*Loud applause.*)

We must draw definite practical conclusions from all this. These practical conclusions must of course consist first of all in achieving an improvement in the work on the most important and still weak sectors of economic activity.

In the Soviet Union all the industrial and transport enterprises which were left over from the pre-revolutionary period are working. With us there is no closing down of works and factories. If with us there are enterprises which are not sufficiently utilized, this is not to be attributed to lack of orders or lack of purchasing power on the part of the consumers. In the years since the revolution, thousands of new enterprises have been set going. Not a day passes without our industry,

our transport and our agriculture increasing their output and new works being added to those which are already functioning.

At the same time we must admit that there are many weaknesses and shortcomings in the organizing of production. To keep to the main matter, one must say that our greatest weakness is the *low productivity* of labor.

I will not cite any statistical data. Everyone of you knows of not a few examples of this low productivity of labor and also of examples of how in some enterprises, instead of a growth, a decline of the productivity of labor is to be recorded.

We know the reasons for this. First of all, it is due to the fact that in the last year or so our enterprises have engaged a tremendous number of *new* workers who have never worked in factories before. In the last two or three years alone 2½ million new workers have been brought into the industrial enterprises. We must add to these the several millions of new workers engaged on the construction of new buildings. The whole of these new workers and employees are passing through the first school of work in industry, are first learning to work at the machines, are first learning collective work and proletarian discipline. Among these new workers there are already many real shock-brigade workers and heroes of labor, but a considerable part of these new workers has served greatly to increase the stratum of inexperienced and undisciplined workers in our enterprises. In addition, there took place in these years an influx of elements hostile to the working class; sometimes openly antagonistic and direct anti-Soviet elements.

There is no doubt that the lack of technical and economic cadres also affects the productivity of labor.

I will not deal with the other causes of the low productivity of labor. They can be traced in the last resort to the lack of organizational work in our enterprises.

It is obvious that we cannot put up with this state of affairs.

"Socialism"—said Lenin—"requires a conscious movement forward of the masses to a higher productivity of labor in comparison with capitalism."

These and many other references by Lenin to the importance of the struggle for increasing the productivity of labor for Socialism must serve to guide us also at the present time. The working class of our country must make the fight against the low productivity of labor in our industry, transport and agriculture one of their main practical tasks.

The working class can now develop this fight with the prospect of rapid and considerable successes. There exist the prerequisites for this.

We have done a good deal in the last few years for the re-equipment

of our enterprises. Our machine-construction industry has accomplished tremendous work. We have imported numerous machines, plants and other factory equipment from abroad. In addition to a great number of new agricultural and industrial enterprises which are equipped with the most modern technique, one can cite a long list of factories and works which have been reconstructed, and thereby converted into completely new enterprises with first-class technique.

From this one can see what a solid material technical basis we have for the development of the fight for increasing the productivity of labor. The material basis already existing, if rightly utilized, renders it possible to lighten the labor of the workers in many respects and at the same time successfully increase productivity of labor in the whole industry, transport and socialized agriculture.

A whole number of new measures on the part of the Party and the government facilitate the struggle to increase the productivity of labor.

These measures include the decisions regarding improvement in the supplies to the workers and the extension of the powers of the factory managements responsible for the supplies to the workers in the big factories; the recently issued decree regarding the fight against absence from work without excuse which is directed against idlers, slackers and those who abuse the privileges of special food-cards, as well as other measures against the abnormal fluctuation of cadres in industry and in transport, which are likewise of great importance in regard to this question.

The trade unions themselves have recently undertaken an increased supervision of the work of their lower organizations and especially of the factory committees. The attitude of the working masses to the question of increasing the productivity of labor is shown by the fact that Socialist competition is bringing forth ever fresh thousands of shock-brigaders and heroes of labor from the ranks of the workers, engineers and technicians.

We therefore have every reason for making the improvement in the productivity of labor our main practical task.

Insofar as the Socialist forms of our national economy have acquired a dominating position and thereby secured the necessary degree of construction (growth of the most important branches of industry and extension of the area under cultivation), the promotion of the productivity of labor must become a decisive practical task for the whole working class and of the peasants on the collective farms. It is also clear that the successful increase of the productivity of labor is based upon the

intelligent utilization of the greatly increasing material-technical basis of our enterprises, on the better organization of labor and, of course, on securing the necessary working discipline. There is no need to prove that in all these respects we have vast inner reserves and tremendous possibilities, the utilization of which depends wholly and entirely upon the Socialist consciousness, upon the activity and the degree of organization of the working class and its economic and technical commanding staff.

In connection with all these questions a special responsibility rests with the technical intelligentsia. It must be openly admitted that the engineer-technical cadres and their organizations have not yet by a long way done all that is necessary in this respect. In the meantime, we must judge from the real activity and devotion of the engineers and technicians to the cause of the proletarian revolution on the basis of their participation in the work of the Party, Soviets and trade unions for increasing the productivity of labor in the Socialist undertakings.

There is no need for me to deal at length with the question of the attitude of the Soviet power to the technical intelligentsia. I will only say a few words on this subject.

In the first place it is clear that the attitude of the Soviet power to the technical intelligentsia depends entirely upon the technical intelligentsia themselves, upon the attitude of the technical intelligentsia to the cause of the working class and upon their practical participation in the building of Socialism. (*Applause.*) The relations of the Soviet power to the technical intelligentsia and the attitude of the masses of engineers and technicians to the struggle of the working class which is building Socialism, are inseparably bound up with one another. Not only the present conference of engineers and technicians, all of whom, I hope, are sincere friends of the working class (*Applause*), but also the whole body of technicians and engineers in our country must, by their work in the factories and in the organization of economy, secure that the attitude to them of the Party and the government shall be the same as that which exists in our country for the class-conscious and active builders of Socialism. (*Applause.*)

There is no need for me to explain the differences, which are already known to you, in the attitude of the Soviet power to the various strata of the technical intelligentsia. I shall not be saying anything new to you if I repeat that our attitude to the wreckers, that our policy towards them as towards sworn enemies of the working class, remains firm and ruthless. (*Applause.*) On the other hand, as regards those honest, non-Party specialists who work hand in hand with us, we consider

it our task to achieve with them complete understanding of our aims and practical tasks, an understanding which is indispensable to all fighters for Socialism. (*Applause.*)

In the reconstruction period very much depends upon the cadres of engineers and technicians. Judged from the standpoint of the present tasks of reconstruction, we have very few cadres of old, highly qualified specialists. It is all the more necessary therefore for us to preserve such cadres and help them in their work. No single branch of our industry can manage even now without these old, highly qualified cadres.

But the old cadres of technical intelligentsia no longer have the monopoly position they formerly possessed. The position has changed considerably, new technical cadres and red specialists have streamed into and are streaming into our industry day after day. The cause of Socialist construction now depends more and more upon the work of these new technical and economic forces.

The ranks of the engineering and technical workers have grown enormously in the last two or three years. In no single sphere of our construction have we such a rapid growth as in the training of technical cadres. This is an enormous achievement on our part.

But even so we cannot close our eyes to the shortcomings connected with this rapid growth. One cannot deny that, along with the whole positive significance of the enormous extent of the training of red specialists there exists not a little superficiality, and sometimes also a lack of scientific-technical training. It must be pointed out that our economic organizations conduct the technical high schools and polytechnics inefficiently. In this connection attention must be called to the great political importance of the decision recently adopted by the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union on decisively improving the work of technical high schools and universities. It is necessary that our engineers and technicians actively participate in carrying out the appropriate measures.

Finally, regarding the material and living conditions of the engineers and technicians. This question was already dealt with in the report delivered today and I shall not indulge in repetitions.

It must be clear to you that our Party and the government have adopted a number of serious measures and show the greatest concern for the material and living conditions of the engineers and technicians. You are well aware of the government decisions regarding improving the housing conditions of the engineers and technicians. A number of important measures are also being adopted in regard to improving supplies. The salaries of the engineers and technicians in the Soviet Union

are not declining, as in the case in all capitalist countries, but are increasing every year. It cannot be denied that the carrying out in practice of the above-mentioned measures depends upon the work of the local organs, and also upon the checking up of this work by the central organizations. More attention must also be devoted to this in the future.

A comparison of the position of our engineers and technicians with the position of the technical intelligentsia in the capitalist countries is very instructive. Precisely at the present time, in the period of the severe crisis in the capitalist countries, capitalism has forced under its iron heel not only the workers and toiling peasants, but also the great mass of engineers and technicians and maintains the well-being only of the ruling capitalist leaders and their parasites and watch-dogs. The capitalists do not shrink from day after day throwing onto the street and reducing to beggary people who only yesterday occupied leading technical positions in their works and factories. Naturally there is now heard even from the ranks of those specialists who only yesterday had nothing whatever to do with politics—not to speak of the fight against the capitalist—voices of despair and protest against the rule of the bourgeoisie, against the regime of capitalism.

It should also be noted that in the capitalist press of Europe and America there is to be heard ever louder the voices of those intellectuals who are indignant on account of the proposals, emanating from the bourgeoisie, to abandon all technical progress, and who are now compelled to admit that in the whole world there is only one state, the Soviet Union, which connects its hopes and aims with technical progress and firmly believes in it. In this recognition we see not so much the recognition of our merits, as the objective confirmation of the actual advantages of Socialism over capitalism, which is now over-ripe and decaying.

At the same time we do not cease to speak of the difficulties of Socialist construction, and will not cease to summon the working class and all toilers in the country to the active fight for overcoming these difficulties. We know that the fight against these difficulties, against the difficulties of growth of Socialist economy and culture, will not weaken our muscles but will steel them, that is to say will strengthen our whole construction and open up new and ever grander prospects for the victory of emancipated labor in Socialist society.

Gorki in his article, "On the Most Important," has already shown in beautiful language how our Socialist construction is changing the

whole face of our country and its whole life, even in its remotest corners. In this article, published on October 31, Gorki says:

"This process is growing in breadth and depth; it is the process of the regeneration of our whole country, its rebirth to a new life, to the creation of a new culture. The little towns with wooden buildings; the nests of dull-witted petty bourgeois, of intellectually inert people, of the small parasites who spent their whole lives in cheating in order to enrich themselves at the cost of the workers and peasants who have died in conditions of semi-poverty are disappearing. Instead of these secluded retreats, new Socialist towns are rising in the centers of industry. The idiotism of the village, the clusters of small wooden houses with their three front windows and stuffy rooms in which the old rubbish of religious superstition was hoarded for centuries, where day in and day out there went on the petty struggle of brutal individualism, of blind self-centered, spiteful, grasping, egotism with all its abominations, are disappearing.

"Under the wheels of the tractors and combines, in face of the power of the new agricultural technique, the dull egotism of the village with the slavish submission to the elementary force of nature, with the lack of ideas, and servile surrender to fate, is disappearing."

We all read the works of Gorki, and know how well he understands the many, many characteristic features of the life of old Russia, and how wonderfully and artistically he is able to portray them. We can understand therefore, his joy and happiness when he sees now, in place of that obsolete, rotten system, a new life and Socialist culture arising.

I should like to quote still another passage from Gorki's article. He concludes the above-mentioned article "On the Most Important":

"Hundreds of thousands, millions of young people faded and withered without blossoming; they perished under the yoke of idiotism of the small provincial towns, of the villages and settlements. Now, however, all ways are open to this youth, and the eager desire for knowledge is animating them more and more . . . The Party is striking ever deeper roots in this youth; it is drawing up the most valuable juices from the ground, is absorbing youthful energy, is revolutionarily organizing the youth, training them in various spheres and enriching the country with intellectual forces. This is the most important and most valuable of all that is being created in our beautiful, rich, great and happy country."

With us the material basis of the new Socialist society is becoming stronger, and many millions of young people, full of energy, courage and belief in the cause of Socialism, are growing up. We must agree with the assertion that this is the hopeful guarantee of the victory of our cause.

You see, comrades, that the Bolshevik revolution in our country has not only smashed the system of the bourgeois-feudal order, but is also organizing the new Socialist society by work, in which our engineers and technicians must stand in the front ranks. (*Loud applause, which develops into an ovation.*)