



Trotsky on the national question

Two articles, first time in English

The national struggle and the unity of the proletariat

Marxism has a long tradition on the national question, nowadays largely distorted. Workers' Liberty sees the restoration of the Marxist tradition on this issue as one of its tasks. These two articles by Leon Trotsky have been translated into English for the first time by Stan Crooke.

The full extent of the wretched helplessness of the Third Duma has been revealed only now, when in the course of its work the Duma has come up against the major issues.

"Peasant land-organisation" — but long live the nobleman-landowner! "Equality before the court" — but long live the landowner justice of the peace! "Inviolability of the person" — but under the condition of an increase in the number of gendarmes — and, moreover: provided that there is no note of being of Jewish origin in one's "identity" passport.

On the national question the Duma emerges more than on any other issue as

the heiress of the autocracy of the epoch of disintegration.

In this massive country, alight with cunning and violence, where there live side-by-side more than a hundred nationalities which developing capitalism snatches into its whirlpool, Tsarist power, in its struggle for self-preservation, has done everything in its power to confuse, complicate, shatter and weaken the democratic and revolutionary class struggle of the masses by means of national baiting. In the Caucasus the government has incited the dark and fanatical Tartars against the revolutionary proletariat and the Armenian lower middle-class opposition.

Over a long period of time it has stirred up the Lettish peasants in the Baltic region against landowners whom it regarded as unreliable — the German barons. In the Western provinces — Byelorussian and Ukrainian peasants against Polish landowners. In Finland — the only recently aroused Finnish workers against the liberal Swedish bourgeoisie.

Everywhere and in all places it has incited the popular masses against Jews — in pursuit of the same goals for which it sought to favour the Jews in the epoch of the Polish uprisings, in order to be able to rely upon them in the struggle against the rebellious Polish *shlachty**. It has combined vile social demagogy with abominable national baiting.

But arousing the masses is always dangerous for those in power. The workers' Zubatovshchina** dissolved into a powerful strike movement. The peasant struggle grew into an agrarian uprising in which the Lettish peasantry was one of the most militant detachments. Finnish workers as a whole rose up into the ranks of social democracy. But, on the other hand, yesterday's enemies of the autocracy became its friends. At the time when the native nobility rallied to counter-revolutionary organisations, the Baltic barons, accompanied by military expeditions, shot and hanged Lettish peasants, and Polish nationalists slaughtered worker-revolutionaries.

The Narodovtsy***, the party of an "independent Poland", supported the slogan of a "Great Russia" by the time of the Third Duma. At the time when the dark Persian-Tartar masses in the Caucasus, the former army of Armenian pogroms, awaken to conscious life, the Armenian bourgeoisie, together with the entire intelligentsia, crosses over into the camp of law and order. At their November congress in Grodno the representatives of the Jewish bourgeoisie proclaim the necessity of disavowing broad political "ideals" in the name of everyday "practical work". Finally, in the current fateful hour for Finland, the Finnish bourgeoisie displays a readiness to make all manner of concessions to Tsarism as a reliable defence against the Finnish proletariat.

Such is the colossal work of the revolution — it wrenched the millions-strong working masses who had sunk into spiritual slavery from out of political darkness, it raised them above their local,

professional and national standpoints and prejudices, it allowed them to sense and exercise the revolutionary forces being unleashed within them — and thereby forced the bourgeois and landowners' groups of differing national origins, yesterday still oppositional, liberal, radical, separatist, revolutionary, to become the friends of one leadership — *firm, central, state power*.

But in that period when the bourgeoisie of all nations of Russia discards into the litter bin the sweeping demands of national autonomy or national independence and is agreeable to paying any price for the protection of Tsarism, the latter again introduces national divisions into its midst. It cannot satisfy the demands of bourgeois development by means of far-reaching reforms, and indeed the bourgeoisie itself fears this more than fire — there remains to Tsarism only a re-dividing of the bourgeoisie, separating out from it a privileged layer, protecting it at the expense of the rest, and basing itself upon it. *Russia for the Russians!*

Here is the slogan of the domestic policies of counter-revolution. Protecting the scanty domestic market where possible for "national" Great Russian capital, imposing all possible restrictions on the Jewish bourgeoisie, passing over Polish capital in the distribution of government commercial orders, keeping administrative, judicial and officers' positions open only for the sons of the Russian nobility and the Great Russian bourgeoisie — this means thereby tying the latter more firmly to Stolypin's state order. *Russia for the Russians!*

The Octobrists, the recently created national party, and the pogromist-clerical-police unions of the extreme Right now likewise live off this idea as well. Thus how pitifully and helplessly there echoed in the Duma the speeches of the Cadet Rodichev, who demanded equal rights for Jews — in the name of the equal value of all people and in the interests of the re-education of district inspectors. These appeals are all the more impotent given that the Cadet Party itself, which declaims about the equal value of people and picks up the votes of the Jewish bourgeoisie, at the same time preaches a nationalistic sermon of Slavophilia and, through its right wing in the shape of Struve and his associates, openly descends to anti-semitism.

Nationalism and chauvinism — in foreign policies, just as in domestic policies as well! From this there now live and breathe the entire ruling and propertied classes of Russia — from his majesty's own "responsible opposition" to his majesty's own irresponsible pogromists.

What conclusion does there then follow from this?

The bourgeoisie of the dominant nation *does not want* equality of national rights.

The bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation *is not able to fight* for equality of rights. The national question, like the question of the creation of free conditions of life and

development for all peoples inhabiting Russia falls with its entire weight to the proletariat. To you, workers of Russia!

It was not the proletariat who built this monstrous state. It does not take any responsibility for it. It does not take upon itself, in the manner of liberalism, any obligations with respect to "Great Russia". For workers the Russian Empire is alien fetters placed upon them by history, and, together with this, the arena of their class struggle. We stand here, on this ground sown by crimes, it was not us who created it, not us who chose it, it was given us as a brutal fact — we who wish to cleanse it of blood and filth and make it fit for the peaceful cohabitation of peoples.

This task is enormous, but its enormity is not frightening. Because the national question for the proletariat is only part of its overall historical task. For the worker, in all places and at all times, national oppression turns into class oppression, and every act of violence against the nation inflicts its first and its most cruel wound on the worker. Not only Jewish, Polish, Lettish, Ukrainian or Georgian workers feel and know this and are convinced of it anew every day, but also Russian workers. Because that selfsame government, by those selfsame methods by which it oppresses and tortures Jews and Poles, as "*inorodtsky*"****, torments and oppresses you, *as workers*.

The revolution bequeathed to the bourgeoisie the curse of national hatred and national rivalry; to us it bequeathed the unity of proletarian tasks and the means of struggle. In the flames of revolution the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party embraced Polish and Lettish Social-Democracy, the Ukrainian Union "Spilka" and the General Jewish Workers' Union (the "Bund"). In our ranks there were not a few arguments about the most suitable form of unification of national organisations — and these arguments will probably continue to crop up on more than one occasion; there was a moment, in 1903, when the Bund left the Party because of disagreements on this question. But in the epoch of the revolution both sides — both Party and Bund — said to each other: one form of organisation may be better, the other worse; but above all organisational *forms* stands the necessity of the *unity* of class organisation.

We counterpose this unity of the proletariat without distinction of race, nation, creed and language to the nationalist baiting and pogromist sermon of the parties of reaction, in this unity lying the guarantee of our victories.

Translation notes:

* "shlachty" — Polish nobility; Russian transliteration of the Polish word in the original.

** "Zubatovshchina" — yellow, fake, "trade union" movement set up by the government, under the control of Zubatov.

*** "Narodovtsy" — Polish nationalists.

**** "inorodtsy" — expression denoting members of non-Russian peoples living on Russian soil.

Once Again: The Education of Youth and the National Question

(Pravda, no.95, 1 May 1923)

'A' is a member of the Komsomol, (Young Communists), a capable and dedicated young revolutionary. Fought in the Red Army as a volunteer; suffers some deficiencies, however, in aspects of Marxist education and political experience.

'B' s a slightly more serious comrade.

A. Of course it is impossible to object to the resolution of the XII Congress on the national question. But, nevertheless, the question was posed artificially. For us, communists, the national question is not so acutely significant.

B. Is that so? You did indeed say just now that you agree with the resolution of the XII Congress? But, at the same time, the basic meaning of this resolution consists in the fact that it is not a matter of the national question for communists, but that communists are for the resolution of the national question as a constituent part of the more general question of man's living arrangements on earth.

If you have liberated yourself in a circle of self-education with the help of the methods of Marxism from this or that national prejudice, then this is, of course, very good, and a great step forward in your personal development. In this sphere, however, the task of the ruling party is slightly broader: by means of state institutions and other institutions directed by the Party it is necessary to provide the millions-strong masses of different races with the possibility of finding real and living satisfaction of their national interests and needs, and thereby provide them with the possibility of liberating themselves from national antagonisms and prejudices — not on the scale of a Marxist circle but on the scale of the historical experience of peoples.

There is therefore an irreconcilable contradiction between your formal acknowledgement of the resolution and your statement that for us, communists, the national question does not possess great significance: you thereby show that you do not acknowledge the resolution, i.e. speaking frankly, purely comradesly without the intention of saying anything offensive — you do not understand its political meaning.

A. Then you have misunderstood me.

B. Hmmm.

A. I merely wished to say that for us,

communists, the class question possesses an incomparably greater significance than the national one. Consequently, it is necessary to keep a sense of proportion. At the same time, I fear that the national question has recently concerned us excessively at the expense of the class question.

B. Perhaps I have thereby again misunderstood you. But in my opinion, with this new statement you make a new and even bigger mistake in principle. All our politics — in the economic sphere, in state construction, in the national question, in the diplomatic sphere — are class politics. They are dictated by the historical interests of the proletariat, which fights for the complete liberation of humanity from all forms of oppression. Our attitude to the national question, the measures taken by us to solve the national question are a constituent part of our class position, and nothing secondary to it or opposed to it.

You say that the class criterion is the main thing for us. This is quite true, but only inasmuch as this really is a class criterion, that is, inasmuch as it includes answers to all basic questions of historical development, including the national question also. Class criterion minus national question is not class criterion, but merely the stump of it, inevitably drawing closer to shopfloor sectionalism, to trade-unionism, etc.

A. In your opinion, then, it turns out that a concern for the resolution of the national question, i.e. for forms of cohabitation of national groups and national minorities with each other, is as important a question for us as the preservation of the power of the working class or the dictatorship of the Communist Party as well! From here it is a small step to sliding into complete opportunism i.e. to the subordination of revolutionary tasks to the interests of accommodation between peoples.

B. I have a feeling, a premonition, that today it falls to me to be amongst the "deviationists"... But I shall nevertheless try, my young friend, to defend my point of view. Indeed, the entire question as it now confronts us, if it is formulated politically, means for us: *how i.e. by what measures, by what methods of activity, by what approach, to maintain and strengthen the power of the working class on a territory where there live side-by-side many nationalities* in which the central

Great-Russian core, which earlier played a Great-Power role, constitutes less than half the entire population of the Union.

Precisely in the process of development of the proletarian dictatorship, by the course of our entire state construction and our everyday struggle for the preservation and consolidation of workers' power, we have found ourselves at the present moment moved more forcefully than ever before to take up the national question in all its living reality, in its everyday state, economic, cultural and vital concreteness.

And here, when the party as a whole begins to pose the question thus — and to pose it differently is not possible — you (and not you alone, unfortunately) declare with a naive doctrinarism: the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat is more important than the national question. But it is indeed precisely in the name of the dictatorship of the proletariat that we are now also practically penetrating the national question — and will continue to penetrate it for a long time to come. What sense does your opposition have? Only those who do not understand the meaning of "the national moments in the state and party construction" can pose the question in such a manner. And already, in every case, all nihilists and indifferent people on the national question gladly snatch at such a formulation. To turn one's back on the needs and interests of the formerly oppressed small nations, especially the backward peasant ones, is a very simple and not in the least troublesome affair, especially if in such a manner a lazy indifference can be cloaked by general phrases about internationalism, about the dictatorship of the Communist Party being more important than all and any national questions...

A. As you please. But by posing the question thus you improperly, in my opinion, bend the stick in the direction of the backward peasant outlying regions, and thereby risk inflicting the greatest damage on the proletarian centres on which our party and Soviet power are based. Either I do not understand anything, or you do indeed deviate towards the backward predominantly peasant nationalities.

B. Well, well, well. You and I have finally agreed on my peasantophile deviation. And it was exactly this which I expected, because all phenomena in the world, including political mistakes, possess their own logic... "A deviation towards the backward peasant masses" — but have you heard what the XII Congress said concerning this?

A. Concerning what?

B. Concerning the mutual relations between the proletariat and the peasantry: about the smychka (link or bond between workers and peasants, industry and agriculture — trans).

A. Smychka? What's the smychka doing here? I am in agreement with the XII Congress as a whole. The smychka between the proletariat and the peasantry is the basis of everything. The question of the

smychka is the question of our revolution. Whoever is against the smychka, he...

B. Okay, okay. But don't you think that the dictatorship of the working class and of our party stands higher for us than the peasant question, and therefore than the question of the smychka?

A. That is, how?

B. Well, very simply. We, the Communist Party, the vanguard of the proletariat, cannot subordinate our social-revolutionary goals to either the prejudices or the interests of the peasantry, a petty-bourgeois class in its tendencies. It is indeed, thus, my left-wing friend?

A. But, permit me, this is a sophism, this is a quite different matter and does not relate to the question. The smychka is the basis, the smychka is the foundation. Comrad Lenin wrote that without the smychka with the peasantry we will not arrive at socialism; moreover, without the achievement of the economic smychka and the guarantee of the political smychka, Soviet power will inevitably collapse.

B. So that is that. Therefore — you will agree, please — it is absurd, politically illiterate, to *counterpose* the smychka with the peasantry to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Of course, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the basic idea of our programme, the basic criterion of our state and economic construction. But the entire essence of the matter lies in the fact that precisely this very dictatorship is inconceivable without defined mutual relations with the peasantry. If the smychka with the peasantry is detached from the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, then for the present historical period, the result is a bare form, an empty and vacuous abstraction.

A. I do not object, but what relation has this...?

B. The clearest, the most direct. In our Soviet Union the smychka with the peasantry of course presupposes a smychka not only with the Great Russian peasantry. Our non-Great Russian peasantry is more numerous, and it is split into many national groups. For these national groups each state, political, economic question is refracted through the prism of their native language, their national-economic and everyday peculiarities, their national distrust founded on past experiences. Language, speech, is the most basic, the most widely embracing, the most profoundly penetrating means of smychka between individual and individual, and therefore between class and class. If in our conditions the question of proletarian revolution is, as you acknowledge, above all the question of the mutual relations between the proletariat and the peasantry, then this latter question is over half way to being the question of the mutual relations between the most advanced and influential Great Russian proletariat and the peasant masses of other nationalities, formerly

mercilessly oppressed and still mindful of all insults levelled against them. Your misfortune, my friend, lies in the fact that all your would-be radical arguments, which are nihilistic in essence and not thought through to their conclusion, are destructive not only in the national question, but also in the basic question of the smychka between the worker and the muzhik.

A. But, permit me, there were moments when our troops entered Georgia, and drove out from there the imperialist Menshevik-agents without first consulting the population, thereby clearly breaching the principle of self-determination. And there was a moment when our troops advanced on Warsaw...

B. Of course, there were these moments, and I remember them very clearly and do not in the least disavow them. But there were also — not moments, but an entire period when we took away all surplus produce from the peasants, and sometimes also the essential produce, with the help of armed force, not halting before the most extreme measures.

A. What do you thereby want to say?

B. The very thing which I said. The revolution not only took, with weapons in its hands, the surplus from the peasants but also introduced a military regime in the factories and the plants. If we had not done this at that certain most acute and serious period, then we would have perished. But if we should wish to carry out these measures in conditions when they are not demanded by iron and unavoidable necessity, then we would perish even more surely. This, of course, also relates to our policies in the national question.

At a certain moment revolutionary self-preservation demanded the blow against Tiflis and the march on Warsaw. We would have been wretched cowards and traitors to the revolution (which includes both the peasant question and the national question) if we had halted before the vacuous and empty fetish of the national "principle", because there was quite clearly no real national self-determination in Georgia with the Mensheviks: Anglo-French imperialism dominated there unchecked, and this gradually subjected to itself the Caucasus and threatened us from the South.

In the national question, as too in all other questions, for us it is not a matter of juridical abstractions but of real interests and relations. Our military incursion in the Caucasus can be justified and is justified in the eyes of workers insofar as it struck a blow against imperialism and created the conditions for genuine and real self-determination of the Caucasian nationalities. If the popular masses of the Transcaucasus had evaluated our military interference as usurpation and if this had been our fault, then it would thereby have turned into the greatest crime — not against an abstract national "principle", but against the interests of the revolution.

Here there is a complete analogy with our peasant policies. The Razverstka (tax in kind which the village as a whole, rather than individual peasants, was responsible for raising — trans.) was very terrible. But the peasantry excuses it, insofar as it is convinced that the circumstances allow only this means for Soviet power to go over to its basic task: the universal easing of life for workers, including the peasantry as well.

A. But you nevertheless cannot deny that the class principle stands higher for us than the principle of national self-determination! This is really ABC.

B. The rule of abstract "principles", my dear friend, is always the last refuge for those who have become confused in the material world. I have already told you that the class principle, if it is understood not idealistically but in a Marxist manner, does not exclude but on the contrary embraces national self-determination. But the latter we again understand not as a supra-historical principle (in the manner of the Kantian categorical imperative) but as the totality of the real, material, living conditions, providing the masses of the oppressed nationalities with the possibility of straightening up their backs, rising up, learning, developing, joining world culture. For us, as Marxists, it must be indisputable that only consistent, i.e. revolutionary carrying-out of the class "principle" can guarantee maximum realisation of the "principle" of national self-determination.

A. But did not you yourself have really to say in explanation of our Transcaucasian intervention that revolutionary defence stands higher for us than the national principle?

B. Probably, I had to, even certainly. But in what conditions and in what sense? In the struggle against the imperialists and the Mensheviks, who transform national self-determination into a metaphysical absolute — insofar as it is turned against the revolution (they themselves of course, trample national self-determination underfoot). We replied "woe to the heroes" of the Second International, we replied that the interests of defence of the revolution stand higher for us than juridical fetishes, that the actual interests of the oppressed, of the weak nationalities are dearer to us than to anyone else.

A. And the maintenance of Red troops in the Caucasus, in Turkestan, in the Ukraine...? Perhaps this is not a breach of national self-determination? Perhaps this is not a contradiction? And perhaps it is not to be explained by the fact that the revolution stands higher for us than the national question?

B. When the native labouring masses understand (and when we, with all our strength, facilitate for them such an understanding) that these troops are on their territory for the sole purpose of guaranteeing their inviolability by imperialism — then there is no contradiction

here. When these troops do not permit any insult against the national feelings of the native masses but on the contrary pay purely fraternal attention to them — then there is no contradiction here. Finally, when the Byelorussian proletariat does everything it can in order to help the more backward national elements of the Union participate consciously and independently in the construction of the Red Army — in order that they can defend themselves above all by their own strength — then there must also thereby disappear even the shadow of a contradiction between our national programme and our practice. The resolution of all these questions depends not on our good will alone; but it is necessary that we show the maximum of good will for their genuine resolution in a proletarian manner... I remember that two years ago I read the speeches of one former general who had been in the service of Soviet power about how the Georgians were terrible chauvinists, how little they understood Muscovite internationalism, and how many Red troops were required for action against Georgian, Azerbaidjhan and every other Caucasian nationalism. It is quite obvious that the old, coarse, Great-Powerism was merely being masked in the case of this general by a new terminology.

And there is no point in concealing the sin: this general is not an exception. In the Soviet apparatus, including the military apparatus, such tendencies are strong in the highest degree — and not only in the case of former generals. And if they were to gain the upper hand, then the contradiction between our programme and policies would inevitably lead to a catastrophe.

We therefore also posed the national question point blank, in order to eliminate such a threat through exerting the entire strength of the party.

A. Accepted. But how do you nevertheless explain the fact that those very comrades who are completely imbued with the importance of the smychka with the peasantry adopt at the same time, as I also do, a much more reserved position in relation to the national question, regarding this question as exaggerated and pregnant with the threat of bending the stick towards the backward outskirts?

B. How do I explain such a contradiction? Logically it is explained by the fact that not all people are consistent in their conclusions. But a logical explanation is insufficient for us. A political explanation consists in the fact that in our party the leading role is played by (and in the immediate future cannot be other than played by) the Great Russian core, which, on the basis of the experience of these five years, has thoroughly thought through and felt its way through the question of the mutual relations between the Great Russian proletariat and the Great Russian peasantry. By the method of simple analogy we extend these relationships to our entire Soviet Union, forgetting, or inadequately learning, that on the periphery there live other national groups with a dif-

ferent history, with a different level of development, and, above all, with accumulated insults.

The bulk of the Great Russian core of the party has still been insufficiently permeated by the national aspect of the question about the smychka, and all the more by the full extent of the national question. And from here there emerge the contradictions of which you speak — sometimes naive, sometimes absurd, sometimes flagrant. And this is why there is no exaggeration in the decisions of the XII Congress on the national question. On the contrary, they answer the most profound and vital necessity. And we will not only have to carry them out but also develop them further.

A. If the Communists of the Great Russian centre carry out the correct policies in Great Russia, then surely in the other parts of our Union there are Communists who carry out the same work in a different national situation. Here it is only a natural and unavoidable division of labour. In this matter the Great Russian Communists must and will fight with Great Power chauvinism, and the Communists of other nationalities with their own local nationalism, principally directed against the Russians.

B. In your words there is only part of the truth, and sometimes part of the truth leads to completely wrong conclusions. Our party is not at all a federation of national communist groups with a division of labour according to their national characteristic. Such a reorganisation of the party would be dangerous in the utmost.

A. But I am not at all proposing it...

B. Of course you are not proposing it. But the development of your thoughts can lead to such a conclusion. You insist that Great Russian Communists have to fight with Great Power nationalism, Ukrainian Communists with Ukrainian nationalism. This is reminiscent of the formula of the Spartacists at the beginning of the war; "the main enemy is in the home camp". But there it was a case of the struggle of the proletarian vanguard against its imperialist bourgeoisie, its militaristic state. This slogan possessed a profound revolutionary content there. Of course, German revolutionaries had to fight with Hohenzollern imperialism, not unmask French militarism etc.

However, it would be a complete distortion of perspectives to transfer this principle to the constituent parts of the state in the Soviet Union, because with us there is one army, one diplomacy and, what is most important of all, one centralised party. It is quite correct that fighting against Georgian nationalism can best be done by Georgian Communists. But this is a question of tact, not principle. The matter basically consists in clearly understanding the historical roots of the Great Power offensive nationalism of the Great Russians, and of the defensive nationalism of the small nations. It is necessary to make clear to oneself the real proportions between

these historical factors, and this clarification must be the same in the head of both the Great Russian, and the Georgian, and the Ukrainian, because these very proportions do not depend on a subjective local or national approach but answer — must answer — the actual relationship of historical forces.

The Azerbaidjhan Communist working in Baku or the Muslim countryside, the Great Russian Communist working in Ivanovo-Voznesensk, must possess the same conception in the national question.

And this same conception must consist in the same relation to Great Russian and Muslim nationalism. In relation to the former — merciless struggle, a firm rebuff, especially in all those cases when it appears administratively-governmentally. In relation to the latter, patient, attentive, painstaking, educational work. If a Communist in a locality were to keep his eyes shut to the full extent of the national question and were to begin to fight against nationalism (or, not infrequently, against what appears to him to be nationalism) by limited and simplified methods, by impatient denial, defamation, stigmatisation, etc., then perhaps he will gather round himself active, revolutionary, "left", young elements who are subjectively dedicated to internationalism, but he will never provide us with a firm and serious smychka with the native peasant mass.

A. But it is the very "lefts" who insist in the outlying republics on the most revolutionary, the most energetic resolution of the agrarian question. And this is surely the main bridge to our peasantry?

B. Indisputably, the agrarian question, above all in the sense of the liquidation of any remnants of feudal relations, must be resolved everywhere and in all places. Now already possessing a stable Union-state, we can carry out this resolution of the land question with all the necessary determination. Of course, the resolution of the land question is the most capital task of the revolution... But the liquidation of landed proprietorship is a single act. But that which we call the national question is a very drawn-out process. The national question does not disappear after the land revolution. On the contrary it then merely advances centre-stage. And the responsibility for any shortcomings, inadequacies, injustices, inattention, coarseness towards the native masses will — and not by chance — be associated in their heads with Moscow. It is therefore necessary for Moscow, as the centre of our state Union, to be the permanent initiator and motor of active policies, permeated through and through with fraternal attention to all nationalities which are joining the Soviet Union. To speak in this case of exaggerations means truly to understand nothing.

A. There is a lot of truth in what you say, but...

B. You know what? Read through the resolution of the XII Congress after our conversation. And then, on occasion, we shall perhaps have a talk again.