



*В.И. Ленин*

*Workers of All Countries, Unite!*

**Lenin**



# **On Trade Unions**

**A Collection of Articles and Speeches**



**Progress Publishers • Moscow**

**В. И. ЛЕНИН**  
**О ПРОФСОЮЗАХ**

*На английском языке*

First printing 1970  
Second printing 1974  
Third printing 1976  
Fourth printing 1978

Л 10102-164 41-78  
014 (01) -78

*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

## CONTENTS

FOREWORD . . . . .	11
<i>From</i> WHAT THE "FRIENDS OF THE PEOPLE" ARE AND HOW THEY FIGHT THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS . . . . .	28
<i>From</i> DRAFT AND EXPLANATION OF A PROGRAMME FOR THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY . . . . .	31
Draft Programme . . . . .	31
Explanation of the Programme . . . . .	34
<i>From</i> A PROTEST BY RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS ON STRIKES . . . . .	54
<i>From</i> WHAT IS TO BE DONE? . . . . .	57
II. The Spontaneity of the Masses and the Consciousness of the Social-Democrats . . . . .	68
a) The Beginning of the Spontaneous Upsurge . . . . .	69
b) Bowing to Spontaneity. <i>Rabochaya Mysl</i> . . . . .	73
c) The Self-Emancipation Group and <i>Rabocheye Dyelo</i> . . . . .	82
III. Trade-Unionist Politics and Social-Democratic Politics . . . . .	92
a) Political Agitation and Its Restriction by the Economists . . . . .	93
c) Political Exposures and "Training in Revolution- ary Activity" . . . . .	103
e) The Working Class as Vanguard Fighter for Democracy . . . . .	109
IV. The Primitiveness of the Economists and the Organi- sation of the Revolutionaries . . . . .	125
c) Organisation of Workers and Organisation of Revo- lutionaries . . . . .	125
DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE FOR THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. . . . .	141
<i>From</i> ONE STEP FORWARD, TWO STEPS BACK ( <i>The Crisis in Our Party</i> ) . . . . .	142
<i>From</i> TWO TACTICS OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY IN THE DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION . . . . .	146
<i>From</i> THE JENA CONGRESS OF THE GERMAN SOCIAL- DEMOCRATIC WORKERS' PARTY . . . . .	149

TO S. I. GUSEV. <i>To Nation from Lenin</i> . . . . .	152
From THE POLITICAL STRIKE AND THE STREET FIGHTING IN MOSCOW . . . . .	157
NOTE TO M. BORISOV'S ARTICLE "ON THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT AND THE TASKS OF SOCIAL- DEMOCRACY" . . . . .	162
THE ALL-RUSSIA POLITICAL STRIKE . . . . .	163
RESOLUTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ST. PETERSBURG SOVIET OF WORKERS' DEP- UTIES ON MEASURES FOR COUNTERACTING THE LOCK- OUT ADOPTED ON NOVEMBER 14 (27), 1905 . . . . .	167
THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND NON-PARTY REVOLU- TIONISM . . . . .	169
I . . . . .	169
II . . . . .	172
From A TACTICAL PLATFORM FOR THE UNITY CON- GRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. . . . .	177
From DRAFT RESOLUTIONS FOR THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. . . . .	178
4. The Intensification of Mass Destitution and of the Economic Struggle . . . . .	178
5. Non-Party Workers' Organisations and the Anarcho- Syndicalist Trend Among the Proletariat . . . . .	179
DRAFT RESOLUTIONS FOR THE THIRD CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (SECOND ALL-RUSSIA) . . . . .	181
1. Draft Resolution on Participation in the Elections to the Third Duma . . . . .	181
2. Outline of a Draft Resolution on the All-Russia Con- gress of Trade Unions . . . . .	182
From THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS IN STUTTGART . . . . .	183
PREFACE TO THE PAMPHLET BY VOINOV (A. V. LU- NACHARSKY) ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE PARTY TOWARDS THE TRADE UNIONS . . . . .	185
TRADE UNION NEUTRALITY . . . . .	193
BRITISH AND GERMAN WORKERS DEMONSTRATE FOR PEACE . . . . .	204
From MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU . . . . .	208
From THE RESOLUTION OF THE SIXTH (PRAGUE) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. . . . .	213
The Character and Organisational Forms of Party Work The Party's Attitude to the Workers' State Insurance Duma Bill . . . . .	214
I . . . . .	214
II . . . . .	216

IN SWITZERLAND . . . . .	218
From THE ITALIAN SOCIALIST CONGRESS . . . . .	221
IN BRITAIN . . . . .	223
IN AMERICA . . . . .	225
THE BRITISH LABOUR MOVEMENT IN 1912 . . . . .	227
EXPERIENCE TEACHES . . . . .	229
IN BRITAIN ( <i>The Sad Results of Opportunism</i> ) . . . . .	232
LESSONS OF THE BELGIAN STRIKE . . . . .	234
HOLIDAYS FOR WORKERS . . . . .	236
THE RESULTS OF STRIKES IN 1912 AS COMPARED WITH THOSE OF THE PAST . . . . .	238
IN AUSTRALIA . . . . .	241
MAY DAY ACTION BY THE REVOLUTIONARY PRO- LETARIAT . . . . .	244
CLASS WAR IN DUBLIN . . . . .	254
WORK IN LEGAL ASSOCIATIONS ( <i>Resolution of the Sum- mer, 1913, Joint Conference of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. and Party Officials</i> ) . . . . .	259
From MATERIAL ON THE CONFLICT WITHIN THE SO- CIAL-DEMOCRATIC DUMA GROUP . . . . .	261
What Is the Will of the Workers as Shown by the St. Pe- tersburg Trade Unions? . . . . .	261
NARODNIKS AND LIQUIDATORS IN THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT ( <i>A Valuable Admission</i> ) . . . . .	263
FORMS OF THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT ( <i>The Lock- Out and Marxist Tactics</i> ) . . . . .	267
OUR TASKS . . . . .	271
WHAT SHOULD NOT BE COPIED FROM THE GERMAN LABOUR MOVEMENT . . . . .	275
From REPORT OF THE C.C., R.S.D.L.P. TO THE BRUS- SELS CONFERENCE AND INSTRUCTIONS TO THE C.C. DELEGATION . . . . .	280
From KARL MARX . . . . .	282
From IMPERIALISM AND THE SPLIT IN SOCIALISM . . . . .	285
From TASKS OF THE LEFT ZIMMERWALDISTS IN THE SWISS SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY . . . . .	295
From LECTURE ON THE 1905 REVOLUTION . . . . .	296
RESOLUTION ON MEASURES TO COPE WITH ECO- NOMIC DISORGANISATION . . . . .	301
THE NEED FOR AN AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS' UNION IN RUSSIA . . . . .	304
Article One . . . . .	304
Article Two . . . . .	308

VIOLETIONS OF DEMOCRACY IN MASS ORGANISATIONS	309
From CAN THE BOLSHEVIKS RETAIN STATE POWER?	310
From ORIGINAL VERSION OF THE ARTICLE <i>THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT</i> . . .	317
TASKS OF THE TRADE UNIONS . . . . .	319
I . . . . .	319
II . . . . .	319
III . . . . .	320
From REPORT AT THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIA TRADE UNION CONGRESS. <i>January 20, 1919</i> . . . . .	323
SPEECH ON THE ORGANISATION OF A FARM LABOURERS' UNION AT THE SESSION OF THE FIRST CONGRESS OF FARM LABOURERS OF PETROGRAD GUBERNIA. <i>March 13, 1919</i> . . . . .	334
From DRAFT PROGRAMME OF THE R.C.P.(B.) . . . . .	339
FOREWORD TO HENRI GUILBEAUX'S PAMPHLET <i>SOCIALISM AND SYNDICALISM IN FRANCE DURING THE WAR</i> . . . . .	341
From GREETINGS TO ITALIAN, FRENCH AND GERMAN COMMUNISTS . . . . .	343
From "LEFT-WING" COMMUNISM—AN INFANTILE DISORDER . . . . .	349
VI. Should Revolutionaries Work in Reactionary Trade Unions? . . . . .	349
THESES FOR THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL . . . . .	359
From Theses on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International . . . . .	359
From the Terms of Admission into the Communist International . . . . .	363
DRAFT RESOLUTION ON "THE TASKS OF THE TRADE UNIONS, AND THE METHODS OF THEIR ACCOMPLISHMENT" . . . . .	365
THESES ON PRODUCTION PROPAGANDA ( <i>Rough Draft</i> ) THE TRADE UNIONS, THE PRESENT SITUATION AND TROTSKY'S MISTAKES. <i>Speech Delivered at a Joint Meeting of Communist Delegates to the Eighth Congress of Soviets, Communist Members of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and Communist Members of the Moscow City Council of Trade Unions. December 30, 1920</i> . . . . .	370
THE PARTY CRISIS . . . . .	393
THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF MINERS. <i>January 25-February 2, 1921</i> . . . . .	404
1. Report on the Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions Delivered on January 23 at a Meeting of the Communist Group of the Congress . . . . .	404

2. Speech Closing the Discussion Delivered at a Meeting of the Communist Group of the Congress. January 24	414
ONCE AGAIN ON THE TRADE UNIONS, THE CURRENT SITUATION AND THE MISTAKES OF TROTSKY AND BUKHARIN . . . . .	420
The Danger of Factional Pronouncements to the Party	421
Formal Democracy and the Revolutionary Interest . .	424
The Political Danger of Splits in the Trade Union Move- ment . . . . .	425
Disagreements on Principle . . . . .	430
Politics and Economics. Dialectics and Eclecticism . .	433
Dialectics and Eclecticism. "School" and "Apparatus"	440
Conclusion . . . . .	450
PRELIMINARY DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE TENTH CONGRESS OF THE R.C.P. ON THE SYNDICALIST AND ANARCHIST DEVIATION IN OUR PARTY . . . . .	458
MESSAGE OF GREETINGS TO THE FIRST INTERNA- TIONAL CONGRESS OF REVOLUTIONARY TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL UNIONS . . . . .	462
DRAFT THESES ON THE ROLE AND FUNCTIONS OF THE TRADE UNIONS UNDER THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY	463
1. The New Economic Policy and the Trade Unions . .	463
2. State Capitalism in the Proletarian State and the Trade Unions . . . . .	463
3. The State Enterprises That Are Being Put on a Profit Basis and the Trade Unions . . . . .	464
4. The Essential Difference Between the Class Struggle of the Proletariat in a State Which Recognises Private Ownership of the Land, Factories, etc., and Where Political Power Is in the Hands of the Capitalist Class, and the Class Struggle of the Proletariat in a State Which Does Not Recognise Private Ownership of the Land and the Majority of the Large Enterprises and Where Political Power Is in the Hands of the Proletariat	465
5. Reversion to Voluntary Trade Union Membership	466
6. The Trade Unions and the Management of Industry	467
7. The Role and Functions of the Trade Unions in the Business and Administrative Organisations of the Proletarian State . . . . .	467
8. Contact With the Masses—the Fundamental Condition for All Trade Union Activity . . . . .	469
9. The Contradictions in the Status of the Trade Unions Under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat . . . . .	470
10. The Trade Unions and the Specialists . . . . .	472
11. The Trade Unions and Petty-Bourgeois Influence on the Working Class . . . . .	473
Notes . . . . .	475
Name Index . . . . .	515

---

## FOREWORD

World developments show again and again that the current political life of mankind centres round the international working class and its chief offspring, the socialist community. The proletariat heads the struggle of all working people for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. The international working class is a great social force now numbering about five hundred million. Approximately 150 million of this total are the workers of the socialist countries; 200 million are toiling and fighting for their rights in the industrially advanced capitalist countries, and another 150 million form the proletariat and contiguous strata in the developing countries.

The working class keeps growing, with fresh groups from the urban middle strata and proletarianised peasants continually swelling its ranks. The composition and structure of the proletariat, its economic status and social position change, and so do the forms and methods of its class struggle.

In present-day conditions, the struggle of the proletariat is the pivot of the world revolutionary process. Lenin showed that victory in this struggle can only be achieved through the common effort of all progressive forces, led by the proletariat and guided by a Marxist Communist Party. The trade unions still play an important part in organising and directing this struggle.

The aggravation of social antagonisms in the capitalist system, the influence of the scientific and technological revolution on the condition of the working people, and the



extraordinarily acute ideological struggle between capitalism and socialism, far from relieving the trade unions of their task of directing the economic struggle of the proletariat, face them with new complex problems and increase their involvement in the common struggle for socialism. Left trends are having a growing impact on the reformist trade union movement. At the same time the old reformist tendencies to keep the trade union movement of the working people within the narrow bounds of traditional economism and to make it refrain from engaging in consistent class struggle are still strong in the capitalist countries. Various new fashionable trends of a Right-opportunist shade are emerging which preach abstract "supraclass" unity in the name of the notorious "class peace". The new sections of the proletarians, not yet schooled in the irreconcilable class struggle, are especially liable to fall under the spell of illusions about the feasibility and benefits of "social partnership" and are trapped by bourgeois ideology.

Accumulating considerable experience over the years, the capitalists have learned to manoeuvre and adjust their policies to the workers' movement, and it not infrequently happens that they try to turn some of the workers' demands to their own profit. To bring down the pitch of the proletariat's class struggle, divert the proletariat from political action, restrict its activities to the safe sphere of economism, the employers today often concede certain economic demands, partially raising wages, increasing insurance benefits, and so on.

Besides bribing the exclusive "labour aristocracy" as it did in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, state-monopoly capital is able to instil some elements of bourgeois mentality in the working class on a much wider scale. The bourgeoisie strive to disguise the ever increasing exploitation and intensification of labour by every possible means, including a certain improvement of the workers' living standards. Propaganda of the advantages of the "consumer society" and "de-proletarianisation" of the working class and the theories of "democratisation of capital" and "people's capitalism" are aimed at undermining working-class unity and have an adverse effect on the progress of the workers' movement.

The only way to counter this is by constantly developing and enhancing the workers' class-consciousness, revolutionising the trade unions and clearing them of the opportunist mess, improving the communist political leadership of the workers' mass organisations and stepping up all forms of ideological struggle against anti-proletarian tendencies and sentiments among the workers.

This is why it is of special importance today to study Lenin's rich theoretical legacy on the working-class and trade union movement.

The works of Lenin presented in this collection contain a profound Marxist analysis of the main problems with which we are still constantly faced. Lenin's precise formulations, his ability to tie in intricate theoretical questions with current practice, his party and deeply scientific approach to the assessment of the problems studied all combine to make these works a real political school for all those who are interested in the problems of the working-class and trade union movement and would like to gain a better understanding of its prospects and difficulties at the present stage.

\* \* \*

In the 27 years covered by the works published in this collection, the world underwent enormous social changes: the transition of capitalism into its highest and final stage, imperialism, the 1905-07 revolution in Russia, revolutions in Turkey, Mexico and China; the First World War, the overthrow of tsarism in February 1917 and, finally, the Great October Socialist Revolution and the establishment of the world's first workers' and peasants' state.

In analysing every aspect of the developing revolutionary struggle of the proletariat in Russia, Western Europe and the United States over those eventful years, Lenin always proceeded from the concrete historical situation, from the general and specific socio-economic conditions existing in the given country.

Some of the works in this volume deal with the working-class and trade union movement in pre-revolutionary Russia, but the conclusions and directions contained in Lenin's

well-known *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats, What Is To Be Done?, On Strikes, One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, The Socialist Party and Non-Party Revolutionism* and other writings are still topical and significant today; they help us to understand the general laws and forms of development of the international workers' movement as a whole.

One of the most fundamental problems still facing the proletariat is that of "*spontaneity*" and "*consciousness*" in the workers' movement.

Lenin's analysis of the problem helps us to get at the socio-economic and ideological roots of modern reformism, to see the essence of its policy and the harm it can do to the proletarian movement.

The struggle which Lenin and the Russian revolutionary Social-Democrats waged to introduce the conscious element into the spontaneously developing workers' movement is a model of the Marxist approach to the revolutionary education of the masses.

Towards the end of the 1890s, an acute ideological struggle broke out among the Russian Social-Democrats on the question of leadership of the workers' movement. Lenin and his followers insisted that the Marxist Party should give constant political and ideological guidance to the proletariat and its mass organisations and introduce revolutionary class-consciousness into the people's spontaneous movement against capital and autocracy.

Lenin's ideological opponents—the so-called Economists—adopted the line of bowing to the workers' spontaneous outbursts, insisting that the movement should be limited to purely economic demands.

The fight against Economism acquired particular importance because the Social-Democratic Party had been formed in Russia before workers' mass trade unions, which began to spread only at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Lenin wrote in this connection: "It is important that at the very outset Russian Social-Democrats should strike the right note in regard to the trade unions, and at once create a tradition of Social-Democratic initiative in this matter, of Social-Democratic participation, of Social-Democratic leadership." It was precisely to tune the trade unions to

the proper revolutionary pitch, to prevent them from sinking into the quagmire of spontaneous reformism, that Lenin and his followers made awareness the corner-stone of the workers' movement.

In his *What Is To Be Done?* Lenin proved by summing up vast historical material and the experience of both Western Europe and Russia, that in their spontaneous activity the workers could only develop a narrow trade-unionist consciousness, i.e. that they could realise the necessity of uniting in trade unions to fight for higher wages but by no means to oppose the very system of wage slavery. As Lenin pointed out, the narrow craft-unionism or economism of the workers' movement does not frighten the capitalists. They even find it profitable, because it puts them in a position to bind the worker to production and make him conciliatory and politically passive—all at the price of a few paltry concessions.

Lenin wrote: "The spontaneous working-class movement is trade-unionism, ... and trade-unionism means the ideological enslavement of the workers by the bourgeoisie."

That is why it has always been the primary purpose of the Marxist Party to work constantly to introduce revolutionary political awareness into the actions of the proletariat, so as "*to divert* the working-class movement from the spontaneous trade-unionist striving to come under the wing of the bourgeoisie, and to bring it under the wing of revolutionary Social-Democracy"

Lenin regarded the development and strengthening of revolutionary awareness in the workers as the necessary condition for a further successful upsurge of the proletariat's movement and its transition to the next and higher stage. He wrote "The working-class movement only then grows out of its embryonic state, its infancy, and becomes a *class* movement when it makes the transition to the political struggle." Conscious political struggle is what fits the proletariat for the role of the revolutionary vanguard of the working people, putting it in the lead even at the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. That was the case in Russia in 1905-07 and the same can be said about the development of the revolutionary process in some Asian African and Latin American countries.

While constantly endeavouring to introduce revolutionary consciousness into the workers' struggle, Lenin always emphasised the necessity to combine the political and the economic forms of the working-class movement and drew attention to their indissoluble connection. Although he gave priority to the political demands and forms of the proletariat's struggle, Lenin did not belittle economic struggle, but regarded it as a component part of the single revolutionary movement of the working class for democracy and socialism. At the first stage, he observed, "the economic struggle, the struggle for immediate and direct improvement of conditions, is alone capable of rousing the most backward strata of the exploited masses, gives them a real education and transforms them—during a revolutionary period—into an army of political fighters within the space of a few months". As Lenin's works show, the economic struggle is merely one of the forms of the proletariat's class struggle, and one, at that, which cannot abolish capitalism by itself. Only when it is closely linked with the political struggle is it capable of doing away with capitalist rule and bringing victory for the proletariat.

In Western Europe today, this close interweaving of politics and economics is manifested in the movement of the proletariat for democratic control over production and distribution. Lenin was the first to advance a programme of action to introduce workers' control at factories, institute elective industrial courts, effect "supervision, by workers' elected representatives, of the proper fixing of rates", and so on. Coming out against the bourgeois reformist tactics of "social partnership", the revolutionary proletariat in many capitalist countries defends its independent position in the economic sphere, and seeks to "influence affairs of state". A tense ideological struggle is now unfolding around the problem of democratic control over the economy. In many cases there may be a real danger of the trade unions being included (institutionalised) in the state-monopoly capitalist system. That is the opportunist line which the Right-wing reformist leaders of some trade unions have taken. And they try to cover up their treachery with phrases about the trade unions' "neutrality", "non-partisanship", etc.

It was because such arguments were fairly widespread in Russia at the time that Lenin especially analysed the problem of "*trade union neutrality*". The tendency to "neutralise" the trade unions began to spread in Russia just as the unions were being organised. Participation of different social groups and classes in the democratic struggle against the autocracy just before and during the first Russian revolution of 1905-07 facilitated the spread of the erroneous idea that the proletariat pursues some "non-party" general democratic struggle, that party allegiance merely prevents it from taking part in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Disclosing the causes of this, Lenin pointed out that nothing but "preoccupation with the struggle in progress ... causes people to idealise these immediate, elementary aims, to depict them in rosy colours and sometimes even to clothe them in fantastic garb. Simple democracy, ordinary bourgeois democracy, is taken as socialism and 'registered' as such. Everything seems to be 'non-party'; everything seems to fuse into a single movement for 'liberation' (actually, a movement liberating the whole of bourgeois society); everything acquires a faint, a very faint tint of 'socialism', owing above all to the leading part played by the socialist proletariat in the democratic struggle". Naturally enough, such a situation could well give a temporary prevalence to the idea of "non-partisanship": "non-party organisation, non-party democratism, non-party strikeism, non-party revolutionism".

Bourgeois ideologists are trying to spread in the developing countries a somewhat similar idea that trade unions are non-political. The struggle now developing in Asian, African and Latin American countries against foreign imperialism and survivals of the pre-capitalist epoch is represented by bourgeois propaganda as a sort of non-party, supraclass national revolution. Nevertheless, the class character of the democratic, anti-imperialist revolution does not vanish, the class interests of the proletariat remain interwoven with those of the whole people. The proletariat takes part in the general democratic movement as the main, the leading force, since "purely socialist demands are still a matter of the future, the immediate demands of the day are the democratic demands of the workers in the political sphere, and the eco-

conomic demands within the framework of capitalism in the economic sphere".

In his *The Socialist Party and Non-Party Revolutionism* Lenin showed that cashing in on the broadly democratic character of that stage in the struggle to get the workers' organisations to fall in with the idea of non-partisanship was sheer opportunism and support of bourgeois domination. That is why so much harm is done by the recently disseminated bourgeois theories of "social integration" of workers and employers in the developing countries for the common struggle against the imperialists; by the theories of an "integrated industrial society" in which, it is alleged, the workers' trade unions need not be guided by any ideology but must further the development of the national economy in the mutual interests of labour and capital. Briefly, all those "theories" and "conceptions" aim at diverting the trade unions from independent political struggle, keeping them "away from any contact with socialism", making them neutral, non-political, in a word, bourgeois. That was the reason why Lenin and the Bolsheviks always actively opposed any attempts to make the trade unions politically sterile and fought for permanent and effective guidance of their activities by the Communist Party, for close contacts between the Communist and trade union movements. Trade union neutrality inevitably brings the working class to the quagmire of opportunism, to retreats "that involve a blunting of the proletarian class struggle" and "submitting to the tender mercies of capital". In his article "Trade Union Neutrality" (1908), Lenin lays bare the evil of cowardly opportunism parading in the cloak of neutrality.

Lenin saw the most efficient and concrete expression of the struggle against the neutralist tendency in the Communists' persistent day-to-day work in the trade unions, in the strengthening of contacts between the Party and people. That is why *the problem of the Communists' work in the trade unions, of the fight against the agents of the bourgeoisie in the workers' movement—the "labour aristocracy" and trade union bureaucrats*—has a place of importance in Lenin's works. Under Lenin's guidance, the Bolsheviks worked out a definite policy which ruled that "partisanship of the trade unions must be achieved exclusively by S.-D. work within

the unions, that the S.-D.'s must form solid Party cells in the unions, and that illegal unions should be formed since legal ones are impossible". Besides work in the trade unions, the Bolshevik tactics included active participation of the Social-Democrats in other legal workers' organisations such as co-operatives, reading-rooms, libraries, clubs, insurance societies, and so on.

Questions of the trade union policy of Communist Parties come in for detailed consideration in Lenin's "*Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder; Theses for the Second Congress of the Communist International; Greetings to Italian, French and German Communists*, etc. Lenin described as ridiculous and childlike nonsense all talk to the effect that it is needless and even impermissible for Communists to work in reactionary trade unions and that a "brand-new, perfectly immaculate" trade union should be set up. Lenin's answer to the German "Left-wing" Communists was: "We can (and must) begin to build socialism, not with abstract human material, or with human material specially prepared by us, but with the human material bequeathed to us by capitalism. True, that is no easy matter, but no other approach to this task is serious enough to warrant discussion". Lenin considered that to refuse to work in reactionary trade unions when, for one reason or another, they are winning over considerable numbers of the working class would mean abandoning backward workers to the influence of the opportunists, "the agents of the bourgeoisie, the labour aristocrats or 'the workers who have become completely bourgeois'".

On the other hand, being in the very midst of the membership of reactionary trade unions, the Communists are in a position to expose the turncoat opportunist and social-chauvinist leaders on the spot and win new groups of workers over to their side by their activities and their example. Compared with poor and backward Russia, the opportunist elements had much more influence on the trade unions in the monopoly-capitalist West, for there, as Lenin observes, "the craft-union, narrow-minded, selfish, case-hardened, covetous, and petty-bourgeois 'labour aristocracy', imperialist-minded, and imperialist-corrupted, has developed into a much stronger section".



Corruption of the upper crust of the working class by the capitalists has assumed numerous forms. The "labour aristocrats" used to be recruited mainly among the more skilled craftsmen, but now the situation is different.

Today the role of chief agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement is played by corrupt trade union bureaucrats, who substitute, as it were, for the former labour aristocracy in a number of countries. These inveterate traitors form a caste which, in Lenin's phrase, "might even be called the social mainstay of the bourgeoisie". Lenin observed that "*every* imperialist 'Great Power' can and does bribe" the upper crust of the working class and particularly trade union bureaucrats and that "a '*bourgeois labour party*' is inevitable and typical in all imperialist countries".

Lenin ruthlessly exposed the treacherous activities of the trade union bureaucrats and bourgeois politicians of the labourite stripe in the international workers' movement, emphasising that their loud talk of socialism is a mere screen for their "bourgeois labour policy". "For, strange as it may seem," Lenin wrote, "in bourgeois society even the working class can carry on a bourgeois policy, if it forgets about its emancipatory aims, puts up with wage slavery and confines itself to seeking alliances now with one bourgeois party, now with another, for the sake of imaginary 'improvements' in its indentured conditions."

In his "Trade Union Neutrality", "In America", "What Should Not Be Copied From the German Labour Movement" and other works, Lenin exposed the opportunistic essence of the stand taken by such noted figures of the world trade union movement as Richard Bell (Britain), Samuel Gompers (U.S.A.), Karl Legien (Germany) and others.

Strasser, a close associate of Samuel Gompers, told the U.S. Senate as early as 1883 that the American trade unions of the day had no ultimate purpose in mind; that they were moving ahead day after day, attacking only such objectives as could be carried off immediately. Similar pronouncements are not infrequent today too. For example, Chairman of the U.S. Steel Corporation B. Fairless says that everything can be arranged quite simply if they manage to free themselves of the illusion that the workers and employers have different economic interests and must therefore always be trying

to snatch something one from the other, whereas in fact their interests coincide (!). In reality, the only interests which coincide are those of the bourgeoisie and of their accredited agents in the workers' movement.

That is why, in developing theoretically the question of achieving revolutionary unity of the proletariat in advanced capitalist countries, Lenin stated that a necessary condition for it was to remove the trade union bureaucracy from the leadership of the workers' movement and replace reformist-minded leaders by revolutionary workers "in proletarian organisations of absolutely every type—not only political, but also trade union, co-operative, educational, etc." Lenin urged the need for irreconcilable struggle against compromisers of any kind, emphasising that, unless it was purged of opportunism, the workers' movement would long remain bourgeois, i.e., purely trade-unionist.

In his campaign against reformism in the workers' movement, Lenin also gave much attention to the *problem of overcoming anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist tendencies* in it. The danger of such ultra-revolutionary sentiments has again become quite considerable in a number of countries at present. It emerges especially during student unrest and demonstrations by the urban middle strata. Sometimes, syndicalist deviations are observable also during strikes, when the trade unions, failing to combine the various forms and methods of struggle, needlessly exhaust the workers' strength. Lenin viewed anarcho-syndicalism as one of the "non-socialist extremes", as a malady that "destroyed the discipline of the working-class struggle" and limited its chances of success. The Communists' aim, Lenin underlined, is to wage a constant struggle against any fashionable petty-bourgeois trends arrayed in socialist clothing. Otherwise—as the recent serious conflicts in Western Europe have demonstrated—some groups, especially the youth, rather readily depart from the standards of consistent and organised revolutionary struggle, universalising some of its forms, and even come out against workers' trade unions.

Lenin, strongly criticising stereotyped methods, always paid great attention to the *problem of extending and combining the most diverse forms and methods of working-class struggle*. It is not accidental that the Communists attach

importance to the selection of tactical means, for nothing obstructs the capitalists' resistance and increases the workers' chance of success so much as diversity of the weapons used by the proletariat. In the article "Forms of the Working-Class Movement (The Lock-out and Marxist Tactics)", Lenin wrote: "Marxist tactics consist in combining the *different* forms of struggle, in the skilful transition from one form to another, in steadily enhancing the consciousness of the masses and extending the area of their collective actions, each of which, taken separately, may be aggressive or defensive, and all of which, taken together, lead to a more intense and decisive conflict." The task was to teach the workers to choose the ways which were the most effective in the circumstances, and that, Lenin wrote, could only be achieved "by going more carefully into the expediency of any given action, by changing the form of struggle, substituting ... one form for another, the general tendency being to *rise to higher forms*".

Lenin's works are brilliant examples of Marxist analysis of the stages, forms and tendencies of the proletarian movement in Russia, Britain, Germany, the United States, France, Belgium, Italy and many other countries. Lenin's analysis of the national features of trade union activity and policy has preserved its full force and significance to this day. "Contact with the masses," Lenin concludes, "i.e., with the overwhelming majority of the workers (and eventually of all the working people) is the most important and most fundamental condition for the success of all trade union activity." Together with the working masses, "the vanguard of the proletariat, the Marxist centralised political party... will take the people along the true road to the triumph of proletarian dictatorship".

\* \* \*

*Analysis of the tasks and forms of trade union activities in the period of proletarian dictatorship and the building of socialism* occupies a significant place in the works published in this volume.

In his brochure *Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?*, written just before the October Socialist Revolution, Lenin defined the role of trade union organisations in the period

when the working class assumes power. The tasks of the proletariat after the overthrow of capitalist rule, their entire tactics and activity change radically. Lenin pointed out: "Yesterday the watchword was mistrust of the state, for it was a bourgeois state; today the state is becoming, has in effect become, proletarian; the working class is becoming, has become, the ruling class of the state."

Besides extensively participating in organising the socialist economy, the trade unions are also called upon "to overcome by stubborn, persistent, more extensive educational and organisational work the prejudices of certain petty-bourgeois sections of the proletariat and semi-proletariat. The unions must steadily extend the insufficiently wide base of the Soviet government" and find new organisational forms of enlisting the entire population in building socialism.

"While formally remaining independent organisations," Lenin wrote, the trade unions "can and should ... take an active part in the work of the Soviet government by directly working in all government bodies, by organising mass control over their activities, etc., and by setting up new bodies for the registration, control and regulation of all production and distribution, relying on the organised initiative of the broad masses of the interested working peoples themselves." The trade unions' tasks also included increasing labour productivity, raising the people's cultural standards, training new personnel for socialist industry, and so on. They were to play the role of main link between the Party and the rest of the working population. General success in building socialism depended to a great extent on correctly established relations between the Party and trade unions. That was why the Bolshevik Party had to consolidate its influence in the trade unions, the largest mass organisations. With the ending of the Civil War and "War Communism", trade union activity had to be organised in a new way, democratic principles had to be extended. This question was put on the agenda of the Fifth All-Russia Conference of the Trade Unions, held from November 2 to 6, 1920. The conference directed that the trade unions should carry out mainly organisational-economic and educational work. Consolidation of democratic principles, production propaganda, introduction of bonuses in kind, institution of disci-

plinary courts to deal with offenders against labour discipline, inculcation of a statesmanlike attitude to production—such was the work the trade unions were to organise on a national scale.

During the conference, the Party encountered opposition. A serious discussion started within the Party and went far beyond the trade union question, since it bore on the general problem of relations between the Party and the proletariat in building socialism. Actually, the question was that of the “different *approach* to the mass, the different way of winning it over and *keeping in touch* with it”.

Trotsky, who fought against the restoration of democratic norms in trade union activity, advanced the slogans of “tightening the screws”, militarising the trade unions, introducing barracks discipline at factories—in short, turning the trade unions into an instrument for “militarising labour”. Trotsky categorically denied the role of the trade unions in protecting the material and spiritual interests of the working class, defended the principle of equalitarian distribution, belittled the significance of material incentives in raising labour productivity, etc. He advocated a “shake-up”, i.e., replacement of trade union officials “from above”, by orders; appointment instead of election in trade union bodies, “governmentalisation” of the trade unions, i.e., their transformation into a mere appendage of the state apparatus. In a word, Trotsky’s platform did nothing to help broaden the Party’s contact with the masses. On the contrary, it was conducive to disruption of the contact, and that threatened the existence of the first proletarian state in the world.

Lenin resolutely opposed Trotsky’s slogans. He exposed their petty-bourgeois essence and showed what disastrous consequences could follow from their implementation. Lenin amplified and developed the teaching on the role of the trade unions in building socialism. He stressed in his speeches and articles that the trade unions were the very foundation in the absence of which the Party could not “exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat”. Not being a state organisation, the trade unions resort mainly to persuasion. They educate the masses in the spirit of socialist awareness, help them to gain an intimate knowledge of the tasks of build-

ing socialism and enlist their active participation in it. All this is indeed "a school of administration, a school of economic management, a school of communism", Lenin concludes.

Trotsky's slogans were typical bureaucratic distortions that could have grave political consequences. Trotsky's line of "shake-ups" "cannot be tolerated ... because it threatens a split", Lenin wrote.

Trotsky's ruinous policy made itself felt in the fate of a leading trade union—Tsektran, the Central Committee of the Joint Trade Union of Rail and Water Transport Workers—which, because it had a Trotskyite leadership, began to degenerate into a bureaucratic body divorced from the masses. Being aware of the great danger of a rift between the Party and the masses, polarisation of the Party and the people, Lenin pointed out that unless this danger was eliminated and the error rectified, the dictatorship of the proletariat could not survive.

Very dangerous also was the slogan of trade unions' "governmentalisation". The fusion of trade union leadership with the state bodies that the Trotskyites looked forward to, would have brought about the liquidation of the broad self-active organisation of the proletariat. Lenin wrote that "governmentalisation" of the trade unions would leave them no chance to fulfil the important function of "*non-class economic struggle*", i.e., to protect the material and spiritual interests of the working people and fight bureaucratic distortions.

In the course of the trade union discussion, some other groupings also formed within the Party, Bukharin's buffer group, as it was called, being the most dangerous. Set up as an intermediary between Lenin's and Trotsky's platforms to help find a middle way, this group soon began to oppose Lenin's platform openly. Bukharin held, for instance, that trade union representatives should be appointed to executive jobs in state economic bodies. Lenin viewed that proposal as an expression of petty-bourgeois syndicalism. He wrote: "Why have a Party, if industrial management is to be appointed ('mandatory nomination') by the trade unions nine-tenths of whose members are non-Party workers? Bukharin has talked himself into a logical, theoretical

and practical implication of a split in the Party, or, rather, a breakaway of the syndicalists from the Party".

The main slogan of another dissenting group—the so-called workers' opposition—was to hand over economic management to an All-Russia Congress of Producers organised in trade unions. The opposition suggested, for instance, that the Supreme Economic Council should simply be broken up and made over to the relevant industrial trade unions. That, in effect, put the trade unions and broad working masses in contraposition to the political vanguard of the proletariat, the Party, whose role in economic management was reduced to nought. Underlining the great harm of this, Lenin wrote that the Party "is capable of uniting, training and organising a vanguard of the proletariat and of the whole mass of the working people that alone will be capable of withstanding the inevitable petty-bourgeois vacillations of this mass and the inevitable traditions and relapses of narrow craft unionism or craft prejudices among the proletariat, and of guiding all the united activities of the whole of the proletariat, i.e., of leading it politically, and through it, the whole mass of the working people". Lenin described such an understanding of the Party's role and its relationship with the proletariat outside the Party and the broad sections of working people as a departure from Marxism and a deviation towards petty-bourgeois syndicalism.

The discussion was summed up and ended with the adoption of Lenin's platform by the Tenth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) in 1921. The congress stressed that the methods of workers' democracy, which had had to be temporarily restricted during the Civil War, should be restored as quickly and on as broad a scale as possible, first and foremost in the trade union movement.

The Party's consistent implementation of the Lenin line towards the trade unions helped put an end to petty-bourgeois vacillation and eliminate the dangerous-syndicalist and anarchist deviations which could have brought Soviet power to ruin.

These problems were thoroughly elucidated in Lenin's "The Trade Unions, the Present Situation and Trotsky's Mistakes", "The Party Crisis", "Draft Theses on the Role and Functions of the Trade Unions", "Once Again on the Trade

Unions" and other works. The speeches Lenin made and the articles he wrote during the discussion on the trade unions are still of enormous political interest; they show what difficulties the Party had to contend with in the years immediately following the October Socialist Revolution.

Of special interest also in this connection are Lenin's draft theses on *the role of the trade unions under the New Economic Policy* and the existence of state-capitalist forms of economy in the proletarian state.

Under the New Economic Policy, when there was a certain strengthening of private enterprise tendencies, there arose a greater danger of the trade unions falling under the influence of petty-bourgeois ideology. It was "urgently necessary to counteract this by intensifying the struggle against petty-bourgeois influences upon the working class". In implementing their policy the Communist Party and the Soviet Government took all these circumstances into account.

Lenin wrote: "Being a school of communism in general, the trade unions must, in particular, be a school for training the whole mass of workers, and eventually all working people, in the art of managing socialist industry (and gradually also agriculture)". This task posed by Lenin is being carried out successfully.

Even from a review as short as this, it is clear that Lenin's legacy on the problems of the workers' and trade union movement is immensely rich and useful. The contemporary epoch sheds a new light on Lenin's brilliant ability to see far into the future and lends particular significance to his conclusions and forecasts. Thorough and systematic study of Lenin's works enriches our experience, builds up political self-consciousness, teaches us to fight resolutely for peace, democracy and socialism.

\* \* \*

The translations included in this volume are made from the 4th edition of Lenin's *Collected Works* prepared by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. The corrections have been made in accordance with the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*.

B. Koval



---

## ***From What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats***

The political activity of the Social-Democrats lies in promoting the development and organisation of the working-class movement in Russia, in transforming this movement from its present state of sporadic attempts at protest, "riots" and strikes devoid of a guiding idea, into an organised struggle of the **WHOLE** Russian working **CLASS** directed against the bourgeois regime and working for the expropriation of the expropriators and the abolition of the social system based on the oppression of the working people. Underlying these activities is the common conviction of Marxists that the Russian worker is the sole and natural representative of Russia's entire working and exploited population.\*

Natural because the exploitation of the working people in Russia *is everywhere capitalist in nature*, if we leave out of account the moribund remnants of serf economy; but the exploitation of the mass of producers is on a small scale, scattered and undeveloped, while the exploitation of the factory proletariat is on a large scale, socialised and concentrated. In the former case, exploitation is still enmeshed in medieval forms, various political, legal and conventional

---

\* Russia's man of the future is the muzhik—thought the representatives of peasant socialism, the Narodniks<sup>1</sup> in the broadest sense of the term. Russia's man of the future is the worker—think the Social-Democrats. That is how the Marxist view was formulated in a certain manuscript.

trappings, tricks and devices, which hinder the working people and their ideologists from seeing the essence of the system which oppresses the working people, from seeing where and how a way can be found out of this system. In the latter case, on the contrary, exploitation is fully developed and emerges in its pure form, without any confusing details. The worker cannot fail to see that he is oppressed by *capital*, that his struggle has to be waged against the bourgeois *class*. And this struggle, aimed at satisfying his immediate economic needs, at improving his material conditions, inevitably demands that the workers organise, and inevitably becomes a war not against individuals, but against a *class*, the class which oppresses and crushes the working people not only in the factories, but everywhere. That is why the factory worker is none other than the foremost representative of the entire exploited population. And in order that he may fulfil his function of representative in an organised, sustained struggle it is by no means necessary to enthuse him with "perspectives"; all that is needed is simply to *make him understand his position*, to make him understand the political and economic structure of the system that oppresses him, and the necessity and inevitability of class antagonisms under this system. This position of the factory worker in the general system of capitalist relations makes him the sole fighter for the emancipation of the working class, for only the higher stage of development of capitalism, large-scale machine industry, creates the material conditions and the social forces necessary for this struggle. Everywhere else, where the forms of capitalist development are low, these material conditions are absent; production is scattered among thousands of tiny enterprises (and they do not cease to be scattered *enterprises* even under the most equalitarian forms of communal land-ownership), for the most part the exploited still possess tiny enterprises, and are thus tied to the very bourgeois system they should be fighting: this retards and hinders the development of the social forces capable of overthrowing capitalism. Scattered, individual, petty exploitation ties the working people to one locality, divides them, prevents them from becoming conscious of class solidarity, prevents them from uniting once they have understood that oppression is

not caused by some particular individual, but by the whole economic system. Large-scale capitalism, on the contrary, inevitably severs all the workers' ties with the old society, with a particular locality and a particular exploiter; it unites them, compels them to think and places them in conditions which enable them to commence an organised struggle. Accordingly, it is on the working class that the Social-Democrats concentrate all their attention and all their activities. When its advanced representatives have mastered the ideas of scientific socialism, the idea of the historical role of the Russian worker, when these ideas become widespread, and when stable organisations are formed among the workers to transform the workers' present sporadic economic war into conscious class struggle—then the Russian **WORKER**, rising at the head of all the democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and lead the **RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT** (side by side with the proletariat of **ALL COUNTRIES**) *along the straight road of open political struggle* to **THE VICTORIOUS COMMUNIST REVOLUTION**.

1894

Written in spring-summer  
of 1894. A hectographed  
edition came out in 1894

*Collected Works*, Vol. 1,  
pp. 298-300

---

## ***From Draft and Explanation of a Programme for the Social-Democratic Party***

### **Draft Programme**

A. 1. Big factories are developing in Russia with ever-growing rapidity, ruining the small handicraftsmen and peasants, turning them into propertyless workers, and driving ever-increasing numbers of the people to the cities, factory and industrial villages and townlets.

2. This growth of capitalism signifies an enormous growth of wealth and luxury among a handful of factory owners, merchants and landowners, and a still more rapid growth of the poverty and oppression of the workers. The improvements in production and the machinery introduced in the big factories, while facilitating a rise in the productivity of social labour, serve to strengthen the power of the capitalists over the workers, to increase unemployment and with it to accentuate the defenceless position of the workers.

3. But while carrying the oppression of labour by capital to the highest pitch, the big factories are creating a special class of workers which is enabled to wage a struggle against capital, because their very conditions of life are destroying all their ties with their own petty production, and, by uniting the workers through their common labour and transferring them from factory to factory, are welding masses of working folk together. The workers are beginning a struggle against the capitalists, and an intense urge for unity is appearing among them. Out of the isolated revolts of the workers is growing the struggle of the Russian working class.

4. This struggle of the working class against the capitalist class is a struggle against all classes who live by the labour of others, and against all exploitation. It can only end in the passage of political power into the hands of the working class, the transfer of all the land, instruments, factories, machines, and mines to the whole of society for the organisation of socialist production, under which all that is produced by the workers and all improvements in production must benefit the working people themselves.

5. The movement of the Russian working class is, according to its character and aims, part of the international (Social-Democratic) movement of the working class of all countries.

6. The main obstacle in the struggle of the Russian working class for its emancipation is the absolutely autocratic government and its irresponsible officials. Basing itself on the privileges of the landowners and capitalists and on subservience to their interests, it denies the lower classes any rights whatever and thus fetters the workers' movement and retards the development of the entire people. That is why the struggle of the Russian working class for its emancipation necessarily gives rise to the struggle against the absolute power of the autocratic government.

B. 1. The Russian Social-Democratic Party declares that its aim is to assist this struggle of the Russian working class by developing the class-consciousness of the workers, by promoting their organisation, and by indicating the aims and objects of the struggle.

2. The struggle of the Russian working class for its emancipation is a political struggle, and its first aim is to achieve political liberty.

3. That is why the Russian Social-Democratic Party will, without separating itself from the working-class movement, support every social movement against the absolute power of the autocratic government, against the class of privileged landed nobility and against all the vestiges of serfdom and the social-estate system which hinder free competition.

4. On the other hand, the Russian Social-Democratic workers' party will wage war against all endeavours to patronise the labouring classes with the guardianship of the absolute government and its officials, all endeavours to

retard the development of capitalism, and consequently the development of the working class.

5. The emancipation of the workers must be the act of the working class itself.

6. What the Russian people need is not the help of the absolute government and its officials, but emancipation from oppression by it.

C. Making these views its starting-point, the Russian Social-Democratic Party demands first and foremost:

1. The convening of a Zemsky Sobor made up of representatives of all citizens so as to draw up a constitution.

2. Universal and direct suffrage for all citizens of Russia who have reached 21 years of age, irrespective of religion or nationality.

3. Freedom of assembly and organisation, and the right to strike.

4. Freedom of the press.

5. Abolition of social estates, and complete equality of all citizens before the law.

6. Freedom of religion and equality of all nationalities. Transfer of the registration of births, marriages and deaths to independent civic officials, independent, that is, of the police.

7. Every citizen to have the right to prosecute any official, without having to complain to the latter's superiors.

8. Abolition of passports, full freedom of movement and residence.

9. Freedom of trades and occupations and abolition of guilds.

D. For the workers, the Russian Social-Democratic Party demands:

1. Establishment of industrial courts in all industries, with elected judges from the capitalists and workers, in equal numbers.

2. Legislative limitation of the working day to 8 hours.

3. Legislative prohibition of night work and shifts. Prohibition of work by children under 15 years of age.

4. Legislative enactment of national holidays.

5. Application of factory laws and factory inspection to all industries throughout Russia, and to government factories, and also to handicraftsmen who work at home.

6. The Factory Inspectorate must be independent and not be under the Ministry of Finance. Members of industrial

courts must enjoy equal rights with the Factory Inspectorate in ensuring the observance of factory laws.

7. Absolute prohibition everywhere of the truck system.

8. Supervision, by workers' elected representatives, of the proper fixing of rates, the rejection of goods, the expenditure of accumulated fines and the factory-owned workers' quarters.

A law that all deductions from workers' wages, whatever the reason for their imposition (fines, rejects, etc.), shall not exceed the sum of 10 kopeks per ruble all told.

9. A law making the employers responsible for injuries to workers, the employer being required to prove that the worker is to blame.

10. A law making the employers responsible for maintaining schools and providing medical aid to the workers.

### Explanation of the Programme

The programme is divided into three main parts. Part one sets forth all the tenets from which the remaining parts of the programme follow. This part indicates the position occupied by the working class in contemporary society, the meaning and significance of their struggle against the employers and the political position of the working class in the Russian state.

Part two sets forth the *Party's aim*, and indicates the Party's relation to other political trends in Russia. It deals with what should be the activity of the Party and of all class-conscious workers, and what should be their attitude to the interests and strivings of the other classes in Russian society.

Part three contains the Party's practical demands. This part is divided into three sections. The first section contains demands for nation-wide reforms. The second section states the demands and programme of the working class. The third section contains demands in the interests of the peasants. Some preliminary explanations of the sections are given below, before proceeding to the practical part of the programme.

A. 1. The programme deals first of all with the rapid growth of big factories, because this is the main thing in contemporary Russia that is completely changing all the old conditions of life, particularly the living conditions of the labouring class. Under the old conditions practically all the country's wealth was produced by petty proprietors, who constituted the overwhelming majority of the population. The population lived an immobile life in the villages, the greater part of their produce being either for their own consumption, or for the small market of neighbouring villages which had little contact with other nearby markets. These very same petty proprietors worked for the landlords, who compelled them to produce mainly for their consumption. Domestic produce was handed over for processing to artisans, who also lived in the villages or travelled in the neighbouring areas to get work.

But after the peasants were emancipated,<sup>2</sup> these living conditions of the mass of the people underwent a complete change: the small artisan establishments began to be replaced by big factories, which grew with extraordinary rapidity; they ousted the petty proprietors, turning them into wage-workers, and compelled hundreds and thousands of workers to work together, producing tremendous quantities of goods that are being sold all over Russia.

The emancipation of the peasants destroyed the immobility of the population and placed the peasants in conditions under which they could no longer get a livelihood from the patches of land that remained in their possession. Masses of people left home to seek a livelihood, making for the factories or for jobs on the construction of the railways which connect the different corners of Russia and carry the output of the big factories everywhere. Masses of people went to jobs in the towns, took part in building factory and commercial premises, in delivering fuel to factories, and in preparing raw materials for them. Finally, many people were occupied at home, doing jobs for merchants and factory owners who could not expand their establishments fast enough. Similar changes took place in agriculture; the landlords began to produce grain for sale, big cultivators from among the peasants and merchants came on the scene, and grain in hundreds of millions of



poods began to be sold abroad. Production required wage-workers, and hundreds of thousands and millions of peasants, giving up their tiny allotments, went to work as regular or day-labourers for the new masters engaged in producing grain for sale. Now it is these changes in the old way of life that are described by the programme, which says that the big factories are ruining the small handicraftsmen and peasants, turning them into wage-workers. Small-scale production is being replaced everywhere by large-scale, and in this large-scale production the masses of the workers are just hirelings employed for wages by the capitalist, who possesses enormous capital, builds enormous workshops, buys up huge quantities of materials and fills his pockets with all the profit from this mass-scale production by the combined workers. Production has become capitalist, and it exerts merciless and ruthless pressure on all the petty proprietors, destroying their immobile life in the villages, compelling them to travel from one end of the country to the other as ordinary unskilled labourers, selling their labour-power to capital....

These are what constitute the tremendous changes in the country's life brought about by the big factories—small-scale production is being replaced by large-scale, the petty proprietors are turning into wage-workers. What, then, does this change mean for the whole of the working population, and where is it leading? This is dealt with further in the programme.

A. 2. Accompanying the replacement of small- by large-scale production is the replacement of small financial resources in the hands of the individual proprietor by enormous sums employed as capital, the replacement of small, insignificant profits by profits running into millions. That is why the growth of capitalism is leading everywhere to the growth of luxury and riches. A whole class of big financial magnates, factory owners, railway owners, merchants, and bankers has arisen in Russia, a whole class of people who live off income derived from money capital loaned on interest to industrialists has arisen; the big landowners have become enriched, drawing fairly large sums from the peasants by way of land redemption payments, taking advantage of their need of land to raise the price of the

land leased to them, and setting up large beet-sugar refineries and distilleries on their estates. The luxury and extravagance of all these wealthy classes have reached unparalleled dimensions, and the main streets of the big cities are lined with their princely mansions and luxurious palaces. But as capitalism grew, the workers' conditions became steadily worse. If earnings increased in some places following the peasants' emancipation, they did so very slightly and not for long, because the mass of hungry people swarming in from the villages forced rates down, while the cost of foodstuffs and necessities continued to go up, so that even with their increased wages the workers got fewer means of subsistence; it became increasingly difficult to find jobs, and side by side with the luxurious mansions of the rich (or on city outskirts) there grew up the slums where the workers were forced to live in cellars, in overcrowded, damp and cold dwellings, and even in dug-outs near the new industrial establishments. As capital grew bigger it increased its pressure on the workers, turning them into paupers, compelling them to devote all their time to the factory, and forcing the workers' wives and children to go to work. This, therefore, is the first change towards which the growth of capitalism is leading: tremendous wealth is accumulating in the coffers of a small handful of capitalists, while the masses of the people are being turned into paupers.

The second change consists in the fact that the replacement of small- by large-scale production has led to many improvements in production. First of all, work done singly, separately in each little workshop, in each isolated little household, has been replaced by the work of combined labourers working together at one factory, for one landowner, for one contractor. Joint labour is far more effective (productive) than individual, and renders it possible to produce goods with far greater ease and rapidity. But all these improvements are enjoyed by the capitalist alone who pays the workers next to nothing and appropriates all the profit deriving from the workers' combined labour. The capitalist gets still stronger and the worker gets still weaker because he becomes accustomed to doing some one kind of work and it is more difficult for him to transfer to another job, to change his occupation.

Another, far more important, improvement in production is the introduction of *machines* by the capitalist. The effectiveness of labour is increased manifold by the use of machines; but the capitalist turns all this benefit against the worker: taking advantage of the fact that machines require less physical labour, he assigns women and children to them, and pays them less. Taking advantage of the fact that where machines are used far fewer workers are wanted, he throws them out of the factory in masses and then takes advantage of this unemployment to enslave the worker still further, to increase the working day, to deprive the worker of his night's rest and to turn him into a simple appendage to the machine. Unemployment, created by machinery and constantly on the increase, now makes the worker utterly defenceless. His skill loses its worth, he is easily replaced by a plain unskilled labourer, who quickly becomes accustomed to the machine and gladly undertakes the job for lower wages. Any attempt to resist increased oppression by the capitalist leads to dismissal. On his own the worker is quite helpless against capital, and the machine threatens to crush him.

A. 3. In explaining the previous point, we showed that on his own the worker is helpless and defenceless against the capitalist who introduces machines. The worker has at all costs to seek means of resisting the capitalist, in order to defend himself. And he finds such means in *organisation*. Helpless on his own, the worker becomes a force when organised with his comrades, and is enabled to fight the capitalist and resist his onslaught.

*Organisation* becomes a necessity for the worker, now faced by big capital. But is it possible to organise a motley mass of people who are strangers to one another, even if they work in one factory? The programme indicates the conditions that prepare the workers for unity and develop in them the capacity and ability to organise. These conditions are as follows: 1) the large factory, with machine production that requires regular work the whole year round, completely breaks the tie between the worker and the land and his own farm, turning him into an absolute proletarian. The fact of each farming for himself on a patch of land divided the workers and gave each one of them a

certain specific interest, separate from that of his fellow worker, and was thus an obstacle to organisation. The worker's break with the land destroys these obstacles. 2) Further, the joint work of hundreds and thousands of workers in itself accustoms the workers to discuss their needs jointly, to take joint action, and clearly shows them the identity of the position and interests of the entire mass of workers. 3) Finally, constant transfers of workers from factory to factory accustom them to compare the conditions and practices in the different factories and enable them to convince themselves of the identical nature of the exploitation in all factories, to acquire the experience of other workers in their clashes with the capitalist, and thus enhance the solidarity of the workers. Now it is because of these conditions, taken together, that the appearance of big factories has given rise to the organisation of the workers. Among the Russian workers unity is expressed mainly and most frequently in strikes (we shall deal further with the reason why organisation in the shape of unions or mutual benefit societies is beyond the reach of our workers). The more the big factories develop, the more frequent, powerful and stubborn become the workers' strikes; the greater the oppression of capitalism and the greater the need for joint resistance by the workers. Strikes and isolated revolts of the workers, as the programme states, now constitute the most widespread phenomenon in Russian factories. But, with the further growth of capitalism and the increasing frequency of strikes, they prove inadequate. The employers take joint action against them: they conclude agreements among themselves, bring in workers from other areas, and turn for assistance to those who run the machinery of state, who help them crush the workers' resistance. Instead of being faced by the one individual owner of each separate factory, the workers are now faced by the *entire capitalist class* and the government that assists it. The *entire capitalist class* undertakes a struggle against the *entire working class*; it devises common measures against the strikes, presses the government to adopt anti-working-class legislation, transfers factories to more out-of-the-way localities, and resorts to the distribution of jobs among people working at home and to a thousand and one other ruses and devices

against the workers. The organisation of the workers of a separate factory, even of a separate industry, proves inadequate for resisting the entire capitalist class, and joint action by the *entire working class* becomes absolutely necessary. Thus, out of the isolated revolts of the workers grows the struggle of the entire working class. The struggle of the workers against the employers turns into a *class struggle*. All the employers are united by the one interest of keeping the workers in a state of subordination and of paying them the minimum wages possible. And the employers see that the only way they can safeguard their interests is by joint action on the part of the entire employing class, by acquiring influence over the machinery of state. The workers are likewise bound together by a common interest, that of preventing themselves being crushed by capital, of upholding their right to life and to a human existence. And the workers likewise become convinced that they, too, need unity, joint action by the entire class, the working class, and that to that end they must secure influence over the machinery of state.

A. 4. We have explained how and why the struggle between the factory workers and the employers becomes a class struggle, a struggle of the working class—the proletarians—against the capitalist class—the bourgeoisie. The question arises, what significance has this struggle for the entire people and for all working people? Under the contemporary conditions, of which we have already spoken in the explanation of point 1, production by wage-workers increasingly ousts petty economy. The number of people *who live by wage-labour* grows rapidly, and not only does the number of regular factory workers increase, but there is a still greater increase in the number of peasants who also have to search for work as wage-labourers, in order to live. At the present time, work for hire, work for the capitalist, has already become the most widespread form of labour. The domination of capital over labour embraces the bulk of the population not only in industry, but also in agriculture. Now it is this exploitation of wage-labour underlying contemporary society that the big factories develop to the utmost. All the methods of exploitation used by all capitalists in all industries, and which the entire

mass of Russia's working-class population suffers from, are concentrated, intensified, made the regular rule right in the factory and spread to all aspects of the worker's labour and life, they create a whole routine, a whole system whereby the capitalist sweats the worker. Let us illustrate this with an example: at all times and places, anybody who undertakes work for hire, rests, leaves his work on a holiday if it is celebrated in the neighbourhood. It is quite different in the factory. Once the factory management has engaged a worker, it disposes of his services just as it likes, paying no attention to the worker's habits, to his customary way of life, to his family position, to his intellectual requirements. The factory drives the employee to work when it needs his labour, compelling him to fit in his entire life with its requirements, to tear his rest hours to pieces, and, if he is on shifts, to work at night and on holidays. All the imaginable abuses relating to working time are set into motion by the factory and at the same time it introduces its "rules," its "practices", which are obligatory for every worker. The order of things in the factory is deliberately adapted to squeezing out of the hired worker all the labour he is capable of yielding, to squeezing it out at top speed and then to throwing him out! Another example. Everybody who takes a job, undertakes, of course, to submit to the employer, to do everything he is ordered. But when anybody hires himself out on a temporary job, he does not surrender his will at all; if he finds his employer's demands wrong or excessive, he leaves him. The factory, on the other hand, demands that the worker surrender his will altogether; it introduces discipline within its walls, compels the worker to start or to stop work when the bell rings, assumes the right itself to punish the worker, and subjects him to a fine or a deduction for every violation of rules which it has itself drawn up. The worker becomes part of a huge aggregate of machinery. He must be just as obedient, enslaved, and without a will of his own, as the machine itself.

Yet another example. Anybody who takes a job has frequent occasion to be dissatisfied with his employer, and complains about him to the court or a government official. Both the official and the court usually settle the dispute in the employer's favour, support him, but this promotion of

the employer's interests is not based on a general regulation or a law, but on the subservience of individual officials, who at different times protect him to a greater or lesser degree, and who settle matters unjustly in the employer's favour, either because they are acquaintances of his, or because they are uninformed about working conditions and cannot understand the worker. Each separate case of such injustice depends on each separate clash between the worker and the employer, on each separate official. The factory, on the other hand, gathers together such a mass of workers, carries oppression to such a pitch, that it becomes impossible to examine every separate case. General regulations are established, a law is drawn up on relations between the workers and the employers, a law that is obligatory for all. In this law the promotion of the employer's interests is backed up by the authority of the state. The injustice of individual officials is replaced by the injustice of the law itself. Regulations appear, for example, of the following type: if the worker is absent from work, he not only loses wages, but has to pay a fine in addition, whereas the employer pays nothing if he sends the workers home for lack of work; the employer may dismiss the worker for using strong language, whereas the worker cannot leave the job if he is similarly treated; the employer is entitled on his own authority to impose fines, make deductions or demand that overtime be worked, etc.

All these examples show us how the factory intensifies the exploitation of the workers and makes this exploitation universal, makes a whole "*system*" of it. The worker now has to deal, willy-nilly, not with an individual employer and his will and oppression, but with the arbitrary treatment and oppression he suffers from the entire employing class. The worker sees that his oppressors are not some one capitalist, but the entire capitalist class, because the system of exploitation is the same in all establishments. The individual capitalist cannot even depart from this system: if, for example, he were to take it into his head to reduce working hours, his goods would cost him more than those produced by his neighbour, another factory owner, who makes his employees work longer for the same wage. To secure an improvement in his conditions, the worker now

has to deal with the entire social system aimed at the exploitation of labour by capital. The worker is now confronted not by the individual injustice of an individual official, but by the injustice of the state authority itself, which takes the entire capitalist class under its protection and issues laws, obligatory for all, that serve the interests of that class. Thus, the struggle of the factory workers against the employers inevitably turns into a struggle against the entire capitalist class, against the entire social order based on the exploitation of labour by capital. That is why the workers' struggle acquires a social significance, becomes a struggle on behalf of all working people against all classes that live by the labour of others. That is why the workers' struggle opens up a new era in Russian history and is the dawn of the workers' emancipation.

What, however, is the domination of the capitalist class over the entire mass of working folk based on? It is based on the fact that all the factories, mills, mines, machines, and instruments of labour are in the hands of the capitalists, are their private property; on the fact that they possess enormous quantities of land (of all the land in European Russia, more than one-third belongs to landed proprietors, who do not number half a million). The workers possess no instruments of labour or materials, and so they have to sell their labour-power to the capitalists, who only pay the workers what is necessary for their keep, and place all the surplus produced by labour in their pockets; thus they pay for only part of the working time they use, and appropriate the rest. The entire increase in wealth resulting from the combined labour of the masses of workers or from improvements in production goes to the capitalist class, while the workers, who toil from generation to generation, remain propertyless proletarians. That is why there is only one way of ending the exploitation of labour by capital, and that is to abolish the private ownership of the instruments of labour, to hand over all the factories, mills, mines, and also all the big estates, etc., to the whole of society and to conduct socialist production in common, directed by the workers themselves. The articles produced by labour in common will then go to benefit the working people themselves, while the surplus they produce over and above their keep will serve to satisfy the needs of



the workers themselves, to secure the full development of all their capabilities and equal rights to enjoy all the achievements of science and art. That is why the programme states that the struggle between the working class and the capitalists can end only in this way. To achieve that, however, it is necessary that political power, i.e., the power to govern the state, should pass from the hands of a government which is under the influence of the capitalists and landowners, or from the hands of a government directly made up of elected representatives of the capitalists, into the hands of the working class.

Such is the ultimate aim of the struggle of the working class, such is the condition for its complete emancipation. This is the ultimate aim for which class-conscious, organised workers should strive; here in Russia, however, they still meet with tremendous obstacles, which hinder them in their struggle for emancipation.

A. 5. The fight against the domination of the capitalist class is now being waged by the workers of all European countries and also by the workers of America and Australia. Working-class organisation and solidarity is not confined to one country or one nationality: the workers' parties of different countries proclaim aloud the complete identity (solidarity) of interests and aims of the workers of the whole world. They come together at joint congresses, put forward common demands to the capitalist class of all countries, have established an international holiday of the entire organised proletariat striving for emancipation (May Day), thus welding the working class of all nationalities and of all countries into one great workers' army. The unity of the workers of all countries is a necessity arising out of the fact that the capitalist class, which rules over the workers, does not limit its rule to one country. Commercial ties between the different countries are becoming closer and more extensive; capital constantly passes from one country to another. The banks, those huge depositories that gather capital together and distribute it on loan to capitalists, begin as national institutions and then become international, gather capital from all countries, and distribute it among the capitalists of Europe and America. Enormous joint-stock companies are now being organised to set up capitalist

enterprises not in one country, but in several at once; international associations of capitalists make their appearance. Capitalist domination is international. That is why the workers' struggle in all countries for their emancipation is only successful if the workers fight jointly against international capital. That is why the Russian worker's comrade in the fight against the capitalist class is the German worker, the Polish worker, and the French worker, just as his enemy is the Russian, the Polish, and the French capitalists. Thus, in the recent period foreign capitalists have been very eagerly transferring their capital to Russia, where they are building branch factories and founding companies for running new enterprises. They are flinging themselves greedily on this young country in which the government is more favourable and obsequious to capital than anywhere else, in which they find workers who are less organised and less capable of fighting back than in the West, and in which the workers' standard of living, and hence their wages, are much lower, so that the foreign capitalists are able to draw enormous profits, on a scale unparalleled in their own countries. International capital has already stretched out its hand to Russia. The Russian workers are stretching out their hands to the international labour movement.

B. 1. This is the most important, the paramount, point of the programme, because it indicates what should constitute the activity of the Party in defending the interests of the working class, the activity of all class-conscious workers. It indicates how the striving for socialism, the striving for the abolition of the age-old exploitation of man by man, should be linked up with the popular movement engendered by the living conditions created by the large-scale factories.

The Party's activity must consist in promoting the workers' class struggle. The Party's task is not to concoct some fashionable means of helping the workers, but to join up with the workers' movement, to bring light into it, to assist the workers in the struggle they themselves have already begun to wage. The Party's task is to uphold the interests of the workers and to represent those of the entire working-class movement. Now, what must this assistance to the workers in their struggle consist of?

The programme says that this assistance must consist,

firstly, in developing the workers' class-consciousness. We have already spoken of how the workers' struggle against the employers becomes the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

What is meant by workers' class-consciousness follows from what we have said on the subject. The workers' class-consciousness means the workers' understanding that the only way to improve their conditions and to achieve their emancipation is to conduct a struggle against the capitalist and factory-owner class created by the big factories. Further, the workers' class-consciousness means their understanding that the interests of all the workers of any particular country are identical, that they all constitute one class, separate from all the other classes in society. Finally, the class-consciousness of the workers means the workers' understanding that to achieve their aims they have to work to influence affairs of state, just as the landlords and the capitalists did, and are continuing to do now.

By what means do the workers reach an understanding of all this? They do so by constantly gaining experience from the very struggle that they begin to wage against the employers and that increasingly develops, becomes sharper, and involves larger numbers of workers as big factories grow. There was a time when the workers' enmity against capital only found expression in a hazy sense of hatred of their exploiters, in a hazy consciousness of their oppression and enslavement, and in the desire *to wreak vengeance* on the capitalists. The struggle at that time found expression in isolated revolts of the workers, who wrecked buildings, smashed machines, attacked members of the factory management, etc. That was the *first*, the initial, form of the working-class movement, and it was a necessary one, because hatred of the capitalist has always and everywhere been the first impulse towards arousing in the workers the desire to defend themselves. The Russian working-class movement has, however, already outgrown this original form. Instead of having a hazy hatred of the capitalist, the workers have already begun to understand the antagonism between the interests of the working class and of the capitalist class. Instead of having a confused sense of oppression, they have begun to distinguish *the ways and means* by which capital

oppresses them, and are revolting against various forms of oppression, placing limits to capitalist oppression, and protecting themselves against the capitalist's greed. Instead of wreaking vengeance on the capitalists they are now turning to the fight for concessions, they are beginning to face the capitalist class with one demand after another, and are demanding improved working conditions, increased wages, and shorter working hours. Every strike concentrates all the attention and all the efforts of the workers on some particular aspect of the conditions under which the working class lives. Every strike gives rise to discussions about these conditions, helps the workers to appraise them, to understand what capitalist oppression consists in in the particular case, and what means can be employed to combat this oppression. Every strike enriches the experience of the entire working class. If the strike is successful it shows them what a strong force working-class unity is, and impels others to make use of their comrades' success. If it is not successful, it gives rise to discussions about the causes of the failure and to the search for better methods of struggle. This transition of the workers to the steadfast struggle for their vital needs, the fight for concessions, for improved living conditions, wages and working hours, now begun all over Russia, means that the Russian workers are making tremendous progress, and that is why the attention of the Social-Democratic Party and all class-conscious workers should be concentrated mainly on this struggle, on its promotion. Assistance to the workers should consist in showing them those most vital needs for the satisfaction of which they should fight, should consist in analysing the factors particularly responsible for worsening the conditions of different categories of workers, in explaining factory laws and regulations the violation of which (added to the deceptive tricks of the capitalists) so often subject the workers to double robbery. Assistance should consist in giving more precise and definite expression to the workers' demands, and in making them public, in choosing the best time for resistance, in choosing the method of struggle, in discussing the position and the strength of the two opposing sides, in discussing whether a still better choice can be made of the method of fighting (a method, perhaps, like addressing a letter

to the factory owner, or approaching the inspector, or the doctor, according to circumstances, where direct strike action is not advisable, etc.).

We have said that the Russian workers' transition to such struggle is indicative of the tremendous progress they have made. This struggle places (leads) the working-class movement on to the high road, and is the certain guarantee of its further success. The mass of working folk learn from this struggle, firstly, how to recognise and to examine one by one the methods of capitalist exploitation, to compare them with the law, with their living conditions, and with the interests of the capitalist class. By examining the different forms and cases of exploitation, the workers learn to understand the significance and the essence of exploitation as a whole, learn to understand the social system based on the exploitation of labour by capital. Secondly, in the process of this struggle the workers test their strength, learn to organise, learn to understand the need for and the significance of organisation. The extension of this struggle and the increasing frequency of clashes inevitably lead to a further extension of the struggle, to the development of a sense of unity, a sense of solidarity—at first among the workers of a particular locality, and then among the workers of the entire country, among the entire working class. Thirdly, this struggle develops the workers' political consciousness. The living condition of the mass of working folk places them in such a position that they do not (cannot) possess either the leisure or the opportunity to ponder over problems of state. On the other hand, the workers' struggle against the factory owners for their daily needs automatically and inevitably spurs the workers on to think of state, political questions, questions of how the Russian state is governed, how laws and regulations are issued, and whose interests they serve. Each clash in the factory necessarily brings the workers into conflict with the laws and representatives of state authority. In this connection the workers hear "political speeches" for the first time. At first from, say, the factory inspectors, who explain to them that the trick employed by the factory owner to defraud them is based on the exact meaning of the regulations, which have been endorsed by the appropriate authority and give the

employer a free hand to defraud the workers, or that the factory owner's oppressive measures are quite lawful, since he is merely availing himself of his rights, giving effect to such and such a law, that has been endorsed by the state authority that sees to its implementation. The political explanations of Messrs. the Inspectors are occasionally supplemented by the still more beneficial "political explanations" of the minister, who reminds the workers of the feelings of "Christian love" that they owe to the factory owners for their making millions out of the workers' labour. Later, these explanations of the representatives of the state authority, and the workers' direct acquaintance with the facts showing for whose benefit this authority operates, are still further supplemented by leaflets or other explanations given by socialists, so that the workers get their political education in full from such a strike. They learn to understand not only the specific interests of the working class, but also the specific place occupied by the working class in the state. And so the *assistance* which the Social-Democratic Party can render to the class struggle of the workers should be: to develop the workers' class-consciousness by assisting them in the fight for their most vital needs.

The second type of *assistance* should consist, as the programme states, in promoting the organisation of the workers. The struggle we have just described necessarily requires that the workers be organised. Organisation becomes necessary for strikes, to ensure that they are conducted with great success, for collections in support of strikers, for setting up workers' mutual benefit societies, and for propaganda among the workers, the distribution among them of leaflets, announcements, manifestos, etc. Organisation is still more necessary to enable the workers to defend themselves against persecution by the police and the gendarmerie, to conceal from them all the workers' contacts and associations and to arrange the delivery of books, pamphlets, newspapers, etc. To assist in all this—such is the Party's second task.

The third consists in indicating the real aims of the struggle, i. e., in explaining to the workers what the exploitation of labour by capital consists in, what it is based on, how the private ownership of the land and the instruments

of labour leads to the poverty of the working masses, compels them to sell their labour to the capitalists and to yield up gratis the entire surplus produced by the worker's labour over and above his keep, in explaining, furthermore, how this exploitation inevitably leads to the class struggle between the workers and the capitalists, what the conditions of this struggle and its ultimate aims are—in a word, in explaining what is briefly stated in the programme.

B. 2. What is meant by these words: the struggle of the working class is a political struggle? They mean that the working class cannot fight for its emancipation without securing influence over affairs of state, over the administration of the state, over the issue of laws. The need for such influence has long been understood by the Russian capitalists, and we have shown how they have been able, despite all sorts of prohibitions contained in the police laws, to find thousands of ways of influencing the state authority, and how this authority serves the interests of the capitalist class. Hence it naturally follows that the working class, too, cannot wage its struggle, cannot even secure a lasting improvement of its lot unless it influences state authority.

We have already said that the workers' struggle against the capitalists will inevitably lead to a clash with the government, and the government itself is exerting every effort to prove to the workers that only by struggle and by joint resistance can they influence state authority. This was shown with particular clarity by the big strikes that took place in Russia in 1885-86. The government immediately set about drawing up regulations concerning workers, at once issued new laws about factory practices, yielded to the workers' insistent demands (for example, regulations were introduced limiting fines and ensuring proper wage payment); in the same way the present strikes (in 1896) have again caused the government's immediate intervention, and the government has already understood that it cannot confine itself to arrests and deportations, that it is ridiculous to regale the workers with stupid sermons about the noble conduct of the factory owners (see the circular issued by Finance Minister Witte to factory inspectors. Spring 1896). The government has realised that "organised workers constitute a force to be reckoned with" and so

it already has the factory legislation under review and is convening in St. Petersburg a Congress of Senior Factory Inspectors to discuss the question of reducing working hours and other inevitable concessions to the workers.

Thus we see that the struggle of the working class against the capitalist class must necessarily be a political struggle. Indeed, this struggle is already exerting influence on the state authority, is acquiring political significance. But the workers' utter lack of political rights, about which we have already spoken, and the absolute impossibility of the workers openly and directly influencing state authority become more clearly and sharply exposed and felt as the working-class movement develops. That is why the most urgent demand of the workers, the primary objective of the working-class influence on affairs of state must be *the achievement of political freedom*, i.e., the direct participation, guaranteed by law (by a constitution), of all citizens in the government of the state, the guaranteed right of all citizens freely to assemble, discuss their affairs, influence affairs of state through their associations and the press. The achievement of political freedom becomes the "*vital task of the workers*" because without it the workers do not and cannot have any influence over affairs of state, and thus inevitably remain a rightless, humiliated and inarticulate class. And if even now, when the workers are only just beginning to fight and to close their ranks, the government is already hastening to make concessions to the workers, in order to check the further growth of the movement, there can be no doubt that when the workers fully close their ranks and unite under the leadership of one political party, they will be able to compel the government to surrender, they will be able to win political freedom for themselves and the entire Russian people!

The preceding parts of the programme indicated the place occupied by the working class in contemporary society and the contemporary state, what is the aim of the struggle of the working class, and what constitutes the task of the Party that represents the workers' interests. Under the absolute rule of the government there are not, nor can there be, openly functioning political parties in Russia, but there are political trends which express the interests of



other classes and which exert influence over public opinion and the government. Hence, in order to make clear the position of the Social-Democratic Party, it is necessary now to indicate its attitude towards the remaining political trends in Russian society, so as to enable the workers to determine who may be their ally and to what extent, and who their enemy. That is indicated in the two following points of the programme.

B. 3. The programme declares that the workers' allies are, firstly, all those social strata which oppose the absolute power of the autocratic government. Since this absolute rule is the main obstacle to the workers' fight for their emancipation, it naturally follows that it is in the direct interest of the workers to support every social movement against absolutism (absolute means unlimited; absolutism is the unlimited rule of the government). The stronger the development of capitalism, the deeper become the contradictions between this bureaucratic administration and the interests of the propertied classes themselves, the interests of the bourgeoisie. And the Social-Democratic Party proclaims that it will support all strata and grades of the bourgeoisie who oppose the absolute government.

It is infinitely more to the workers' advantage for the bourgeoisie to *influence* affairs of state *directly*, than for their influence to be exerted, as is the case now, through a crowd of venal and despotic officials. It is far more advantageous to the workers for the bourgeoisie to *openly* influence policy than, as is the case now, to exert a *concealed* influence, concealed by the supposedly all-powerful "independent" government, which is called a government "by the grace of God", and hands out "its graces" to the suffering and industrious landlords and the poverty-stricken and oppressed factory owners. The workers need *open struggle* against the capitalist class, in order that the entire Russian proletariat may see for whose interests the workers are waging the struggle, and may learn how to wage the struggle properly; in order that the intrigues and aspirations of the bourgeoisie may not be hidden in the anterooms of grand dukes, in the saloons of senators and ministers, and in departmental offices barred to the public, and in order that they may come to the surface and open the eyes of all and

sundry as to who really inspires government policy and what the capitalists and landlords are striving for. And so, down with everything that hides the present influence of the capitalist class, and our support for any representative of the bourgeoisie who *comes out* against the bureaucracy, the bureaucratic administration, against the absolute government! But, while proclaiming its support for every social movement against absolutism, the Social-Democratic Party recognises that it does not separate itself from the working-class movement, because the working class has its specific interests, which are opposed to the interests of all other classes. While rendering support to all representatives of the bourgeoisie in the fight for political freedom, the workers should remember that the propertied classes can only be their allies for a time, that the interests of the workers and the capitalists cannot be reconciled, that the workers need the abolition of the government's absolute rule only in order to wage an open and extensive struggle against the capitalist class.

Written in prison:

*Draft Programme*

in December, later than

9 (21), 1895;

*Explanation of the Programme*

in June-July, 1896

First published in 1924

in the magazine

*Proletarskaya Revolutsia* No. 3

*Collected Works*, Vol. 2,  
pp. 95-98; 98-107; 108-  
09; 112-21

---

## ***From A Protest by Russian Social-Democrats*<sup>3</sup>**

First of all, the authors of the *Credo* have an entirely false conception of the history of the West-European working class movement. It is not true to say that the working class in the West did not take part in the struggle for political liberty and in political revolutions. The history of the Chartist movement<sup>4</sup> and the revolutions of 1848 in France, Germany, and Austria prove the opposite. It is absolutely untrue to say that "Marxism was the theoretical expression of the prevailing practice: of the political struggle predominating over the economic." On the contrary, "Marxism" appeared at a time when non-political socialism prevailed (Owenism, "Fourierism", "true socialism" etc.) and the *Communist Manifesto* took up the cudgels at once against non-political socialism. Even when Marxism came out fully armed with theory (*Capital*) and organised the celebrated International Working Men's Association,<sup>5</sup> the political struggle was by no means the prevailing practice (narrow trade-unionism in England, anarchism and Proudhonism in the Romance countries). In Germany the great historic service performed by Lassalle was the transformation of the working class from an appendage of the liberal bourgeoisie into an independent political party. Marxism linked up the economic and the political struggle of the working class into a single inseparable whole; and the effort of the authors of the *Credo* to separate these forms of struggle is one of their most clumsy and deplorable departures from Marxism.

Further, the authors of the *Credo* also have an entirely wrong conception of the present state of the West-European working-class movement and of the theory of Marxism, under the banner of which that movement is marching. To talk about a "crisis of Marxism" is merely to repeat the nonsense of the bourgeois hacks who are doing all they can to exacerbate every disagreement among the socialists and turn it into a split in the socialist parties. The notorious Bernsteinism<sup>6</sup>—in the sense in which it is commonly understood by the general public, and by the authors of the *Credo* in particular—is an attempt to narrow the theory of Marxism, to convert the revolutionary workers' party into a reformist party. As was to be expected, this attempt has been strongly condemned by the majority of the German Social-Democrats. Opportunist trends have repeatedly manifested themselves in the ranks of German Social-Democracy, and on every occasion they have been repudiated by the Party, which loyally guards the principles of revolutionary international Social-Democracy. We are convinced that every attempt to transplant opportunist views to Russia will encounter equally determined resistance on the part of the overwhelming majority of Russian Social-Democrats.

Similarly, there can be no suggestion of a "radical change in the practical activity" of the West-European workers' parties, in spite of what the authors of the *Credo* say: the tremendous importance of the economic struggle of the proletariat, and the necessity for such a struggle, were recognised by Marxism from the very outset. As early as the forties Marx and Engels conducted a polemic against the utopian socialists who denied the importance of this struggle.

When the International Working Men's Association was formed about twenty years later, the question of the importance of trade unions and of the economic struggle was raised at its very first congress, in Geneva, in 1866. The resolution adopted at that congress spoke explicitly of the importance of the economic struggle and warned the socialists and the workers, on the one hand, against exaggerating its importance (which the English workers were inclined to do at that time) and, on the other, against underestimating its importance (which the French and the Germans, partic-

ularly the Lassalleans,<sup>7</sup> were inclined to do). The resolution recognised that the trade unions were not only a natural, but also an essential phenomenon under capitalism and considered them an extremely important means for organising the working class in its daily struggle against capital and for the abolition of wage-labour. The resolution declared that the trade unions must not devote attention exclusively to the "immediate struggle against capital", must not remain aloof from the general political and social movement of the working class; they must not pursue "narrow" aims, but must strive for the general emancipation of the millions of oppressed workers. Since then the workers' parties in the various countries have discussed the question many times and, of course, will discuss it again and again—whether to devote more or somewhat less attention at any given moment to the economic or to the political struggle of the proletariat; but the general question, or the question in principle, today remains as it was presented by Marxism. The conviction that the class struggle of the proletariat must necessarily combine the political and the economic struggle into one integral whole has entered into the flesh and blood of international Social-Democracy. The experience of history has, furthermore, incontrovertibly proved that absence of political freedom, or restriction of the political rights of the proletariat, always make it necessary to put the political struggle in the forefront.

Written in August, prior  
to 22 (September 3), 1899  
First published abroad  
in December 1899  
as separate reprints  
from the magazine  
*Rabocheye Dyelo* No. 4-5

*Collected Works*, Vol. 4,  
pp. 175-77

---

## On Strikes

In recent years, workers' strikes have become extremely frequent in Russia. There is no longer a single industrial gubernia in which there have not occurred several strikes. And in the big cities strikes never cease. It is understandable, therefore, that class-conscious workers and socialists should more and more frequently concern themselves with the question of the significance of strikes, of methods of conducting them, and of the tasks of socialists participating in them.

We wish to attempt to outline some of our ideas on these questions. In our first article we plan to deal generally with the significance of strikes in the working-class movement; in the second we shall deal with anti-strike laws in Russia; and in the third, with the way strikes were and are conducted in Russia and with the attitude that class-conscious workers should adopt to them.

### I

In the first place we must seek an explanation for the outbreak and spread of strikes. Everyone who calls to mind strikes from personal experience, from reports of others, or from the newspapers will see immediately that strikes break out and spread wherever big factories arise and grow in number. It would scarcely be possible to find a single one among the bigger factories employing hundreds (at times

even thousands) of workers in which strikes have not occurred. When there were only a few big factories in Russia there were few strikes; but ever since big factories have been multiplying rapidly in both the old industrial districts and in new towns and villages, strikes have become more frequent.

Why is it that large-scale factory production always leads to strikes? It is because capitalism must necessarily lead to a struggle of the workers against the employers, and when production is on a large scale the struggle of necessity takes on the form of strikes.

Let us explain this.

Capitalism is the name given to that social system under which the land, factories, implements, etc., belong to a small number of landed proprietors and capitalists, while the mass of the people possesses no property, or very little property, and is compelled to hire itself out as workers. The landowners and factory owners hire workers and make them produce wares of this or that kind which they sell on the market. The factory owners, furthermore, pay the workers only such a wage as provides a bare subsistence for them and their families, while everything the worker produces over and above this amount goes into the factory owner's pocket, as his profit. Under capitalist economy, therefore, the people in their mass are the hired workers of others, they do not work for themselves but work for employers for wages. It is understandable that the employers always try to reduce wages; the less they give the workers, the greater their profit. The workers try to get the highest possible wage in order to provide their families with sufficient and wholesome food, to live in good homes, and to dress as other people do and not like beggars. A constant struggle is, therefore, going on between employers and workers over wages; the employer is free to hire whatever worker he thinks fit and, therefore, seeks the cheapest. The worker is free to hire himself out to an employer of his choice, so that he seeks the dearest, the one that will pay him the most. Whether the worker works in the country or in town, whether he hires himself out to a landlord, a rich peasant, a contractor, or a factory owner, he always bargains with the employer, fights with him over the wages.

But is it possible for a single worker to wage a struggle by himself? The number of working people is increasing: peasants are being ruined and flee from the countryside to the town or the factory. The landlords and factory owners are introducing machines that rob the workers of their jobs. In the cities there are increasing numbers of unemployed and in the villages there are more and more beggars; those who are hungry drive wages down lower and lower. It becomes impossible for the worker to fight against the employer by himself. If the worker demands good wages or tries not to consent to a wage cut, the employer tells him to get out, that there are plenty of hungry people at the gates who would be glad to work for low wages.

When the people are ruined to such an extent that there is always a large number of unemployed in the towns and villages, when the factory owners amass huge fortunes and the small proprietors are squeezed out by the millionaires, the individual worker becomes *absolutely powerless* in face of the capitalist. It then becomes possible for the capitalist to crush the worker completely, to drive him to his death at slave labour and, indeed, not him alone, but his wife and children with him. If we take, for instance, those occupations in which the workers have not yet been able to win the protection of the law and in which they cannot offer resistance to the capitalists, we see an inordinately long working day, sometimes as long as 17-19 hours; we see children of 5 or 6 years of age overstraining themselves at work; we see a generation of permanently hungry workers who are gradually dying from starvation. Example: the workers who toil in their own homes for capitalists; besides, any worker can bring to mind a host of other examples! Even under slavery or serfdom there was never any oppression of the working people as terrible as that under capitalism when the workers cannot put up a resistance or cannot win the protection of laws that restrict the arbitrary actions of the employers.

And so, in order to stave off their reduction to such extremities, the workers begin a desperate struggle. As they see that each of them, individually, is completely powerless and that the oppression of capital threatens to crush him, the workers begin to revolt jointly against their



employers. Workers' strikes begin. At first the workers often fail to realise what they are trying to achieve, lacking consciousness of the *wherefore* of their action; they simply smash the machines and destroy the factories. They merely want to display their wrath to the factory owners; they are trying out their joint strength in order to get out of an unbearable situation, without yet understanding why their position is so hopeless and what they should strive for.

In all countries the wrath of the workers first took the form of isolated revolts—the police and factory owners in Russia call them “mutinies”. In all countries these isolated revolts gave rise to more or less peaceful strikes, on the one hand, and to the all-sided struggle of the working class for its emancipation, on the other.

What significance have strikes (or stoppages) for the struggle of the working class? To answer this question, we must first have a fuller view of strikes. The wages of a worker are determined, as we have seen, by an agreement between the employer and the worker, and if, under these circumstances, the individual worker is completely powerless, it is obvious that workers must fight jointly for their demands, they are compelled to organise strikes either to prevent the employers from reducing wages or to obtain higher wages. It is a fact that in every country with a capitalist system there are strikes of workers. Everywhere, in all the European countries and in America, the workers feel themselves powerless when they are disunited; they can only offer resistance to the employers jointly, either by striking or threatening to strike. As capitalism develops, as big factories are more rapidly opened, as the petty capitalists are more and more ousted by the big capitalists, the more urgent becomes the need for the joint resistance of the workers, because unemployment increases, competition sharpens between the capitalists who strive to produce their wares at the cheapest (to do which they have to pay the workers as little as possible), and the fluctuations of industry become more accentuated and crises\* more acute. When

---

\* We shall deal elsewhere in greater detail with crises in industry and their significance to the workers. Here we shall merely note that during recent years in Russia industrial affairs have been going well, industry has been “prospering”, but that now (at the end of 1899)

industry prospers, the factory owners make big profits but do not think of sharing them with the workers; but when a crisis breaks out, the factory owners try to push the losses on to the workers. The necessity for strikes in capitalist society has been recognised to such an extent by everybody in the European countries that the law in those countries does not forbid the organisation of strikes; only in Russia barbarous laws against strikes still remain in force (we shall speak on another occasion of these laws and their application).

However, strikes, which arise out of the very nature of capitalist society, signify the beginning of the working-class struggle against that system of society. When the rich capitalists are confronted by individual, propertyless workers, this signifies the utter enslavement of the workers. But when those propertyless workers unite, the situation changes. There is no wealth that can be of benefit to the capitalists if they cannot find workers willing to apply their labour-power to the instruments and materials belonging to the capitalists and produce new wealth. As long as workers have to deal with capitalists on an individual basis they remain veritable slaves who must work continuously to profit another in order to obtain a crust of bread, who must for ever remain docile and inarticulate hired servants. But when the workers state their demands jointly and refuse to submit to the money-bags, they cease to be slaves, they become human beings, they begin to demand that their labour should not only serve to enrich a handful of idlers, but should also enable those who work to live like human beings. The slaves begin to put forward the demand to become masters, not to work and live as the landlords and capitalists want them to, but as the working people themselves want to. Strikes, therefore, always instil fear into the capitalists, because they begin to undermine their supremacy. "All wheels stand still, if your mighty arm wills it," a German workers' song says of the working class. And so it is in reality: the factories, the landlords' land, the machines,

there are already clear signs that this "prosperity" will end in a crisis: difficulties in marketing goods, bankruptcies of factory owners, the ruin of petty proprietors, and terrible calamities for the workers (unemployment, reduced wages, etc.).

the railways, etc., etc., are all like wheels in a giant machine—the machine that extracts various products, processes them, and delivers them to their destination. The whole of this machine is set in motion by *the worker* who tills the soil, extracts ores, makes commodities in the factories, builds houses, workshops, and railways. When the workers refuse to work, the entire machine threatens to stop. Every strike reminds the capitalists that it is the workers and not they who are the real masters—the workers who are more and more loudly proclaiming their rights. Every strike reminds the workers that their position is not hopeless, that they are not alone. See what a tremendous effect strikes have both on the strikers themselves and on the workers at neighbouring or nearby factories or at factories in the same industry. In normal, peaceful times the worker does his job without a murmur, does not contradict the employer, and does not discuss his condition. In times of strikes he states his demands in a loud voice, he reminds the employers of all their abuses, he claims his rights, he does not think of himself and his wages alone, he thinks of all his workmates who have downed tools together with him and who stand up for the workers' cause, fearing no privations. Every strike means many privations for the working people, terrible privations that can be compared only to the calamities of war—hungry families, loss of wages, often arrests, banishment from the towns where they have their homes and their employment. Despite all these sufferings, the workers despise those who desert their fellow workers and make deals with the employers. Despite all these sufferings, brought on by strikes, the workers of neighbouring factories gain renewed courage when they see that their comrades have engaged themselves in struggle. "People who endure so much to bend one single bourgeois will be able to break the power of the whole bourgeoisie," said one great teacher of socialism, Engels, speaking of the strikes of the English workers. It is often enough for one factory to strike, for strikes to begin immediately in a large number of factories. What a great moral influence strikes have, how they affect workers who see that their comrades have ceased to be slaves and, if only for the time being, have become people on an equal footing with

the rich! Every strike brings thoughts of socialism very forcibly to the worker's mind, thoughts of the struggle of the entire working class for emancipation from the oppression of capital. It has often happened that before a big strike the workers of a certain factory or a certain branch of industry or of a certain town knew hardly anything and scarcely ever thought about socialism; but after the strike, study circles and associations become much more widespread among them and more and more workers become socialists.

A strike teaches workers to understand what the strength of the employers and what the strength of the workers consists in; it teaches them not to think of their own employer alone and not of their own immediate workmates alone but of all the employers, the whole class of capitalists and the whole class of workers. When a factory owner who has amassed millions from the toil of several generations of workers refuses to grant a modest increase in wages or even tries to reduce wages to a still lower level and, if the workers offer resistance, throws thousands of hungry families out into the street, it becomes quite clear to the workers that the capitalist class as a whole is the enemy of the whole working class and that the workers can depend only on themselves and their united action. It often happens that a factory owner does his best to deceive the workers, to pose as a benefactor, and conceal his exploitation of the workers by some petty sops or lying promises. A strike always demolishes this deception at one blow by showing the workers that their "benefactor" is a wolf in sheep's clothing.

A strike, moreover, opens the eyes of the workers to the nature, not only of the capitalists, but of the government and the laws as well. Just as the factory owners try to pose as benefactors of the workers, the government officials and their lackeys try to assure the workers that the tsar and the tsarist government are equally solicitous of both the factory owners and the workers, as justice requires. The worker does not know the laws, he has no contact with government officials, especially with those in the higher posts, and, as a consequence, often believes all this. Then comes a strike. The public prosecutor, the factory inspector, the police, and frequently troops, appear at the factory. The workers learn

that they have violated the law: the employers are permitted by law to assemble and openly discuss ways of reducing workers' wages, but workers are declared criminals if they come to a joint agreement! Workers are driven out of their homes; the police close the shops from which the workers might obtain food on credit, an effort is made to incite the soldiers against the workers even when the workers conduct themselves quietly and peacefully. Soldiers are even ordered to fire on the workers and when they kill unarmed workers by shooting the fleeing crowd in the back, the tsar himself sends the troops an expression of his gratitude (in this way the tsar thanked the troops who had killed striking workers in Yaroslavl in 1895<sup>8</sup>). It becomes clear to every worker that the tsarist government is his worst enemy, since it defends the capitalists and binds the workers hand and foot. The workers begin to understand that laws are made in the interests of the rich alone; that government officials protect those interests; that the working people are gagged and not allowed to make known their needs; that the working class must win for itself the right to strike, the right to publish workers' newspapers, the right to participate in a national assembly that enacts laws and supervises their fulfilment. The government itself knows full well that strikes open the eyes of the workers and for this reason it has such a fear of strikes and does everything to stop them as quickly as possible. One German Minister of the Interior, one who was notorious for the persistent persecution of socialists and class-conscious workers, not without reason, stated before the people's representatives: "Behind every strike lurks the hydra [monster] of revolution."<sup>9</sup> Every strike strengthens and develops in the workers the understanding that the government is their enemy and that the working class must prepare itself to struggle against the government for the people's rights.

Strikes, therefore, teach the workers to unite; they show them that they can struggle against the capitalists only when they are united; strikes teach the workers to think of the struggle of the whole working class against the whole class of factory owners and against the arbitrary, police government. This is the reason that socialists call strikes "a school of war", a school in which the workers learn to make

war on their enemies for the liberation of the whole people, of all who labour, from the yoke of government officials and from the yoke of capital.

"A school of war" is, however, not war itself. When strikes are widespread among the workers, some of the workers (including some socialists) begin to believe that the working class can confine itself to strikes, strike funds, or strike associations alone; that by strikes alone the working class can achieve a considerable improvement in its conditions or even its emancipation. When they see what power there is in a united working class and even in small strikes, some think that the working class has only to organise a general strike throughout the whole country for the workers to get everything they want from the capitalists and the government. This idea was also expressed by the workers of other countries when the working-class movement was in its early stages and the workers were still very inexperienced. *It is a mistaken idea.* Strikes are *one* of the ways in which the working class struggles for its emancipation, but they are not the only way; and if the workers do not turn their attention to other means of conducting the struggle, they will slow down the growth and the successes of the working class. It is true that funds are needed to maintain the workers during strikes, if strikes are to be successful. Such workers' funds (usually funds of workers in separate branches of industry, separate trades or workshops) are maintained in all countries; but here in Russia this is especially difficult, because the police keep track of them, seize the money, and arrest the workers. The workers, of course, are able to hide from the police; naturally, the organisation of such funds is valuable, and we do not want to advise workers against setting them up. But it must not be supposed that workers' funds, when prohibited by law, will attract large numbers of contributors, and so long as the membership in such organisations is small, workers' funds will not prove of great use. Furthermore, even in those countries where workers' unions exist openly and have huge funds at their disposal, the working class can still not confine itself to strikes as a means of struggle. All that is necessary is a hitch in the affairs of industry (a crisis, such as the one that is approaching in Russia today) and the

factory owners will even deliberately cause strikes, because it is to their advantage to cease work for a time and to deplete the workers' funds. The workers, therefore, cannot, under any circumstances, confine themselves to strike actions and strike associations. Secondly, strikes can only be successful where workers are sufficiently class-conscious, where they are able to select an opportune moment for striking, where they know how to put forward their demands, and where they have connections with socialists and are able to procure leaflets and pamphlets through them. There are still very few such workers in Russia, and every effort must be exerted to increase their number in order to make the working-class cause known to the masses of workers and to acquaint them with socialism and the working-class struggle. This is a task that the socialists and class-conscious workers must undertake jointly by organising a socialist working-class party for this purpose. Thirdly, strikes, as we have seen, show the workers that the government is their enemy and that a struggle against the government must be carried on. Actually, it is strikes that have gradually taught the working class of all countries to struggle against the governments for workers' rights and for the rights of the people as a whole. As we have said, only a socialist workers' party can carry on this struggle by spreading among the workers a true conception of the government and of the working-class cause. On another occasion we shall discuss specifically how strikes are conducted in Russia and how class-conscious workers should avail themselves of them. Here we must point out that strikes are, as we said above, "a school of war" and not the war itself, that strikes are only one means of struggle, only one aspect of the working-class movement. From individual strikes the workers can and must go over, as indeed they are actually doing in all countries, to a struggle of the entire working class for the emancipation of all who labour. When all class-conscious workers become socialists, i.e., when they strive for this emancipation, when they unite throughout the whole country in order to spread socialism among the workers, in order to teach the workers all the means of struggle against their enemies, when they build up a socialist workers' party that struggles for the emancipation of the people as a whole from

government oppression and for the emancipation of all working people from the yoke of capital—only then will the working class become an integral part of that great movement of the workers of all countries that unites all workers and raises the red banner inscribed with the words: "Workers of all countries, unite!"

Written at the end of 1899

First published in 1924  
in the magazine

*Proletarskaya Revolyutsia* No. 8-9

*Collected Works*, Vol. 4,  
pp. 310-19



---

## *From What Is To Be Done?*

### II

#### The Spontaneity of the Masses and the Consciousness of the Social-Democrats

We have said that our movement, much more extensive and deep than the movement of the seventies, must be inspired with the same devoted determination and energy that inspired the movement at that time. Indeed, no one, we think, has until now doubted that the strength of the present-day movement lies in the awakening of the masses (principally, the industrial proletariat) and that its weakness lies in the lack of consciousness and initiative among the revolutionary leaders.

However, of late a staggering discovery has been made, which threatens to disestablish all hitherto prevailing views on this question. This discovery was made by *Rabocheye Dyelo*,<sup>10</sup> which in its polemic with *Iskra*<sup>11</sup> and *Zarya*<sup>12</sup> did not confine itself to making objections on separate points, but tried to ascribe "general disagreements" to a more profound cause—to the "different appraisals of the *relative* importance of the spontaneous and consciously 'methodical' element". *Rabocheye Dyelo* formulated its indictment as a "*belittling of the significance of the objective or the spontaneous element of development*".\* To this we say: Had the polemics with *Iskra* and *Zarya* resulted in nothing more than causing *Rabocheye Dyelo* to hit upon these "general disagreements", that alone would give us considerable satis-

---

\* *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, September 1901, pp. 17-18. *Rabocheye Dyelo's* italics.

faction, so significant is this thesis and so clear is the light it sheds on the quintessence of the present-day theoretical and political differences that exist among Russian Social-Democrats.

For this reason the question of the relation between consciousness and spontaneity is of such enormous general interest, and for this reason the question must be dealt with in great detail.

#### a) The Beginning of the Spontaneous Upsurge

In the previous chapter we pointed out how *universally* absorbed the educated youth of Russia was in the theories of Marxism in the middle of the nineties. In the same period the strikes that followed the famous St. Petersburg industrial war of 1896<sup>13</sup> assumed a similar general character. Their spread over the whole of Russia clearly showed the depth of the newly awakening popular movement, and if we are to speak of the "spontaneous element" then, of course, it is this strike movement which, first and foremost, must be regarded as spontaneous. But there is spontaneity and spontaneity. Strikes occurred in Russia in the seventies and sixties (and even in the first half of the nineteenth century), and they were accompanied by the "spontaneous" destruction of machinery, etc. Compared with these "revolts", the strikes of the nineties might even be described as "conscious", to such an extent do they mark the progress which the working-class movement made in that period. This shows that the "spontaneous element", in essence, represents nothing more nor less than consciousness in an *embryonic form*. Even the primitive revolts expressed the awakening of consciousness to a certain extent. The workers were losing their age-long faith in the permanence of the system which oppressed them and began ... I shall not say to understand, but to sense the necessity for collective resistance, definitely abandoning their slavish submission to the authorities. But this was, nevertheless, more in the nature of outbursts of desperation and vengeance than of *struggle*. The strikes of the nineties revealed far greater flashes of consciousness;

definite demands were advanced, the strike was carefully timed, known cases and instances in other places were discussed, etc. The revolts were simply the resistance of the oppressed, whereas the systematic strikes represented the class struggle in embryo, but only in embryo. Taken by themselves, these strikes were simply trade union struggles, not yet Social-Democratic struggles. They marked the awakening antagonisms between workers and employers; but the workers were not, and could not be, conscious of the irreconcilable antagonism of their interests to the whole of the modern political and social system, i.e., theirs was not yet Social-Democratic consciousness. In this sense, the strikes of the nineties, despite the enormous progress they represented as compared with the "revolts", remained a purely spontaneous movement.

We have said that *there could not have been* Social-Democratic consciousness among the workers. It would have to be brought to them from without. The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade union consciousness, i.e., the conviction that it is necessary to combine in unions, fight the employers, and strive to compel the government to pass necessary labour legislation, etc.\* The theory of socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical, and economic theories elaborated by educated representatives of the propertied classes, by intellectuals. By their social status, the founders of modern scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, themselves belonged to the bourgeois intelligentsia. In the very same way, in Russia, the theoretical doctrine of Social-Democracy arose altogether independently of the spontaneous growth of the working-class movement; it arose as a natural and inevitable outcome of the development of thought among the revolutionary socialist intelligentsia. In the period under discussion, the middle nineties, this doctrine not only represented the completely formulated programme of the Emancipation of Labour

---

\* Trade-unionism does not exclude "politics" altogether, as some imagine. Trade unions have always conducted some political (but not Social-Democratic) agitation and struggle. We shall deal with the difference between trade-union politics and Social-Democratic politics in the next chapter.

group,<sup>14</sup> but had already won over to its side the majority of the revolutionary youth in Russia.

Hence, we had both the spontaneous awakening of the working masses, their awakening to conscious life and conscious struggle, and a revolutionary youth, armed with Social-Democratic theory and straining towards the workers. In this connection it is particularly important to state the oft-forgotten (and comparatively little-known) fact that, although the *early* Social-Democrats of that period *zealously carried on economic agitation* (being guided in this activity by the truly useful indications contained in the pamphlet *On Agitation*,<sup>15</sup> then still in manuscript), they did not regard this as their sole task. On the contrary, *from the very beginning* they set for Russian Social-Democracy the most far-reaching historical tasks, in general, and the task of overthrowing the autocracy, in particular. Thus, towards the end of 1895, the St. Petersburg group of Social-Democrats, which founded the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class,<sup>16</sup> prepared the first issue of a newspaper called *Rabocheye Dyelo*. This issue was ready to go to press when it was seized by the gendarmes, on the night of December 8, 1895, in a raid on the house of one of the members of the group, Anatoly Alexeyevich Vaneyev,\* so that the first edition of *Rabocheye Dyelo* was not destined to see the light of day. The leading article in this issue (which perhaps thirty years hence some *Russkaya Starina* will unearth in the archives of the Department of Police) outlined the historical tasks of the working class in Russia and placed the achievement of political liberty<sup>17</sup> at their head. The issue also contained an article entitled "What Are Our Ministers Thinking About?"\*\* which dealt with the crushing of the elementary education committees by the police. In addition, there was some correspondence from St. Petersburg, and from other parts of Russia (e.g., a letter on the massacre of the workers

---

\* A. A. Vaneyev died in Eastern Siberia in 1899 from consumption, which he contracted during solitary confinement in prison prior to his banishment. That is why we considered it possible to publish the above information, the authenticity of which we guarantee, for it comes from persons who were closely and directly acquainted with A. A. Vaneyev.

\*\* See *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 87-92.—Ed.

in Yaroslavl Gubernia). This, "first effort", if we are not mistaken, of the Russian Social-Democrats of the nineties was not a purely local, or less still, "Economic", newspaper, but one that aimed to unite the strike movement with the revolutionary movement against the autocracy, and to win over to the side of Social-Democracy all who were oppressed by the policy of reactionary obscurantism. No one in the slightest degree acquainted with the state of the movement at that period could doubt that such a paper would have met with warm response among the workers of the capital and the revolutionary intelligentsia and would have had a wide circulation. The failure of the enterprise merely showed that the Social-Democrats of that period were unable to meet the immediate requirements of the time owing to their lack of revolutionary experience and practical training. This must be said, too, with regard to the *S.-Peterburgsky Rabochy Listok*<sup>18</sup> and particularly with regard to *Rabochaya Gazeta*<sup>19</sup> and the *Manifesto* of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party,<sup>20</sup> founded in the spring of 1898. Of course, we would not dream of blaming the Social-Democrats of that time for this unpreparedness. But in order to profit from the experience of that movement, and to draw practical lessons from it, we must thoroughly understand the causes and significance of this or that shortcoming. It is therefore highly important to establish the fact that a part (perhaps even a majority) of the Social-Democrats, active in the period of 1895-98, justly considered it possible even then, at the very beginning of the "spontaneous" movement, to come forward with a most extensive programme and a militant tactical line.\* Lack of training of the majority

---

\* "In adopting a hostile attitude towards the activities of the Social-Democrats of the late nineties, *Iskra* ignores the absence at that time of conditions for any work other than the struggle for petty demands," declare the Economists in their "Letter to Russian Social-Democratic Organs" (*Iskra*, No. 12). The facts given above show that the assertion about "absence of conditions" is *diametrically opposed to the truth*. Not only at the end, but even in the mid-nineties, all the conditions existed for *other* work, besides the struggle for petty demands—all the conditions except adequate training of leaders. Instead of frankly admitting that we, the ideologists, the leaders, lacked sufficient training—the "Economists" seek to shift the blame entirely upon the "absence of conditions", upon the effect of material

of the revolutionaries, an entirely natural phenomenon, could not have roused any particular fears. Once the tasks were correctly defined, once the energy existed for repeated attempts to fulfil them, temporary failures represented only part misfortune. Revolutionary experience and organisational skill are things that can be acquired, provided the desire is there to acquire them, provided the shortcomings are recognised, which in revolutionary activity is more than half-way towards their removal.

But what was only part misfortune became full misfortune when this consciousness began to grow dim (it was very much alive among the members of the groups mentioned), when there appeared people—and even Social-Democratic organs—that were prepared to regard shortcomings as virtues, that even tried to invent a *theoretical* basis for their *slavish cringing before spontaneity*. It is time to draw conclusions from this trend, the content of which is incorrectly and too narrowly characterised as “Economism”.

#### b) Bowing to Spontaneity

*Rabochaya Mysl*

Before dealing with the literary manifestation of this subservience to spontaneity, we should like to note the following characteristic fact (communicated to us from the above-mentioned source), which throws light on the conditions in which the two future conflicting trends in Russian Social-Democracy arose and grew among the comrades working in St. Petersburg. In the beginning of 1897, just prior to their banishment, A. A. Vaneyev and several of his comrades attended a private meeting at which “old” and “young” members of the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class gathered.<sup>21</sup> The conversation centred chiefly about the question of organisation, particularly about the “Rules for the workers’ mutual benefit fund”, which, in their final form, were published in *Listok*

---

environment that determines the road from which no ideologist will be able to divert the movement. What is this but slavish cringing before spontaneity, what but the infatuation of the “ideologists” with their own shortcomings?

"*Rabotnika*",<sup>22</sup> No. 9-10 (p. 46). Sharp differences immediately showed themselves between the "old" members ("Decembrists"<sup>23</sup> as the St. Petersburg Social-Democrats jestingly called them) and several of the "young" members (who subsequently took an active part in the work of *Rabochaya Mysl*), with a heated discussion ensuing. The "young" members defended the main principles of the rules in the form in which they were published. The "old" members contended that the prime necessity was not this, but the consolidation of the League of Struggle into an organisation of revolutionaries to which all the various workers' mutual benefit funds, students' propaganda circles, etc., should be subordinated. It goes without saying that the disputing sides far from realised at the time that these disagreements were the beginning of a cleavage; on the contrary, they regarded them as something isolated and casual. But this fact shows that in Russia, too, "Economism" did not arise and spread without a struggle against the "old" Social-Democrats (which the Economists of today are apt to forget). And if, in the main, this struggle has not left "documentary" traces behind it, it is *solely* because the membership of the circles then functioning underwent such constant change that no continuity was established and, consequently, differences in point of view were not recorded in any documents.

The founding of *Rabochaya Mysl* brought Economism to the light of day, but not at one stroke. We must picture to ourselves concretely the conditions for activity and the short-lived character of the majority of the Russian study circles (a thing that is possible only for those who have themselves experienced it) in order to understand how much there was of the fortuitous in the successes and failures of the new trend in various towns, and the length of time during which neither the advocates nor the opponents of the "new" could make up their minds—and literally had no opportunity of so doing—as to whether this really expressed a distinct trend or merely the lack of training of certain individuals. For example, the first mimeographed copies of *Rabochaya Mysl* never reached the great majority of Social-Democrats, and if we are able to refer to the leading article in the first number, it is only because it was reproduced in an article by V. I. (*Listok "Rabotnika"*, No. 9-10,

p. 47, et seq.), who, of course, did not fail to extol with more zeal than reason the new paper, which was so different from the papers and projects for papers mentioned above.\* It is well worth dwelling on this leading article because it brings out in bold relief *the entire spirit of Rabochaya Mysl* and Economism generally.

After stating that the arm of the "blue-coats"<sup>24</sup> could never halt the progress of the working-class movement, the leading article goes on to say: "...The virility of the working-class movement is due to the fact that the workers themselves are at last taking their fate into their own hands, and out of the hands of the leaders"; this fundamental thesis is then developed in greater detail. Actually, the leaders (i.e., the Social-Democrats, the organisers of the League of Struggle) were, one might say, torn out of the hands of the workers\*\* by the police; yet it is made to appear that the workers were fighting against the leaders and liberated themselves from their yoke! Instead of sounding the call to go forward towards the consolidation of the revolutionary organisation and the expansion of political activity, the call was issued for a *retreat* to the purely trade-union struggle. It was announced that "the economic basis of the movement is eclipsed by the effort never to forget the political ideal", and that the watchword for the working-class movement was "struggle for economic conditions" (!) or, better still, "the workers for the workers". It was declared that strike funds "are more valuable to the movement than a hundred other organisations" (compare this statement made in October 1897, with the polemic between the "Decem-

---

\* It should be stated in passing that the praise of *Rabochaya Mysl* in November 1898, when Economism had become fully defined especially abroad, emanated from the selfsame V. I., who very soon after became one of the editors of *Rabocheye Dyelo*. And yet *Rabocheye Dyelo* denied that there were two trends in Russian Social-Democracy, and continues to deny it to this day!

\*\* That this simile is a correct one is shown by the following characteristic fact. When, after the arrest of the "Decembrists", the news spread among the workers of the Schlüsselburg Highway that the discovery and arrest were facilitated by an *agent-provocateur*, N. N. Mikhailov, a dentist, who had been in contact with a group associated with the "Decembrists", the workers were so enraged that they decided to kill him.



brists" and the young members in the beginning of 1897), etc. Catchwords like "we must concentrate, not on the 'cream' of the workers, but on the 'average', mass worker"; "politics always obediently follows economics",\* etc., etc., became the fashion, exercising an irresistible influence upon the masses of the youth who were attracted to the movement but who, in the majority of cases, were acquainted only with such fragments of Marxism as were expounded in legally appearing publications.

Political consciousness was completely overwhelmed by spontaneity—the spontaneity of the "Social-Democrats" who repeated Mr. V. V.'s "ideas", the spontaneity of those workers who were carried away by the arguments that a kopek added to a ruble was worth more than any socialism or politics, and that they must "fight, knowing that they are fighting, not for the sake of some future generation, but for themselves and their children" (leader in *Rabochaya Mysl*, No. 1). Phrases like these have always been a favourite weapon of the West-European bourgeois, who, in their hatred for socialism, strove (like the German "*Sozial-Politiker*" Hirsch) to transplant English trade-unionism to their native soil and to preach to the workers that by engaging in the purely trade-union struggle\*\* they would be fighting for themselves and for their children, and not for some future generations with some future socialism. And now the "V. V.'s of Russian Social-Democracy" have set about repeating these bourgeois phrases. It is important at this point to note three circumstances that will be useful to our further analysis of *contemporary* differences.\*\*\*

\* These quotations are taken from the same leading article in the first number of *Rabochaya Mysl*. One can judge from this the degree of theoretical training possessed by these "V. V.'s of Russian Social-Democracy",<sup>25</sup> who kept repeating the crude vulgarisation of "economic materialism" at a time when the Marxists were carrying on a literary war against the real Mr. V. V., who had long ago been dubbed "a past master of reactionary deeds", for holding *similar* views on the relations between politics and economics!

\*\* The Germans even have a special expression, *Nur-Gewerkschaftler*, which means an advocate of the "pure trade union" struggle.

\*\*\* We emphasise the word *contemporary* for the benefit of those who may pharisaically shrug their shoulders and say: It is easy enough to attack *Rabochaya Mysl* now, but is not all this ancient history? *Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur* (change the name and the tale

In the first place, the overwhelming of political consciousness by spontaneity, to which we referred above, also took place *spontaneously*. This may sound like a pun, but, alas, it is the bitter truth. It did not take place as a result of an open struggle between two diametrically opposed points of view, in which one triumphed over the other; it occurred because of the fact that an increasing number of "old" revolutionaries were "torn away" by the gendarmes and increasing numbers of "young" "V. V.'s of Russian Social-Democracy" appeared on the scene. Everyone, who has, I shall not say participated in, but at least breathed the atmosphere of, the *present-day* Russian movement, knows perfectly well that this is precisely the case. And if, nevertheless, we insist strongly that the reader be fully clear on this generally known fact, if we cite, for explicitness, as it were, the facts of the first edition of *Rabocheye Dyelo* and of the polemic between the "old" and the "young" at the beginning of 1897, we do this because the people who vaunt their "democracy" speculate on the ignorance of these facts on the part of the broad public (or of the very young generation). We shall return to this point further on.

Secondly, in the very first literary expression of Economism we observe the exceedingly curious phenomenon—highly characteristic for an understanding of all the differences prevailing among present-day Social-Democrats—that the adherents of the "labour movement pure and simple", worshippers of the closest "organic" contacts (*Rabocheye Dyelo's* term) with the proletarian struggle, opponents of any non-worker intelligentsia (even a socialist intelligentsia), are compelled, in order to defend their positions, to resort to the arguments of the *bourgeois* "pure trade-unionists". This shows that from the very outset *Rabochaya Mysl* began—unconsciously—to implement the programme of the *Credo*. This shows (something *Rabocheye Dyelo* cannot grasp) that all worship of the spontaneity of the working-class movement, all belittling of the role of "the conscious element", of the role of Social-Democracy, means, quite independently of whether he who belittles that role desires it or not, a strength-

is about you.—Ed.) is our answer to such contemporary Pharisees, whose complete subjection to the ideas of *Rabochaya Mysl* will be proved further on.

ening of the influence of bourgeois ideology upon the workers. All those who talk about "overrating the importance of ideology",\* about exaggerating the role of the conscious element,\*\* etc., imagine that the labour movement pure and simple can elaborate, and will elaborate, an independent ideology for itself, if only the workers "wrest their fate from the hands of the leaders". But this is a profound mistake. To supplement what has been said above, we shall quote the following profoundly true and important words of Karl Kautsky on the new draft programme of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party:\*\*\*

"Many of our revisionist critics believe that Marx asserted that economic development and the class struggle create not only the conditions for socialist production, but also, and directly, the *consciousness* [K.K.'s italics]\*\*\*\* of its necessity. And these critics assert that England, the country most highly developed capitalistically, is more remote than any other from this consciousness. Judging by the draft, one might assume that this allegedly orthodox-Marxist view, which is thus refuted, was shared by the committee that drafted the Austrian programme. In the draft programme it is stated: 'The more capitalist development increases the numbers of the proletariat, the more the proletariat is compelled and becomes fit to fight against capitalism. The proletariat becomes conscious' of the possibility and of the necessity for socialism. In this connection socialist consciousness appears to be a necessary and direct result of the proletarian class struggle. But this is absolutely untrue. Of course, socialism, as a doctrine, has its roots in modern economic relationships just as the class struggle of the proletariat has, and, like the latter, emerges from the struggle against the capitalist-created poverty and misery of the masses. But socialism and the class struggle arise side by side and not one out of the other; each arises under different conditions. Modern socialist consciousness can arise only on the basis of profound scientific knowledge. Indeed, modern economic science is as much a condition for socialist production as, say, modern technology, and the proletariat can create neither the one nor the other, no matter how much it may desire to do so; both arise out of the modern social process. The vehicle of science is not the proletariat, but the *bourgeois intelligentsia* [K. K.'s italics]: it was in the minds of individual members of this stratum that modern socialism originated, and it

\* Letter of the "Economists", in *Iskra*, No. 12.

\*\* *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10.

\*\*\* *Neue Zeit*,<sup>26</sup> 1901-1902, XX, I, No. 3, p. 79. The committee's draft to which Kautsky refers was adopted by the Vienna Congress (at the end of last year) in a slightly amended form.<sup>27</sup>

\*\*\*\* Interpolations in square brackets (within passages quoted by Lenin) have been introduced by Lenin, unless otherwise indicated.—Ed.

was they who communicated it to the more intellectually developed proletarians who, in their turn, introduce it into the proletarian class struggle where conditions allow that to be done. Thus, socialist consciousness is something introduced into the proletarian class struggle from without [*von aussen Hineingetragen*] and not something that arose within it spontaneously [*urwüchsig*]. Accordingly, the old Hainfeld programme quite rightly stated that the task of Social-Democracy is to imbue the proletariat [literally: saturate the proletariat] with the *consciousness* of its position and the consciousness of its task. There would be no need for this if consciousness arose of itself from the class struggle. The new draft copied this proposition from the old programme, and attached it to the proposition mentioned above. But this completely broke the line of thought...."

Since there can be no talk of an independent ideology formulated by the working masses themselves in the process of their movement,\* the *only* choice is—either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course (for mankind has not created a "third" ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or an above-class ideology). Hence, to belittle the socialist ideology in *any way, to turn aside from it in the slightest degree* means to strengthen bourgeois ideology. There is much talk of spontaneity. But the *spontaneous* development of the working-class movement leads to its subordination to bourgeois ideology, *to its development along the lines of the Credo programme*; for the spontaneous working-class movement is trade-unionism, is *Nur-Gewerkschaftler*ei, and trade-unionism means the ideological enslavement of

---

\* This does not mean, of course, that the workers have no part in creating such an ideology. They take part, however, not as workers, but as socialist theoreticians, as Proudhons and Weitlings; in other words, they take part only when they are able, and to the extent that they are able, more or less, to acquire the knowledge of their age and develop that knowledge. But in order that working men *may succeed in this more often*, every effort must be made to raise the level of the consciousness of the workers in general; it is necessary that the workers do not confine themselves to the artificially restricted limits of "*literature for workers*" but that they learn to an increasing degree to master *general literature*. It would be even truer to say "are not confined", instead of "do not confine themselves", because the workers themselves wish to read and do read all that is written for the intelligentsia, and only a few (bad) intellectuals believe that it is enough "for workers" to be told a few things about factory conditions and to have repeated to them over and over again what has long been known.

the workers by the bourgeoisie. Hence, our task, the task of Social-Democracy, is to *combat spontaneity*, to *divert* the working-class movement from this spontaneous, trade-unionist striving to come under the wing of the bourgeoisie, and to bring it under the wing of revolutionary Social-Democracy. The sentence employed by the authors of the "Economist" letter published in *Iskra*, No. 12, that the efforts of the most inspired ideologists fail to divert the working-class movement from the path that is determined by the interaction of the material elements and the material environment is therefore *tantamount to renouncing socialism*. If these authors were capable of fearlessly, consistently, and thoroughly considering what they say, as everyone who enters the arena of literary and public activity should be, there would be nothing left for them but to "fold their useless arms over their empty breasts" and—surrender the field of action to the Struves and Prokopoviches, who are dragging the working-class movement "along the line of least resistance", i.e., along the line of bourgeois trade-unionism, or to the Zubatovs, who are dragging it along the line of clerical and gendarme "ideology".

Let us recall the example of Germany. What was the historic service Lassalle rendered to the German working-class movement? It was that he *diverted* that movement from the path of progressionist trade-unionism and co-operativism towards which it had been spontaneously moving (*with the benign assistance of Schulze-Delitzsch and his like*). To fulfil such a task it was necessary to do something quite different from talking of underrating the spontaneous element, of tactics-as-process, of the interaction between elements and environment, etc. *A fierce struggle against spontaneity* was necessary, and only after such a struggle, extending over many years, was it possible, for instance, to convert the working population of Berlin from a bulwark of the progressionist party into one of the finest strongholds of Social-Democracy. This struggle is by no means over even today (as might seem to those who learn the history of the German movement from Prokopovich, and its philosophy from Struve). Even now the German working class is, so to speak, split up among a number of ideologies. A section of the workers is organised in Catholic and monarchist trade

unions; another section is organised in the Hirsch-Dunker unions,<sup>28</sup> founded by the bourgeois worshippers of English trade-unionism, the third is organised in Social-Democratic trade unions. The last-named group is immeasurably more numerous than the rest, but the Social-Democratic ideology was able to achieve this superiority, and will be able to maintain it, only in an unswerving struggle against all other ideologies.

But why, the reader will ask, does the spontaneous movement, the movement along the line of least resistance, lead to the domination of bourgeois ideology? For the simple reason that bourgeois ideology is far older in origin than socialist ideology, that it is more fully developed, and that it has at its disposal *immeasurably* more means of dissemination.\* And the younger the socialist movement in any given country, the more vigorously it must struggle against all attempts to entrench non-socialist ideology, and the more resolutely the workers must be warned against the bad counsellors who shout against "overrating the conscious element", etc. The authors of the Economist letter, in unison with *Rabocheye Dyelo*, inveigh against the intolerance that is characteristic of the infancy of the movement. To this we reply: Yes, our movement is indeed in its infancy, and in order that it may grow up faster, it must become imbued with intolerance against those who retard its growth by their subservience to spontaneity. Nothing is so ridiculous and harmful as pretending that we are "old hands" who have long ago experienced all the decisive stages of the struggle.

Thirdly, the first issue of *Rabochaya Mysl* shows that the term "Economism" (which, of course, we do not propose to

---

\* It is often said that the working class *spontaneously* gravitates towards socialism. This is perfectly true in the sense that socialist theory reveals the causes of the misery of the working class more profoundly and more correctly than any other theory, and for that reason the workers are able to assimilate it so easily, *provided*, however, this theory does not itself yield to spontaneity, *provided* it subordinates spontaneity to itself. Usually this is taken for granted, but it is precisely this which *Rabocheye Dyelo* forgets or distorts. The working class spontaneously gravitates towards socialism; nevertheless, most widespread (and continuously and diversely revived) bourgeois ideology spontaneously imposes itself upon the working class to a still greater degree.

abandon, since, in one way or another, this designation has already established itself) does not adequately convey the real character of the new trend. *Rabochaya Mysl* does not altogether repudiate the political struggle; the rules for a workers' mutual benefit fund published in its first issue contain a reference to combating the government. *Rabochaya Mysl* believes, however, that "politics always obediently follows economics" (*Rabocheye Dyelo* varies this thesis when it asserts in its programme that "in Russia more than in any other country, the economic struggle is inseparable from the political struggle"). If by politics is meant Social-Democratic politics, then the theses of *Rabochaya Mysl* and *Rabocheye Dyelo* are utterly incorrect. The economic struggle of the workers is very often connected (although not inseparably) with bourgeois politics, clerical politics, etc., as we have seen. *Rabocheye Dyelo's* theses are correct, if by politics is meant trade-union politics, viz., the common striving of all workers to secure from the government measures for alleviating the distress to which their condition gives rise, but which do not abolish that condition, i.e., which do not remove the subjection of labour to capital. That striving indeed is common to the English trade-unionists, who are hostile to socialism, to the Catholic workers, to the "Zubatov" workers,<sup>29</sup> etc. There is politics and politics. Thus, we see that *Rabochaya Mysl* does not so much deny the political struggle as it bows to its spontaneity, to its unconsciousness. While fully recognising the political struggle (better: the political desires and demands of the workers), which arises spontaneously from the working-class movement itself it absolutely refuses independently to work out a specifically Social-Democratic politics corresponding to the general tasks of socialism and to present-day conditions in Russia. Further on we shall show that *Rabocheye Dyelo* commits the same error.

c) The Self-Emancipation Group<sup>30</sup>  
and *Rabocheye Dyelo*

We have dealt at such length with the little-known and now almost forgotten leading article in the first issue of

*Rabochaya Mysl* because it was the first and most striking expression of that general stream of thought which afterwards emerged into the light of day in innumerable streamlets. V. I. was perfectly right when, in praising the first issue and the leading article of *Rabochaya Mysl*, he said that the article had been written in a "sharp and fervent" manner (*Listok "Rabotnika"*, No. 9-10, p. 49). Every man with convictions who thinks he has something new to say writes "fervently" and in such a way as to make his views stand out in bold relief. Only those who are accustomed to sitting between two stools lack "fervour"; only such people are able to praise the fervour of *Rabochaya Mysl* one day and attack the "fervent polemics" of its opponents the next.

We shall not dwell on the *Separate Supplement to "Rabochaya Mysl"*<sup>31</sup> (below we shall have occasion, on various points, to refer to this work, which expresses the ideas of the Economists more consistently than any other) but shall briefly mention the "Appeal of the Self-Emancipation of the Workers Group" (March 1899, reprinted in the London *Nakanune*,<sup>32</sup> No. 7, July 1899). The authors of the "Appeal" rightly say that "the workers of Russia are *only just awakening*, are just beginning to look about them, and are *instinctively clutching at the first available* means of struggle". Yet they draw from this the same false conclusion as that drawn by *Rabochaya Mysl*, forgetting that the instinctive is the unconscious (the spontaneous) to the aid of which socialists must come; that the "first available means of struggle" will always be, in modern society, the trade-union means of struggle, and the "first available" ideology the bourgeois (trade-union) ideology. Similarly, these authors do not "repudiate" politics, they merely (merely!) echo Mr. V. V. that politics is the superstructure, and therefore, "political agitation must be the superstructure to the agitation carried on in favour of the economic struggle; it must arise on the basis of this struggle and follow in its wake".

As for *Rabocheye Dyelo*, it began its activity with the "defence" of the Economists. It stated a *downright untruth* in its opening issue (No. 1, pp. 141-42) in claiming that it "does not know to which young comrades Axelrod referred" when he warned the Economists in his well-known pam-



phlet.\* In the polemic that flared up with Axelrod and Plekhanov over this untruth, *Rabocheye Dyelo* had to admit that "in form of perplexity, it sought to defend all the younger Social-Democrats abroad from this unjust accusation" (the charge of narrowness levelled by Axelrod at the Economists). In reality this accusation was completely justified, and *Rabocheye Dyelo* knew perfectly well that, among others, it applied also to V. I., a member of its Editorial Board. Let me note in passing that in this polemic Axelrod was entirely right and *Rabocheye Dyelo* entirely wrong in their respective interpretations of my pamphlet *The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats*.\*\* The pamphlet was written in 1897, before the appearance of *Rabochaya Mysl*, when I thought, rightly, that the original tendency of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle, which I characterised above, was dominant. And this tendency was dominant at least until the middle of 1898. Consequently, *Rabocheye Dyelo* had no right whatever, in its attempt to deny the existence and danger of Economism, to refer to a pamphlet that expressed views forced out by "Economist" views in St. Petersburg in 1897-98.\*\*\*

But *Rabocheye Dyelo* not only "defended" the Economists, it itself constantly fell into their fundamental errors. The source of this confusion is to be found in the ambiguity of the interpretation given to the following thesis of the *Rabocheye Dyelo* programme: "We consider that the most important phenomenon of Russian life, the one that

\* *Present Tasks and Tactics of the Russian Social-Democracy*, Geneva, 1898. Two letters to *Rabochaya Gazeta*, written in 1897.

\*\* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 323-51.—Ed.

\*\*\* In defending its first untruth ("we do not know to which young comrades Axelrod referred"), *Rabocheye Dyelo*, added a second, when it wrote in its *Reply*: "Since the review of *The Tasks* was published, tendencies have arisen, or become more or less clearly defined, among certain Russian Social-Democrats, towards economic one-sidedness, which represent a step backwards from the state of our movement as described in *The Tasks*" (p. 9). This, in the *Reply*, published in 1900. But the first issue of *Rabocheye Dyelo* (containing the review) appeared in April 1899. Did Economism really arise only in 1899? No. The year 1899 saw the first protest of the Russian Social-Democrats against Economism (the protest against the *Credo*). Economism arose in 1897, as *Rabocheye Dyelo* very well knows, for already in November 1898, V. I. was praising *Rabochaya Mysl* (see *Listok "Rabotnika"*, No. 9-10).

will mainly *determine the tasks* [our italics] and the character of the publication activity of the Union, is the *mass working-class movement* [*Rabocheye Dyelo's* italics] which has arisen in recent years." That the mass movement is a most important phenomenon is a fact not to be disputed. But the crux of the matter is, how is one to understand the statement that the mass working-class movement will "determine the tasks"? It may be interpreted in one of two ways. *Either* it means bowing to the spontaneity of this movement, i.e., reducing the role of Social-Democracy to mere subservience to the working-class movement as such (the interpretation of *Rabochaya Mysl*, the Self-Emancipation Group, and other Economists), *or* it means that the mass movement places before us *new* theoretical, political, and organisational tasks, far more complicated than those that might have satisfied us in the period before the rise of the mass movement. *Rabocheye Dyelo* inclined and still inclines towards the first interpretation, for it has said nothing definite about any new tasks, but has argued constantly as though the "mass movement" *relieves* us of the necessity of clearly understanding and fulfilling the tasks it sets before us. We need only point out that *Rabocheye Deylo* considered that it was impossible to set the overthrow of the autocracy as the *first* task of the mass working-class movement, and that it degraded this task (in the name of the mass movement) to that of a struggle for immediate political demands (*Reply*, p. 25).

We shall pass over the article by B. Krichevsky, editor of *Rabocheye Dyelo*, entitled "The Economic and the Political Struggle in the Russian Movement", published in No. 7 of that paper, in which these very mistakes\* are repeated, and proceed directly to *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10. We shall

---

\* The "stages theory", or the theory of "timid zigzags", in the political struggle is expressed, for example, in this article, in the following way: "Political demands, which in their character are common to the whole of Russia, should, however, at first [this was written in August 1900!] correspond to the experience gained by the given stratum [sic!] of workers in the economic struggle. Only [!] on the basis of this experience can and should political agitation be taken up," etc. (p. 11). On page 4, the author, protesting against what he regards as the absolutely unfounded charge of Economist heresy, pathetically exclaims: "What Social-Democrat does not know

not, of course, enter in detail into the various objections raised by Krichevsky and Martynov against *Zarya* and *Iskra*. We are here interested solely in the basis of principles on which *Rabocheye Dyelo*, in its tenth issue, took its stand. Thus, we shall not examine the strange fact that *Rabocheye Dyelo* saw a "diametrical contradiction" between the proposition:

"Social-Democracy does not tie its hands, it does not restrict its activities to some one preconceived plan or method of political struggle; it recognises all means of struggle, as long as they correspond to the forces at the disposal of the Party," etc. (*Iskra*, No. 1)\*

and the proposition:

"Without a strong organisation skilled in waging political struggle under all circumstances and at all times, there can be no question of that systematic plan of action, illumined by firm principles and steadfastly carried out, which alone is worthy of the name of tactics (*Iskra*, No. 4).\*\*

To confound recognition, *in principle*, of all means of struggle, of all plans and methods, provided they are expedient, with the demand *at a given political moment* to be guided by a strictly observed plan is tantamount, if we are to talk of tactics, to confounding the recognition by medical science of various methods of treating diseases with the necessity for adopting a certain definite method of

that according to the theories of Marx and Engels the economic interests of certain classes play a decisive role in history, and, *consequently*, that particularly the proletariat's struggle for its economic interests must be of paramount importance in its class development and struggle for emancipation?" (Our italics). The word "consequently" is completely irrelevant. The fact that economic interests play a decisive role *does not in the least imply* that the economic (i.e., trade-union) struggle is of prime importance; for the most essential, the "decisive" interests of classes can be satisfied *only* by radical *political* changes in general. In particular the fundamental economic interests of the proletariat can be satisfied only by a political revolution that will replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the dictatorship of the proletariat. Krichevsky repeats the arguments of the "V. V.'s of Russian Social-Democracy" (viz., that politics follows economics, etc.) and of the Bernsteinians of German Social-Democracy (e.g., by similar arguments Woltmann sought to prove that the workers must first of all acquire "economic power" before they can think about political revolution).

\* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 371.—Ed.

\*\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 18.—Ed.

treatment for a given disease. The point is, however, that *Rabocheye Dyelo*, itself the victim of a disease which we have called bowing to spontaneity, refuses to recognise any "method of treatment" for *that* disease. Hence, it has made the remarkable discovery that "tactics-as-plan contradicts the fundamental spirit of Marxism" (No. 10, p. 18), that tactics are "*a process of growth of Party tasks, which grow together with the Party*" (p. 11, *Rabocheye Dyelo's* italics). This remark has every chance of becoming a celebrated maxim, a permanent monument to the *Rabocheye Dyelo* "trend". To the question, *whither?* the leading organ replies: Movement is a process of changing the distance between the starting-point and subsequent points of the movement. This matchless example of profundity is not merely a curiosity (were it that, it would not be worth dealing with at length), but the *programme of a whole trend*, the very programme which R. M. (in the "*Separate Supplement*" to *Rabochaya Mysl*) expressed in the words: That struggle is desirable which is possible, and the struggle which is possible is that which is going on at the given moment. This is precisely the trend of unbounded opportunism, which passively adapts itself to spontaneity.

"Tactics-as-plan contradicts the essence of Marxism!" But this is a slander of Marxism; it means turning Marxism into the caricature held up by the Narodniks in their struggle against us. It means belittling the initiative and energy of class-conscious fighters, whereas Marxism, on the contrary, gives a gigantic impetus to the initiative and energy of the Social-Democrat, opens up for him the widest perspectives, and (if one may so express it) places at his disposal the mighty force of many millions of workers "spontaneously" rising for the struggle. The entire history of international Social-Democracy teems with plans advanced now by one, now by another, political leader, some confirming the far-sightedness and the correct political and organisational views of their authors and other revealing their short-sightedness and their political errors. At the time when Germany was at one of the crucial turning-points in its history—the formation of the Empire, the opening of the Reichstag, and the granting of universal suffrage—Liebknecht had one plan for Social-Democratic politics and work

in general, and Schweitzer had another. When the Anti-Socialist Law<sup>33</sup> came down on the heads of the German socialists, Most and Hasselmann had one plan—they were prepared then and there to call for violence and terror; Höchberg, Schramm, and (partly) Bernstein had another—they began to preach to the Social-Democrats that they themselves had provoked the enactment of the law by being unreasonably bitter and revolutionary, and must now earn forgiveness by their exemplary conduct. There was yet a third plan proposed by those who prepared and carried out the publication of an illegal organ.<sup>34</sup> It is easy, of course, with hindsight, many years after the struggle over the selection of the path to be followed, and after history has pronounced its verdict as to the expediency of the path selected, to utter profound maxims about the growth of Party tasks, which grow together with the Party. But at a time of confusion,\* when the Russian "Critics" and Economists are degrading Social-Democracy to the level of trade-unionism, and when the terrorists are strongly advocating the adoption of "tactics-as-plan" that repeats the old mistakes, at such a time, to confine oneself to profundities of this kind, means simply to issue to oneself a "certificate of poverty". At a time when many Russian Social-Democrats suffer from a lack of initiative and energy, from an inadequate "scope of political propaganda, agitation, and organisation,"\*\* from a lack of "plans" for a broader organisation of revolutionary work, at such a time, to declare that "tactics-as-plan contradicts the essence of Marxism" means not only to vulgarise Marxism in the realm of theory, but to drag the Party backward in practice.

*Rabocheye Dyelo* goes on to sermonise:

"The task of the revolutionary Social-Democrat is only to accelerate objective development by his conscious work, not to obviate it or substitute his own subjective plans for this development. *Iskra* knows all this in theory; but the enormous importance which Marxism justly attaches to conscious revolutionary work causes it in practice,

\* "*Ein Jahr der Verwirrung*" ("A Year of Confusion") is the title Mehring gave to the chapter of his *History of German Social-Democracy* in which he describes the hesitancy and lack of determination displayed at first by the socialists in selecting the "tactics-as-plan" for the new situation.

\*\* Leading article in *Iskra*, No. 1. (See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 369.)—Ed.

owing to its doctrinaire view of tactics, to belittle the significance of the objective or the spontaneous element of development" (p. 18).

Another example of the extraordinary theoretical confusion worthy of Mr. V. V. and his fraternity. We would ask our philosopher: how may a designer of subjective plans "belittle" objective development? Obviously by losing sight of the fact that this objective development creates or strengthens, destroys or weakens certain classes, strata, or groups, certain nations or groups of nations, etc., and in this way serves to determine a given international political alignment of forces, or the position adopted by revolutionary parties, etc. If the designer of plans did that, his guilt would not be that he belittled the spontaneous element, but, on the contrary, that he belittled the *conscious* element, for he would then show that he lacked the "consciousness" properly to understand objective development. Hence, the very talk of "estimating the *relative* significance" (*Rabocheye Dyelo's* italics) of spontaneity and consciousness itself reveals a complete lack of "consciousness". If certain "spontaneous elements of development" can be grasped at all by human understanding, then an incorrect estimation of them will be tantamount to "belittling the conscious element". But if they cannot be grasped, then we do not know them, and therefore cannot speak of them. What then is Krichevsky discussing? If he thinks that *Iskra's* "subjective plans" are erroneous (as he in fact declares them to be), he should have shown what objective facts they ignore, and only then charged *Iskra* with *lacking political consciousness* for ignoring them, with "belittling the conscious element", to use his own words. If, however, displeased with subjective plans, he can bring forward no argument other than that of "belittling the spontaneous element" (!), he merely shows: (1) that, theoretically, he understands Marxism à la Kareyev and Mikhailovsky, who have been sufficiently ridiculed by Beltov; and (2) that, practically, he is quite satisfied with the "spontaneous elements of development" that have drawn our legal Marxists towards Bernsteinism and our Social-Democrats towards Economism, and that he is "full of wrath" against those who have determined at all costs to *divert* Russian Social-Democracy from the path of "spontaneous" development.

Further, there follow things that are positively droll. "Just as human beings will reproduce in the old-fashioned way despite all the discoveries of natural science, so the birth of a new social order will come about, in the future too, *mainly* as a result of elemental outbursts, despite all the discoveries of social science and the increase in the number of conscious fighters" (p. 19). Just as our grandfathers in their old-fashioned wisdom used to say, Anyone can bring children into the world, so today the "modern socialists" (*à la* Nartsis Tuporylov<sup>35</sup>) say in their wisdom, Anyone can participate in the spontaneous birth of a new social order. We too hold that anyone can. All that is required for participation of that kind is to *yield* to Economism when Economism reigns and to terrorism when terrorism arises. Thus, in the spring of this year, when it was so important to utter a note of warning against infatuation with terrorism, *Rabocheye Dyelo* stood in amazement, confronted by a problem that was "new" to it. And now, six months after, when the problem has become less topical, it presents us at one and the same time with the declaration: "We think that it is not and should not be the task of Social-Democracy to counteract the rise of terroristic sentiments" (*Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, p. 23), and with the conference resolution. "The conference regards systematic and aggressive terror as being inopportune" (*Two Conferences*, p. 18). How beautifully clear and coherent this is! Not to counteract, but to declare inopportune, and to declare it in such a way that unsystematic and defensive terror does not come within the scope of the "resolution". It must be admitted that such a resolution is extremely safe and is fully insured against error, just as a man who talks, but says nothing, insures himself against error. All that is needed to frame such a resolution is an ability to keep *at the tail-end* of the movement. When *Iskra* ridiculed *Rabocheye Dyelo* for declaring the question of terror to be new,\* the latter angrily accused *Iskra* of "having the incredible effrontery to impose upon the Party organisation solutions of tactical questions proposed by a group of emigrant writers more than fifteen years ago" (p. 24).

---

\* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 18-20.—Ed.

Effrontery indeed, and what an overestimation of the conscious element—first to resolve questions theoretically beforehand, and then to try to convince the organisation, the Party, and the masses of the correctness of this solution!\* How much better it would be to repeat the elements and, without “imposing” anything upon anybody, swing with every “turn”—whether in the direction of Economism or in the direction of terrorism. *Rabocheye Dyelo* even generalises this great precept of worldly wisdom and accuses *Iskra* and *Zarya* of “setting up their programme against the movement, like a spirit hovering over the formless chaos” (p. 29). But what else is the function of Social-Democracy if not to be a “spirit” that not only hovers over the spontaneous movement, but also *raises* this movement *to the level of “its programme”*? Surely, it is not its function to drag at the *tail* of the movement. At best, this would be of no service to the movement; at worst, it would be exceedingly harmful. *Rabocheye Dyelo*, however, not only follows this “tactics-as-process”, but elevates it to a principle, so that it would be more correct to describe its tendency not as opportunism, but as *tail-ism* (from the word tail). And it must be admitted that those who are determined always to follow behind the movement and be its tail are absolutely and forever guaranteed against “belittling the spontaneous element of development”.

\* \* \*

And so, we have become convinced that the fundamental error committed by the “new trend” in Russian Social-Democracy is its bowing to spontaneity and its failure to understand that the spontaneity of the masses demands a high degree of consciousness from us Social-Democrats. The greater the spontaneous upsurge of the masses and the more widespread the movement, the more rapid, incomparably so, the demand for greater consciousness in the theoretical, political, and organisational work of Social-Democracy.

---

\* Nor must it be forgotten that in solving “theoretically” the problem of terror, the Emancipation of Labour group *generalised* the experience of the antecedent revolutionary movement.



The spontaneous upsurge of the masses in Russia proceeded (and continues) with such rapidity that the young Social-Democrats proved unprepared to meet these gigantic tasks. This unpreparedness is our common misfortune, the misfortune of *all* Russian Social-Democrats. The upsurge of the masses proceeded and spread with uninterrupted continuity; it not only continued in the places where it began, but spread to new localities and to new strata of the population (under the influence of the working-class movement, there was a renewed ferment among the student youth, among the intellectuals generally, and even among the peasantry). Revolutionaries, however, *lagged behind* this upsurge, both in their "theories" and in their activity; they failed to establish a constant and continuous organisation capable of *leading* the whole movement.

In Chapter I, we established that *Rabocheye Dyelo* belittled our theoretical tasks and that it "spontaneously" repeated the fashionable catchword "freedom of criticism"; those who repeated this catchword lacked the "consciousness" to understand that the positions of the opportunist "Critics" and those of the revolutionaries in Germany and in Russia are diametrically opposed.

In the following chapters, we shall show how this bowing to spontaneity found expression in the sphere of the political tasks and in the organisational work of Social-Democracy.

### III

#### Trade-Unionist Politics and Social-Democratic Politics

We shall again begin by praising *Rabocheye Dyelo*. "Literature of Exposure and the Proletarian Struggle" is the title Martynov gave the article on his differences with *Iskra* published in *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10. He formulated the substance of the differences as follows: "We cannot confine ourselves solely to exposing the system that stands in its [the working-class party's] path of development. We must also react to the immediate and current interests of the proletariat.... *Iskra* ... is in fact an organ of revolu-

tionary opposition that exposes the state of affairs in our country, particularly the political state of affairs.... We, however, work and shall continue to work for the cause of the working class in close organic contact with the proletarian struggle" (p. 63). One cannot help being grateful to Martynov for this formula. It is of outstanding general interest, because substantially it embraces not only our disagreements with *Rabocheye Dyelo*, but the general disagreement between ourselves and the "Economists" on the political struggle. We have shown that the "Economists" do not altogether repudiate "politics", but that they are constantly straying from the Social-Democratic to the trade-unionist conception of politics. Martynov strays in precisely this way, and we shall therefore take his views as a *model* of Economist error on this question. As we shall endeavour to prove, neither the authors of the "*Separate Supplement*" to *Rabochaya Mysl* nor the authors of the manifesto issued by the Self-Emancipation Group, nor the authors of the Economist letter published in *Iskra*, No. 12, will have any right to complain against this choice.

#### a) Political Agitation and Its Restriction by the Economists

Everyone knows that the economic\* struggle of the Russian workers underwent widespread development and consolidation simultaneously with the production of "literature" exposing economic (factory and occupational) conditions. The "leaflets" were devoted mainly to the exposure of the factory system, and very soon a veritable passion for exposures was roused among the workers. As soon as the workers realised that the Social-Democratic study circles desired to, and could, supply them with a new kind of leaflet that told the whole truth about their miserable

---

\* To avoid misunderstanding, we must point out that here, and throughout this pamphlet, by economic struggle, we imply (in keeping with the accepted usage among us) the "practical economic struggle", which Engels, in the passage quoted above, described as "resistance to the capitalists", and which in free countries is known as the organised-labour, syndical, or trade-union struggle.

existence, about their unbearably hard toil, and their lack of rights, they began to send in, actually flood us with, correspondence from the factories and workshops. This "exposure literature" created a tremendous sensation, not only in the particular factory exposed in the given leaflet, but in all the factories to which news of the revealed facts spread. And since the poverty and want among the workers in the various enterprises and in the various trades are much the same, the "truth about the life of the workers" stirred *everyone*. Even among the most backward workers, a veritable passion arose to "get into print"—a noble passion for this rudimentary form of war against the whole of the present social system which is based upon robbery and oppression. And in the overwhelming majority of cases these "leaflets" were in truth a declaration of war, because the exposures served greatly to agitate the workers; they evoked among them common demands for the removal of the most glaring outrages and roused in them a readiness to support the demands with strikes. Finally, the employers themselves were compelled to recognise the significance of these leaflets as a declaration of war, so much so that in a large number of cases they did not even wait for the outbreak of hostilities. As is always the case, the mere publication of these exposures made them effective, and they acquired the significance of a strong moral influence. On more than one occasion, the mere appearance of a leaflet proved sufficient to secure the satisfaction of all or part of the demands put forward. In a word, economic (factory) exposures were and remain an important lever in the economic struggle. And they will continue to retain this significance as long as there is capitalism, which makes it necessary for the workers to defend themselves. Even in the most advanced countries of Europe it can still be seen that the exposure of abuses in some backward trade, or in some forgotten branch of domestic industry, serves as a starting-point for the awakening of class-consciousness, for the beginning of a trade-union struggle, and for the spread of socialism.\*

\* In the present chapter we deal only with the *political* struggle, in its broader or narrower meaning. Therefore, we note only in passing, merely as a curiosity, *Rabocheye Dyelo's* charge that *Iskra* is

The overwhelming majority of Russian Social-Democrats have of late been almost entirely absorbed by this work of organising the exposure of factory conditions. Suffice it to recall *Rabochaya Mysl* to see the extent to which they have been absorbed by it—so much so, indeed, that they have lost sight of the fact that this, *taken by itself*, is in essence still not Social-Democratic work, but merely trade union work. As a matter of fact, the exposures merely dealt with the relations between the workers *in a given trade* and their employers, and all they achieved was that the sellers of labour-power learned to sell their “commodity” on better terms and to fight the purchasers over a purely commercial deal. These exposures could have served (if properly utilised by an organisation of revolutionaries) as a beginning and a component part of Social-Democratic activity; but they could also have led (and, given a worshipful attitude towards spontaneity, were bound to lead) to a “purely trade-union” struggle and to a non-Social-Democratic working-class movement. Social-Democracy leads the struggle of the working class, not only for better terms for the sale of labour-power, but for the abolition of the social system that compels the propertyless to sell themselves to the rich. Social-Democracy represents the working class, not in its relation to a given group of employers alone, but in its relation to all classes of modern society and to the state as an organised political force. Hence, it follows that not only must Social-Democrats not confine themselves exclusively to the economic struggle, but that they must not allow the organisation of economic exposures to become the predominant part of their activities. We must take up

“too restrained” in regard to the economic struggle (*Two Conferences*, p. 27, rehashed by Martynov in his pamphlet, *Social-Democracy and the Working Class*). If the accusers computed by the hundred-weights or reams (as they are so fond of doing) any given year's discussion of the economic struggle in the industrial section of *Iskra*, in comparison with the corresponding sections of *Rabocheye Dyelo* and *Rabochaya Mysl* combined, they would easily see that the latter lag behind even in this respect. Apparently, the realisation of this simple truth compels them to resort to arguments that clearly reveal their confusion. “*Iskra*,” they write, “willy-nilly [!] is compelled [!] to reckon with the imperative demands of life and to publish at least [!] correspondence about the working-class movement” (*Two Conferences* p. 27). Now this is really a crushing argument!

actively the political education of the working class and the development of its political consciousness. Now that *Zarya* and *Iskra* have made the first attack upon Economism, "all are agreed" on this (although some agree only in words, as we shall soon see).

The question arises, what should political education consist in? Can it be confined to the propaganda of working-class hostility to the autocracy? Of course not. It is not enough to *explain* to the workers that they are politically oppressed (any more than it is to *explain* to them that their interests are antagonistic to the interests of the employers). Agitation must be conducted with regard to every concrete example of this oppression (as we have begun to carry on agitation round concrete examples of economic oppression). Inasmuch as *this* oppression affects the most diverse classes of society, inasmuch as it manifests itself in the most varied spheres of life and activity—vocational, civic, personal, family, religious, scientific, etc., etc.—is it not evident that *we shall not be fulfilling our task* of developing the political consciousness of the workers if we do not *undertake* the organisation of the *political exposure* of the autocracy in *all its aspects*? In order to carry on agitation round concrete instances of oppression, these instances must be exposed (as it is necessary to expose factory abuses in order to carry on economic agitation).

One might think this to be clear enough. It turns out, however, that it is only in words that "all" are agreed on the need to develop political consciousness, *in all its aspects*. It turns out that *Rabocheye Dyelo*, for example, far from tackling the task of organising (or making a start in organising) comprehensive political exposure, is even trying to *drag Iskra*, which has undertaken this task, *away from it*. Listen to the following: "The political struggle of the working class is merely [it is certainly not "merely"] the most developed, wide, and effective form of economic struggle" (programme of *Rabocheye Dyelo*, published in issue No. 1, p. 3). "The Social-Democrats are now confronted with the task of lending the economic struggle itself, as far as possible, a political character" (Martynov, *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, p. 42). "The economic struggle is the most widely applicable means of drawing the masses into active political struggle" (resolution

adopted by the Conference of the Union Abroad and "amendments" thereto, *Two Conferences*, pp. 11 and 17). As the reader will observe, all these theses permeate *Rabocheye Dyelo* from its very first number to the latest "Instructions to the Editors", and all of them evidently express a single view regarding political agitation and struggle. Let us examine this view from the standpoint of the opinion prevailing among all Economists, that political agitation must *follow* economic agitation. Is it true that, in general,\* the economic struggle "is the most widely applicable means" of drawing the masses into the political struggle? It is entirely untrue. *Any and every* manifestation of police tyranny and autocratic outrage, not only in connection with the economic struggle, is not one whit less "widely applicable" as a means of "drawing in" the masses. The rural superintendents<sup>36</sup> and the flogging of peasants, the corruption of the officials and the police treatment of the "common people" in the cities, the fight against the famine-stricken and the suppression of the popular striving towards enlightenment and knowledge, the extortion of taxes and the persecution of the religious sects, the humiliating treatment of soldiers and the barrack methods in the treatment of the students and liberal intellectuals—do all these and a thousand other similar manifestations of tyranny, though not directly connected with the "economic" struggle, represent, in general, *less* "widely applicable" means and occasions for political agitation and for drawing the masses into the political struggle? The very opposite is true. Of the sum-total of cases in which the workers suffer (either on their own account or on account of those closely connected with them) from tyranny, violence, and the lack of rights,

---

\* We say "in general", because *Rabocheye Dyelo* speaks of general principles and of the general tasks of the Party as a whole. Undoubtedly, cases occur in practice when politics really *must* follow economics, but only Economists can speak of this in a resolution intended to apply to the whole of Russia. Cases do occur when *it is possible* "right from the beginning" to carry on political agitation "exclusively on an economic basis"; yet *Rabocheye Dyelo* came in the end to the conclusion that "there is no need for this whatever" (*Two Conferences*, p. 11). In the following chapter, we shall show that the tactics of the "politicians" and revolutionaries not only do not ignore the trade-union tasks of Social-Democracy, but that, on the contrary, they alone *can secure* their consistent fulfilment.

undoubtedly only a small minority represent cases of police tyranny in the trade-union struggle as such. Why then should we, beforehand, *restrict* the scope of political agitation by declaring only *one* of the means to be "the most widely applicable", when Social-Democrats must have, in addition, other, generally speaking, no less "widely applicable" means?

In the dim and distant past (a full year ago!...) *Rabocheye Dyelo* wrote: "The masses begin to understand immediate political demands after one strike, or at all events, after several", "as soon as the government sets the police and gendarmerie against them" [*August* (No. 7) 1900, p. 15]. This opportunist theory of stages has now been rejected by the Union Abroad, which makes a concession to us by declaring: "There is no need whatever to conduct political agitation right from the beginning, exclusively on an economic basis" (*Two Conferences*, p. 11). The Union's repudiation of part of its former errors will show the future historian of Russian Social-Democracy better than any number of lengthy arguments the depths to which our Economists have degraded socialism! But the Union Abroad must be very naïve indeed to imagine that the abandonment of one form of restricting politics will induce us to agree to another form. Would it not be more logical to say, in this case too, that the economic struggle should be conducted on the widest possible basis, that it should always be utilised for political agitation, but that "there is no need whatever" to regard the economic struggle as the *most* widely applicable means of drawing the masses into active political struggle?

The Union Abroad attaches significance to the fact that it has substituted the phrase "most widely applicable means" for the phrase "the best means" contained in one of the resolutions of the Fourth Congress of the Jewish Workers' Union (Bund).<sup>37</sup> We confess that we find it difficult to say which of these resolutions is the better one. In our opinion they are *both* worse. Both the Union Abroad and the Bund fall into the error (partly, perhaps, unconsciously, under the influence of tradition) of giving an Economist, trade-unionist interpretation to politics. Whether this is done by employing the word "best" or the words "most widely applicable" makes no essential difference whatever. Had the Union Abroad said

that "political agitation on an economic basis" is the most widely applied (not "applicable") means, it would have been right in regard to a certain period in the development of our Social-Democratic movement. It would have been right in regard to the *Economists* and to many (if not the majority) of the practical workers of 1898-1901; for these practical Economists *applied* political agitation (to the extent that they applied it at all) *almost exclusively on an economic basis*. Political agitation on *such* lines was recognised and, as we have seen, even recommended by *Rabochaya Mysl* and the Self-Emancipation Group. *Rabocheye Dyelo* should have *strongly condemned* the fact that the useful work of economic agitation was accompanied by the harmful restriction of the political struggle; instead, it declares the means most widely applied (*by the Economists*) to be the most widely applicable! It is not surprising that when we call these people Economists, they can do nothing but pour every manner of abuse upon us; call us "mystifiers", "disrupters", "papal nuncios", and "slanderers"\*; go complaining to the whole world that we have mortally offended them; and declare almost on oath that "not a single Social-Democratic organisation is now tinged with Economism".\*\* Oh, those evil, slanderous politicians! They must have deliberately invented this Economism, out of sheer hatred of mankind, in order mortally to offend other people.

What concrete, real meaning attaches to Martynov's words when he sets before Social-Democracy the task of "lending the economic struggle itself a political character"? The economic struggle is the collective struggle of the workers against their employers for better terms *in the sale of their labour-power*, for better living and working conditions. This struggle is necessarily a trade-union struggle, because working conditions differ greatly in different trades, and, consequently, the struggle *to improve* them can only be conducted on the basis of trade organisations (in the Western countries, through trade unions; in Russia, through temporary trade associations and through leaflets, etc.). Lending "the eco-

\* These are the precise expressions used in *Two Conferences*, pp. 31, 32, 28, and 30.

\*\* *Two Conferences*, p. 32.



conomic struggle itself a political character" means, therefore, striving to secure satisfaction of these trade demands, the improvement of working conditions in each separate trade by means of "legislative and administrative measures" (as Martynov puts it on the ensuing page of his article, p. 43). This is precisely what all workers' trade unions do and always have done. Read the works of the soundly scientific (and "soundly" opportunist) Mr. and Mrs. Webb and you will see that the British trade unions long ago recognised, and have long been carrying out, the task of "lending the economic struggle itself a political character"; they have long been fighting for the right to strike, for the removal of all legal hindrances to the co-operative and trade-union movements, for laws to protect women and children, for the improvement of labour conditions by means of health and factory legislation, etc.

Thus, the pompous phrase about "lending the economic struggle *itself* a political character", which sounds so "terrifically" profound and revolutionary, serves as a screen to conceal what is in fact the traditional striving to *degrade* Social-Democratic politics to the level of trade-union politics. Under the guise of rectifying the one-sidedness of *Iskra*, which, it is alleged, places "the revolutionising of dogma higher than the revolutionising of life",\* we are presented with the *struggle for economic reforms* as if it were something entirely new. In point of fact, the phrase "lending the economic struggle itself a political character" means nothing more than the struggle for economic reforms. Martynov himself might have come to this simple conclusion, had he pondered over the significance of his own words. "Our Party," he says, training his heaviest guns on *Iskra*, "could and should have presented concrete demands to the government for legislative and administrative measures against economic exploitation, unemployment, famine, etc." (*Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, pp. 42-43). Concrete demands for measures—does not this mean demands for social reforms?

---

\* *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, p. 60. This is the Martynov variation of the application, which we have characterised above, of the thesis "Every step of real movement is more important than a dozen programmes" to the present chaotic state of our movement. In fact, this is merely a translation into Russian of the notorious Bernsteinian sentence: "The movement is everything, the final aim is nothing."

Again we ask the impartial reader: Are we slandering the *Rabocheye Dyelo*-ites (may I be forgiven for this awkward, currently used designation!) by calling them concealed Bernsteinians when, as their point of *disagreement* with *Iskra*, they advance their thesis on the necessity of struggling for economic reforms?

Revolutionary Social-Democracy has always included the struggle for reforms as part of its activities. But it utilises "economic" agitation for the purpose of presenting to the government, not only demands for all sorts of measures, but also (and primarily) the demand that it cease to be an autocratic government. Moreover, it considers it its duty to present this demand to the government on the basis, *not* of the economic struggle *alone*, but of all manifestations in general of public and political life. In a word, it subordinates the struggle for reforms, as the part to the whole, to the revolutionary struggle for freedom and for socialism. Martynov, however, resuscitates the theory of stages in a new form and strives to prescribe, as it were, an exclusively economic path of development for the political struggle. By advancing at this moment, when the revolutionary movement is on the upgrade, an alleged special "task" of struggling for reforms, he is dragging the Party backwards and is playing into the hands of both "Economist" and liberal opportunism.

To proceed. Shamefacedly hiding the struggle for reforms behind the pompous thesis of "lending the economic struggle itself a political character", Martynov advanced, as if it were a special point, *exclusively economic* (indeed, exclusively factory) reforms. As to the reason for his doing that, we do not know it. Carelessness, perhaps? Yet if he had in mind something else besides "factory" reforms, then the whole of his thesis, which we have cited, loses all sense. Perhaps he did it because he considers it possible and probable that the government will make "concessions" only in the economic sphere?\* If so, then it is a strange delusion. Concessions are also possible and are made in the sphere of legislation con-

\* P. 43. "Of course, when we advise the workers to present certain economic demands to the government, we do so because in the *economic* sphere the autocratic government is, of necessity, prepared to make certain concessions."

cerning flogging, passports, land redemption payments, religious sects, the censorship, etc., etc. "Economic" concessions (or pseudo-concessions) are, of course, the cheapest and most advantageous from the government's point of view, because by these means it hopes to win the confidence of the working masses. For this very reason, we Social-Democrats *must not* under any circumstances or in any way whatever create grounds for the belief (or the misunderstanding) that we attach greater value to economic reforms, or that we regard them as being particularly important, etc. "Such demands", writes Martynov, speaking of the concrete demands for legislative and administrative measures referred to above, "would not be merely a hollow sound, because, promising certain palpable results, they might be actively supported by the working masses...." We are not Economists, oh no! We only cringe as slavishly before the "palpableness" of concrete results as do the Bernsteins, the Prokopoviches, the Struves, the R.M.'s, and *tutti quant!* We only wish to make it understood (together with Nartsis Tuporylov) that all which "does not promise palpable results" is merely a "hollow sound"! We are only trying to argue as if the working masses were incapable (and had not already proved their capabilities, notwithstanding those who ascribe their own philistinism to them) of actively supporting *every* protest against the autocracy, even if it *promises absolutely no palpable results whatever!*

Let us take, for example, the very "measures" for the relief of unemployment and the famine that Martynov himself advances. *Rabocheye Dyelo* is engaged, judging by what it has promised, in drawing up and elaborating a programme of "concrete [in the form of bills?] demands for legislative and administrative measures", "promising palpable results", while *Iskra*, which "constantly places the revolutionising of dogma higher than the revolutionising of life", has tried to explain the inseparable connection between unemployment and the whole capitalist system, has given warning that "famine is coming", has exposed the police "fight against the famine-stricken", and the outrageous "provisional penal servitude regulations"; and *Zarya* has published a special reprint, in the form of an agitationai pamphlet, of a section of its "Review of Home Affairs", deal-

ing with the famine.\* But good God! How "one-sided" were these incorrigibly narrow and orthodox doctrinaires, how deaf to the calls of "life itself"! Their articles contained—oh horror!—*not a single*, can you imagine it?—*not a single* "concrete demand" "promising palpable results"! Poor doctrinaires! They ought to be sent to Krichevsky and Martynov to be taught that tactics are a process of growth, of that which grows, etc., and that the economic struggle *itself* should be given a political character!

"In addition to its immediate revolutionary significance, the economic struggle of the workers against the employers and the government [*economic* struggle against the government"!] has also this significance: it constantly brings home to the workers the fact that they have no political rights" (Martynov, p. 44). We quote this passage, not in order to repeat for the hundredth and thousandth time what has been said above, but in order to express particular thanks to Martynov for this excellent new formula: "the economic struggle of the workers against the employers and the government." What a pearl! With what inimitable skill and mastery in eliminating all partial disagreements and shades of differences among Economists this clear and concise proposition expresses the *quintessence* of Economism, from summoning the workers "to the political struggle, which they carry on in the general interest, for the improvement of the conditions of all the workers",\*\* continuing through the theory of stages, and ending in the resolution of the conference on the "most widely applicable", etc. "Economic struggle against the government" is precisely trade-unionist politics, which is still very far from being Social-Democratic politics.

### c) Political Exposures and "Training in Revolutionary Activity"

In advancing against *Iskra* his theory of "raising the activity of the working masses", Martynov actually betrayed an urge to *belittle* that activity, for he declared the very

\* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 253-74.—Ed.

\*\* *Rabochaya Mysl*, "Separate Supplement", p. 14.

economic struggle before which all Economists grovel to be the preferable, particularly important, and "most widely applicable" means of rousing this activity and its broadest field. This error is characteristic, precisely in that it is by no means peculiar to Martynov. In reality, it is possible to "raise the activity of the working masses" *only* when this activity is *not restricted* to "political agitation on an economic basis". A basic condition for the necessary expansion of political agitation is the organisation of *comprehensive* political exposure. *In no way* except by means of such exposures *can* the masses be trained in political consciousness and revolutionary activity. Hence, activity of this kind is one of the most important functions of international Social-Democracy as a whole, for even political freedom does not in any way eliminate exposures; it merely shifts somewhat their sphere of direction. Thus, the German party is especially strengthening its positions and spreading its influence, thanks particularly to the untiring energy with which it is conducting its campaign of political exposure. Working-class consciousness cannot be genuine political consciousness unless the workers are trained to respond to *all* cases of tyranny, oppression, violence, and abuse, no matter *what class* is affected—unless they are trained, moreover, to respond from a Social-Democratic point of view and no other. The consciousness of the working masses cannot be genuine class-consciousness, unless the workers learn, from concrete, and above all from topical, political facts and events to observe *every* other social class in *all* the manifestations of its intellectual, ethical, and political life; unless they learn to apply in practice the materialist analysis and the materialist estimate of *all* aspects of the life and activity of *all* classes, strata, and groups of the population: Those who concentrate the attention, observation, and consciousness of the working class exclusively, or even mainly, upon itself alone are not Social-Democrats; for the self-knowledge of the working class is indissolubly bound up, not solely with a fully clear theoretical understanding ... it would be even truer to say, not so much with the theoretical, as with the practical, understanding—of the relationships between *all* the various classes of modern society, acquired through the experience of political life. For this reason the conception of the economic struggle as the most widely

applicable means of drawing the masses into the political movement, which our Economists preach, is so extremely harmful and reactionary in its practical significance. In order to become a Social-Democrat, the worker must have a clear picture in his mind of the economic nature and the social and political features of the landlord and the priest, the high state official and the peasant, the student and the vagabond; he must know their strong and weak points; he must grasp the meaning of all the catchwords and sophisms by which each class and each stratum *camouflages* its selfish strivings and its real "inner workings"; he must understand what interests are reflected by certain institutions and certain laws and how they are reflected. But this "clear picture" cannot be obtained from any book. It can be obtained only from living examples and from exposures that follow close upon what is going on about us at a given moment; upon what is being discussed, in whispers perhaps, by each one in his own way; upon what finds expression in such and such events, in such and such statistics, in such and such court sentences, etc., etc. These comprehensive political exposures are an essential and *fundamental* condition for training the masses in revolutionary activity.

Why do the Russian workers still manifest little revolutionary activity in response to the brutal treatment of the people by the police, the persecution of religious sects, the flogging of peasants, the outrageous censorship, the torture of soldiers, the persecution of the most innocent cultural undertakings, etc.? Is it because the "economic struggle" does not "stimulate" them to this, because such activity does not "promise palpable results", because it produces little that is "positive"? To adopt such an opinion, we repeat, is merely to direct the charge where it does not belong, to blame the working masses for one's own philistinism (or Bernsteinism). We must blame ourselves, our lagging behind the mass movement, for still being unable to organise sufficiently wide, striking, and rapid exposures of all the shameful outrages. When we do that (and we must and can do it), the most backward worker will understand, *or will feel*, that the students and religious sects, the peasants and the authors are being abused and outraged by those same dark forces that are oppressing and crushing him at every step of his life. Feeling that, he

himself will be filled with an irresistible desire to react, and he will know how to hoot the censors one day, on another day to demonstrate outside the house of a governor who has brutally suppressed a peasant uprising, on still another day to teach a lesson to the gendarmes in surplices who are doing the work of the Holy Inquisition, etc. As yet we have done very little, almost nothing, to bring before the working masses prompt exposures on all possible issues. Many of us as yet do not recognise this as our *bounden duty* but trail spontaneously in the wake of the "drab everyday struggle", in the narrow confines of factory life. Under such circumstances to say that "*Iskra* displays a tendency to minimise the significance of the forward march of the drab everyday struggle in comparison with the propaganda of brilliant and completed ideas" (Martynov, op. cit., p. 61), means to drag the Party back, to defend and glorify our unpreparedness and backwardness.

As for calling the masses to action, that will come of itself as soon as energetic political agitation, live and striking exposures come into play. To catch some criminal red-handed and immediately to brand him publicly in all places is of itself far more effective than any number of "calls"; the effect very often is such as will make it impossible to tell exactly who it was that "called" upon the masses and who suggested this or that plan of demonstration, etc. Calls for action, not in the general, but in the concrete, sense of the term can be made only at the place of action; only those who themselves go into action, and do so immediately, can sound such calls. Our business as Social-Democratic publicists is to deepen, expand, and intensify political exposures and political agitation.

A word in passing about "calls to action". *The only newspaper* which prior to the spring events called upon the workers to intervene actively in a matter that certainly did not promise any palpable results whatever for the workers, i.e., the drafting of the students into the army, was *Iskra*. Immediately after the publication of the order of January 11, on "drafting the 183 students into the army", *Iskra* published an article on the matter (in its February issue, No. 2),\* and,

---

\* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 414-19.—Ed.

before any demonstration was begun, forthwith *called upon* "the workers to go to the aid of the students", called upon the "people" openly to take up the government's arrogant challenge. We ask: how is the remarkable fact to be explained that although Martynov talks so much about "calls to action", and even suggests "calls to action" as a special form of activity, he said not a word about *this* call? After this, was it not sheer philistinism on Martynov's part to allege that *Iskra* was *one-sided* because it did not issue sufficient "calls" to struggle for demands "promising palpable results"?

Our Economists, including *Rabocheye Dyelo*, were successful because they adapted themselves to the backward workers. But the Social-Democratic worker, the revolutionary worker (and the number of such workers is growing) will indignantly reject all this talk about struggle for demands "promising palpable results", etc., because he will understand that this is only a variation of the old song about adding a kopek to the ruble. Such a worker will say to his counsellors from *Rabochaya Mysl* and *Rabocheye Dyelo*: you are busying yourselves in vain, gentlemen, and shirking your proper duties, by meddling with such excessive zeal in a job that we can very well manage ourselves. There is nothing clever in your assertion that the Social-Democrats' task is to lend the economic struggle itself a political character; that is only the beginning, it is not the main task of the Social-Democrats. For all over the world, including Russia, *the police themselves often take the initiative in lending the economic struggle a political character, and the workers themselves learn to understand whom the government supports.\** The

---

\* The demand "to lend the economic struggle itself a political character" most strikingly expresses *subservience to spontaneity* in the sphere of political activity. Very often the economic struggle *spontaneously* assumes a political character, that is to say, without the intervention of the "revolutionary bacilli—the intelligentsia", without the intervention of the class-conscious Social-Democrats. The economic struggle of the English workers, for instance, also assumed a political character without any intervention on the part of the socialists. The task of the Social-Democrats, however, is not exhausted by political agitation on an economic basis; their task is *to convert* trade-unionist politics into Social-Democratic political struggle, *to utilise* the sparks of political consciousness which the economic struggle generates among the workers, for the purpose of



"economic struggle of the workers against the employers and the government", about which you make as much fuss as if you had discovered a new America, is being waged in all parts of Russia, even the most remote, by the workers themselves who have heard about strikes, but who have heard almost nothing about socialism. The "activity" you want to stimulate among us workers, by advancing concrete demands that promise palpable results, we are already displaying and in our everyday, limited trade-union work we put forward these concrete demands, very often without any assistance whatever from the intellectuals. But *such* activity is not enough for us; we are not children to be fed on the thin gruel of "economic" politics alone; we want to know everything that others know, we want to learn the details of *all* aspects of political life and to take part *actively* in every single political event. In order that we may do this, the intellectuals must talk to us less of what we already know\* and tell us

*raising* the workers to the level of *Social-Democratic* political consciousness. The Martynovs, however, instead of raising and stimulating the spontaneously awakening political consciousness of the workers *bow to spontaneity* and repeat over and over *ad nauseam*, that the economic struggle "impels" the workers to realise their own lack of political rights. It is unfortunate, gentlemen, that the spontaneously awakening trade-unionist political consciousness does not "*impel*" you to an understanding of your Social-Democratic tasks.

\* To prove that this imaginary speech of a worker to an Economist is based on fact, we shall refer to two witnesses who undoubtedly have direct knowledge of the working-class movement and who are least of all inclined to be partial towards us "doctrinaires"; for one witness is an Economist (who regards even *Rabocheye Dyelo* as a political organ!), and the other is a terrorist. The first witness is the author of a remarkably truthful and vivid article entitled "The St. Petersburg Working-Class Movement and the Practical Tasks of Social-Democracy", published in *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 6. He divides the workers into the following categories: 1) class-conscious revolutionaries; 2) intermediate stratum; 3) the remaining masses. The intermediate stratum, he says, "is often more interested in questions of political life than in its own immediate economic interests, the connection between which and the general social conditions it has long understood".... *Rabochaya Mysl* "is sharply criticised": "It keeps on repeating the same thing over and over again, things we have long known, read long ago." "Again nothing in the political review!" (pp. 30-31). But even the third stratum, "the younger and more sensitive section of the workers, less corrupted by the tavern and the church, who hardly ever have the opportunity of getting hold of political literature, discuss political events in a rambling way and ponder over the frag-

more about what we do not yet know and what we can never learn from our factory and "economic" experience, namely, political knowledge. You intellectuals can acquire this knowledge, and it is your *duty* to bring it to us in a hundred- and a thousand-fold greater measure than you have done up to now; and you must bring it to us, not only in the form of discussions, pamphlets, and articles (which very often—pardon our frankness—are rather dull), but precisely in the form of vivid *exposures* of what our government and our governing classes are doing at this very moment in all spheres of life. Devote more zeal to carrying out this duty and *talk less about "raising the activity of the working masses"*. We are far more active than you think, and we are quite able to support, by open street fighting, even demands that do not promise any "palpable results" whatever. It is not for you to "raise" our activity, because *activity is precisely the thing you yourselves lack*. Bow less in subservience to spontaneity, and think more about raising *your own* activity, gentlemen!

#### e) The Working Class as Vanguard Fighter for Democracy

We have seen that the conduct of the broadest political agitation and, consequently, of all-sided political exposures is an absolutely necessary and a *paramount* task of our activity, if this activity is to be truly Social-Democratic. However, we arrived at this conclusion *solely* on the grounds of the pressing needs of the working class for political knowledge and political training. But such a presentation of the question is too narrow, for it ignores the general democratic tasks of Social-Democracy, in particular of present-day Russian Social-Democracy. In order to explain the point more concretely we shall approach the subject from an aspect

---

mentary news they get about student riots", etc. The terrorist writes as follows: "...They read over once or twice the petty details of factory life in other towns, not their own, and then they read no more ... dull, they find it.... To say nothing in a workers' paper about the government ... is to regard the workers as being little children.... The workers are not little children" (*Svoboda*,<sup>38</sup> published by the Revolutionary-Socialist Group, pp. 69-70).

that is "nearest" to the Economist, namely, from the practical aspect. "Everyone agrees" that it is necessary to develop the political consciousness of the working class. The question is, *how* that is to be done and what is required to do it. The economic struggle merely "impels" the workers to realise the government's attitude towards the working class. Consequently, *however much we may try* to "lend the economic struggle itself a political character", *we shall never be able* to develop the political consciousness of the workers (to the level of Social-Democratic political consciousness) by keeping within the framework of the economic struggle, for *that framework is too narrow*. The Martynov formula has some value for us, not because it illustrates Martynov's aptitude for confusing things, but because it pointedly expresses the basic error that all the Economists commit, namely, their conviction that it is possible to develop the class political consciousness of the workers *from within*, so to speak, from their economic struggle, i.e., by making this struggle the exclusive (or, at least, the main) starting-point, by making it the exclusive (or, at least, the main) basis. Such a view is radically wrong. Piqued by our polemics against them, the Economists refuse to ponder deeply over the origins of these disagreements, with the result that we simply cannot understand one another. It is as if we spoke in different tongues.

Class political consciousness can be brought to the workers *only from without*, that is, only from outside the economic struggle, from outside the sphere of relations between workers and employers. The sphere from which alone it is possible to obtain this knowledge is the sphere of relationships of *all* classes and strata to the state and the government, the sphere of the interrelations between *all* classes. For that reason, the reply to the question as to what must be done to bring political knowledge to the workers cannot be merely the answer with which, in the majority of cases, the practical workers, especially those inclined towards Economism, mostly content themselves, namely: "To go among the workers." To bring political knowledge to the *workers* the Social-Democrats must *go among all classes of the population*; they must dispatch units of their army *in all directions*.

We deliberately select this blunt formula, we deliberately express ourselves in this sharply simplified manner, not

because we desire to indulge in paradoxes, but in order to "impel" the Economists to a realisation of their tasks which they unpardonably ignore, to suggest to them strongly the difference between trade-unionist and Social-Democratic politics, which they refuse to understand. We therefore beg the reader not to get wrought up, but to hear us patiently to the end.

Let us take the type of Social-Democratic study circle that has become most widespread in the past few years and examine its work. It has "contacts with the workers" and rests content with this, issuing leaflets in which abuses in the factories, the government's partiality towards the capitalists, and the tyranny of the police are strongly condemned. At workers' meetings the discussions never, or rarely ever, go beyond the limits of these subjects. Extremely rare are the lectures and discussions held on the history of the revolutionary movement, on questions of the government's home and foreign policy, on questions of the economic evolution of Russia and of Europe, on the position of the various classes in modern society, etc. As to systematically acquiring and extending contact with other classes of society, no one even dreams of that. In fact, the ideal leader, as the majority of the members of such circles picture him, is something far more in the nature of a trade-union secretary than a socialist political leader. For the secretary of any, say English, trade union always helps the workers to carry on the economic struggle, he helps them to expose factory abuses, explains the injustice of the laws and of measures that hamper the freedom to strike and to picket (i.e., to warn all and sundry that a strike is proceeding at a certain factory), explains the partiality of arbitration court judges who belong to the bourgeois classes, etc., etc. In a word, every trade-union secretary conducts and helps to conduct "the economic struggle against the employers and the government". It cannot be too strongly maintained that *this is still not* Social-Democracy, that the Social-Democrat's ideal should not be the trade-union secretary, but *the tribune of the people*, who is able to react to every manifestation of tyranny and oppression, no matter where it appears, no matter what stratum or class of the people it affects; who is able to generalise all these manifestations and produce a single picture of police

violence and capitalist exploitation; who is able to take advantage of every event, however small, in order to set forth *before all* his socialist convictions and his democratic demands, in order to clarify for *all* and everyone the world-historic significance of the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat. Compare, for example, a leader like Robert Knight (the well-known secretary and leader of the Boiler-Makers' Society, one of the most powerful trade unions in England), with Wilhelm Liebknecht, and try to apply to them the contrasts that Martynov draws in his controversy with *Iskra*. You will see—I am running through Martynov's article—that Robert Knight engaged more in “calling the masses to certain concrete actions” (Martynov, *op. cit.*, p. 39), while Wilhelm Liebknecht engaged more in “the revolutionary elucidation of the whole of the present system or partial manifestations of it” (38-39); that Robert Knight “formulated the immediate demands of the proletariat and indicated the means by which they can be achieved” (41), whereas Wilhelm Liebknecht, while doing this, did not hold back from “simultaneously guiding the activities of various opposition strata”, “dictating a positive programme of action for them”\* (41); that Robert Knight strove “as far as possible to lend the economic struggle itself a political character” (42) and was excellently able “to submit to the government concrete demands promising certain palpable results” (43), whereas Liebknecht engaged to a much greater degree in “one-sided” “exposures” (40); that Robert Knight attached more significance to the “forward march of the drab everyday struggle” (61), whereas Liebknecht attached more significance to the “propaganda of brilliant and completed ideas” (61); that Liebknecht converted the paper he was directing into “an organ of revolutionary opposition that exposed the state of affairs in our country, particularly the political state of affairs, insofar as it affected the interests of the most varied strata of the population” (63), whereas Robert Knight “worked for the cause of the working class in close organic connection with the proletarian struggle” (63)—if by “close and organic connection” is meant the subservience to

\* For example, during the Franco-Prussian War, Liebknecht dictated a programme of action *for the whole of democracy*; to an even greater extent Marx and Engels did this in 1848.

spontaneity which we examined above, by taking the examples of Krichevsky and Martynov—and “restricted the sphere of his influence”, convinced, of course, as is Martynov, that “by doing so he deepened that influence” (63). In a word, you will see that *de facto* Martynov reduces Social-Democracy to the level of trade-unionism, though he does so, of course, not because he does not desire the good of Social-Democracy, but simply because he is a little too much in a hurry to render Plekhanov more profound, instead of taking the trouble to understand him.

Let us return, however, to our thesis. We said that a Social-Democrat, if he really believes it necessary to develop comprehensively the political consciousness of the proletariat, must “go among all classes of the population”. This gives rise to the questions: how is this to be done? have we enough forces to do this? is there a basis for such work among all the other classes? will this not mean a retreat, or lead to a retreat, from the class point of view? Let us deal with these questions.

We must “go among all classes of the population” as theoreticians, as propagandists, as agitators, and as organisers. No one doubts that the theoretical work of Social-Democrats should aim at studying all the specific features of the social and political condition of the various classes. But extremely little is done in this direction, as compared with the work that is done in studying the specific features of factory life. In the committees and study circles, one can meet people who are immersed in the study even of some special branch of the metal industry; but one can hardly ever find members of organisations (obliged, as often happens, for some reason or other to give up practical work) who are especially engaged in gathering material on some pressing question of social and political life in our country which could serve as a means for conducting Social-Democratic work among other strata of the population. In dwelling upon the fact that the majority of the present-day leaders of the working-class movement lack training, we cannot refrain from mentioning training in this respect also, for it too is bound up with the “Economist” conception of “close organic connection with the proletarian struggle”. The principal thing, of course, is *propaganda* and *agitation* among all strata of the people. The

work of the West-European Social-Democrat is in this respect facilitated by the public meetings and rallies which *all* are free to attend, and by the fact that in parliament he addresses the representatives of *all* classes. We have neither a parliament nor freedom of assembly; nevertheless, we are able to arrange meetings of workers who desire to listen to a *Social-Democrat*. We must also find ways and means of calling meetings of representatives of all social classes that desire to listen to a *democrat*; for he is no Social-Democrat who forgets in practice that "the Communists support every revolutionary movement",<sup>39</sup> that we are obliged for that reason to expound and emphasise *general democratic tasks before the whole people*, without for a moment concealing our socialist convictions. He is no Social-Democrat who forgets in practice his obligation to be *ahead of all* in raising, accentuating, and solving *every* general democratic question.

"But everyone agrees with this!" the impatient reader will exclaim, and the new instructions adopted by the last conference of the Union Abroad for the Editorial Board of *Rabocheye Dyelo* definitely say: "All events of social and political life that affect the proletariat either directly as a special class or as *the vanguard of all the revolutionary forces in the struggle for freedom* should serve as subjects for political propaganda and agitation" (*Two Conferences*, p. 17, our italics). Yes, these are very true and very good words, and we would be fully satisfied if *Rabocheye Dyelo* understood them and if it refrained from saying in the next breath things that contradict them. For it is not enough to call ourselves the "vanguard", the advanced contingent; we must act in such a way that *all* the other contingents recognise and are obliged to admit that we are marching in the vanguard. And we ask the reader: Are the representatives of the other "contingents" such fools as to take our word for it when we say that we are the "vanguard"? Just picture to yourselves the following: a Social-Democrat comes to the "contingent" of Russian educated radicals, or liberal constitutionalists, and says, We are the vanguard; "the task confronting us now is, as far as possible, to lend the economic struggle itself a political character". The radical, or constitutionalist, if he is at all intelligent (and there are many intelligent men among Russian radicals and constitutional-

ists), would only smile at such a speech and would say (to himself, of course, for in the majority of cases he is an experienced diplomat): "Your 'vanguard' must be made up of simpletons. They do not even understand that it is our task, the task of the progressive representatives of bourgeois democracy to lend the workers' economic struggle *itself* a political character. Why, we too, like the West-European bourgeois, want to draw the workers into politics, *but only into trade-unionist, not into Social-Democratic politics*. Trade-unionist politics of the working class is precisely *bourgeois politics* of the working class, and this 'vanguard's' formulation of its task is the formulation of trade-unionist politics! Let them call themselves Social-Democrats to their heart's content, I am not a child to get excited over a label. But they must not fall under the influence of those pernicious orthodox doctrinaires, let them allow 'freedom of criticism' to those who unconsciously are driving Social-Democracy into trade-unionist channels."

And the faint smile of our constitutionalist will turn into Homeric laughter when he learns that the Social-Democrats who talk of Social-Democracy as the vanguard, today, when spontaneity almost completely dominates our movement, fear nothing so much as "belittling the spontaneous element", as "underestimating the significance of the forward movement of the drab everyday struggle, as compared with the propaganda of brilliant and completed ideas", etc., etc.! A "vanguard" which fears that consciousness will outstrip spontaneity, which fears to put forward a bold "plan" that would compel general recognition even among those who differ with us. Are they not confusing "vanguard" with "rearguard"?

Indeed, let us examine the following piece of reasoning by Martynov. On page 40 he says that *Iskra* is one-sided in its tactics of exposing abuses, that "however much we may spread distrust and hatred of the government, we shall not achieve our aim until we have succeeded in developing sufficient active social energy for its overthrow". This, it may be said parenthetically, is the familiar solicitude for the activation of the masses, with a simultaneous striving to restrict one's own activity. But that is not the main point at the moment. Martynov speaks here, accordingly, of *rev-*



olutionary energy ("for overthrowing"). And what conclusion does he arrive at? Since in ordinary times various social strata inevitably march separately, "it is, therefore, clear that we Social-Democrats cannot simultaneously guide the activities of various opposition strata, we cannot dictate to them a positive programme of action, we cannot point out to them in what manner they should wage a day-to-day struggle for their interests.... The liberal strata will themselves take care of the active struggle for their immediate interests, the struggle that will bring them face to face with our political régime" (p. 41). Thus, having begun with talk about revolutionary energy, about the active struggle for the overthrow of the autocracy, Martynov immediately turns towards trade-union energy and active struggle for immediate interests! It goes without saying that we cannot guide the struggle of the students, liberals, etc., for their "immediate interests"; but this was not the point at issue, most worthy Economist! The point we were discussing was the possible and necessary participation of various social strata in the overthrow of the autocracy; and not only are we *able*, but it is our bounden duty, to guide *these* "activities of the various opposition strata", if we desire to be the "vanguard". Not only will our students and liberals, etc., themselves take care of "the struggle that brings them face to face with our political régime"; the police and the officials of the autocratic government will see to this first and foremost. But if "we" desire to be front-rank democrats, we must make it our concern *to direct* the thoughts of those who are dissatisfied only with conditions at the university, or in the Zemstvo, etc., to the idea that the entire political system is worthless. *We* must take upon ourselves the task of organising an all-round political struggle under the leadership of *our* Party in such a manner as to make it possible for all oppositional strata to render their fullest support to the struggle and to our Party. *We* must train our Social-Democratic practical workers to become political leaders, able to guide all the manifestations of this all-round struggle, able at the right time to "dictate a positive programme of action" for the aroused students, the discontented Zemstvo people,<sup>40</sup> the incensed religious sects, the offended elementary school-teachers, etc., etc. For that reason, Martynov's

assertion that "with regard to these, we can function *merely in the negative* role of exposers of abuses ... we can *only* dissipate their hopes in various government commissions" *is completely false* (our italics). By saying this, Martynov shows that he *absolutely fails to understand* the role that the revolutionary "vanguard" must really play. If the reader bears this in mind, he will be clear as to the *real meaning* of Martynov's concluding remarks: "*Iskra* is the organ of the revolutionary opposition which exposes the state of affairs in our country, particularly the political state of affairs, insofar as it affects the interests of the most varied strata of the population. We, however, work and will continue to work for the cause of the working class in close organic contact with the proletarian struggle. By restricting the sphere of our active influence we deepen that influence" (63). The true sense of this conclusion is as follows: *Iskra* desires to *elevate* the trade-unionist politics of the working class (to which, through misconception, through lack of training, or through conviction, our practical workers frequently confine themselves) to the level of Social-Democratic politics. *Rabocheye Dyelo*, however, desires to *degrade* Social-Democratic politics to trade-unionist politics. Moreover, it assures the world that the two positions are "entirely compatible within the common cause" (63). *O, sancta simplicitas!*

To proceed. Have we sufficient forces to direct our propaganda and agitation among *all* social classes? Most certainly. Our Economists, who are frequently inclined to deny this, lose sight of the gigantic progress our movement has made from (approximately) 1894 to 1901. Like real "tail-enders", they often go on living in the bygone stages of the movement's inception. In the earlier period, indeed, we had astonishingly few forces, and it was perfectly natural and legitimate then to devote ourselves exclusively to activities among the workers and to condemn severely any deviation from this course. The entire task then was to consolidate our position in the working class. At the present time, however, gigantic forces have been attracted to the movement. The best representatives of the younger generation of the educated classes are coming over to us. Everywhere in the provinces there are people, resident there by dint of circumstance, who have taken part in the movement in the past or who desire

to do so now and who are gravitating towards Social-Democracy (whereas in 1894 one could count the Social-Democrats on the fingers of one's hand). A basic political and organisational shortcoming of our movement is our *inability* to utilise all these forces and give them appropriate work (we shall deal with this more fully in the next chapter). The overwhelming majority of these forces entirely lack the opportunity of "going among the workers", so that there are no grounds for fearing that we shall divert forces from our main work. In order to be able to provide the workers with real, comprehensive, and live political knowledge, we must have "our own people", Social-Democrats, everywhere, among all social strata, and in all positions from which we can learn the inner springs of our state mechanism. Such people are required, not only for propaganda and agitation, but in a still larger measure for organisation.

Is there a basis for activity among all classes of the population? Whoever doubts this lags in his consciousness behind the spontaneous awakening of the masses. The working-class movement has aroused and is continuing to arouse discontent in some, hopes of support for the opposition in others, and in still others the realisation that the autocracy is unbearable and must inevitably fall. We would be "politicians" and Social-Democrats in name only (as all too often happens in reality), if we failed to realise that our task is to utilise every manifestation of discontent, and to gather and turn to the best account every protest, however small. This is quite apart from the fact that the millions of the labouring peasantry, handicraftsmen, petty artisans, etc., would always listen eagerly to the speech of any Social-Democrat who is at all qualified. Indeed, is there a single social class in which there are no individuals, groups, or circles that are discontented with the lack of rights and with tyranny and, therefore, accessible to the propaganda of Social-Democrats as the spokesmen of the most pressing general democratic needs? To those who desire to have a clear idea of what the political agitation of a Social-Democrat among *all* classes and strata of the population should be like, we would point to *political exposures* in the broad sense of the word as the principal (but, of course, not the sole) form of this agitation.

"We must arouse in every section of the population that is at all politically conscious a passion for *political* exposure," I wrote in my article "Where To Begin" [*Iskra*, May (No. 4) 1901], with which I shall deal in greater detail later. "We must not be discouraged by the fact that the voice of political exposure is today so feeble, timid, and infrequent. This is not because of a wholesale submission to police despotism, but because those who are able and ready to make exposures have no tribune from which to speak, no eager and encouraging audience, they do not see anywhere among the people that force to which it would be worth while directing their complaint against the 'omnipotent' Russian Government.... We are now in a position to provide a tribune for the nation-wide exposure of the tsarist government, and it is our duty to do this. That tribune must be a Social-Democratic newspaper."\*

The ideal audience for political exposure is the working class, which is first and foremost in need of all-round and live political knowledge, and is most capable of converting this knowledge into active struggle, even when that struggle does not promise "palpable results". A tribune for *nation-wide* exposures can be only an all-Russia newspaper. "Without a political organ, a political movement deserving that name is inconceivable in the Europe of today"; in this respect Russia must undoubtedly be included in present-day Europe. The press long ago became a power in our country, otherwise the government would not spend tens of thousands of rubles to bribe it and to subsidise the Katkovs and Meshcherskys. And it is no novelty in autocratic Russia for the underground press to break through the wall of censorship and *compel* the legal and conservative press to speak openly of it. This was the case in the seventies and even in the fifties. How much broader and deeper are now the sections of the people willing to read the illegal underground press, and to learn from it "how to live and how to die", to use the expression of a worker who sent a letter to *Iskra* (No. 7).<sup>41</sup> Political exposures are as much a declaration of war against the *government* as economic exposures are a declaration of war against the factory owners. The moral significance of this declaration of war will be all the greater, the wider and more powerful the campaign of exposure will be and the more numerous and determined the social *class* that has *declared war in order to begin the war*. Hence, political

---

\* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 21-22.—Ed.

exposures in themselves serve as a powerful instrument for *disintegrating* the system we oppose, as a means for diverting from the enemy his casual or temporary allies, as a means for spreading hostility and distrust among the permanent partners of the autocracy.

In our time only a party that will *organise* really *nation-wide* exposures can become the vanguard of the revolutionary forces. The word "nation-wide" has a very profound meaning. The overwhelming majority of the non-working-class expositors (be it remembered that in order to become the vanguard, we must attract other classes) are sober politicians and level-headed men of affairs. They know perfectly well how dangerous it is to "complain" even against a minor official, let alone against the "omnipotent" Russian Government. And they will come *to us* with their complaints only when they see that these complaints can really have effect, and that we represent *a political force*. In order to become such a force in the eyes of outsiders, much persistent and stubborn work is required *to raise* our own consciousness, initiative, and energy. To accomplish this it is not enough to attach a "vanguard" label to rearguard theory and practice.

But if we have to undertake the organisation of a really nation-wide exposure of the government, in what way will then the class character of our movement be expressed?—the overzealous advocate of "close organic contact with the proletarian struggle" will ask us, as indeed he does. The reply is manifold: we Social-Democrats will organise these nation-wide exposures; all questions raised by the agitation will be explained in a consistently Social-Democratic spirit, without any concessions to deliberate or undeliberate distortions of Marxism; the all-round political agitation will be conducted by a party which unites into one inseparable whole the assault on the government in the name of the entire people, the revolutionary training of the proletariat, and the safeguarding of its political independence, the guidance of the economic struggle of the working class, and the utilisation of all its spontaneous conflicts with its exploiters which rouse and bring into our camp increasing numbers of the proletariat.

But a most characteristic feature of Economism is its failure to understand this connection, more, this identity of

the most pressing need of the proletariat (a comprehensive political education through the medium of political agitation and political exposures) with the need of the general democratic movement. This lack of understanding is expressed, not only in "Martynovite" phrases, but in the references to a supposedly class point of view identical in meaning with these phrases. Thus, the authors of the "Economist" letter in *Iskra*, No. 12, state\*: "This basic drawback of *Iskra* [overestimation of ideology] is also the cause of its inconsistency on the question of the attitude of Social-Democracy to the various social classes and tendencies. By theoretical reasoning [not by "the growth of Party tasks, which grow together with the Party"], *Iskra* solved the problem of the immediate transition to the struggle against absolutism. In all probability it senses the difficulty of such a task for the workers under the present state of affairs [not only senses, but knows full well that this task appears less difficult to the workers than to the "Economist" intellectuals with their nursemaid concern, for the workers are prepared to fight even for demands which, to use the language of the never-to-be-forgotten Martynov, do not "promise palpable results"] but lacking the patience to wait until the workers will have gathered sufficient forces for this struggle, *Iskra* begins to seek allies in the ranks of the liberals and intellectuals."...

Yes, we have indeed lost all "patience" "waiting" for the blessed time, long promised us by diverse "conciliators", when the Economists will have stopped charging the workers with *their own* backwardness and justifying their own lack of energy with allegations that the workers lack strength. We ask our Economists: What do they mean by "the gathering of working-class strength for the struggle"? Is it not evident that this means the political training of the workers, so that *all* the aspects of our vile autocracy are revealed to them? And is it not clear that *precisely for this work* we

\* Lack of space has prevented us from replying in detail, in *Iskra*, to this letter, which is highly characteristic of the Economists. We were very glad at its appearance, for the allegations that *Iskra* did not maintain a consistent class point of view had reached us long before that from various sources, and we were waiting for an appropriate occasion, or for a formulated expression of this fashionable charge, to give our reply. Moreover, it is our habit to reply to attacks, not by defence, but by counter-attack.

need "allies in the ranks of the liberals and intellectuals", who are prepared to join us in the exposure of the political attack on the Zemstvo officials, on the teachers, on the statisticians, on the students, etc.? Is this surprisingly "intricate mechanism" really so difficult to understand? Has not P.B. Axelrod constantly repeated since 1897 that "the task before the Russian Social-Democrats of acquiring adherents and direct and indirect allies among the non-proletarian classes will be solved principally and primarily by the character of the propagandist activities conducted among the proletariat itself"? But the Martynovs and the other Economists continue to imagine that "by economic struggle against the employers and the government" the workers must *first* gather strength (for trade-unionist politics) and *then* "go over"—we presume from trade-unionist "training for activity"—to Social-Democratic activity!

"...In this quest," continue the Economists, "*Iskra* not infrequently departs from the class point of view, obscures class antagonisms, and puts into the forefront the common nature of the discontent with the government, although the causes and the degree of the discontent vary considerably among the 'allies'. Such, for example, is *Iskra's* attitude towards the Zemstvo...." *Iskra*, it is alleged, "promises the nobles that are dissatisfied with the government's sops the assistance of the working class, but it does not say a word about the class antagonism that exists between these social strata". If the reader will turn to the article "The Autocracy and the Zemstvo" (*Iskra*, Nos. 2 and 4), to which, *in all probability*, the authors of the letter refer, he will find that they\* deal with the attitude of the *government* towards the "mild agitation of the bureaucratic Zemstvo, which is based on the social-estates", and towards the "independent activity of even the propertied classes". The article states that the workers cannot look on indifferently while the government is waging a struggle against the Zemstvo, and the Zemstvos are called upon to stop making mild speeches and to speak firmly and resolutely when revolutionary Social-Democracy confronts the government in all its strength.

\* In the interval *between* these articles there was one (*Iskra*, No. 3), which dealt especially with class antagonisms in the countryside. (See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 420-28.—Ed.)

What the authors of the letter do not agree with here is not clear. Do they think that the workers will "not understand" the phrases "propertied classes" and "bureaucratic Zemstvo based on the social-estates"? Do they think that *urging* the Zemstvo to abandon mild speeches and to speak firmly is "overestimating ideology"? Do they imagine the workers can "gather strength" for the struggle against the autocracy if they know nothing about the attitude of the autocracy towards the Zemstvo *as well*? All this too remains unknown. One thing alone is clear and that is that the authors of the letter have a very vague idea of what the political tasks of Social-Democracy are. This is revealed still more clearly by their remark: "Such, too, is *Iskra's* attitude towards the student movement" (i.e., it also "obscures the class antagonisms"). Instead of calling on the workers to declare by means of public demonstrations that the real breeding place of unbridled violence, disorder, and outrage is not the university youth but the Russian Government (*Iskra*, No. 2\*), we ought probably to have inserted arguments in the spirit of *Rabochaya Mysl'*! Such ideas were expressed by Social-Democrats in the autumn of 1901, after the events of February and March, on the eve of a fresh upsurge of the student movement, which reveals that even in this sphere the "spontaneous" protest against the autocracy is *outstripping* the conscious Social-Democratic leadership of the movement. The spontaneous striving of the workers to defend the students who are being assaulted by the police and the Cossacks surpasses the conscious activity of the Social-Democratic organisation!

"And yet in other articles," continue the authors of the letter, "*Iskra* sharply condemns all compromise and defends, for instance, the intolerant conduct of the Guesdists."<sup>42</sup> We would advise those who are wont so conceitedly and frivolously to declare that the present disagreements among the Social-Democrats are unessential and do not justify a split, to ponder these words. Is it possible for people to work together in the same organisation, when some among them contend that we have done extremely little to explain the hostility of the autocracy to the various classes and to inform

---

\* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 414-19.—Ed.



the workers of the opposition displayed by the various social strata to the autocracy, while others among them see in this clarification a "compromise"—evidently a compromise with the theory of "economic struggle against the employers and the government"?

We urged the necessity of carrying the class struggle into the rural districts in connection with the fortieth anniversary of the emancipation of the peasantry (issue No. 3\*), and spoke of the irreconcilability of the local government bodies and the autocracy in relation to Witte's secret Memorandum (No. 4). In connection with the new law we attacked the feudal landlords and the government which serves them (No. 8\*\*) and we welcomed the illegal Zemstvo congress. We urged the Zemstvo to pass over from abject petitions (No. 8\*\*\*) to struggle. We encouraged the students, who had begun to understand the need for the political struggle, and to undertake this struggle (No. 3), while, at the same time, we lashed out at the "outrageous incomprehension" revealed by the adherents of the "purely student" movement, who called upon the students to abstain from participating in the street demonstrations (No. 3, in connection with the manifesto issued by the Executive Committee of the Moscow students on February 25). We exposed the "senseless dreams" and the "lying hypocrisy" of the cunning liberals of *Rossiia*<sup>43</sup> (No. 5), while pointing to the violent fury with which the government-gaoler persecuted "peaceful writers, aged professors, scientists, and well-known liberal Zemstvo members" (No. 5, "Police Raid on Literature"). We exposed the real significance of the programme of "state protection for the welfare of the workers" and welcomed the "valuable admission" that "it is better, by granting reforms from above, to forestall the demand for such reforms from below than to wait for those demands to be put forward" (No. 6\*\*\*\*). We encouraged the protesting statisticians (No. 7) and censured the strike-breaking statisticians (No. 9). He who sees in these tactics an obscuring of the class-consciousness of the proletariat and a *compromise with liberalism* reveals

\* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 420-28.—Ed.

\*\* Ibid., Vol. 5, pp. 95-100.—Ed.

\*\*\* Ibid., pp. 101-02.—Ed.

\*\*\*\* Ibid., pp. 87-88.—Ed.

his utter failure to understand the true significance of the programme of the *Credo* and carries out that programme *de facto*, however much he may repudiate it. For by such an approach he drags Social-Democracy towards the "economic struggle against the employers and the government" and yields to liberalism, abandons the task of actively intervening in every "liberal" issue and of determining his own, Social-Democratic, attitude towards this question.

#### IV. The Primitiveness of the Economists and the Organisation of the Revolutionaries

##### c) Organisation of Workers and Organisation of Revolutionaries

It is only natural to expect that for a Social-Democrat whose conception of the political struggle coincides with the conception of the "economic struggle against the employers and the government", the "organisation of revolutionaries" will more or less coincide with the "organisation of workers". This, in fact, is what actually happens; so that when we speak of organisation, we literally speak in different tongues. I vividly recall, for example, a conversation I once had with a fairly consistent Economist, with whom I had not been previously acquainted. We were discussing the pamphlet, *Who Will Bring About the Political Revolution?* and were soon of a mind that its principal defect was its ignoring of the question of organisation. We had begun to assume full agreement between us; but, as the conversation proceeded, it became evident that we were talking of different things. My interlocutor accused the author of ignoring strike funds, mutual benefit societies, etc., whereas I had in mind an organisation of revolutionaries as an essential factor in "bringing about" the political revolution. As soon as the disagreement became clear, there was hardly, as I remember, a single question of principle upon which I was in agreement with the Economist!

What was the source of our disagreement? It was the fact that on questions both of organisation and of politics the Economists are forever lapsing from Social-Democracy

into trade-unionism. The political struggle of Social-Democracy is far more extensive and complex than the economic struggle of the workers against the employers and the government. Similarly (indeed for that reason), the organisation of the revolutionary Social-Democratic Party must inevitably be of *a kind different* from the organisation of the workers designed for this struggle. The workers' organisation must in the first place be a trade-union organisation; secondly, it must be as broad as possible; and thirdly, it must be as public as conditions will allow (here, and further on, of course, I refer only to absolutist Russia). On the other hand, the organisation of the revolutionaries must consist first and foremost of people who make revolutionary activity their profession (for which reason I speak of the organisation of *revolutionaries*, meaning revolutionary Social-Democrats). In view of this common characteristic of the members of such an organisation, *all distinctions as between workers and intellectuals*, not to speak of distinctions of trade and profession, in both categories, *must be effaced*. Such an organisation must perforce not be very extensive and must be as secret as possible. Let us examine this threefold distinction.

In countries where political liberty exists the distinction between a trade union and a political organisation is clear enough, as is the distinction between trade unions and Social-Democracy. The relations between the latter and the former will naturally vary in each country according to historical, legal, and other conditions; they may be more or less close, complex, etc. (in our opinion they should be as close and as little complicated as possible); but there can be no question in free countries of the organisation of trade unions coinciding with the organisation of the Social-Democratic Party. In Russia, however, the yoke of the autocracy appears at first glance to obliterate all distinctions between the Social-Democratic organisation and the workers' associations, since *all* workers' associations and *all* study circles are prohibited, and since the principal manifestation and weapon of the workers' economic struggle—the strike—is regarded as a criminal (and sometimes even as a political!) offence. Conditions in our country, therefore, on the one hand, strongly “impel” the workers engaged in economic

struggle to concern themselves with political questions, and, on the other, they "impel" Social-Democrats to confound trade-unionism with Social-Democracy (and our Krichevskys, Martynovs, and Co., while diligently discussing the first kind of "impulsion", fail to notice the second). Indeed, picture to yourselves people who are immersed ninety-nine per cent in "the economic struggle against the employers and the government". Some of them will never, during the *entire* course of their activity (from four to six months), be impelled to think of the need for a more complex organisation of revolutionaries. Others, perhaps, will come across the fairly widely distributed Bernsteinian literature, from which they will become convinced of the profound importance of the forward movement of "the drab everyday struggle". Still others will be carried away, perhaps, by the seductive idea of showing the world a new example of "close and organic contact with the proletarian struggle"—contact between the trade-union and the Social-Democratic movements. Such people may argue that the later a country enters the arena of capitalism and, consequently, of the working-class movement, the more the socialists in that country may take part in, and support, the trade-union movement, and the less the reason for the existence of non-Social-Democratic trade unions. So far the argument is fully correct; unfortunately, however, some go beyond that and dream of a complete fusion of Social-Democracy with trade-unionism. We shall soon see, from the example of the Rules of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle, what a harmful effect such dreams have upon our plans of organisation.

The workers' organisations for the economic struggle should be trade-union organisations. Every Social-Democratic worker should as far as possible assist and actively work in these organisations. But, while this is true, it is certainly not in our interest to demand that only Social-Democrats should be eligible for membership in the "trade" unions, since that would only narrow the scope of our influence upon the masses. Let every worker who understands the need to unite for the struggle against the employers and the government join the trade unions. The very aim of the trade unions would be impossible of achievement, if they did not unite all who have attained at least this elementary

degree of understanding, if they were not very *broad* organisations. The broader these organisations, the broader will be our influence over them—an influence due, not only to the “spontaneous” development of the economic struggle, but to the direct and conscious effort of the socialist trade union members to influence their comrades. But a broad organisation cannot apply methods of strict secrecy (since this demands far greater training than is required for the economic struggle). How is the contradiction between the need for a large membership and the need for strictly secret methods to be reconciled? How are we to make the trade unions as public as possible? Generally speaking, there can be only two ways to this end: either the trade unions become legalised (in some countries this preceded the legalisation of the socialist and political unions), or the organisation is kept secret, but so “free” and amorphous, *lose*\* as the Germans say, that the need for secret methods becomes almost negligible as far as the bulk of the members is concerned.

The legalisation of non-socialist and non-political labour unions in Russia has begun, and there is no doubt that every advance made by our rapidly growing Social-Democratic working-class movement will multiply and encourage attempts at legalisation—attempts proceeding for the most part from supporters of the existing order, but partly also from the workers themselves and from liberal intellectuals. The banner of legality has already been hoisted by the Vasilyevs and the Zubatovs. Support has been promised and rendered by the Ozerovs and the Wormses, and followers of the new tendency are now to be found among the workers. Henceforth, we cannot but reckon with this tendency. How we are to reckon with it, on this there can be no two opinions among Social-Democrats. We must steadfastly expose any part played in this movement by the Zubatovs and the Vasilyevs, the gendarmes and the priests, and explain their real intentions to the workers. We must also expose all the conciliatory, “harmonious” notes that will be heard in the speeches of liberal politicians at legal meetings of the workers, irrespective of whether the speeches are motivated by an earnest conviction of the desirability of peaceful class

---

\* *Lose* (German)—loose.—Ed.

collaboration, by a desire to curry favour with the powers that be, or whether they are simply the result of clumsiness. Lastly, we must warn the workers against the traps often set by the police, who at such open meetings and permitted societies spy out the "fiery ones" and try to make use of legal organisations to plant their *agents provocateurs* in the illegal organisations.

Doing all this does not at all mean forgetting that *in the long run* the legalisation of the working-class movement will be to our advantage, and not to that of the Zubatovs. On the contrary, it is precisely our campaign of exposure that will help us to separate the tares from the wheat. What the tares are, we have already indicated. By the wheat we mean attracting the attention of ever larger numbers, including the most backward sections, of the workers to social and political questions, and freeing ourselves, the revolutionaries, from functions that are essentially legal (the distribution of legal books, mutual aid, etc.), the development of which will inevitably provide us with an increasing quantity of material for agitation. In this sense, we may, and should, say to the Zubatovs and the Ozerovs: Keep at it, gentlemen, do your best! Whenever you place a trap in the path of the workers (either by way of direct provocation, or by the "honest" demoralisation of the workers with the aid of "Struve-ism"<sup>44</sup>), we will see to it that you are exposed. But whenever you take a real step forward, though it be the most "timid zigzag", we will say: Please continue! And the only step that can be a real step forward is a real, if small, extension of the workers' field of action. Every such extension will be to our advantage and will help to hasten the advent of legal societies of the kind in which it will not be *agents provocateurs* who are detecting socialists, but socialists who are gaining adherents. In a word, our task is to fight the tares. It is not our business to grow wheat in flower-pots. By pulling up the tares, we clear the soil for the wheat. And while the Afanasy Ivanoviches and Pulkheria Ivanovnas<sup>45</sup> are tending their flower-pot crops, we must prepare the reapers, not only to cut down the tares of today, but to reap the wheat of tomorrow.\*

\* *Iskra's* campaign against the tares evoked the following angry outburst from *Rabocheye Dyelo*: "For *Iskra*, the signs of the times lie

Thus, *we* cannot by means of legalisation *solve* the problem of creating a trade-union organisation that will be as little secret and as extensive as possible (but we should be extremely glad if the Zubatovs and the Ozerovs disclosed to us even a partial opportunity for such a solution—to this end, however, we must strenuously combat them!). There remain secret trade-union organisations, and *we must* give all possible assistance to the workers who (as we definitely know) are adopting this course. Trade-union organisations, not only can be of tremendous value in developing and consolidating the economic struggle, but can also become a very important auxiliary to political agitation and revolutionary organisation. In order to achieve this purpose, and in order to guide the nascent trade-union movement in the channels desired by Social-Democracy, we must first understand clearly the absurdity of the plan of organisation the St. Petersburg Economists have been nursing for nearly five years. That plan is set forth in the “Rules for a Workers’ Mutual Benefit Fund” of July 1897 (*Listok “Rabotnika”*, No. 9-10, p. 46, taken from *Rabochaya Mysl*, No. 1), as well as in the “Rules for a Trade-Union Workers’ Organisation”, of October 1900 (special leaflet printed in St. Petersburg and referred to in *Iskra*, No. 1). Both these sets of rules have one main shortcoming: they set up the broad workers’ organisation in a rigidly specified structure and confound it with the organisation of revolutionaries. Let us take the last-mentioned set of rules, since it is drawn up in greater detail. The body consists of *fifty-two* paragraphs. Twenty-three deal with the structure, the method of functioning, and the competence of the “workers’ circles”, which are to be organised in every factory (“a maximum of ten persons”) and which elect “central (factory) groups”. “The central

not so much in the great events [of the spring], as in the miserable attempts of the agents of Zubatov to ‘legalise’ the working-class movement. It fails to see that these facts tell against it; for they testify that the working-class movement has assumed menacing proportions in the eyes of the government” (*Two Conferences*, p. 27). For all this we have to blame the “dogmatism” of the orthodox who “turn a deaf ear to the imperative demands of life”. They obstinately refuse to see the yard-high wheat and are combating inch-high tares! Does this not reveal a “distorted sense of perspective in regard to the Russian working-class movement” (*ibid.*, p. 27)?

group," says § 2, "observes all that goes on in its factory or workshop and keeps a record of events." "The central group presents to subscribers a monthly financial account" (§ 17), etc. Ten paragraphs are devoted to the "district organisation", and nineteen to the highly complex inter-connection between the Committee of the Workers' Organisation and the Committee of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle (elected representatives of each district and of the "executive groups"—"groups of propagandists, groups for maintaining contact with the provinces and with the organisation abroad, groups for managing stores, publications, and funds").

Social-Democracy="executive groups" in relation to the economic struggle of the workers! It would be difficult to show more glaringly how the Economists' ideas deviate from Social-Democracy to trade-unionism, and how alien to them is any idea that a Social-Democrat must concern himself first and foremost with an organisation of revolutionaries capable of guiding the *entire* proletarian struggle for emancipation. To talk of "the political emancipation of the working class" and of the struggle against "tsarist despotism", and at the same time to draft rules like these, means to have no idea whatsoever of the real political tasks of Social-Democracy. Not one of the fifty or so paragraphs reveals even a glimmer of understanding that it is necessary to conduct the widest possible political agitation among the masses, an agitation highlighting every aspect of Russian absolutism and the specific features of the various social classes in Russia. Rules like these are of no use even for the achievement of trade-union, let alone political, aims, since trade unions are organised *by trades*, of which no mention is made.

But most characteristic, perhaps, is the amazing top-heaviness of the whole "system", which attempts to bind each single factory and its "committee" by a permanent string of uniform and ludicrously petty rules and a three-stage system of election. Hemmed in by the narrow outlook of Economism, the mind is lost in details that positively reek of red tape and bureaucracy. In practice, of course, three-fourths of the clauses are never applied; on the other hand, a "secret" organisation of this kind, with its central



group in each factory, makes it very easy for the gendarmes to carry out raids on a vast scale. The Polish comrades have passed through a similar phase in their movement, with everybody enthusiastic about the extensive organisation of workers' benefit funds; but they very quickly abandoned this idea when they saw that such organisations only provided rich harvests for the gendarmes. If we have in mind broad workers' organisations, and not widespread arrests, if we do not want to provide satisfaction to the gendarmes, we must see to it that these organisations remain without any rigid formal structure. But will they be able to function in that case? Let us see what the functions are: "...To observe all that goes on in the factory and keep a record of events" (§ 2 of the Rules). Do we really require a formally established group for this purpose? Could not the purpose be better served by correspondence conducted in the illegal papers without the setting up of special groups? "...To lead the struggles of the workers for the improvement of their workshop conditions" (§ 3). This, too, requires no set organisational form. Any sensible agitator can in the course of ordinary conversation gather what the demands of the workers are and transmit them to a narrow—not a broad—organisation of revolutionaries for expression in a leaflet. "...To organise a fund ... to which subscriptions of two kopeks per ruble\* should be made" (§ 9)—and then to present to subscribers a monthly financial account (§ 17), to expel members who fail to pay their contributions (§ 10), and so forth. Why, this is a very paradise for the police; for nothing would be easier for them than to penetrate into such a secrecy of a "central factory fund", confiscate the money, and arrest the best people. Would it not be simpler to issue one-kopek or two-kopek coupons bearing the official stamp of a well-known (very narrow and very secret) organisation, or to make collections without coupons of any kind and to print reports in a certain agreed code in an illegal paper? The object would thereby be attained, but it would be a hundred times more difficult for the gendarmes to pick up clues.

I could go on analysing the Rules, but I think that what

---

\* Of wages earned.—*Tr.*

has been said will suffice. A small, compact core of the most reliable, experienced, and hardened workers, with responsible representatives in the principal districts and connected by all the rules of strict secrecy with the organisation of revolutionaries, can, with the widest support of the masses and without any formal organisation, perform *all* the functions of a trade-union organisation, in a manner, moreover, desirable to Social-Democracy. Only in this way can we secure the *consolidation* and development of a *Social-Democratic* trade-union movement, despite all the gendarmes.

It may be objected that an organisation which is so *lose* that it is not even definitely formed, and which has not even an enrolled and registered membership, cannot be called an organisation at all. Perhaps so. Not the name is important. What is important is that this "organisation without members" shall do everything that is required, and from the very outset ensure a solid connection between our future trade unions and socialism. Only an incorrigible utopian would have a *broad* organisation of workers, with elections, reports, universal suffrage, etc., under the autocracy.

The moral to be drawn from this is simple. If we begin with the solid foundation of a strong organisation of revolutionaries, we can ensure the stability of the movement as a whole and carry out the aims both of Social-Democracy and of trade unions proper. If, however, we begin with a broad workers' organisation, which is supposedly most "accessible" to the masses (but which is actually most accessible to the gendarmes and makes revolutionaries most accessible to the police), we shall achieve neither the one aim nor the other; we shall not eliminate our rule-of-thumb methods, and, because we remain scattered and our forces are constantly broken up by the police, we shall only make trade unions of the Zubatov and Ozerov type the more accessible to the masses.

What, properly speaking, should be the functions of the organisation of revolutionaries? We shall deal with this question in detail. First, however, let us examine a very typical argument advanced by our terrorist, who (sad fate!) in this matter also is a next-door neighbour to the Economist. *Svoboda*, a journal published for workers, contains in

its first issue an article entitled "Organisation", the author of which tries to defend his friends, the Economist workers of Ivanovo-Voznesensk. He writes:

"It is bad when the masses are mute and unenlightened, when the movement does not come from the rank and file. For instance, the students of a university town leave for their homes during the summer and other holidays, and immediately the workers' movement comes to a standstill. Can a workers' movement which has to be pushed on from outside be a real force? No, indeed.... It has not yet learned to walk, it is still in leading-strings. So it is in all matters. The students go off, and everything comes to a standstill. The most capable are seized; the cream is skimmed—and the milk turns sour. If the 'Committee' is arrested, everything comes to a standstill until a new one can be formed. And one never knows what sort of committee will be set up next—it may be nothing like the former. The first said one thing, the second may say the very opposite. Continuity between yesterday and tomorrow is broken, the experience of the past does not serve as a guide for the future. And all because no roots have been struck in depth, in the masses; the work is carried on not by a hundred fools, but by a dozen wise men. A dozen wise men can be wiped out at a snap, but when the organisation embraces masses, everything proceeds from them, and nobody, however he tries, can wreck the cause" (p. 63).

The facts are described correctly. The picture of our amateurism is well drawn. But the conclusions are worthy of *Rabochaya Mysl*, both as regards their stupidity and their lack of political tact. They represent the height of stupidity, because the author confuses the philosophical and social-historical question of the "depth" of the "roots" of the movement with the technical and organisational question of the best method in combating the gendarmes. They represent the height of political tactlessness, because, instead of appealing from bad leaders to good leaders, the author appeals from the leaders in general to the "masses". This is as much an attempt to drag us back organisationally as the idea of substituting excitative terrorism for political agitation drags us back politically. Indeed, I am experiencing a veritable *embarras de richesses*, and hardly know where to begin to disentangle the jumble offered up by *Svoboda*. For clarity, let me begin by citing an example. Take the Germans. It will not be denied, I hope, that theirs is a mass organisation, that in Germany everything proceeds from the masses, that the working-class movement there has learned to walk. Yet observe how these millions value their

"dozen" tried political leaders, how firmly they cling to them. Members of the hostile parties in parliament have often taunted the socialists by exclaiming: "Fine democrats you are indeed! Yours is a working-class movement only in name; in actual fact the same clique of leaders is always in evidence, the same Bebel and the same Liebknecht, year in and year out, and that goes on for decades. Your supposedly elected workers' deputies are more permanent than the officials appointed by the Emperor!" But the Germans only smile with contempt at these demagogic attempts to set the "masses" against the "leaders", to arouse bad and ambitious instincts in the former, and to rob the movement of its solidity and stability by undermining the confidence of the masses in their "dozen wise men". Political thinking is sufficiently developed among the Germans, and they have accumulated sufficient political experience to understand that without the "dozen" tried and talented leaders (and talented men are not born by the hundreds), professionally trained, schooled by long experience, and working in perfect harmony, no class in modern society can wage a determined struggle. The Germans too have had demagogues in their ranks who have flattered the "hundred fools", exalted them above the "dozen wise men", extolled the "horny hand" of the masses, and (like Most and Hasselmann) have spurred them on to reckless "revolutionary" action and sown distrust towards the firm and steadfast leaders. It was only by stubbornly and relentlessly combating all demagogic elements within the socialist movement that German socialism has managed to grow and become as strong as it is. Our wiseacres, however, at a time when Russian Social-Democracy is passing through a crisis entirely due to the lack of sufficiently trained, developed, and experienced leaders to guide the spontaneously awakening masses, cry out with the profundity of fools: "It is a bad business when the movement does not proceed from the rank and file."

"A committee of students is of no use; it is not stable." Quite true. But the conclusion to be drawn from this is that we must have a committee of professional *revolutionaries*, and it is immaterial whether a student or a worker is capable of becoming a professional revolutionary. The conclusion you draw, however, is that the working-class movement

must not be pushed on from outside! In your political innocence you fail to notice that you are playing into the hands of our Economists and fostering our amateurism. Wherein, may I ask, did our students "push on" our workers? *In the sense* that the student brought to the worker the fragments of political knowledge he himself possessed, the crumbs of socialist ideas he had managed to acquire (for the principal intellectual diet of the present-day student, legal Marxism, could furnish only the rudiments, only scraps of knowledge). There has never been too much of *such* "pushing on from outside"; on the contrary, there has so far been all too little of it in our movement, for we have been stewing too assiduously in our own juice; we have bowed far too slavishly to the elementary "economic struggle of the workers against the employers and the government". We professional revolutionaries must and will make it our business to engage in *this kind* of "pushing on" a hundred times more forcibly than we have done hitherto. But the very fact that you select so hideous a phrase as "pushing on from outside"—a phrase which cannot but rouse in the workers (at least in the workers who are as unenlightened as you yourselves) a sense of distrust towards *all* who bring them political knowledge and revolutionary experience from outside, which cannot but rouse in them an instinctive desire to resist *all* such people—proves you to be *demagogues*, and demagogues are the worst enemies of the working class.

And, please—don't hasten howling about my "uncomradely methods" of debating. I have not the least desire to doubt the purity of your intentions. As I have said, one may become a demagogue out of sheer political innocence. But I have shown that you have descended to demagoguery, and I will never tire of repeating that demagogues are the worst enemies of the working class. The worst enemies, because they arouse base instincts in the masses, because the unenlightened worker is unable to recognise his enemies in men who represent themselves, and sometimes sincerely so, as his friends. The worst enemies, because in the period of disunity and vacillation, when our movement is just beginning to take shape, nothing is easier than to employ demagogic methods to mislead the masses, who can realise their error only later by bitter experience. That is why the

slogan of the day for the Russian Social-Democrat must be —resolute struggle against *Svoboda* and *Rabocheye Dyelo*, both of which have sunk to the level of demagoguery. We shall deal with this further in greater detail.\*

"A dozen wise men can be more easily wiped out than a hundred fools." This wonderful truth (for which the hundred fools will always applaud you) appears obvious only because in the very midst of the argument you have skipped from one question to another. You began by talking and continued to talk of the unearthing of a "committee", of the unearthing of an "organisation", and now you skip to the question of unearthing the movement's "roots" in their "depths". The fact is, of course, that our movement cannot be unearthed, for the very reason that it has countless thousands of roots deep down among the masses; but that is not the point at issue. As far as "deep roots" are concerned, we cannot be "unearthed" even now, despite all our amateurism, and yet we all complain, and cannot but complain, that the "organisations" are being unearthed and as a result it is impossible to maintain continuity in the movement. But since you raise the question of *organisations* being unearthed and persist in your opinion, I assert that it is far more difficult to unearth a dozen wise men than a hundred fools. This position I will defend, no matter how much you instigate the masses against me for my "anti-democratic" views, etc. As I have stated repeatedly, by "wise men", in connection with organisation, I mean *professional revolutionaries*, irrespective of whether they have developed from among students or working men. I assert: 1) that no revolutionary movement can endure without a stable organisation of leaders maintaining continuity; 2) that the broader the popular mass drawn spontaneously into the struggle, which forms the basis of the movement and participates in it, the more urgent the need for such an organisation, and the more solid this organisation must be (for it is much easier for all

---

\* For the moment let us observe merely that our remarks on "pushing on from outside" and *Svoboda's* other disquisitions on organisation apply in their entirety to all the Economists, including the adherents of *Rabocheye Dyelo*; for some of them have actively preached and defended such views on organisation, while others among them have drifted into them.

sorts of demagogues to side-track the more backward sections of the masses); 3) that such an organisation must consist chiefly of people professionally engaged in revolutionary activity; 4) that in an autocratic state, the more we *confine* the membership of such an organisation to people who are professionally engaged in revolutionary activity and who have been professionally trained in the art of combating the political police, the more difficult will it be to unearth the organisation; and 5) the *greater* will be the number of people from the working class and from the other social classes who will be able to join the movement and perform active work in it.

I invite our Economists, terrorists, and "Economists-terrorists"\* to confute these propositions. At the moment, I shall deal only with the last two points. The question as to whether it is easier to wipe out "a dozen wise men" or "a hundred fools" reduces itself to the question, above considered, whether it is possible to have a mass *organisation* when the maintenance of strict secrecy is essential. We can never give a mass organisation that degree of secrecy without which there can be no question of persistent and continuous struggle against the government. To concentrate all secret functions in the hands of as small a number of professional revolutionaries as possible does not mean that the latter will "do the thinking for all" and that the rank and file will not take an active part in the *movement*. On the contrary, the membership will promote increasing numbers of the professional revolutionaries from its ranks; for it will know that it is not enough for a few students and

\* This term is perhaps more applicable to *Svoboda* than the former, for in an article entitled "The Regeneration of Revolutionism" the publication defends terrorism, while in the article at present under review it defends Economism. One might say of *Svoboda* that "it would if it could, but it can't." Its wishes and intentions are of the very best—but the result is utter confusion; this is chiefly due to the fact that, while *Svoboda* advocates continuity of organisation, it refuses to recognise continuity of revolutionary thought and Social-Democratic theory. It wants to revive the professional revolutionary ("The Regeneration of Revolutionism"), and to that end proposes, first, excitative terrorism, and, secondly, "an organisation of average workers" (*Svoboda*, No. 1, p. 66, et seq.), as less likely to be "pushed on from outside". In other words, it proposes to pull the house down to use the timber for heating it.

for a few working men waging the economic struggle to gather in order to form a "committee", but that it takes years to train oneself to be a professional revolutionary; and the rank and file will "think", not only of amateurish methods, but of such training. Centralisation of the secret functions of the *organisation* by no means implies centralisation of all the functions of the *movement*. Active participation of the widest masses in the illegal press will not diminish because a "dozen" professional revolutionaries centralise the secret functions connected with this work; on the contrary, it will *increase* tenfold. In this way, and in this way alone, shall we ensure that reading the illegal press, writing for it, and to some extent even distributing it, will *almost cease to be secret work*, for the police will soon come to realise the folly and impossibility of judicial and administrative red-tape procedure over every copy of a publication that is being distributed in the thousands. This holds not only for the press, but for every function of the movement, even for demonstrations. The active and widespread participation of the masses will not suffer; on the contrary, it will benefit by the fact that a "dozen" experienced revolutionaries, trained professionally no less than the police, will centralise all the secret aspects of the work—the drawing up of leaflets, the working out of approximate plans; and the appointing of bodies of leaders for each urban district, for each factory district, and for each educational institution, etc. (I know that exception will be taken to my "undemocratic" views, but I shall reply below fully to this anything but intelligent objection.) Centralisation of the most secret functions in an organisation of revolutionaries will not diminish, but rather increase the extent and enhance the quality of the activity of a large number of other organisations, that are intended for a broad public and are therefore as loose and as non-secret as possible, such as workers' trade unions; workers' self-education circles and circles for reading illegal literature; and socialist, as well as democratic, circles among *all* other sections of the population; etc., etc. We must have such circles, trade unions, and organisations everywhere in *as large a number as possible* and with the widest variety of functions; but it would be absurd and harmful to *confound* them with the



organisation of revolutionaries, to efface the border-line between them, to make still more hazy the all too faint recognition of the fact that in order to "serve" the mass movement we must have people who will devote themselves exclusively to Social-Democratic activities, and that such people must *train* themselves patiently and steadfastly to be professional revolutionaries.

Yes, this recognition is incredibly dim. Our worst sin with regard to organisation consists in the fact that *by our primitiveness we have lowered the prestige of revolutionaries in Russia*. A person who is flabby and shaky on questions of theory, who has a narrow outlook, who pleads the spontaneity of the masses as an excuse for his own sluggishness, who resembles a trade-union secretary more than a spokesman of the people, who is unable to conceive of a broad and bold plan that would command the respect even of opponents, and who is inexperienced and clumsy in his own professional art—the art of combating the political police—such a man is not a revolutionary, but a wretched amateur!

Let no active worker take offence at these frank remarks, for as far as insufficient training is concerned, I apply them first and foremost to myself. I used to work in a study circle that set itself very broad, all-embracing tasks; and all of us, members of that circle, suffered painfully and acutely from the realisation that we were acting as amateurs at a moment in history when we might have been able to say, varying a well-known statement: "Give us an organisation of revolutionaries, and we will overturn Russia!" The more I recall the burning sense of shame I then experienced, the bitterer become my feelings towards those pseudo-Social-Democrats whose preachings "bring disgrace on the calling of a revolutionary", who fail to understand that our task is not to champion the degrading of the revolutionary to the level of an amateur, but *to raise* the amateurs to the level of revolutionaries.

Written in the autumn  
of 1901-February 1902  
Published in book form in March  
1902, Stuttgart

*Collected Works*, Vol. 5,  
pp. 373-408; 412-17;  
421-36; 451-67

---

## Draft Resolution on the Economic Struggle for the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.

The congress deems it absolutely essential in all cases to support and develop in every way the economic struggle of the workers and their trade unions (principally the all-Russia unions) and from the very outset to ensure that the economic struggle and the trade-union movement in Russia have a Social-Democratic character.

Written June-July not later than 17 (30), 1903

First published in 1927 in *Lenin Miscellany VI*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 473

---

## *From One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*

(The Crisis in Our Party)

... Incidentally, the example of the trade unions is particularly significant for an assessment of the controversial question of § 1. That these unions *should* work "under the control and direction" of the Social-Democratic organisations, of that there can be no two opinions among Social-Democrats. But *on those grounds* to confer on all members of trade unions the right to "proclaim themselves" members of the Social-Democratic Party would be an obvious absurdity and would constitute a double danger: on the one hand, of *narrowing* the dimensions of the trade union movement and thus weakening the solidarity of the workers; and, on the other, of opening the door of the Social-Democratic Party to vagueness and vacillation. The German Social-Democrats had occasion to solve a similar problem in a practical instance, in the celebrated case of the Hamburg bricklayers working on piece rates.<sup>46</sup> The Social-Democrats did not hesitate for a moment to proclaim strike-breaking dishonourable in Social-Democratic eyes, that is, to acknowledge that to direct and support strikes was *their own* vital concern; but at the same time they just as resolutely rejected the demand for identifying the interests of the Party with the interests of the trade unions, for *making the Party responsible* for individual acts of individual trade unions. The Party should and will strive to imbue the trade unions with its spirit and bring them under its influence; but precisely in order to do so it must distinguish the fully Social-

Democratic elements in these unions (the elements belonging to the Social-Democratic Party) from those which are not fully class-conscious and politically active, and not confuse the two, as Comrade Axelrod would have us do.

"...Centralisation of the most secret functions in an organisation of revolutionaries will not diminish, but rather increase the extent and enhance the quality of the activity of a large number of other organisations that are intended for a broad public and are therefore as loose and as non-secret as possible, such as workers' trade unions; workers' self-education circles and circles for reading illegal literature; and socialist, as well as democratic, circles among *all* other sections of the population; etc., etc. We must have such circles, trade unions, and organisations everywhere in *as large a number as possible* and with the widest variety of functions; but it would be absurd and harmful to *confound* them with the organisation of *revolutionaries*, to efface the border-line between them..." (p. 96).<sup>\*</sup> This quotation shows how out of place it was for Comrade Martov to remind me that the organisation of revolutionaries should be *enveloped* by broad organisations of workers. I had already pointed this out in *What Is To Be Done?*—and in *A Letter to a Comrade* I developed this idea more concretely. Factory circles, I wrote there, "are particularly important to us: the main strength of the movement lies in the organisation of the workers at the *large* factories, for the large factories (and mills) contain not only the predominant part of the working class, as regards numbers, but even more as regards influence, development, and fighting capacity. Every factory must be our fortress.... The factory subcommittee should endeavour to embrace the whole factory, the largest possible number of the workers, with a network of all kinds of circles (or agents).... All groups, circles, subcommittees, etc., should enjoy the status of committee institutions or branches of a committee. Some of them will openly declare their wish to join the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party and, *if endorsed* by the committee, will join the Party, and will assume definite functions (on the instructions of, or in agreement with, the committee), will undertake to obey

---

<sup>\*</sup> See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 466.—*Ed.*

the orders of the Party organs, *receive the same rights as all Party members*, and be regarded as immediate candidates for membership of the committee, etc. Others *will not join* the R.S.D.L.P., and will have the status of circles formed by Party members, or associated with one Party group or another, etc." (pp. 17-18).<sup>\*</sup> The words I have underlined make it particularly clear that the *idea* of my formulation of § 1 was already fully expressed in *A Letter to a Comrade*. The conditions for joining the Party are directly indicated there, namely: 1) a certain degree of organisation, and 2) endorsement by a Party committee. A page later I roughly indicate also what groups and organisations should (or should not) be admitted to the Party, and for what reasons: "The distributing groups should belong to the R.S.D.L.P. and know a certain number of its members and functionaries. The groups for studying labour conditions and drawing up trade union demands need not necessarily belong to the R.S.D.L.P. Groups of students, officers, or office employees engaged in self-education *in conjunction with one or two Party members* should in some cases not even be aware that these belong to the Party, etc." (pp. 18-19).<sup>\*\*</sup>

There you have additional material on the subject of the "open visor"! Whereas the formula of Comrade Martov's draft does not even touch on relations between the Party and the organisations, I pointed out nearly a year before the congress that some organisations should belong to the Party, and others not. In *A Letter to a Comrade* the idea I advocated at the congress was already clearly outlined. The matter might be put graphically in the following way. Depending on degree of organisation in general and of secrecy of organisation in particular, roughly the following categories may be distinguished: 1) organisations of revolutionaries; 2) organisations of workers, as broad and as varied as possible (I confine myself to the working class, taking it as self-evident that, under certain conditions, certain elements of other classes will also be included here). These two categories constitute the Party. Further, 3) workers' organisations associated with the Party; 4) workers' organisations

<sup>\*</sup> See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, pp. 242-43, 244-45, 246.—*Ed.*

<sup>\*\*</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, p. 247.—*Ed.*

not associated with the Party but actually under its control and direction; 5) unorganised elements of the working class, who in part also come under the direction of the Social-Democratic Party, at any rate during big manifestations of the class struggle. That, approximately, is how the matter presents itself to me. As Comrade Martov sees it, on the contrary, the border-line of the Party remains absolutely vague, for "every striker" can "proclaim himself a Party member". What benefit is there in this looseness? A widespread "title". Its harm is that it introduces a *disorganising* idea, the confusing of class and party.

Written February-May, 1904

Published in book form  
in May 1904, Geneva

*Collected Works*, Vol. 7,  
pp. 264-67

---

## ***From Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution***

Intellectual bourgeois know full well that they will not be able to get rid of the working-class movement. That is why they do not at all come out against the working-class movement as such, or against the proletariat's class struggle as such—no, they even pay lip service to the right to strike and to a genteel class struggle, since they understand the working-class movement and the class struggle in the Brentano or Hirsch-Duncker sense. In other words they are fully prepared to “yield” to the workers the right to strike and freedom of association (which in fact has already been almost won by the workers themselves), if only the workers renounce their “rebelliousness”, their “narrow-minded revolutionism”, their hostility to “compromises of practical use”, their claims and aspirations to place upon the “revolution of the whole Russian people” the imprint of *their* class struggle, the imprint of proletarian consistency, proletarian determination, and “plebeian Jacobinism”. That is why intellectual bourgeois all over Russia are exerting every effort, resorting to thousands of ways and means—books, \* lectures, speeches, talks, etc., etc.—to imbue the workers with the ideas of (bourgeois) sober-mindedness, (liberal) practicalness, (opportunist) realism, (Brentano) class struggle,<sup>47</sup> (Hirsch-Duncker) trade unions, etc. The last two slogans are particularly convenient for the bourgeois of the “Constitutional-Democratic” party, the *Osvobozhdeniye* party, since in appearance they coincide with Marxist slo-

---

\* Cf. Prokopovich, *The Labour Question in Russia*.

gans, and, with some minor omissions and slight distortions, can easily be confused with and sometimes even passed off as Social-Democratic slogans. For instance, the legal liberal newspaper *Rassvet*<sup>48</sup> (which we shall some day try to discuss in greater detail with *Proletary*<sup>49</sup> readers) frequently says such "outspoken" things about the class struggle, the possible deception of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, the working-class movement, the proletariat's initiative, etc., etc., that the inattentive reader or unenlightened worker might easily be led to believe that its "Social-Democratism" is genuine. Actually, however, it is a bourgeois imitation of Social-Democratism, an opportunist distortion and perversion of the concept of the class struggle.

At the root of all this gigantic bourgeois subterfuge (gigantic in the extent of its influence on the masses) lies an urge to reduce the working-class movement mainly to a trade union movement, to keep it as far away as possible from an independent policy (i.e., one that is revolutionary and directed towards a democratic dictatorship), "to make the idea of the class struggle overshadow, in the workers' minds, the idea of a Russian revolution of the whole people".

As the reader will perceive, we have turned the *Osvobozhdeniye* formulation upside down. This is an excellent formulation, one that excellently expresses two views upon the proletariat's role in a democratic revolution—the bourgeois view and the Social-Democratic view. The bourgeoisie wants to confine the proletariat to the trade union movement, and thereby to "make the idea of the (*Brentano*) class struggle overshadow in its mind the idea of a Russian revolution of the whole people"—fully in the spirit of the Bernsteinian authors of the *Credo*, who tried to make the idea of a "purely working-class movement" overshadow in the workers' minds the idea of political struggle. On the contrary, Social-Democracy wants to develop the proletariat's class struggle to the level of leadership in the Russian revolution of the whole people, i.e., to bring that revolution to the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.

The revolution in our country is one of the whole people, says the bourgeoisie to the proletariat. As a separate class, you should, therefore, confine yourselves to your class struggle; in the name of "common sense" you should



devote your attention mainly to the trade unions and their legalisation; you should consider these trade unions as "the most important starting-point in your political education and organisation"; in a revolutionary situation you should for the most part draw up "sound" resolutions like the new-*Iskra* resolution; you should give heed to resolutions "more favourably inclined towards the liberals"; you should show preference for leaders with a tendency to become "practical leaders of the real political movement of the working class", and should "preserve the realistic elements of the Marxist world outlook" (if you have unfortunately already become infected with the "stringent formulas" of this "unscientific" catechism).

The revolution in our country is one of the whole people, the Social-Democrats say to the proletariat. As the most progressive and the only thoroughly revolutionary class, you should strive to play not merely a most active part in it, but the leading part as well. Therefore, you must not confine yourself within a narrowly conceived framework of the class struggle, understood mainly as the trade union movement; on the contrary, you must strive to extend the framework and the content of your class struggle so as to make it *include* not only *all* the aims of the present, democratic Russian revolution of the whole people, but the aims of the subsequent socialist revolution as well. Therefore, without ignoring the trade union movement, or refusing to take advantage of even the slightest legal opportunities, you must in a revolutionary period bring into the forefront the tasks of an insurrection and the formation of a revolutionary army and a revolutionary government, as being the only way to the people's complete victory over tsarism, to the achievement of a democratic republic and genuine political freedom.

It would be superfluous to speak about the half-hearted and inconsistent stand, naturally so pleasing to the bourgeoisie, taken on this question by the new-*Iskra* resolutions because of their mistaken "line".

Written June-July 1905  
Published in book form  
by the C.C., R.S.D.L.P.  
in July 1905, Geneva

*Collected Works*, Vol. 9,  
pp. 119-22

---

## ***From The Jena Congress of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party***<sup>50</sup>

Congresses of the German Social-Democrats have long become events whose importance goes far beyond the confines of the German labour movement. The German Social-Democratic movement ranks first in respect of organisation, integrality and coherence, and the extent and rich content of its Marxist literature. It is natural that under such circumstances resolutions of the German Social-Democratic congresses also frequently acquire almost international significance. Such was the case with the question of the latest opportunist tendencies in socialism (Bernsteinism). The decision of the Dresden Social-Democratic Congress, which confirmed the old and tested tactics of revolutionary Social-Democracy, was adopted by the Amsterdam International Socialist Congress, and has now become the common decision of the whole class-conscious proletariat throughout the world.<sup>51</sup> Such is now the case too. The question of a mass political strike—the main question at the Jena Congress—is agitating the entire international Social-Democratic movement. It has been brought to the fore lately by events in a number of countries, including Russia, and even perhaps Russia in particular. The German Social-Democrats' decision will undoubtedly exercise considerable influence on the entire international labour movement by giving support and strength to the revolutionary spirit of militant workers....

Another question that came up for discussion at Jena prior to the question of political strike is also highly instruc-

tive for Russia. This was the question of the May Day celebrations, or, to be more exact (to take the gist of the matter and not the item that gave rise to the discussion), the question of the relation of the trade union movement to the Social-Democratic Party. *Proletary* has spoken several times about the profound impression made on German Social-Democrats, and not only on them alone, by the Cologne Trade Union Congress.<sup>52</sup> It became more than evident at this congress that even in Germany, where the traditions of Marxism and its influence are strongest, *anti-socialist* tendencies, tendencies towards "pure trade-unionism" of the British, i.e., absolutely bourgeois type, are developing in the trade unions—mark you, *Social-Democratic* trade unions. That is why from the question of a May Day demonstration in its literal sense, there inevitably arose at the Jena Congress the question of trade-unionism and Social-Democracy, the question of Economism, to speak in terms of trends within the Russian Social-Democratic movement.

Fischer, who delivered the report on the question of May Day, frankly stated that it would be a bad mistake to ignore the fact that in the trade unions the socialist spirit is disappearing now here, now there. Things had gone so far that, for instance, Bringmann, representative of the carpenters' union, had uttered and published statements like the following: "The strike on May Day is like a foreign body in the human body." "In the given circumstances the trade unions are the sole means for improving the condition of the workers," etc. And these "symptoms of disease", as Fischer aptly termed them, are being supplemented by a number of others. In Germany, as in Russia and indeed everywhere, a narrow trade-unionism, or Economism, is linking up with opportunism (revisionism). The newspaper published by this same carpenters' union wrote about the crumbling foundations of scientific socialism, the erroneousness of the theory of crises, the theory of collapse, etc. The revisionist Calwer did not call on the workers to show discontent or increase their demands, but to be modest, etc., etc. Leibknecht met with approval from the congress when he spoke against the idea of the trade unions' "neutrality", and remarked that "Bebel, it is true, also spoke in favour of neutrality. but. in my opinion. this is one of the few points

on which Bebel does not have the backing of the majority of the Party".

Bebel himself denied that he had advised the trade unions to be neutral with regard to the Social-Democratic movement. Bebel fully recognised the danger of narrow trade-unionism. He went on to say that he knew even worse examples of this craft union apathy: young trade union leaders go so far as to jeer at the Party in general, at socialism in general, at the theory of the class struggle. These statements of Bebel's evoked general indignation at the Social-Democratic Congress. There was loud applause when he resolutely declared: "Comrades, be on your guard, think of what you are doing; you are travelling a fatal path, which in the end will lead to your doom."

It thus stands to the credit of the German Social-Democratic movement that it faced the danger squarely. It did not gloss over the extremes of Economism, or invent lame excuses and subterfuges (such as were so abundantly invented by our Plekhanov, for instance, after the Second Congress). No, it bluntly named the disease, resolutely condemned the injurious tendencies, and straightforwardly and openly called on all Party members to combat them. This is instructive to Russian Social-Democrats, some of whom have earned the praise of Mr. Struve for having begun to "see the light" on the question of the trade union movement.

Written in September 1905

First published in 1924  
in the magazine

*Pod Znamenem Marksizma*  
(Under the Banner of Marxism)  
No. 2

*Collected Works*, Vol. 9,  
pp. 290, 292-94

---

To S. I. Gusev

*To Nation from Lenin*

October 13, 1905

Dear friend,

The resolution of the Odessa Committee on the trade union struggle ("decisions" No. 6 or 5—it is not clear; in letter No. 24. It is dated September 1905) seems to me highly erroneous. The excitement of the struggle against the Mensheviks<sup>53</sup> naturally explains this, but one must not fall into the other extreme. And that is just what this resolution does. I venture, therefore, to make a critical analysis of the Odessa Committee's resolution, and would ask the comrades to discuss my remarks, which are in no way due to a desire to find fault.

The resolution is in three (unnumbered) parts in the preamble, and five (numbered) parts in the resolution proper. The first part (the opening paragraph of the preamble) is quite good: to undertake "leadership of *all* manifestations of the class struggle of the proletariat" and "never to forget the task" of leading the trade union struggle. Splendid. Further, the second point, that the task of preparing for an armed uprising comes "into the forefront", and (the third or final point of the preamble) "in consequence of this the task of leading the trade union struggle of the proletariat inevitably recedes into the background". This, in my opinion, is wrong theoretically and incorrect from the point of view of tactics.

It is wrong theoretically to equate the *two tasks* as if they were on the same level: "the task of preparing for an armed uprising" and "the task of leading the trade union struggle". The one task is said to be in the forefront, the other in the background. To speak like that means comparing and con-

trasting things of a different order. The armed uprising is a method of political struggle at a given moment. The trade union struggle is one of the constant forms of the whole workers' movement, one always needed under capitalism and essential at all times. In a passage quoted by me in *What Is To Be Done?* Engels distinguishes three basic forms of the proletarian struggle: economic, political, and theoretical—that is to say, trade union, political, and theoretical (scientific, ideological, and philosophical). How can one of these basic forms of struggle (the trade union form) be put on a level with a *method* of another basic form of struggle at a given moment? How can the whole trade union struggle, as a "task", be put on a level with the present *and by far not the only* method of political struggle? These are incommensurable things, something like adding tenths to hundredths without reducing them to a common denominator. In my opinion, both these points (the second and third) of the preamble should be deleted. Alongside "the task of leading the trade union struggle" can be put only the task of leading the general political struggle as a whole, the task of waging the general ideological struggle as a whole, and not some particular, given, modern tasks of the political or ideological struggle. In place of these two points mention should be made of the necessity of never for a moment forgetting the political struggle, the education of the working class in all the fullness of Social-Democratic ideas, and the need to achieve a close, indissoluble connection between all manifestations of the workers' movement for creating an integral, truly Social-Democratic movement. This indication could be the second point of the preamble. The third could mention the necessity of warning against the narrow conception and narrow formulation of the trade union struggle, which are zealously disseminated by the bourgeoisie. I am not, of course, putting forward a draft for the resolution, I am not touching on the question whether it is worth while making special mention of this; for the time being I am merely examining what expression of your thought would be theoretically correct.

Tactically, the resolution in its present form puts the case for an armed uprising rather lamely. An armed uprising is the highest method of *political* struggle. Its success from the

point of view of the proletariat, i.e., the success of a proletarian uprising under Social-Democratic leadership, and not of any other kind of uprising, requires extensive development of all aspects of the workers' movement. Hence the idea of contraposing the task of an uprising to the task of leading the trade union struggle is supremely incorrect. In this way the task of the uprising is played down, belittled. Instead of summing up and crowning the *entire* workers' movement as a whole, the result is that the task of the uprising is dealt with as a thing apart. Two things are, as it were, mixed up: a resolution on the trade unions struggle in general (this is the *subject* of the Odessa Committee's resolution), and a resolution on the disposition of forces in the present work of the Odessa Committee (your resolution goes off on this tack, but that's quite another pair of shoes).

I pass on to the numbered points of the part comprising the resolution proper.

Ad I. "To expose the illusions" "which are bound up with the trade unions"... this is more or less passable, although it were best deleted. Firstly, it belongs to the preamble, where the inseparable connection of all aspects of the movement should be pointed out. Secondly, the nature of the illusions is not stated. If this is to be inserted at all, there should be added: bourgeois illusions as to the possibility of meeting the economic and other needs of the working class in capitalist society.

..."strongly emphasising *their* [the unions'] narrowness compared with the ultimate aims of the workers' movement". It follows that all trade unions are "narrow". What about *Social-Democratic* trade unions which are linked with the political organisation of the proletariat? The crux of the matter is not that trade unions are "narrow", but that this one aspect (and narrow just because it is one aspect) should be bound up with others. Consequently, these words should either be thrown out or further mention should be made of the need to establish and strengthen the *connection* between one aspect and all the others, the need to imbue the trade unions with *Social-Democratic* content, *Social-Democratic* propaganda, and to draw them into *all* Social-Democratic work, etc.

Ad II. All right.

Ad III. For the reasons stated, it is incorrect to compare the task of the trade unions with the "most urgent and primary task" of an armed uprising. There is no need to speak of the armed uprising in a resolution on the trade union struggle, for the former is a means for the "overthrow of the tsarist autocracy" which is mentioned in point II. The trade unions could broaden the basis from which we shall draw strength for an uprising, so that, I say once again, it is erroneous to contrapose one to the other.

Ad IV. "To wage a vigorous ideological struggle against the so-called Minority", which is reverting to "Economism" "in problems of the trade unions". Isn't this too general for a resolution of the Odessa Committee? Doesn't it seem an exaggeration? After all, there has been no criticism in the press of any resolution of the Mensheviks on the "trade unions". It has merely been pointed out that the liberals praise them for a tendency to fall over backwards in their zeal on this question. The only [inference] to be drawn from this is that we too must show zeal, without however "falling over backwards" in the attempt. I think this point should either be deleted altogether, leaving only a warning against narrowness and mentioning the struggle against the tendencies of the bourgeoisie and liberals to distort the tasks of the trade unions, or it should be formulated specially in connection with some particular resolution of the Mensheviks (I do not know of such resolutions at the present time, unless some kind of Akim resolutions appeared among you in the South).

Ad V. Now this is the real thing. The words "and, if possible, leadership" I would replace by "and leadership". We do everything "if possible". The insertion of these words here of all places may be misinterpreted in the sense that we strive less for leadership, etc.

Generally speaking I think we should be careful not to exaggerate the struggle against the Mensheviks on this issue. This is probably just the time when trade unions will soon begin to spring up. We must not stand aloof, and above all not give any occasion for thinking that we ought to stand aloof, but endeavour to take part, to influence, etc. For there is a special section of workers, elderly family men, who will make very little contribution to the political struggle at present, but very much to the trade union struggle. We must



make use of this section, merely guiding their steps in this field. It is important that at the very outset Russian Social-Democrats should strike the right note in regard to the trade unions, and at once create a tradition of Social-Democratic initiative in this matter, of Social-Democratic participation, of Social-Democratic leadership. In practice, of course, there may not be enough forces, but that is quite another question; even so, given an ability to make use of all the available forces, some will always be found for the trade unions as well. Forces have been found for writing a resolution on the trade unions, i.e., for ideological guidance, and that's the crux of the matter!

I wish you all the best and ask you to drop me a line about receipt of this letter and about your thoughts in connection with it.

Yours,  
*N. Lenin*

Sent from Geneva  
to Odessa

First published in 1926  
in *Lenin Miscellany V*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 34,  
pp. 355-59

---

## ***From The Political Strike and the Street Fighting in Moscow***

The revolutionary events in Moscow have been the first flashes of lightning in a thunderstorm and they have lit up a new field of battle. The promulgation of the State Duma Act<sup>54</sup> and the conclusion of peace<sup>55</sup> have marked the beginning of a new period in the history of the Russian revolution. Already weary of the workers' persistent struggle and disturbed by the spectre of "uninterrupted revolution", the liberal bourgeoisie has heaved a sigh of relief and joyously caught at the sop thrown to it. All along the line a struggle has begun against the idea of a boycott, and liberalism has turned openly towards the right. Unfortunately, even among the Social-Democrats (in the new-*Iskra* camp) there are unstable people who are prepared on certain terms to support these bourgeois traitors to the revolution, and to take the State Duma "seriously". The events in Moscow, it may be hoped, will put the sceptics to shame, and will help the doubters to make a proper appraisal of the state of affairs on the new field of battle. Anæmic intellectuals' dreams of the possibility of popular elections under the autocracy, as well as illusions harboured by dull-witted liberals regarding the State Duma's crucial importance, vanished into thin air at the very first major revolutionary action by the proletariat.

Our information on the Moscow events is as yet (October 12, N. S.) very meagre. It is confined to brief and often contradictory reports in foreign newspapers, and to censor-

screened accounts of the beginning of the movement, published in the legal press. One thing is certain: in its initial stage the Moscow workers' struggle proceeded along lines that have become customary during the past revolutionary year. The working-class movement has left its imprint on the entire Russian revolution. Starting with sporadic strikes it rapidly developed into mass strikes, on the one hand, and into street demonstrations, on the other. In 1905 the political strike has become an established form of the movement, developing before our eyes into insurrection. Whereas it took the entire working-class movement of Russia ten years to reach its present (and of course far from final) stage, the movement in certain parts of the country has progressed in a few days from a mere strike to a tremendous revolutionary outbreak.

The compositors' strike in Moscow, we are informed, was started by politically backward workers. But the movement immediately slipped out of their control, and became a broad trade union movement. Workers of other trades joined in. Street demonstrations by workers, inevitable if only for the purpose of letting uninformed fellow-workers learn of the strike, turned into political demonstrations, with revolutionary songs and speeches. Long suppressed bitterness against the vile farce of "popular" elections to the State Duma came to the surface. The mass strike developed into a mass mobilisation of fighters for genuine liberty. The radical students appeared on the scene, who in Moscow passed a resolution absolutely analogous to that of the St. Petersburg students. In the language of free citizens, not of cringing officials, this resolution very properly branded the State Duma as brazen mockery of the people, and called for a struggle for a republic, for the convocation of a genuinely popular and genuinely constituent assembly by a revolutionary provisional government. The proletariat and progressive sections of the revolutionary democrats began street fighting against the tsarist army and police.

This is how the movement developed in Moscow. On Saturday, September 24 (October 7), the compositors were no longer alone—the tobacco factories and electric trams were also at a standstill, and a bakers' strike had begun. In the evening big demonstrations were held, attended, besides

workers and students, by very many "outsiders" (revolutionary workers and radical students no longer regarded each other as outsiders at open actions by the people). The Cossacks and gendarmes did their utmost to disperse the demonstrators, who kept reassembling. The crowd offered resistance to the police and the Cossacks; revolver shots were fired and many policemen were wounded.

On Sunday, September 25 (October 8), events at once took a formidable turn. At 11 a. m. workers began to assemble in the streets, with the crowd singing the *Marseillaise*. Revolutionary mass meetings were held, and printing-shops whose staff refused to strike were wrecked. Bakeries and gunsmiths' shops were attacked, for the workers needed bread to live and arms to fight for freedom (just as the French revolutionary song has it). It was only after stubborn resistance that the Cossacks managed to disperse the demonstrators. There was a regular battle on Tverskaya Street, near the Governor-General's house. In front of the Filippov bakery a crowd of bakers' apprentices assembled. As the management of the bakery subsequently declared, they were going out peacefully into the street, after stopping work in solidarity with the other strikers. A Cossack detachment attacked the crowd, who made their way into a house, climbed on to the roof and into the garrets, and showered the soldiers with stones. There began a regular siege of the house, with the troops firing on the workers. All communication was cut. Two companies of grenadiers made a flank movement, penetrated into the house from the rear, and captured the enemy's stronghold. One hundred and ninety-two apprentices were arrested, of whom eight were injured; two workers were killed. There were injured among the police and the troops, a captain of gendarmes sustaining fatal injuries.

Naturally, this information is extremely incomplete. According to private telegrams, quoted in some foreign newspapers, the brutality of the Cossacks and soldiers knew no bounds. The Filippov bakery management has protested against the unprovoked outrages perpetrated by the troops. A reputable Belgian newspaper has published a report that janitors were busy cleaning the streets of traces of blood. This minor detail—it says—testifies to the seriousness of the struggle more than lengthy reports can. On the basis

of information from private sources that has found its way into the press, *Vorwärts*<sup>56</sup> has stated that in Tverskaya Street 10,000 strikers clashed with an infantry battalion, which fired several volleys. The ambulance service had its hands full. It is estimated that no less than 50 people were killed and as many as 600 injured. The arrested are reported to have been taken to army barracks, where they were mercilessly and brutally manhandled, being made to run the gauntlet. It is further reported that during the street fighting the officers distinguished themselves by their inhuman brutality, even towards women (a St. Petersburg cable from the special correspondent of the conservative bourgeois *Temps*,<sup>57</sup> dated October 10 [September 27]).

Information on the events of the subsequent days is more and more scanty. The workers' wrath mounted frightfully, the movement gathering momentum. The government took all measures to ban or slash all reports. Foreign newspapers have openly written of the contradiction between the reassuring news from the official agencies (which at one time were believed) and the news transmitted to St. Petersburg by telephone. Gaston Leroux wired to the Paris *Matin*<sup>58</sup> that the censorship was performing prodigies by way of preventing the spread of news that might be in the least alarming. Monday, September 26 (October 9), he wrote, was one of the most sanguinary days in the history of Russia. There was fighting in all the main streets and even near the Governor-General's residence. The demonstrators unfurled a red flag. Many were killed or injured.

The reports in other papers are contradictory. Only one thing is certain—the strike is spreading and has been joined by most workers employed at the big factories, and even in the light industries. The railwaymen too have stopped work. The strike is becoming general. (Tuesday, October 10 [September 27], and Wednesday.)

The situation is extremely grave. The movement is spreading to St. Petersburg: the workers of the San-Galli Works have already downed tools.

This is as far as our information goes to date. Any complete appraisal of the Moscow events on the strength of such information is, of course, out of the question. One still cannot say whether these events are a full-scale rehearsal for

a decisive proletarian onslaught on the autocracy, or whether they are actually the beginning of this onslaught; whether they are only an extension of the "usual" methods of struggle described above to a new area of Central Russia, or whether they are destined to mark the beginning of a higher form of struggle and of a more decisive uprising.

*Proletary* No. 21,  
October 17 (4), 1905

*Collected Works*, Vol. 9,  
pp. 347-51

---

## Note to M. Borisov's Article "On the Trade Union Movement and the Tasks of Social-Democracy" <sup>59</sup>

*From the Editors.* It is with pleasure that we publish this article by a comrade engaged in practical work in Russia, since an all-round discussion of the trade union question is now on the order of the day. Only the experience of the whole Party, constantly illuminated by the theory of Marxism, can help work out the forms of Social-Democratic trade unions most suited to Russian conditions. It is likewise necessary to learn from the lessons given us by our enemies. The bourgeoisie of the whole world was jubilant over the "craft union" tendencies of the Cologne Congress, hoping to divert the workers from socialism to "pure", i.e., bourgeois, trade-unionism. In Russia, even *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*<sup>60</sup> has learned to sing this tune. And once the bourgeoisie begins to praise any one of us for having "seen the light" or for "zeal" in respect of a "rational" trade union movement, it is a sure sign that there are shortcomings in our work. This is just how Comrade M. Borisov puts the question, namely, that we should fulfil our socialist duty in every respect, and by no means allow such shortcomings.

---

## The All-Russia Political Strike

Geneva, October 26 (13)

The barometer indicates a storm—that is what is stated in today's foreign newspapers, which carry telegraphic dispatches on the mighty growth of the *all-Russia political strike*.

Nor is it only the barometer that indicates a storm: everything has been dislodged by the mighty whirlwind of a concerted proletarian onslaught. The revolution is progressing at astonishing speed, unfolding an amazing wealth of events, and if we wanted to give our reader a detailed account of the last three or four days, we should have to write a whole book. However, we shall leave it to future generations to write detailed history. We are witnesses of thrilling scenes of one of the greatest of civil wars, wars for liberty, mankind has ever experienced, and we must live at higher tempo so as to devote all our energies to this war.

The storm has burst—and how insignificant do the liberal and democratic speeches, suppositions, conjectures and plans about the Duma seem now! How out-of-date have all our disputes about the Duma already become—in the space of a few days, a few hours! Some of us doubted whether the revolutionary proletariat was sufficiently strong to frustrate the infamous farce staged by police ministers; some of us were afraid to speak with all boldness about boycotting the elections. But, as it turns out, elections have not yet started everywhere, and already a mere wave of the hand has been enough to rock the whole house of cards. A mere wave of



the hand has forced not only the liberals and the craven *Osvobozhdeniye* gentry<sup>61</sup>, but even Mr. Witte, head of the new "liberal" tsarist government, to talk (true, so far only to talk) of reforms that would undermine all the artful devices of the entire Bulygin farce.

This hand, whose wave brought such an upheaval in the Duma question, is that of the Russian proletariat. A German socialist song runs as follows: "*All the wheels stand still if your mighty arm so will.*" This mighty arm has now been raised. Our indications and predictions on the political mass strike's enormous importance to the armed uprising have been strikingly borne out. The *all-Russia political strike* has this time really involved the whole country, uniting *all the peoples* of the accursed Russian "empire" in the heroic rising of a class that is the most oppressed and the most advanced. Proletarians of all nations of this empire of oppression and violence are now mustering in a great army—an army of liberty and an army of socialism. Moscow and St. Petersburg share the honour of having taken revolutionary proletarian initiative. Both capitals have gone on strike. Finland is striking. Headed by Riga, the Baltic provinces have joined the movement, Heroic Poland has again joined the ranks of the strikers, as if in mockery of the impotent rage of her enemies, who imagined that they could crush her with their blows and have, instead, only welded her revolutionary forces more closely together. The Crimea is rising (Simferopol), and also the South. In Ekaterinoslav barricades are being erected, and blood is being shed. The Volga region (Saratov, Simbirsk, Nizhni-Novgorod) is on strike, and the strike is spreading both to the central agricultural provinces (Voronezh) and to the industrial centre (Yaroslavl).

A modest delegation of the Railwaymen's Union<sup>62</sup> has taken the lead of this army of workers, many million strong and speaking many languages. On a stage where political comedies were played by the liberals, with their highflown and cowardly speeches to the tsar, and with their smirking and scraping to Witte—on this stage a worker suddenly makes an appearance and presents his *ultimatum* to Mr. Witte, the new head of the new "liberal" tsarist government. The railway workers' delegation refused to await that "board of burghers", the State Duma. The workers' delega-

tion did not even care to waste valuable time on "criticism" of this Punch-and-Judy show. The workers' delegation first prepared *criticism by deeds*—the political strike—and then declared to the buffoon of a minister: "There can be only one solution—the convocation of a constituent assembly, elected on the basis of universal and direct suffrage."

The buffoon-minister spoke, to use the apt expression of the railway workers themselves, "like a real hidebound bureaucrat, hedging as usual, and not committing himself to anything definite". He promised decrees on freedom of the press, but rejected universal suffrage; according to foreign press reports, he declared a constituent assembly "impossible at present".

The workers' delegation called a general strike. After leaving the Minister the workers' delegation went to the University, where political meetings attended by some ten thousand people were taking place. The proletariat made good use of the platform placed at its disposal by the revolutionary students. At the first systematic and free political mass meetings held in Russia, in all cities, at schools and factories, and in the streets, the answer given by the buffoon-minister was discussed, and speeches centred around the task of waging a resolute armed struggle, which would make the convocation of a constituent assembly both "possible" and *necessary*. The foreign bourgeois press, including even the most liberal newspapers, is horrified by the "terroristic and seditious" slogans proclaimed by speakers at the free popular meetings, as though the tsar's government, by all its policy of oppression, had not itself made insurrection imperative and inevitable.

The uprising is drawing near, is evolving from the all-Russia political strike before our very eyes. The appointment of a buffoon-minister, who assures the workers that a popular constituent assembly is impossible "at present" clearly shows the growth of the revolutionary forces, and the decline of the forces of the tsar's government. The autocracy is *no longer* strong enough to come out against the revolution openly. The revolution is *not yet* strong enough to deal the enemy a decisive blow. This fluctuation of almost evenly balanced forces inevitably engenders confusion among the authorities, makes for transitions from repression to con-

cession, to laws providing for freedom of the press and freedom of assembly.

Forward, then, to a new, still more widespread and persistent struggle—the enemy must not be given a chance to pull himself together! The proletariat has already performed wonders for the victory of the revolution. The all-Russia political strike has brought this victory tremendously closer, causing the enemy to toss about on his deathbed. However, we are very far indeed from having done everything that we can and must do for final victory. The struggle is approaching, but has not yet reached its real climax. At this very moment the working class is rising, mobilising and arming, on a scale hitherto unparalleled. And it will finally sweep away the abhorrent autocracy, send all the buffoons of ministers packing, set up *its own* provisional revolutionary government, and show all the peoples of Russia how “possible” and necessary it is, just “at present”, to convoke a truly popular and truly constituent assembly.

*Proletary* No. 23,  
October 31 (18), 1905

*Collected Works*, Vol. 9,  
pp. 392-95

---

**Resolution of the Executive Committee  
of the St. Petersburg  
Soviet of Workers' Deputies  
on Measures for Counteracting  
the Lock-out  
Adopted on November 14 (27), 1905<sup>63</sup>**

Citizens, over a hundred thousand workers have been thrown on to the streets in St. Petersburg and other cities.

The autocratic government has declared war on the revolutionary proletariat. The reactionary bourgeoisie is joining hands with the autocracy, intending to starve the workers into submission and disrupt the struggle for freedom.

The Soviet of Workers' Deputies declares that this unparalleled mass dismissal of workers is an act of provocation on the part of the government. The government wants to provoke the proletariat of St. Petersburg to isolated outbreaks; the government wants to take advantage of the fact that the workers of other cities have not yet rallied closely enough to the St. Petersburg workers, and to defeat them all piecemeal.

The Soviet of Workers' Deputies declares that the cause of liberty is in danger. But the workers will not fall into the trap laid by the government. The workers will not accept battle in the unfavourable conditions in which the government wants to impose battle on them. We must and shall exert every effort to unite the whole struggle—the struggle that is being waged both by the proletariat of all Russia and by the revolutionary peasantry, both by the Army and by the Navy, which are already heroically rising for freedom.

In view of the foregoing, the Soviet of Workers' Deputies resolves:

1) All factories that have been shut down must immediately be reopened and all dismissed comrades reinstated. All sections of the people that cherish freedom in reality, and not in words only, are invited to support this demand.

2) In support of this demand, the Soviet of Workers' Deputies considers it necessary to appeal to the solidarity of the entire Russian proletariat, and, if the demand is rejected, to call upon the latter to resort to a general political strike and other forms of resolute struggle.

3) In preparation for this action, the Soviet of Workers' Deputies has instructed the Executive Committee to enter into immediate communication with the workers of other cities, with the railwaymen's, post and telegraph employees', peasant and other unions, as well as with the Army and Navy, by sending delegates and by other means.

4) As soon as this preliminary work is completed, the Executive Committee is to call a special meeting of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies to take a final decision with regard to a strike.

5) The St. Petersburg proletariat has asked all the workers and all sections of society and the people to support the dismissed workers with all the means at their disposal—material, moral and political.

*Novaya Zhizn* No. 13,  
November 15, 1905

*Collected Works*, Vol. 10,  
pp. 50-51

---

## The Socialist Party and Non-Party Revolutionism

### I

The revolutionary movement in Russia, which is rapidly spreading to ever new sections of the population, is giving rise to a number of non-party organisations. The longer the urge for association has been suppressed and persecuted, the more forcibly it asserts itself. All sorts of organisations, frequently loose in form, and most original in character, are constantly springing up. They have no hard and fast boundaries, as have organisations in Europe. Trade unions assume a political character. The political struggle blends with the economic struggle—as, for instance, in the form of strikes—and this gives rise to temporary, or more or less permanent, organisations of a blended type.

What is the significance of this phenomenon, and what should be the attitude of Social-Democrats towards it?

Strict adherence to the party principle is the corollary and the result of a highly developed class struggle. And, vice versa, the interests of the open and widespread class struggle demand the development of the strict party principle. That is why the party of the class-conscious proletariat, the Social-Democratic Party, has always quite rightly combated the non-party idea, and has worked steadily to establish a closely-knit, socialist workers' party consistent in its principles. The more thoroughly the development of capitalism splits up the entire people into classes, accentuating the contradictions among them, the greater is the success of this work among the masses.

It is quite natural that the present revolution in Russia should have given rise, and should continue to give rise, to so many non-party organisations. This is a democratic rev-

olution, i.e., one which is bourgeois as regards its social and economic content. This revolution is overthrowing the autocratic semi-feudal system, extricating the bourgeois system from it, and thereby putting into effect the demands of all the classes of bourgeois society—in this sense being a revolution of the whole people. This, of course, does not mean that our revolution is not a class revolution; certainly not. But it is directed against classes and castes which have become or are becoming obsolete from the point of view of bourgeois society, which are alien to that society and hinder its development. And since the entire economic life of the country has already become bourgeois in all its main features, since the overwhelming majority of the population is in fact already living in bourgeois conditions of existence, the anti-revolutionary elements are naturally extremely few in number, constituting truly a mere "handful" as compared with the "people". Hence the class nature of the bourgeois revolution inevitably reveals itself in the "popular", at first glance non-class, nature of the struggle of all classes of a bourgeois society against autocracy and feudalism.

The epoch of the bourgeois revolution in Russia, no less than in other countries, is distinguished by a relatively undeveloped state of the class contradictions peculiar to capitalist society. True, in Russia capitalism is more highly developed at the present time than it was in Germany in 1848, to say nothing of France in 1789; but there is no doubt about the fact that in Russia purely capitalist antagonisms are very very much overshadowed by the antagonisms between "culture" and Asiatic barbarism, Europeanism and Tartarism, capitalism and feudalism; in other words, the demands that are being put first today are those the satisfaction of which will develop capitalism, cleanse it of the slag of feudalism and improve the conditions of life and struggle both for the proletariat and for the bourgeoisie.

Indeed, if we examine the demands, instructions and *doléances*, which are now being drawn up in infinite numbers in every factory, office, regiment, police unit, parish, educational institution, etc., all over Russia, we shall easily see that the overwhelming majority of them contain purely "cultural" demands, if we may call them so. What I mean is that actually they are not specifically class de-

mands, but demands for elementary rights, demands which will not destroy capitalism but, on the contrary, bring it within the framework of Europeanism, and free it of barbarism, savagery, corruption and other "Russian" survivals of serfdom. In essence, even the proletarian demands are limited, in most cases, to reforms of the sort that are fully realisable within the framework of capitalism. What the Russian proletariat is demanding now and immediately is not something that will undermine capitalism, but something that will cleanse it, something that will accelerate and intensify its development.

Naturally, as a result of the special position which the proletariat occupies in capitalist society, the striving of the workers towards socialism, and their alliance with the Socialist Party assert themselves with elemental force at the very earliest stages of the movement. But purely socialist demands are still a matter of the future: the immediate demands of the day are the democratic demands of the workers in the political sphere, and economic demands within the framework of capitalism in the economic sphere. Even the proletariat is making the revolution, as it were, within the limits of the minimum programme and not of the maximum programme.<sup>64</sup> As for the peasantry, the vast and numerically overwhelming mass of the population, this goes without saying. Its "maximum programme", its ultimate aims, do not go beyond the bounds of capitalism, which would grow more extensively and luxuriantly if all the land were transferred to the whole of the peasantry and the whole of the people. Today the peasant revolution is a bourgeois revolution—however much these words may jar on the sentimental ears of the sentimental knights of our petty-bourgeois socialism.

The character of the revolution now in progress, as outlined above, quite naturally gives rise to non-party organisations. The whole movement, therefore, on the surface inevitably acquires a non-party stamp, a non-party appearance—but only on the surface, of course. The urge for a "human", civilised life, the urge to organise in defence of human dignity, for one's rights as man and citizen, takes hold of everyone, unites all classes, vastly outgrows all party bounds and shakes up people who as yet are very very far from being



able to rise to party allegiance. The vital need of immediate, elementary, essential rights and reforms puts off, as it were, all thought and consideration of anything further. Preoccupation with the struggle in progress, a preoccupation that is quite necessary and legitimate, for without it success in the struggle would be impossible, causes people to idealise these immediate, elementary aims, to depict them in rosy colours and sometimes even to clothe them in fantastic garb. Simple democracy, ordinary bourgeois democracy, is taken as socialism and "registered" as such. Everything seems to be "non-party"; everything seems to fuse into a single movement for "liberation" (actually, a movement liberating the whole of bourgeois society); everything acquires a faint, a very faint tint of "socialism", owing above all to the leading part played by the socialist proletariat in the democratic struggle.

In these circumstances, the idea of non-partisanship cannot but gain certain temporary successes. The slogan of non-partisanship cannot but become a fashionable slogan, for fashion drags helplessly at the tail of life, and it is the non-party organisation that appears to be the most "common" phenomenon on the surface of political life: non-party democracy, non-party strike-ism, non-party revolutionism.

The question now arises: what *should* be the attitude of the adherents and representatives of the various classes towards this fact of non-party organisation, towards this idea of non-partisanship? "Should", that is, not in the subjective sense, but objectively, i.e., not in the sense of what view to take of it, but in the sense of what attitude is inevitably taking shape under the influence of the respective interests and viewpoints of the various classes.

## II

As we have already shown, the non-party principle is the product—or, if you will, the expression—of the bourgeois character of our revolution. The bourgeoisie cannot help inclining towards the non-party principle, for the absence of parties among those who are fighting for the liberation of bourgeois society implies that no fresh struggle will arise against this bourgeois society itself. Those who carry on a

"non-party" struggle for liberty are not aware of the bourgeois nature of liberty, or they sanctify the bourgeois system, or else they put off the struggle against it, its "perfecting", to the Greek calends.<sup>65</sup> And, conversely, those who consciously or unconsciously stand for the bourgeois system cannot help feeling attracted by the idea of non-partisanship.

In a society based upon class divisions, the struggle between the hostile classes is bound, at a certain stage of its development, to become a political struggle. The most purposeful, most comprehensive and specific expression of the political struggle of classes is the struggle of parties. The non-party principle means indifference to the struggle of parties. But this indifference is not equivalent to neutrality, to abstention from the struggle, for in the class struggle there can be no neutrals; in capitalist society, it is impossible to "abstain" from taking part in the exchange of commodities or labour-power. And exchange inevitably gives rise to economic and then to political struggle. Hence, in practice, indifference to the struggle does not at all mean standing aloof from the struggle, abstaining from it, or being neutral. Indifference is tacit support of the strong, of those who rule. In Russia, those who were indifferent towards the autocracy prior to its fall during the October Revolution tacitly supported the autocracy.<sup>66</sup> In present-day Europe, those who are indifferent towards the rule of the bourgeoisie tacitly support the bourgeoisie. Those who are indifferent towards the idea that the struggle for liberty is of a bourgeois nature tacitly support the domination of the bourgeoisie in this struggle, in the free Russia now in the making. Political unconcern is political satiety. A well-fed man is "unconcerned with", "indifferent to", a crust of bread; a hungry man, however, will always take a "partisan" stand on the question of a crust of bread. A person's "unconcern and indifference" with regard to a crust of bread does not mean that he does not need bread, but that he is always sure of his bread, that he is never in want of bread and that he has firmly attached himself to the "party" of the well-fed. The non-party principle in bourgeois society is merely a hypocritical, disguised, passive expression of adherence to the party of the well-fed, of the rulers, of the exploiters.

The non-party idea is a bourgeois idea. The party idea is

a socialist idea. This thesis, in general and as a whole, is applicable to all bourgeois society. One must, of course, be able to adapt this general truth to particular questions and particular cases; but to forget this truth at a time when the whole of bourgeois society is rising in revolt against feudalism and autocracy means in practice completely to renounce socialist criticism of bourgeois society.

The Russian revolution, despite the fact that it is still in the early stages of its development, has already provided no little material to confirm the general considerations here outlined. Only the Social-Democratic Party, the party of the class-conscious proletariat, has always insisted, and insists now, upon strict adherence to the party principle. Our liberals, who voice the views of the bourgeoisie, cannot bear the socialist party principle and will not hear of class struggle. One need but recall the recent speeches of Mr. Rodichev, who for the hundredth time repeated what has been said over and over again by *Osvobozhdeniye* abroad, as well as by the innumerable vassal organs of Russian liberalism. Finally, the ideology of the intermediate class, the petty bourgeoisie, has found a clear expression in the views of the Russian "radicals" of various shades, from *Nasha Zhizn*<sup>67</sup> and the "Radical-Democrats"<sup>68</sup> to the "Socialist-Revolutionaries".<sup>69</sup> The latter have demonstrated their confusion of socialism with democracy most clearly over the agrarian question, particularly by their slogan of "socialisation" (of the land without socialising capital). It is likewise well known that being tolerant towards bourgeois radicalism, they are intolerant towards the Social-Democratic Party principle.

An analysis of just how the interests of the various classes are reflected in the programme and tactics of the Russian liberals and radicals of all shades is beyond our subject. We have touched upon this interesting question only in passing, and must now proceed to draw the practical political conclusions with regard to the attitude of our Party towards non-party organisations.

Is it permissible for socialists to participate in non-party organisations? If so, on what conditions? What tactics should be pursued in these organisations?

The answer to the first question cannot be an uncondition-

al and categorical "no". It would be wrong to say that in no case and under no circumstances should socialists participate in non-party (i.e., more or less consciously or unconsciously bourgeois) organisations. In the period of the democratic revolution, a refusal to participate in non-party organisations would in certain circumstances amount to a refusal to participate in the democratic revolution. But undoubtedly socialists should confine these "certain circumstances" to narrow limits, and should permit of such participation only on strictly defined, restrictive conditions. For while non-party organisations, as we have already said, arise as a result of the relatively undeveloped state of the class struggle, strict adherence to the party principle, on the other hand, is one of the factors that make the class struggle conscious, clear, definite, and principled.

To preserve the ideological and political independence of the party of the proletariat is the constant, immutable and absolute duty of socialists. Whoever fails to fulfil this duty ceases to be a socialist *in fact*, however sincere his "socialist" (in words) convictions may be. Socialists may participate in non-party organisations only by way of exception; and the very purpose, nature, conditions, etc., of this participation must be wholly subordinated to the fundamental task of preparing and organising the socialist proletariat for conscious leadership of the socialist revolution.

Circumstances may compel us to participate in non-party organisations, especially in the period of a democratic revolution, specifically a democratic revolution in which the proletariat plays an outstanding part. Such participation may prove essential, for example, for the purpose of preaching socialism to vaguely democratic audiences, or in the interests of a joint struggle of socialists and revolutionary democrats against the counter-revolution. In the first case, such participation will be a means of securing the acceptance of our ideas; in the second case, it will represent a fighting agreement for the achievement of definite revolutionary aims. In both cases, participation can only be temporary. In both cases, it is permissible only if the independence of the workers' party is fully safeguarded and if the party as a whole controls and guides its members and groups "delegated" to non-party unions or councils.

When the activities of our Party were conducted secretly, the exercise of such control and guidance presented extremely great, and sometimes almost insuperable difficulties. But now that the activities of our Party are becoming more and more open, this control and this guidance can and should be exercised on the largest scale, not only by the higher bodies of the Party, but also by the rank and file, by all the organised workers belonging to our Party. Reports on the activities of Social-Democrats in non-party unions and councils, lectures on the conditions and aims of such activities, resolutions of party organisations of all types about these activities, should become a regular practice in a workers' party. Only by such *real* participation of the Party as a whole, by participation in the *direction* of such activities, can we contrast in practice truly socialist work with general democratic work.

What tactics should we pursue in the non-party unions? First of all, we should use every opportunity to establish independent contacts and to propagate the whole of our socialist programme. Secondly, we should define the immediate political tasks of the day in terms of the fullest and most resolute accomplishment of the democratic revolution; we should put forward the political watchwords of the democratic revolution and advance a "programme" of those reforms which should be carried out by militant revolutionary democrats as distinct from haggling, liberal democrats.

Only if matters are arranged in this way will it be permissible and useful for members of our Party to participate in the non-party revolutionary organisations which are being set up one day by the workers, the next day by the peasants, the day after by the soldiers, etc. Only in that event shall we be in a position to fulfil the twofold task of a workers' party in a bourgeois revolution, namely, to carry the democratic revolution to completion and to extend and strengthen the forces of the socialist proletariat, which needs freedom in order to carry on a ruthless struggle for the overthrow of the rule of capital.

---

## ***From A Tactical Platform for the Unity Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.***

### **The Trade Unions**

#### *Draft Resolution*

Whereas:

1) the Social-Democratic Party has always regarded the economic struggle as a component of the proletarian class struggle;

2) the experience of all capitalist countries shows that the most advisable form of organisation of the working class for the economic struggle is that of broad trade unions;

3) at the present time a general striving is observed among the masses of the workers in Russia to associate in trade unions;

4) the economic struggle can bring about a lasting improvement in the conditions of the masses of the workers, and a strengthening of their truly class organisation, only if this struggle is properly combined with the political struggle of the proletariat;

We are of the opinion, and propose that the congress should agree:

1) that all Party organisations must promote the formation of non-party trade unions, and induce all Party members to join the trade unions in their respective trades;

2) that the Party must exert every effort to educate the workers who belong to trade unions in the spirit of a broad understanding of the class struggle and the socialist aims of the proletariat; by its activities to win a virtually leading position in these unions; and lastly to ensure that these unions, under certain conditions, come into direct association with the Party—however, without at all expelling non-party members from their ranks.

Published March 20, 1906  
in the newspaper  
*Partiinnye Izvestia* No 2

*Collected Works, Vol. 10,*  
pp. 160-61

---

## ***From Draft Resolutions for the Fifth Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.***

### **4. The Intensification of Mass Destitution and of the Economic Struggle**

Whereas:

1) a number of facts testify to the extreme intensification of destitution among the proletariat and also of its economic struggle (the lock-out in Poland,<sup>70</sup> the movement among the workers of St. Petersburg and Ivanovo-Voznesensk against the high cost of living, the extensive strike movement in the Moscow industrial area, the urgent calls of the trade union organisations to prepare for an intense struggle, etc.);

2) all signs go to show that these various manifestations of the economic struggle are accumulating to such an extent that there is every reason to expect mass, economic action all over the country, involving far larger sections of the proletariat than before;

3) the whole history of the Russian revolution shows that all the powerful upsurges of the revolutionary movement began only on the basis of such mass economic movements;

This conference declares:

1) that all Party organisations must pay most serious attention to these circumstances, collect fuller information about them, and that this questions should be put on the agenda of the Fifth Party Congress;

2) that the greatest possible number of Party members must be concentrated on economic agitation among the masses;

3) that this economic movement must be regarded as the main source and foundation of the entire revolutionary crisis that is developing in Russia.

## 5. Non-Party Workers' Organisations and the Anarcho-Syndicalist Trend Among the Proletariat

Whereas:

1) in connection with Comrade Axelrod's agitation for a non-Party labour congress,<sup>71</sup> a trend (represented by Larin, Shcheglo, El, Ivanovsky, Mirov, and the Odessa publication *Osvobozhdeniye Truda*<sup>72</sup>) has appeared in the ranks of the R.S.D.L.P., the aim of which is to destroy the Social-Democratic Labour Party and to set up in its place a non-party political organisation of the proletariat;

2) besides this, outside of and actually against the Party, anarcho-syndicalist agitation is being carried on among the proletariat, using this same slogan of a non-party labour congress and non-party organisations (*Soyuznoye Dyelo* and its group in Moscow, the anarchist press in Odessa, etc.);

3) notwithstanding the resolution passed by the November All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.,<sup>73</sup> a series of disruptive actions has been observed in our Party, with the object of setting up non-party organisations;

4) on the other hand, the R.S.D.L.P. has never renounced its intention of utilising certain non-party organisations, such as the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, in periods of more or less intense revolutionary upheaval, to extend Social-Democratic influence among the working class and to strengthen the Social-Democratic labour movement (see the September resolutions of the St. Petersburg Committee and the Moscow Committee on the labour congress, in *Proletary* Nos. 3 and 4<sup>74</sup>);

5) the incipient revival creates the opportunity to organise or utilise non-party representative working-class institutions, such as Soviets of Workers' Deputies, Soviets of Workers' Delegates, etc., for the purpose of developing the Social-Democratic movement; at the same time the Social-Democratic Party organisations must bear in mind that if Social-Democratic activities among the proletarian masses are properly, effectively and widely organised, such institutions may actually become superfluous;

This conference declares:



1) that a most determined ideological struggle must be waged against the anarcho-syndicalist movement among the proletariat and against Axelrod's and Larin's ideas in the Social-Democratic Party;

2) that a most determined struggle must be waged against all disruptive and demagogic attempts to weaken the R.S.D.L.P. from within or to utilise it for the purpose of substituting non-party political, proletarian organisations for the Social-Democratic Party;

3) that Social-Democratic Party organisations may, in case of necessity, participate in inter-party Soviets of Workers' Delegates, Soviets of Workers' Deputies, and in congresses of representatives of these organisations, and may organise such institutions, provided this is done on strict Party lines for the purpose of developing and strengthening the Social-Democratic Labour Party;

4) that for the purpose of extending and strengthening the influence of the Social-Democratic Party among the broad masses of the proletariat, it is essential, on the one hand, to increase efforts to organise trade unions and conduct Social-Democratic propaganda and agitation within them, and, on the other hand, to draw still larger sections of the working class into the activities of all types of Party organisations.

Written February 15-18  
(February 28-March 3), 1907

Published March 4, 1907  
in *Proletary* No. 14

*Collected Works*, Vol. 12,  
pp. 142-44

---

## Draft Resolutions for the Third Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (Second All-Russia)

### 1

#### Draft Resolution on Participation in the Elections to the Third Duma<sup>75</sup>

Whereas,

1) active boycott, as the experience of the Russian revolution has shown, is correct tactics on the part of the Social-Democrats only under conditions of a sweeping, universal, and rapid upswing of the revolution, developing into an armed uprising, and only in connection with the ideological aims of the struggle against constitutional illusions arising from the convocation of the first representative assembly by the old regime;

2) in the absence of these conditions correct tactics on the part of the revolutionary Social-Democrats calls for participation in the elections, as was the case with the Second Duma, even if all the conditions of a revolutionary period are present;

3) the Social-Democrats, who have always pointed out the essentially Octobrist<sup>76</sup> nature of the Cadet Party<sup>77</sup> and the impermanence of the Cadet electoral law (11.XII.1905)<sup>78</sup> under the autocracy, have no reasons whatever for changing their tactics because this law has been replaced by an Octobrist electoral law;

4) the strike movement which is now developing in the central industrial region of Russia, while being a most important guarantee of a possible revolutionary upswing in the near future, at the same time calls for sustained efforts towards converting the movement, which so far is only a trade union one, into a political and directly revolutionary movement linked with an armed uprising, the conference resolves:

- a) to take part in the elections to the Third Duma too;
- b) to explain to the masses the connection of the coup

d'état of 3.VI.1907<sup>9</sup> with the defeat of the December uprising of 1905, as well as with the betrayals by the liberal bourgeoisie, while at the same time showing the inadequacy of trade union struggle alone and striving to convert the trade union strike movement into a political and direct revolutionary struggle of the masses for the overthrow of the tsarist government by means of an uprising;

c) to explain to the masses that the boycott of the Duma is not by itself capable of raising the working-class movement and the revolutionary struggle to a higher level, and that the tactics of boycott could be appropriate only provided our efforts to convert the trade union upswing into a revolutionary assault were successful.

## 2

### Outline of a Draft Resolution on the All-Russia Congress of Trade Unions

The conference considers it the duty of all members of the Party energetically to carry out the London Congress resolution on the trade unions, all local conditions being taken into consideration when effecting organisational contacts between the trade unions and the Social-Democratic Party or when the latter's leadership is accepted by the former, and always, under all conditions, paying primary attention that the Social-Democrats in the trade unions should not confine themselves to passive accommodation to a "neutral" platform—a favourite practice of all shades of bourgeois-democratic trends (Cadets, non-party Progressists,<sup>80</sup> Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc.)—but should steadfastly uphold the Social-Democratic views in their entirety and should steadfastly promote acceptance by the trade unions of the Social-Democrats' ideological leadership and the establishment of permanent and effective organisational contacts with the trade unions.

Written in July 1907  
First published in 1933  
in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 13,  
pp. 60-61

---

## ***From The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart***<sup>81</sup>

The resolution on the relations between the socialist parties and the trade unions is of especial importance to us Russians. The Stockholm R.S.D.L.P. Congress<sup>82</sup> went on record for *non-party* unions, thus endorsing the neutrality standpoint, which has always been upheld by our non-Party democrats, Bernsteinians and Socialist-Revolutionaries. The London Congress, on the other hand, put forward a different principle, namely, closer alignment of the unions with the Party, even including, under certain conditions, their recognition as Party unions. At Stuttgart in the Social-Democratic subsection of the Russian section (the socialists of each country form a separate section at international congresses) opinion was divided on this issue (there was no split on other issues). Plekhanov upheld the neutrality principle. Voinov, a Bolshevik, defended the anti-neutralist viewpoint of the London Congress and of the Belgian resolution (published in the congress materials with de Brouckère's report, which will soon appear in Russian). Clara Zetkin rightly remarked in her journal *Die Gleichheit*<sup>83</sup> that Plekhanov's arguments for neutrality were just as lame as those of the French. And the Stuttgart resolution—as Kautsky rightly observed and as anyone who takes the trouble to read it carefully will see—puts an end to recognition of the "neutrality" principle. There is not a word in it about neutrality or non-party principles. On the contrary, it definitely recognises

the need for closer and stronger connections between the unions and the socialist parties.

The resolution of the London R.S.D.L.P. Congress on the trade unions has thus been placed on a firm theoretical basis in the form of the Stuttgart resolution. The Stuttgart resolution lays down the general principle that in every country the unions must be brought into permanent and close contact with the socialist party. The London resolution says that in Russia this should take the form, under favourable conditions, of party unions, and party members must work towards that goal.

We note that the harmful aspects of the neutrality principle were revealed in Stuttgart by the fact that the trade union half of the German delegation were the most adamant supporters of opportunist views. That is why in Essen, for example, the Germans were against Van Kol (the trade unions were not represented in Essen, which was a congress solely of the Party), while in Stuttgart they supported him. By playing into the hands of the opportunists in the Social-Democratic movement the advocacy of neutrality in Germany has *actually* had harmful results. This is a fact that should not be overlooked, especially in Russia, where the bourgeois-democratic counsellors of the proletariat, who urge it to keep the trade union movement "neutral", are so numerous.

Written in late August-  
early September 1907  
Published October 20, 1907  
in *Proletary* No. 17

*Collected Works*, Vol. 13,  
pp. 78-79

---

**Preface  
to the Pamphlet by Voinov  
(A. V. Lunacharsky) on the Attitude  
of the Party Towards the Trade Unions<sup>84</sup>**

Comrade Voinov's pamphlet on the attitude of the socialist party of the proletariat towards the trade unions is open to a good deal of misconstruction. There are two reasons for this. In the first place, the author, in the ardour of his fight against a narrow and incorrect conception of Marxism, against an unwillingness to take into consideration the new needs of the working-class movement and take a broader and more profound view of the matter, often expresses himself in too general terms. He attacks orthodoxy—true, orthodoxy in inverted commas, i.e., pseudo-orthodoxy—or German Social-Democracy in general, when, as a matter of fact, his criticism is aimed only at the vulgarisers of orthodoxy, only at the opportunist wing of Social-Democracy. Secondly, the author writes for the Russian public, but hardly takes into consideration the various shadings in the formulation under Russian conditions of the questions he examines. Comrade Voinov's point of view is very far removed from the views of the Russian syndicalists, Mensheviks, and Socialist-Revolutionaries. The inattentive or unscientific reader, however, can easily cavil at one or another phrase or idea of the writer, seeing that the latter had before his eyes chiefly Frenchmen and Italians and did not undertake the task of dissociating himself from all kinds of Russian muddleheads.

As an example of the latter we would mention the Socialist-Revolutionaries. In *Znamya Truda*<sup>85</sup> No. 5, they declare

with their usual presumption: "The Socialist International approved the point of view on the trade union movement which we [!] have always [!] maintained." Let us take the *Collected Articles*, No. 1 (1907), published by *Nasha Mysl*. Mr. Victor Chernov takes Kautsky to task, but is *silent* about the Mannheim resolution and Kautsky's struggle against the opportunist neutralists! Kautsky's article, which the S.R. hack writer attacks, was written on the eve of Mannheim.<sup>66</sup> In Mannheim Kautsky opposed the neutralists. The Mannheim resolution "makes a considerable breach in trade union neutrality" (Kautsky's expression in an article on the Mannheim Congress published in *Die Neue Zeit* for October 6, 1906). And now, in 1907, along comes a critic, who poses as a revolutionary and calls Kautsky "a great dogmatist and inquisitor of Marxism", accusing him—quite in unison with the opportunist neutralists!—of tendentiously belittling the role of the trade unions, of a desire to "subordinate" them to the party, and so on. If we add to this that the S.R.s always stood for non-party trade unions, and that *Znamya Truda*, No. 2 for July 12, 1907 carried an editorial saying that "party propaganda has its place *outside* the union", we shall get a full picture of the S.R.s revolutionism.

When Kautsky combated opportunist neutralism and further developed and deepened the theory of Marxism, moving the trade unions leftwards, these gentlemen fell upon him, repeating the catchwords of the opportunists and continuing on the sly to advocate non-partisanship of the trade unions. When *the same Kautsky* moved the trade unions still further leftwards by amending Beer's resolution at Stuttgart and laying stress in the resolution on the socialist tasks of the trade unions, the gentlemen of the S.R. fraternity started shouting: the Socialist International has endorsed our point of view!

The question arises, are such methods worthy of members of the Socialist International? Does not such criticism testify to presumption and lack of principle?

A specimen of such presumption among the Social-Democrats is the former revolutionary Plekhanov, who is deeply respected by the liberals. In a preface to the pamphlet *We And They* he declares with inimitable, incomparable complacency that the Stuttgart resolution (on the trade unions)

with my amendment deprives the London resolution (that of the London Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.) of its significance. Probably many readers, upon reading this declaration of our magnificent Narcissus,<sup>87</sup> will believe that the struggle at Stuttgart was fought precisely over this amendment of Plekhanov's and that generally speaking this amendment had some serious significance.

In reality, this amendment ("unity of the economic struggle should always be borne in mind") had no serious significance whatever. It even had no bearing on the essence of the questions *in dispute* at Stuttgart, on the essence of the differences of opinion in international socialism.

As a matter of fact, Plekhanov's raptures over "his" amendment have a very vulgar significance—to *mislead* the reader by drawing his attention away from the *really* disputable questions of the trade union movement and to *conceal* the defeat of the idea of neutralism in Stuttgart.

The Stockholm Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1906), at which the Mensheviks won the day, adhered to the point of view of trade union neutrality. The London Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. took a different stand and proclaimed the necessity of working towards partisanship of the unions. The Stuttgart International Congress adopted a resolution, which "*puts an end to neutrality once and for all*", as Kautsky rightly expressed it.\* Plekhanov went into the Commission of the Stuttgart Congress to defend neutrality, as described in detail by Voinov. And Clara Zetkin wrote in *Die Gleichheit*, the mouthpiece of the women's labour movement of Germany, that "Plekhanov *attempted by rather unconvincing arguments* to justify a certain limitation of this principle"\*\*\* (i.e., the principle of close alignment of the unions with the Party).

Thus, the principle of neutrality which Plekhanov advocated was a failure. His arguments were considered "uncon-

\* *Vorwärts*, 1907, No. 209, *Beilage*, Kautsky's report to the Leipzig workers on the Congress in Stuttgart. See *Kalendar dlya vsekh*, 1908, Zerno Publishers, p. 173, my article on the International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart. (See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 87.—Ed.)

\*\* See *Kalendar dlya vsekh*, p. 173, as well as the collected articles of Zarnitsy (St. Petersburg, 1907), which gives a complete translation of this article from *Die Gleichheit*.



vincing" by the German revolutionary Social-Democrats. And he, self-admiringly, declares: "my" amendment was adopted and the resolution of the London Congress loses its significance!...

Yes, yes, but, on the other hand, the Nozdrev<sup>88</sup> presumption of a socialist respected by the liberals apparently does not lose any of its significance.

---

Comrade Voinov is wrong, I believe, in saying that the German orthodox socialists consider the idea of storming harmful and that orthodoxy "had all but adopted the whole spirit of the new Economism". This cannot be said of Kautsky, and Comrade Voinov himself admits the correctness of Kautsky's views. While blaming the Germans for "saying too little about the role of the trade unions as organisers of socialist production", Comrade Voinov mentions elsewhere the opinion of Liebknecht *senior*, who recognised this role in the most emphatic terms. Another mistake of Comrade Voinov was to believe Plekhanov when the latter said that Bebel *deliberately* omitted mention of the Russian revolution in his speech of welcome, and that Bebel *did not want* to speak about Russia. These words of Plekhanov's were simply crude buffoonery on the part of a socialist who is deeply respected by the liberals and should not for a moment have been taken seriously, should not have evoked even the possibility of believing that there was an iota of truth in them. For my part I can testify that during Bebel's speech, Van Kol, a representative of the socialist Right wing who sat next to me in the Bureau, listened to Bebel specially to see whether he would mention Russia. And as soon as Bebel had finished, Van Kol turned to me with a look of surprise; he did not doubt (nor did a single serious member of the congress) that Bebel had forgotten Russia *accidentally*. The best and most experienced speakers sometimes make slips. For Comrade Voinov to call this forgetfulness on the part of the veteran Bebel "characteristic", is, in my opinion, most unfair. It is also profoundly unfair to speak in general about the "*present-day*" opportunistic Bebel. There are no grounds for such a generalisation.

To avoid misunderstandings, however, let me say at once that if anyone tried to use these expressions of Comrade Voinov's against the revolutionary German Social-Democrats, this would be seizing dishonestly on particular words. Comrade Voinov has abundantly proved by his *whole* pamphlet that he is on the side of the German revolutionary Marxists (like Kautsky), that he is working *together with them* to get rid of old prejudices, opportunist clichés, and short-sighted complacency. That is why even in Stuttgart, I lined up with Comrade Voinov on all essentials and agree with him now regarding the entire character of his revolutionary criticism. He is absolutely right in saying that we must now learn from the Germans and *profit* by their experience. Only ignoramuses, who have still learned nothing from the Germans and therefore do not know the ABC, can infer from this a "divergence" within revolutionary Social-Democracy. We must criticise the mistakes of the German leaders fearlessly and openly if we wish to be true to the spirit of Marx and help the Russian socialists to be equal to the present-day tasks of the workers' movement. Bebel was undoubtedly mistaken at Essen as well when he defended Noske, when he upheld the division of wars into defensive and offensive, when he attacked the *method* of struggle of the "radicals" against Van Kol, when he denied (with Singer) the failure and fallacy of the German delegation's tactics at Stuttgart. We should not conceal these mistakes, but should use them as an example to teach the Russian Social-Democrats how to avoid them and live up to the more rigorous requirements of revolutionary Marxism. And let not the Russian anarchist and syndicalist small fry, the liberals, and S.R.s crow over our criticism of Bebel. We shall tell these gentlemen: "Eagles sometimes fly lower than hens, but hens can never fly as high as eagles!"

---

A little over two years ago Mr. Struve, who at that time defended the revolution, wrote about the necessity of open revolutionary action and maintained that the revolution must assume power—this Mr. Struve wrote in *Osvobozhdeniye*, No. 71 (published abroad): "In comparison with the

revolutionism of Mr. Lenin and his associates the revolutionism of the West-European Social-Democracy of Bebel, and even of Kautsky, is opportunism." I answered Mr. Struve at the time: "When and where did I ever claim to have created any sort of special trend in international Social-Democracy not identical with the trend of Bebel and Kautsky?" (*Two Tactics*, p. 50 of the Russian edition).\*

In the summer of 1907 in a pamphlet on the question of boycott of the Third Duma, I had to point out that it would be basically wrong to identify Bolshevism with boycottism or boyevism.\*\*

Now, on the question of the trade unions, equally strong emphasis should be placed on the fact that Bolshevism applies the tactics of revolutionary Social-Democracy in all fields of struggle, in all spheres of activity. What distinguishes Bolshevism from Menshevism is not that the former "repudiates" work in the trade unions or the co-operative societies, etc., but that the former *takes a different line* in the work of propaganda, agitation, and organisation of the working class. Today activity in the trade unions undoubtedly assumes tremendous importance. In contrast to the neutralism of the Mensheviks we must conduct this activity on the lines of closer alignment of the unions with the Party, of the development of socialist consciousness and an understanding of the revolutionary tasks of the proletariat. In Western Europe revolutionary syndicalism in many countries was a direct and inevitable result of opportunism, reformism, and parliamentary cretinism. In our country, too, the first steps of "Duma activity" increased opportunism to a tremendous extent and reduced the Mensheviks to servility before the Cadets. Plekhanov, for example, in his everyday political work, virtually *merged* with the Prokopovich and Kuskova gentry. In 1900, he denounced them for Bernsteinism, for contemplating only the "posterior" of the Russian proletariat (*Vademecum* for the Editorial Staff of *Rabocheye Dyelo*", Geneva, 1900). In 1906-07, the first ballot papers threw Plekhanov into the arms of these gentlemen, who are now contemplating the "posterior" of Rus-

---

\* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 66.—Ed.

\*\* Ibid., Vol. 13, p. 42.—Ed.

sian liberalism. Syndicalism cannot help developing on Russian soil as a reaction against this shameful conduct of "distinguished" Social-Democrats.

Comrade Voinov, therefore, is quite correct in taking the line of calling upon the Russian Social-Democrats to learn *from* the example of opportunism and *from* the example of syndicalism. Revolutionary work in the trade unions, shifting the emphasis from parliamentary trickery to the education of the proletariat, to rallying the purely class organisations, to the struggle outside parliament, to ability to use (and to prepare the masses for the possibility of successfully using) the general strike, as well as the "December forms of struggle", in the Russian revolution—all this comes very strongly into prominence as the task of the Bolshevik trend. And the experience of the Russian revolution immensely facilitates this task for us, provides a wealth of practical guidance and historical data making it possible to appraise in the most concrete way the new methods of struggle, the mass strike, and the use of direct force. These methods of struggle are least of all "new" to the Russian Bolsheviks, the Russian proletariat. They are "new" to the opportunists, who are doing their utmost to erase from the minds of the workers in the West the memory of the Commune,<sup>89</sup> and from the minds of the workers in Russia the memory of December 1905. To strengthen these memories, to make a scientific study of that great experience,\* to spread its lessons among the masses and the realisation of its inevitable repetition on a new scale—this task of the revolutionary Social-Democrats in Russia opens up before us prospects infinitely richer than the one-sided "anti-opportunism" and "anti-parliamentarism" of the syndicalists.

*Against* syndicalism, as a special trend, Comrade Voinov

---

\* It is natural that the Cadets should be eagerly studying the history of the two Dumas. It is natural that they should regard the platitudes and betrayals of Rodichev-Kutlerov liberalism as gems of creation. It is natural that they should falsify history by drawing a veil of silence over their negotiations with the reaction, etc. It is unnatural for the Social-Democrats not to eagerly study October-December 1905, if only because each day of that period meant a hundred times more to the destinies of all the peoples of Russia and the working class in particular than Rodichev's "loyal" phrases in the Duma.

levels four accusations (p. 19 onwards of his pamphlet), which show up its falsity with striking clearness: 1) the "anarchistic looseness of the organisation"; 2) keeping the workers keyed up instead of creating a firm "stronghold of class organisation"; 3) the petty-bourgeois-individualistic features of its ideal and of the Proudhon theory; 4) a stupid "aversion to politics".

There are here not a few points of resemblance to the old "Economism" among the Russian Social-Democrats. Hence I am not so optimistic as Comrade Voinov in regard to a "reconciliation" with revolutionary Social-Democracy on the part of those Economists who have gone over to syndicalism. I also think that Comrade Voinov's proposals for a "General Labour Council" as a superarbiter, with the participation in it of Socialist-Revolutionaries, are quite unpractical. This is mixing up the "music of the future" with the organisational forms of the present. But I am not in the least afraid of Comrade Voinov's perspective, namely: "subordination of political organisations to a class social organisation"... *"only when* [I am still quoting Comrade Voinov, stressing the important words] *... all trade-unionists will have become socialists*". The class instinct of the proletarian mass has *already* begun to be manifested in Russia with full force. This class instinct already provides tremendous guarantees both against the petty-bourgeois woolliness of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and against the Mensheviks' servility to the Cadets. We can already boldly assert that the mass *workers'* organisation in Russia (if it were to be created and in so far as it is for a minute created, if only by elections, strikes, demonstrations, etc.) is *sure* to be closer to Bolshevism, to revolutionary Social-Democracy.

Comrade Voinov rightly regards the "labour congress" adventure as a "frivolous" affair. We shall work hard in the trade unions, we shall work in all fields to spread the revolutionary theory of Marxism among the proletariat and to build up a "stronghold" of *class* organisation. The rest will come of itself.

---

## Trade Union Neutrality

In the previous issue of *Proletary* we published the resolution of our Party Central Committee on trade unions.<sup>90</sup> In reporting the resolution, *Nash Vek*<sup>91</sup> added that it had been adopted unanimously in the C.C., as the Mensheviks voted for it in view of the concessions it contains compared with the original Bolshevik draft. If this report is true (the defunct *Nash Vek* was in general exceptionally well informed about everything relating to Menshevism), it only remains for us to heartily welcome the big step towards united Social-Democratic activity in such an important field as the trade unions. The concessions referred to by *Nash Vek* are quite insignificant, and do not in the least affect the basic principles of the Bolshevik draft (which, incidentally, was published in *Proletary*, No. 17, October 20, 1907, along with a lengthy article in support of it, entitled "The Trade Unions and the Social-Democratic Party").<sup>92</sup>

Our whole Party, consequently, has now recognised that work in the trade unions must be conducted not in the spirit of trade union neutrality but in the spirit of the closest possible relations between them and the Social-Democratic Party. It is also recognised that the partisanship of the trade unions must be achieved exclusively by S.-D. work within the unions, that the S.-D.s. must form solid Party cells in the unions, and that illegal unions should be formed since legal ones are impossible.

There can be no doubt that Stuttgart has been strongly instrumental in bringing the two factions of our Party closer together on the question of the nature of our work in the trade unions. The Stuttgart Congress resolution, as Kautsky pointed out in his report to the Leipzig workers, puts an end to recognising the principle of neutrality. The high degree to which class contradictions have developed, their aggravation latterly in all countries, the long experience of Germany (where the policy of neutrality strengthened opportunism in the trade unions without preventing the appearance of special Christian and liberal unions), and the widening of that special area of proletarian struggle which requires joint and concerted action by both the unions and the political party (the mass strike and the armed uprising in the Russian revolution, as the prototype of likely forms of the proletarian revolution in the West)—all these things have cut the ground from under the neutrality theory.

Among the proletarian parties the question of neutrality is unlikely now to evoke any serious controversy. The case is different with the non-proletarian quasi-socialist parties like our Socialist-Revolutionaries, who are in fact the extreme Left wing of the revolutionary bourgeois party of intellectuals and progressive peasants.

It is highly characteristic that in our country the only people to defend the *idea* of neutrality after Stuttgart have been the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Plekhanov. And they have done so very unsuccessfully.

In the last issue of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party organ, *Znamya Truda* (No. 8, December 1907), we find two articles devoted to the trade union movement. In those articles the S.-R.s attempt primarily to ridicule the statement of the Social-Democratic newspaper, *Vperyod*,<sup>93</sup> that the Stuttgart resolution settled the question of the Party's attitude to the trade unions along the same lines as the London resolution, namely, in the Bolshevik spirit. Our answer is that in the very same issue of *Znamya Truda* the S.-R.s themselves cited *facts* which prove such an assessment to be absolutely correct.

"It was at that time, too," writes *Znamya Truda*, referring to the autumn of 1905, "and it is a characteristic fact, that the three Russian socialist factions: the Menshevik

Social-Democrats, the Bolshevik Social-Democrats, and the S.R.s, first met face to face to state their views on the trade union movement. The Moscow Bureau, which was instructed to select from its midst a central bureau for convening a congress (of trade unions), organised a big meeting of worker trade-unionists at the Olympia Theatre.\* The Mensheviks put forward a classically Marxist, strictly orthodox delimitation between the aim of the Party and that of the trade unions. 'The task of the S.-D. Party is to establish the socialist system and abolish capitalist relations; the task of the trade unions is to improve working conditions within the framework of the capitalist system, so as to secure for labour advantageous conditions for the sale of its labour-power'; the conclusion drawn was that the trade unions are non-partisan, and that they embrace 'all workers of a given occupation'.\*\*

"The Bolsheviks argued that at the present time there could not be a strict separation of politics from occupation, and hence drew the conclusion that 'there must be close unity between the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions, which it must lead'. Finally, the S.-R.s demanded that the unions be strictly non-partisan, in order to avoid a split in the ranks of the proletariat, but rejected any narrowing down of the tasks and activities of the trade unions to a limited sphere, formulating this task as an all-out struggle against capital, and therefore as both an economic and a political struggle."

That is how *Znamya Truda* itself describes the facts! And only a person who is blind or totally incapable of thinking can deny that of these three viewpoints it is the one that speaks of close unity between the Social-Democratic Party and the unions that "is confirmed by the Stuttgart resolution,

---

\* The meeting was attended by about fifteen hundred people. See the report in *Bulleten Muzeya Sodelstviya Truda*, No. 2, November 26, 1905 (quoted by *Znamya Truda*).

\*\* It should be said, however, that the Mensheviks' idea of this "non-partisanship" was a rather peculiar one. Thus, their spokesman illustrated his points in the following way: "A correct answer to the question of partisanship has been given in the Moscow Printers' Union, which proposes that comrades join the S.-D. Party as individuals." (Note by *Znamya Truda*.)



which recommends close ties between the Party and the trade unions."\*

To confuse this perfectly clear issue, the S.-R.s, in the most diverting manner, mixed up the independence of the trade unions in the economic struggle with their non-party character. "The Stuttgart Congress," they write, "definitely stood also for the independence (the non-partisanship) of the unions, i.e., rejected the viewpoint of both the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks." This conclusion is drawn from the following words in the Stuttgart resolution: "Each of the two organisations [the Party and the trade union] has its own sphere, determined by its nature, and within which it must act quite independently. At the same time, however, there is an ever expanding sphere," and so on, as quoted above. Yet we find wags who *mixed up* this demand for the "independence" of the trade unions in the "sphere determined by their nature" with the question of the non-partisanship of the unions or their close alignment with the Party in the political sphere and in dealing with the tasks of the socialist revolution!

In this way our S.-R.s completely suppressed the fundamental issue of the appraisal of the "neutrality" theory, a theory that in fact serves to strengthen the influence of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat. In place of this fundamental issue, they preferred to speak only of the specifically Russian situation where there are several socialist parties, and did so in such a way as to throw a *false* light on what happened at Stuttgart. "One cannot argue that the Stuttgart resolution is hazy," writes *Znamya Truda*, "for Mr. Plekhanov removed all haziness and doubt when he addressed the International Congress as the Party's official representative; and so far no statement has been issued by the Central S.-D. Committee that 'such a statement by Comrade Plekhanov disorganises the ranks of the united party...'"

Gentlemen of the S.-R. Party! You are entitled, of course, to speak ironically about our C.C. having called Plekhanov to order. You are entitled to think that one can respect, say, a party which officially *does not condemn* Mr. Gershuni's

---

\* What the Mensheviks put forward in November 1905 was not orthodox but *vulgar* views on neutrality. Let the S.-R. gentlemen remember that!

pro-Cadet conduct. But why tell a plain untruth? Plekhanov *was not* the representative of the S.-D. Party at the Stuttgart Congress, but only one of its 33 delegates. And what he represented was the views not of the S.-D. Party but of the present Menshevik opposition to that Party and to its London decisions. The S.-R.s cannot but be aware of this, which means they are telling a *deliberate* untruth.

"...In the committee that examined the question of the relations between the trade unions and the political party, he [Plekhanov] literally said the following: 'There are 11 revolutionary organisations in Russia; with which of them should the trade unions align themselves?... Introducing political differences into the trade unions in Russia would be harmful.' In answer to this the members of the committee *all unanimously* declared that the Congress resolution must not be interpreted in that way, that they 'do not by any means oblige the trade unions and their members to join the S.-D. Party', that they, as stated in the resolution, demand their 'complete independence'" (*Znamya Truda's italics*).

You are mixing things up, gentlemen of *Znamya Truda*! In the committee a *Belgian* comrade asked whether it could be made obligatory for trade union members to join the Social-Democratic Party, and *everyone* answered that it could not. Plekhanov, on the other hand, proposed an amendment to the resolution, saying: "unity of the trade union organisation, however, should not be lost sight of." This amendment was adopted, but not unanimously (Comrade Voinov, who represented the views of the R.S.D.L.P., voted for the amendment, and in our opinion was right in doing so). That was how matters stood.

Social-Democrats should never lose sight of unity of the trade union organisation. That is quite right. But this applies also to the S.-R.s whom we invite to ponder over this "unity of the trade union organisation" when the latter announces its close ties with Social-Democracy! Nobody ever dreamt of "obliging" trade union members to join the S.-D. Party; fear made the S.-R.s imagine that. And to suggest that the Stuttgart Congress prohibited trade unions from declaring their close ties with the Social-Democratic Party or from establishing *such* ties in reality, in actual life, is a cock-and-bull story.

"The Russian S.-D.s," writes *Znamya Truda*, "are conducting a strenuous and unremitting campaign to win the

trade unions and subordinate them to their Party leadership. The Bolsheviks are doing this frankly and openly... the Mensheviks have chosen a more roundabout way...." Correct, gentlemen of the S.-R. Party! For the sake of the prestige of the workers' International you are entitled to demand of us that we conduct this campaign in a tactful and restrained way, "not losing sight of the unity of the trade union organisation". We readily admit this, and demand the same admission from you, but we shall not give up our campaign!

But then Plekhanov said that it was harmful to introduce political differences into the unions.... Yes, Plekhanov did say that stupid thing, and the S.-R. gentlemen, naturally, were bound to pounce on it, as they always pounce on everything least worthy of imitation. However, we should not be guided by Plekhanov's words, but by the congress resolution, which *cannot* be implemented without "introducing political differences". Here is a little example. The congress resolution says that the trade unions should not be guided by "the theory of the harmony of interests between labour and capital". We Social-Democrats assert that the agrarian programme, which calls for equalised distribution of the land in a bourgeois society, is based on the theory of the harmony of interests between labour and capital.\* We shall always declare our opposition to such a difference (or even a difference with monarchist-minded workers) being made the grounds for breaking the unity of a strike, etc., but we shall always "introduce this difference" into the workers' ranks in general, and into *all* workers' unions in particular.

Plekhanov's reference to eleven parties is just as foolish. First, Russia is not the only country where there are various socialist parties. Secondly, Russia has only two rival socialist parties of any importance—the S.-D. and the S.-R. parties, for it is quite ridiculous to lump together all the parties of the nationalities. Thirdly, the question of uniting the really socialist parties is quite a special one; by

---

\* Even some S.-R.s realise this now, and have thus taken a definite step towards Marxism. See the very interesting new book by Firsov and Jacoby, which we shall soon discuss in detail with readers of *Proletary*.<sup>64</sup>

dragging it in Plekhanov confuses the issue. We must always and everywhere stand for the alignment of the unions with the socialist party of the working class, but the question as to which party in any given country, among any given nationality, is really socialist and really the party of the working class, is a special question, which is decided not by resolutions of international congresses, but by the outcome of the struggle between the national parties.

How erroneous Comrade Plekhanov's arguments on this subject are is shown in a most striking manner by his article in *Sovremenny Mir*,<sup>85</sup> No. 12, 1907. On page 55 Plekhanov quotes a statement by Lunacharsky that trade union neutrality is supported by the German revisionists. Plekhanov answers this statement as follows: "The revisionists say that the unions must be neutral, but understand by this that the unions must be used to fight orthodox Marxism". And Plekhanov concludes: "The elimination of trade union neutrality will not help matters at all. Even if we make the unions closely and formally dependent on the Party, and revisionist 'ideology' triumphs in the Party, the elimination of trade union neutrality will merely be a fresh victory for 'the critics of Marx'."

This argument is a typical example of Plekhanov's usual method of dodging the issue and suppressing the essence of the dispute. If revisionist ideology really does triumph in the Party, then it will not be a socialist party of the working class. It is not at all a question of how the party takes shape, and what struggle and what splits occur in the process. It is a question of the fact that a socialist party and trade unions exist in every capitalist country, and it is our job to define the basic relations between them. The class interests of the bourgeoisie inevitably give rise to a striving to confine the unions to petty and narrow activity within the framework of the existing social order, to keep them away from any contact with socialism; and the neutrality theory is the ideological cover for these strivings of the bourgeoisie. In one way or another, the revisionists within the S.-D. parties will always clear a way for themselves in capitalist society.

Of course, at the outset of the workers' political and trade union movements in Europe it was possible to uphold

trade union neutrality as a means of widening the original field of proletarian struggle during the period when it was comparatively undeveloped and when the bourgeoisie exerted no systematic influence on the unions. At the present time it is quite indefensible, from the point of view of international Social-Democracy, to uphold trade union neutrality. One can only smile when reading Plekhanov's assurances that "even today, Marx would be in favour of trade union neutrality in Germany", especially when that kind of argument is based on a one-sided interpretation of a single "quotation" from Marx, while ignoring the sum and substance of Marx's statements and the whole spirit of his teachings.

"I stand for neutrality, understood in Bebel's and not the revisionist sense," writes Plekhanov. To talk like that means to swear by Bebel and still get stuck in the mud. Needless to say, Bebel is such a great authority in the international proletarian movement, such an experienced practical leader, a socialist so keenly alive to the requirements of the revolutionary struggle, that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred he climbed out of the mud himself when he happened to slip into it, and he dragged out those who were willing to follow his lead. Bebel was wrong when he joined Vollmar in defending the agrarian programme of the revisionists in Breslau (in 1895), when he insisted (in Essen) on making a distinction in principle between defensive and offensive wars, and when he was ready to elevate trade union "neutrality" to the level of a principle. We readily believe that if Plekhanov gets stuck in the mud only in Bebel's company, it will not happen to him often or for long. But we still think that Bebel should not be imitated when Bebel is wrong.

It is said—and Plekhanov makes a special point of it—that neutrality is necessary in order to unite all the workers who are beginning to see the need for improving their material conditions. But those who say this forget that the present stage of development of class contradictions inevitably introduces "political differences" even into the question of how this improvement is to be secured within the bounds of contemporary society. The theory of the neutrality of the trade unions as opposed to the theory of the need for close ties between them and revolutionary Social-

Democracy, inevitably leads to preference being given to methods of securing this improvement that involve a blunting of the proletarian class struggle. A striking example of this (which, incidentally, is connected with the appraisal of one of the most interesting episodes in the modern labour movement) is to be found in the *very same* issue of *Sovremenny Mir* in which Plekhanov advocates neutrality. Side by side with Plekhanov, we find here Mr. E. P., extolling Richard Bell, the well-known English railwaymen's leader, who ended a dispute between the workers and the railway company by a compromise. Bell is described as the "soul of the whole railwaymen's movement". "There is not the slightest doubt," E. P. writes, "that thanks to his calm, well-considered, and consistent tactics, Bell has won the complete confidence of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, the members of which are ready to follow his lead without hesitation" (*Sovremenny Mir*, No. 12, page 75). This point of view is not accidental, but is essentially connected with the neutrality theory, which puts in the forefront unity of the workers for the improvement of their conditions, and not unity for a struggle that could promote the cause of proletarian emancipation.

But this point of view is not at all in accord with the views of the British socialists, who would probably be very much surprised to learn that the eulogisers of Bell write, without objection being raised, in the same journal as prominent Mensheviks like Plekhanov, Iordansky, and Co.

*Justice*,<sup>96</sup> the British Social-Democratic newspaper, in a leading article on November 16, commented as follows on Bell's agreement with the railway companies: "We cannot but agree with the almost universal trade union condemnation which has been pronounced upon this so-called treaty of peace... it absolutely destroys the very reason of existence of the union.... This preposterous agreement... cannot be binding on the men, and the latter will do well to at once repudiate it." And in its next issue, that of November 23, Burnett, in an article entitled "Sold Again!", wrote the following about this agreement: "Three weeks ago the A.S.R.S. was one of the most powerful trade unions in the country; today it is reduced to the level of a mere benefit society.... All these changes have taken place not because the railway-

men have fought and lost, but because their leaders have deliberately or stupidly sold them to the railway bosses ere the fight began." And the editor added that a similar letter had been received from "a Midland Railway Company's wage-slave".

But perhaps this is the "ardour" of "too revolutionary" Social-Democrats? No. *The Labour Leader*,<sup>97</sup> organ of the moderate Independent Labour Party,<sup>98</sup> which does not even want to call itself socialist, in its issue of November 15 published a letter from a trade-unionist railwayman in which, replying to the praise lavished on Bell by the entire capitalist press (from the radical *Reynolds' News*<sup>99</sup> to the Conservative *Times*<sup>100</sup>), he stated that the settlement made by Bell was the "most contemptible one that has ever occurred in the history of Trade-Unionism", and described Richard Bell as the "Marshal Bazaine of the trade union movement". In the same issue another railwayman demands that "Mr. Bell... should be called upon to explain" the nefarious settlement by which "the railwaymen... are condemned to seven years' penal servitude...". And the editor of this moderate organ, in a leading article of the same issue, describes the settlement as "the Sedan of the British Trade-Union movement". "Never has such an opportunity presented itself for a national manifestation of the power of organised labour." Among the workers there prevailed "unprecedented enthusiasm" and a desire to fight. The article concludes with a scathing comparison between the dire needs of the workers and the triumph of "Mr. Lloyd George [the Cabinet Minister who played the role of lackey to the capitalists] and Mr. Bell hastening to prepare banquets".

Only the extreme opportunists, the Fabians,<sup>101</sup> members of a purely intellectualist organisation, approved the settlement; so that even *The New Age*,<sup>102</sup> which sympathises with the Fabians, blushed for shame and was obliged to admit that while the Conservative bourgeois *Times* had published the Manifesto of the Fabian Society's Executive Committee in full, apart from these gentlemen "no socialist organisation, no trade union, and no prominent labour leader" (December 7th issue, p. 101) had declared in favour of the settlement.

Here you have a specimen of the application of the neutrality theory by Plekhanov's colleague, Mr. E. P. The question was one not of "political differences" but of improving the workers' conditions in existing society. The entire British bourgeoisie, the Fabians, and Mr. E. P. declared for "improvement" at the price of renouncing the struggle and submitting to the tender mercies of capital; all the socialists and trade-unionist workers were for a collective struggle of the workers. Will Plekhanov now continue to advocate "neutrality", instead of a close alignment of the trade unions with the socialist party?

*Proletary* No. 22  
(March 3), February 19, 1908

*Collected Works*, Vol. 13,  
pp. 460-69



---

## British and German Workers Demonstrate for Peace<sup>103</sup>

As is well known, in Britain and Germany a chauvinist campaign has long been conducted by the bourgeois press, especially the gutter press, in which these countries are incited against each other. Competition in the world market between British and German capitalists is becoming more and more bitter. Britain's former supremacy and her undivided ascendancy in the world market, have become a thing of the past. Germany is one of the capitalist countries that are developing particularly rapidly, and her manufactures are seeking markets abroad on an ever-growing scale. The struggle for colonies and the conflict of commercial interests have in capitalist society become one of the main causes of war. It is therefore not surprising that the capitalists of both countries consider war between Britain and Germany inevitable, and the military men on both sides deem it quite desirable. The British jingoes want to undermine the strength of a dangerous rival by smashing Germany's sea power while it is still immeasurably weaker than Britain's. The German Junkers and generals, headed by that Bourbon, Wilhelm II, are spoiling for a fight with Britain, hoping to be able to use their numerical superiority in land forces, and hoping that the clamour of military victories will stifle the growing discontent of the working masses and prevent the aggravation of the class struggle in Germany.

The British and German workers decided to come out publicly against the growing war danger. For a long time the labour press in both countries had been waging an unremitting struggle against chauvinism and militarism. But what was required now was some more imposing expression of the will of the working class than through the organs of the press. The British workers decided to send a delegation to Berlin to attend a grand demonstration that would declare the joint determination of the proletariat of both countries to wage war on war.

The demonstration took place in Berlin on Sunday, September 20 (7, old style). This time the British workers' representatives were able to address the proletariat of Berlin without let or hindrance. Two years before, when J. Jaures had wanted to speak to the German workers on behalf of the French working class at a Social-Democratic mass meeting in Berlin to protest against the bourgeois jingoes, the German Government banned him. This time it did not venture to eject the delegates of the British proletariat.

A mammoth rally of working men was held in one of Berlin's biggest halls. About 5,000 people immediately packed the place, and an overflow of many thousands occupied the surrounding grounds and the street. Stewards wearing red armbands kept order. Comrade Legien, the well-known leader of the German trade unions (called "free", i.e., actually Social-Democratic unions), greeted the British delegation on behalf of the entire politically and industrially organised working class of Germany. He said that fifty years ago French and British workers had demonstrated on behalf of peace. At that time those pioneer socialists were not backed by the organised masses. Today Britain and Germany together had an army of  $4\frac{1}{3}$  million organised workers. It was on behalf of this army that the British delegates and the Berlin rally now spoke, declaring that the decision of war or peace lay in the hands of the working class.

In his speech in reply, the British workers' delegate Madison condemned the jingo slander campaign conducted by the bourgeoisie, and handed over an Address from the Workers of Britain to the Workers of Germany, signed by

3,000 workmen. Among the signatories, he said, were representatives of both trends in the British labour movement (i.e., both Social-Democrats and adherents of the Independent Labour Party, who do not yet hold any consistent socialist point of view). The Address pointed out that wars serve the interests of the propertied classes. The masses of the workers bear all the burdens of war. The propertied classes derive benefit from national calamities. Let the workers unite to fight militarism, to ensure peace!

After other British delegates and a representative of the German Social-Democratic Party, Richard Fischer, had spoken, the meeting closed with the unanimous adoption of a resolution branding the "selfish and short-sighted policy of the ruling and exploiting classes" and expressing readiness to act in accordance with the resolution of the International Congress in Stuttgart, i.e., to fight war by all ways and means. The meeting broke up in an orderly manner amidst the singing of the workers' *Marseillaise*. There were no street demonstrations. The Berlin police and local military authorities were disappointed. It is characteristic of the regime in Germany that the most peaceful demonstration of the workers had to have a police and military demonstration to accompany it. The Berlin garrison was mobilised. Detachments of troops were stationed in different parts of the city in accordance with a strict plan, mostly in such a way that their hiding-places and numbers could not be easily detected. Police units patrolled the streets and squares in the vicinity of the meeting hall, particularly the road leading from there to the royal palace. The latter was ringed with police in plain clothes and troops concealed in house yards. An intricate system of police pickets was organised; groups of policemen loitered at street corners; police officers were detailed to all "important" spots; police cyclists acted as scouts and kept the military authorities informed on every step the "enemy" made; bridges and canal crossings were put under triple guard. "They stood watch over the threatened monarchy", sarcastically wrote *Vorwärts*, commenting on all these measures taken by the Government of Wilhelm II.

It was a rehearsal, we add for our part. Wilhelm II and the German bourgeoisie were rehearsing military combat

with an insurgent proletariat. Such rehearsals are undoubtedly and in any case useful to both the masses of workers and to the soldiers. *Ca ira* (it will be a success!), as the French workers' song says. Repeated rehearsals are leading, maybe very slowly as yet, but very surely, to the great historical climax.

Written September 8 (21)-

October 2 (15), 1908

First published in 1933  
in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 15,  
pp. 210-12

---

## ***From Meeting of the International Socialist Bureau***

The whole of the next day was taken up with the meeting of the International Socialist Bureau. The first item on the agenda, namely, the affiliation of the British Labour Party,<sup>104</sup> occupied the whole of the morning session. According to the Rules of the International, organisations eligible for membership are, first, socialist parties which recognise the class struggle, and secondly, working-class organisations whose standpoint is that of the class struggle (i.e., trade unions). The Labour Party recently formed in the British House of Commons does not openly call itself socialist, and does not expressly and definitely recognise the principle of the class struggle (which, be it said in parenthesis, the British Social-Democrats call upon it to do). Needless to say this Labour Party was admitted to the International in general and to the Stuttgart Socialist Congress in particular, because, as a matter of fact, this Party is an organisation of a mixed type, standing between the two types defined in Clauses 1 and 2 of the Rules of the International, and embodying the political representation of the British trade unions. Nevertheless, the question of the affiliation of this Party was raised, and raised by the Party itself, in the person of the so-called Independent Labour Party (the I.L.P., as the British call it), which is one of the two subsections of the British section of the International. The other subsection is the Social-Democratic Federation.<sup>105</sup>

The Independent Labour Party demanded the *direct* recognition of the Labour Party as an affiliated organisation of the International. Its delegate Bruce Glasier urged the enormous significance of this representation in Parliament of hundreds of thousands of organised workers who were steadily and surely moving towards socialism. He was very contemptuous of principles, formulas and catechisms. Kautsky, in reply to him, dissociated himself from this attitude of contempt towards the principles and ultimate aim of socialism, but wholly supported the affiliation of the Labour Party as a party waging the class struggle in practice. Kautsky moved the following resolution:

"Whereas by previous resolutions of the international congresses, all organisations adopting the standpoint of the proletarian class struggle and recognising the necessity for political action have been accepted for membership, the International Bureau declares that the British Labour Party is admitted to international socialist congresses, because, while not expressly [*ausdrücklich*] accepting the proletarian class struggle, in practice the Labour Party conducts this struggle, and adopts its standpoint, inasmuch as the Party is organised independently of the bourgeois parties." Kautsky was supported by the Austrians, by Vaillant of the French group, and, as the voting showed, by the majority of the small nations. The opposition came first of all from Hyndman, the representative of the British Social-Democratic Federation, who demanded that the *status quo* be maintained until the Labour Party expressly recognised the principle of the class struggle and of socialism; then from Roussel (the second French delegate and a follower of Guesde), Rubanovich of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, and Avramov, the delegate of the revolutionary wing of the Bulgarian socialists.

I took the floor in order to associate myself with the first part of Kautsky's resolution. It was impossible, I argued, to refuse to admit the Labour Party, i.e., the parliamentary representation of the trade unions, since congresses had previously admitted all trade unions whatever, even those which had allowed themselves to be represented by bourgeois parliamentarians. But, I said, the second part of Kautsky's resolution is wrong, because *in practice* the Labour Party is

not a party really independent of the Liberals, and does not pursue a fully independent class policy. I therefore proposed an amendment that the end of the resolution, beginning with the word "because", should read as follows:

"because it [the Labour Party] represents the first step on the part of the really proletarian organisations of Britain towards a conscious class policy and towards a *socialist* workers' party." I submitted this amendment to the Bureau, but Kautsky would not accept it, stating in his next speech that the International Bureau could not adopt decisions based on "expectations". But the main struggle was between the supporters and the opponents of Kautsky's resolution as a whole. When it was about to be voted on, Adler proposed that it be divided into two parts. This was done, and both parts were carried by the International Bureau: the first with three against and one abstention, and the second with four against and one abstention. Thus Kautsky's motion became the decision of the Bureau. Rubanovich abstained on both votes. Let me add that Adler, who spoke after me and before Kautsky's second speech, replied to me in the following manner—I am quoting from the Belgian socialist organ *Le Peuple*,<sup>106</sup> which gave the most detailed and exact reports of the sessions: "Lenin's proposal is tempting [*séduisante*, Adler said: *verlockend*, enticing], but it cannot make us forget that the Labour Party is now outside the bourgeois parties. It is not for us to judge how it did this. We recognise the fact of progress."

Such was the nature of the debate at the International Bureau on the question under discussion. I shall now take the liberty to deal in greater detail with this debate, in order to explain the position that I took up to the readers of *Proletary*. The arguments advanced by V. Adler and K. Kautsky failed to convince me, and I still think they are wrong. By stating in his resolution that the Labour Party "does not expressly accept the proletarian class struggle", Kautsky undoubtedly voiced a certain "expectation", a certain "judgement" as to what the policy of the Labour Party is now and what that policy should be. But Kautsky expressed this *indirectly*, and in such a way that it amounted to an assertion which, first, is incorrect in substance, and secondly, provides a basis for misrepresenting his

*idea*. That by separating *in Parliament* (not during the elections! not in its whole policy! not in its propaganda and agitation!) from the bourgeois parties, the Labour Party in Britain is taking the first step towards socialism and towards a class policy of the proletarian mass organisations is indisputable. This is not an "expectation" but a fact, the very fact which compels us to admit the Labour Party into the International, since we have already accepted the trade unions in it. Finally, it is precisely such a formulation that would make hundreds of thousands of British workers, who undoubtedly respect the decisions of the International but have not yet become full socialists, ponder once again over the question why they are regarded as having taken only the *first* step, and what the *next* steps along this road should be. My formulation does not contain even the shadow of a claim that the International should undertake to solve the concrete and detailed problems of a national labour movement, should undertake to determine when the next steps should be taken, and what they should be. But that further steps are necessary in general must be admitted, in relation to a party which does not expressly and clearly accept the principle of the class struggle. Kautsky in his resolution acknowledged this indirectly, instead of doing so directly. It looked as if the International was certifying that the Labour Party was *in practice* waging a consistent class struggle, as if it was sufficient for a workers' organisation to form a separate labour group in Parliament in order *in its entire conduct* to become independent of the bourgeoisie!

On this question Hyndman, Roussel, Rubanovich and Avramov undoubtedly occupied a still more incorrect position (which Rubanovich did not rectify but confused by his abstention on both parts of the resolution). When Avramov declared that to admit the Labour Party would be to encourage opportunism, he expressed a glaringly wrong view. One need only recall Engels' letters to Sorge. For a number of years Engels strongly insisted that the British Social-Democrats, led by Hyndman, were committing an error by acting like sectarians, failing to link themselves with the unconscious but powerful class instinct of the trade unions, and by turning Marxism into a "dogma", whereas it should be a "guide to action".<sup>107</sup> When there exist objective condi-



tions which retard the growth of the political consciousness and class independence of the proletarian masses, one must be able patiently and steadfastly to work hand in hand with them, making no concessions in principles but not refraining from activity *right in the midst* of the proletarian masses. These lessons of Engels' have been corroborated by the subsequent development of events, when the British trade unions, insular, aristocratic, philistinely selfish, and hostile to socialism, which have produced a number of outright traitors to the working class who have sold themselves to the bourgeoisie for ministerial posts (like the scoundrel John Burns), have nevertheless begun *moving towards* socialism, awkwardly, inconsistently, in zigzag fashion, but still moving towards socialism. Only the blind can fail to see that socialism is now growing apace among the working class in Britain, that socialism is *once again* becoming a mass movement in that country, that the social revolution is approaching in Great Britain.

*Proletary* No. 37  
October 16 (29), 1908  
Signed: *N. Lenin*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 15,  
pp. 233-37

---

## ***From The Resolution of the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.***

### **The Character and Organisational Forms of Party Work**

Recognising that the experience of the past three years has undoubtedly confirmed the main provisions of the resolution on the problem of organisation carried by the December (1908) Conference, and assuming that the new upswing of the working-class movement makes possible the further development of organisational forms of Party work along the lines indicated therein, i.e., by the formation of illegal Social-Democratic cells surrounded by as wide a network as possible of every kind of legal workers' associations,—

the conference considers that:

- 1) it is essential for illegal Party organisations to participate actively in the leadership of the *economic struggle* (strikes, strike committees, etc.), and to ensure co-operation in this sphere between the illegal Party cells and the trade unions, in particular with the S.-D. cells in the trade unions, and also with various leaders of the trade union movement;

- 2) it is desirable that S.-D. cells in unions organised on an *industrial* basis should, whenever local conditions permit, function in conjunction with Party branches organised on a *territorial* basis;

- 3) it is essential for the maximum possible initiative to be shown in the organisation of S.-D. work in legally existing associations—unions, reading rooms, libraries, various types of workers' entertainment societies, the circulation of the trade union journals and the guidance of the trade union press in the spirit of Marxism; the use of the Duma speeches of the S.-D. members, the training of workers to become

legal lecturers, the creation (in connection with the elections to the Fourth Duma) of workers' and other voters' committees for each district, each street, etc., and the organisation of Social-Democratic campaigns in connection with the elections to municipal bodies, etc.;

4) it is essential to make special efforts to strengthen and increase the number of illegal Party cells, and to seek for new organisational forms for them of the greatest possible flexibility, to establish and strengthen leading illegal Party organisations in every town and to propagate such forms of mass illegal organisations as "exchanges", factory Party meetings, and so on;

5) it is desirable to draw the study circles into everyday *practical* work—the distribution of illegal Social-Democratic and legal Marxist literature, and so on;

6) it is essential to bear in mind that systematic agitation through S.-D. literature and particularly the regular distribution of the illegal Party paper, issued frequently and regularly can have a tremendous significance for the establishment of organisational links, both between the illegal cells, and between the S.-D. cells in legally existing workers' associations.

### **The Party's Attitude to the Workers' State Insurance Duma Bill**

#### **I**

1. The share of the wealth produced by the wage-worker which he receives in the form of wages is so insignificant that it is scarcely sufficient to provide for his most essential requirements; the proletarian is therefore deprived of any opportunity to lay aside any part of his earnings to provide for himself in case of inability to work as a result of accident, illness, old age or permanent disablement, as well as in case of unemployment which is inseparably linked up with the capitalist mode of production. The insurance of workers in all the aforementioned cases is therefore a reform imperatively dictated by the entire course of capitalist development.

2. The best form of workers' insurance is *state* insurance based on the following principles: a) it should provide for the workers in *all* cases of incapacity (accidents, illness, old age, permanent disablement; extra provisions for working women during pregnancy and childbirth; benefits for widows and orphans upon the death of the bread-winner) or in case of loss of earnings due to unemployment; b) insurance must include *all* wage-earners and their families; c) all insured persons should receive compensations equal to their *full* earnings, and *all* expenditures on insurance must be borne by the employers and the state; d) all forms of insurance should be handled by *uniform* insurance organisations of the *territorial* type and based on the principle of *full* management by the insured persons themselves.

3. The government Bill, passed by the State Duma, is in radical contradiction to all these fundamental requirements of a rational insurance scheme; for a) it provides for only *two* kinds of insurance, cases of accident and cases of illness; b) it extends to only a small part (according to the most liberal calculations, to one-sixth) of the Russian proletariat, since it excludes from insurance whole regions (Siberia and, in the government's version, also the Caucasus) and whole categories of workers who particularly need insurance (farm labourers, building workers, railway workers, post and telegraph workers, shop assistants, etc.); c) it provides for beggarly rates of compensation (the maximum compensation in case of *total* disablement resulting from accidents is set at two-thirds of the earnings, the latter, moreover, calculated on the basis of standards lower than the actual earnings) and at the same time makes the workers pay the lion's share of the expenditure on insurance—for the plan is to make the workers cover the expenditures not only on insurance against illness but also on insurance against "minor" injuries, which in practice are the most numerous. This new procedure is a change for the worse even compared with the present law, according to which compensation for injuries is paid entirely by the employers; d) it deprives the insurance bodies of every vestige of independence, placing them under the combined surveillance of civil servants (from the courts and the "Council for Insurance Affairs"), the gendarmerie, the police (who, beside exercising general surveil-

lance, are invested with the right to direct the practical activities of the insurance bodies, influence the selection of their personnel, etc.), and the employers (the accident insurance societies under the exclusive control of employers; sick benefit societies run by the factories; society rules guaranteeing the influence of the employers, etc.).

4. This law, which rides roughshod over the most vital interests of the workers, is the only one possible in this present period of frenzied reaction, this period of the domination of counter-revolution, and is the result of many years of preliminary negotiations and agreement between the government and the representatives of capital. An insurance reform really corresponding to the interests of the workers can only be accomplished after the final overthrow of tsarism and the achievement of conditions indispensable for the free class struggle of the proletariat.

## II

In view of the aforementioned, the conference resolves that:

1) It is the urgent task both of the illegal Party organisations and of the comrades active in the legally existing organisations (trade unions, clubs, co-operative societies, etc.) to develop the most extensive agitation against the Duma Insurance Bill, which affects the interests of the entire Russian proletariat as a class, since it grossly violates them.

2) The conference considers it necessary to emphasise that all Social-Democratic agitation concerning the Insurance Bill should be presented in relation to the class position of the proletariat in modern capitalist society, and should criticise the bourgeois illusions being spread by the social-reformists; this agitation must, in general, be linked up with our fundamental socialist tasks; on the other hand, it is necessary in this agitation to show the connection between the character of the Duma "reform" and the current political situation and, in general, its connection with our revolutionary-democratic tasks and slogans.

3) Fully approving of the vote of the Social-Democratic group in the Duma against the Bill, the conference draws

the attention of the comrades to the extensive and valuable material clarifying the attitude of the various classes to labour reforms furnished by the debate in the Duma on this question; the conference particularly stresses the fact that the debate vividly brought out the aspirations of the Octobrist representatives of backward capital openly hostile to the workers, as well as the attitude of the Constitutional-Democratic Party masked, in the hypocritical speeches of its representatives, by social-reformist phrases about "social peace"; in point of fact, the Cadets came out in the Duma against the independent activity of the working class and virulently contested the principal amendments to the Bill proposed by the Social-Democratic group in the Duma.

4) The conference most earnestly warns the workers against all attempts to curtail or completely distort Social-Democratic agitation by confining it to what is legally permissible in the present period of the domination of the counter-revolution; on the other hand, the conference emphasises that the main point of this agitation should be to explain to the proletarian masses that no real improvement in the worker's conditions is possible unless there is a new revolutionary upsurge, that whoever wishes to achieve a genuine labour reform must above all fight for a new, victorious revolution.

5) Should the Duma Bill become law in spite of the protest of the class-conscious proletariat, the conference summons the comrades to make use of the new organisational forms which it provides (workers' sick benefit societies) to carry on energetic propaganda for Social-Democratic ideas in these organisational cells and thus turn the new law, devised as a means of putting new chains and a new yoke upon the proletariat, into a means of developing its class-consciousness, strengthening its organisation and intensifying its struggle for full political liberty and for socialism.

Written in January 1912  
Published in February 1912  
in the pamphlet  
*The All-Russia Conference  
of the R.S.D.L.P.* by the C.C.,  
R.S.D.L.P., Paris

*Collected Works*, Vol. 17,  
pp. 472-74, 475-79

---

## In Switzerland

The local socialists call Switzerland a "republic of lackeys". This petty-bourgeois country, in which inn-keeping has long been a major industry, has depended too much on wealthy parasites squandering millions on summer travel in the mountains. A small proprietor toadying to rich tourists—such, until recently, was the most widespread type of Swiss bourgeois.

Things are changing now. A large-scale industry is developing in Switzerland. The use of waterfalls and mountain rivers as direct sources of electric power is playing a big part in this. The power of falling water, which replaces coal in industry, is often called "white coal".

The industrialisation of Switzerland, i.e., the development there of a large-scale industry, has put an end to the former stagnation in the working-class movement. The struggle between capital and labour is assuming a more acute character. The drowsy, philistine spirit which often in the past pervaded some of the Swiss workers' associations is disappearing to give way to the fighting mood of a class-conscious and organised proletariat that is aware of its strength.

The Swiss workers entertain no illusions about the fact that theirs is a bourgeois republic upholding the same kind of wage-slavery as exists in all the capitalist countries without exception. At the same time, however, they have learned very well to use the freedom of their republican institutions to enlighten and organise the wide mass of the workers.

The fruits of their work were clearly revealed during the general strike in Zurich on July 12 (June 29, old style).

This is how it came about. The painters and fitters in Zurich had been on strike for several weeks, demanding higher wages and shorter hours. The enraged employers decided to break the resistance of the strikers. The government of the bourgeois republic, eager to serve the capitalists, came to their aid, and began to *deport* foreign strikers! (There are many foreign workers, particularly Italians, who go to Switzerland to work.) But the use of brute force did not help. The workers held their ground as one man.

Then the capitalists resorted to the following method. In Hamburg, Germany, there is a firm, owned by Ludwig Koch, which specialises in supplying strike-breakers. The Zurich capitalists—patriots and republicans, don't laugh!—had that firm send in strike-breakers, who they knew included all sorts of criminals convicted in Germany for pandering, brawling, etc. The capitalists supplied this riff-raff or gang of convicts (lumpen proletarians) with pistols. The brazen band of strike-breakers filled the taverns in the workers' district and there engaged in unheard-of hooliganism. When a group of workers gathered together to eject the hooligans, one of the latter *shot down* a worker who was on strike.

The workers' patience was exhausted. They beat up the murderer. It was decided to make an interpellation in the Zurich City Council on the hooligans' outrages. And when the city authorities, in defence of the capitalists, prohibited strike picketing, the workers resolved to protest by a *one-day general strike*.

All the trade unions declared unanimously for the strike. The printers were the only sad exception. They declared against the strike, and the meeting of 425 representatives of all the Zurich workers' organisations replied to the printers' decision with a stentorian cry of "Shame!" The strike was decided on, even though the leaders of political organisations were against it (the same old spirit of the philistine, opportunist Swiss leaders!).

Knowing that the capitalists and the management would try to wreck the peaceful strike, the workers acted according to the wise maxim, "In war as in war." In war-time one does not tell the enemy *when* an attack will take place.



The workers purposely declared on Thursday that the strike would take place on Tuesday or Wednesday, whereas in reality they had fixed it *for Friday*. The capitalists and the management were taken by surprise.

The strike was a signal success. Thirty thousand leaflets in German and Italian were circulated early in the morning. Some 2,000 strikers occupied the tram depots. Everything stopped. Life in the city came to a standstill. Friday is a market day in Zurich, but the city seemed dead. The consumption of spirits (all alcoholic drinks) was prohibited by the strike committee, and the workers strictly obeyed this decision.

An imposing mass demonstration took place at 2 p. m. When the speeches were over, the workers dispersed peacefully, and without singing.

The government and the capitalists, who had hoped to provoke the workers to violence, saw their failure and are now beside themselves with rage. Not only strike picketing, but also open-air meetings and demonstrations have been prohibited by special decree throughout the Zurich Canton. The police occupied the People's House in Zurich and arrested a number of the workers' leaders. The capitalists announced a three-day lock-out by way of avenging themselves for the strike.

The workers are keeping calm; they scrupulously observe the boycott of spirits and wine, saying among themselves: "Why shouldn't a working man rest three days a year, since the rich rest all the year round?"

*Pravda* No. 63  
July 12, 1912  
Signed: B. Zh.

*Collected Works*, Vol. 18,  
pp. 160-62

---

## ***From The Italian Socialist Congress***

A few days ago the Thirteenth Congress of the Italian Socialist Party<sup>108</sup> came to a close in the town of Reggio Emilia.

The struggle within the Italian Socialist Party has assumed particularly sharp forms in recent years. Originally there were two basic trends: revolutionary and reformist. The revolutionaries upheld the proletarian character of the movement and combated all manifestations of opportunism, i.e., the spirit of moderation, deals with the bourgeoisie, and renunciation of the ultimate (socialist) aims of the working-class movement. The cardinal principle of this trend and the basis of its views are the class struggle.

The reformists, in fighting for reforms, i.e., individual improvements of political and economic conditions, kept forgetting the socialist character of the movement. They advocated blocs and alliances with the bourgeoisie to the point of socialists entering bourgeois ministries, of renouncing consistently republican convictions (in monarchical Italy, republican propaganda in itself is not considered unlawful), of defending "colonial policy", the policy of seizing colonies, of oppressing, plundering and exterminating the natives, etc.

These two basic trends, which exist in one form or another in *all* socialist parties, gave rise in Italy to two further extreme trends that deviated completely from socialism and tended therefore to dissociate themselves from the workers'

Socialist Party. One of these non-socialist extremes is *syndicalism*, which became "fashionable" in Italy at one time. The syndicalists inclined towards anarchism, slipped into revolutionary phrase-mongering, destroyed the discipline of the working-class struggle and opposed the use of the parliamentary platform by socialists, or upheld such opposition.

Anarchist influence is feeble everywhere, and the working-class movement is rapidly ridding itself of this sickness.

The Italian syndicalists (led by Arturo Labriola) are already *outside* the Socialist Party. Their role in the working-class movement is negligible. The Marxist revolutionaries in Italy, as in other countries, do not in the least indulge in anarchist sentiments and trends, which disrupt the proletarian movement.

*Pravda* No. 66

July 15, 1912

Signed: I.

*Collected Works*, Vol. 18,

pp. 170-71

---

## In Britain

The British Liberals have been in power for six and a half years. The working-class movement in Britain is becoming stronger and stronger. Strikes are assuming a mass character; moreover, they are ceasing to be purely economic and are developing into political strikes.

Robert Smillie, the leader of the Scottish miners who recently showed such strength in mass struggle,<sup>109</sup> declares that in their next big fight the miners will demand the transfer of the collieries to state ownership. And this next big fight is approaching inexorably, because all the miners of Britain are perfectly well aware that the notorious Minimum Wage Act cannot bring about any appreciable improvement in their conditions.

And so the British Liberals, who are losing ground, have invented a new battle-cry in order once again to induce the mass of the electors to trust the Liberals for a while. "You can't sell without cheating" is the commercial slogan of capitalism. "You can't get seats in parliament without cheating" is the slogan of capitalist politics in free countries.

The "fashionable" slogan invented by the Liberals for this purpose is the demand for "land reform". It is not clear what the Liberals and their expert in humbugging the masses, Lloyd George, mean by that. Apparently, it is a question of increasing the land tax, and no more. But the idea that actually lies behind the resounding talk about "restoring the land to the people", etc., is to collect further millions for military adventures, for the Navy.

In Britain, agriculture is conducted wholly on capitalist lines. The capitalist farmers rent medium-sized plots of land from the landlords and cultivate them with the aid of wage-workers.

Under these circumstances, no "land reform" can in any way change the conditions of the agricultural workers. In Britain the buying-out of landed estates might even become a new method of fleecing the proletariat, since the landlords and the capitalists, who would retain state power, would sell their land at exorbitant prices. And the price would have to be paid by the taxpayers, i.e., the workers again.

The fuss made by the Liberals about the land question has done good in one respect: it has roused interest in organising the agricultural workers.

When Britain's agricultural workers wake up and join together in unions, the Liberals will no longer be able to get away with charlatan "promises of reform" or of allotments for farm-hands and day-labourers.

Recently a reporter of a British labour newspaper visited Joseph Arch, the veteran agricultural workers' leader who has done much to rouse the labourers to a class-conscious life. This could not be done at one stroke, and Arch's slogan—"three acres and a cow" for every agricultural worker—was a very naïve one. The union he founded fell to pieces,<sup>110</sup> but the cause he fought for is not dead and the organisation of the agricultural workers in Britain is once again becoming an immediate issue.

Arch is now 83 years old. He lives in the same village and in the same house in which he was born. He told his interviewer that the agricultural workers' union had managed to raise wages to 15, 16 and 17 shillings a week. And now the wages of agricultural workers in Britain have again dropped—in Norfolk, where Arch lives—to 12 or 13 shillings a week.

*Pravda* No. 89  
August 12, 1912  
Signed: P.

*Collected Works*, Vol. 18,  
pp. 270-71

---

## In America

The 32nd Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor,<sup>111</sup> as the association of trade unions is called, has come to a close in Rochester. Alongside the rapidly growing Socialist Party, this association is a living relic of the past: of the old craft-union, liberal-bourgeois traditions that hang full weight over America's working-class *aristocracy*.

On August 31, 1911, the Federation had 1,841,268 members. Samuel Gompers, a strong opponent of socialism, was re-elected President. But Max Hayes, the socialist workers' candidate, received 5,074 votes against Gompers' 11,974, whereas previously Gompers used to be elected unanimously. The struggle of the socialists against the "trade-unionists" in the American trade union movement is slowly but surely leading to the victory of the former over the latter.

Gompers not only fully accepts the bourgeois myth of "harmony between labour and capital", but carries on a downright bourgeois policy in the Federation against the socialist one, although he professes to stand for the complete political "neutrality" of the trade unions! During the recent presidential elections in America, Gompers reprinted in the Federation's official publication the programmes and platforms of all three bourgeois parties (Democrats, Republicans and Progressists) but did *not* reprint the programme of the *Socialist Party*!

Protests against this mode of action were voiced at the Rochester Convention even by Gompers's own followers.

The state of affairs in the American labour movement shows us, as it does in Britain, the remarkably clear-cut division between purely trade-unionist and socialist strivings, the split between *bourgeois labour policy* and socialist labour policy. For, strange as it may seem, in capitalist society even the working class can carry on a bourgeois policy, if it forgets about its emancipatory aims, puts up with wage-slavery and confines itself to seeking alliances now with one bourgeois party, now with another, for the sake of imaginary "improvements" in its indentured condition.

The principal historical cause of the particular prominence and (temporary) strength of bourgeois labour policy in Britain and America is the long-standing political liberty and the exceptionally favourable conditions, in comparison with other countries, for the deep-going and widespread development of capitalism. These conditions have tended to produce within the working class an aristocracy that has trailed behind the bourgeoisie, *betraying* its own class.

In the twentieth century, this peculiar situation in Britain and America is rapidly disappearing. Other countries are catching up with Anglo-Saxon capitalism, and the *mass* of workers are learning about socialism at first hand. The faster the growth of world capitalism, the sooner will socialism triumph in America and Britain.

Written in December,  
prior to the 7th (20), 1912  
First published in 1954  
in the magazine  
*Kommunist* No. 6

*Collected Works*, Vol. 36,  
pp. 214-15

---

## The British Labour Movement in 1912

The miners' strike was the outstanding event of the past year. While the railway strike in 1911<sup>112</sup> showed the "new spirit" of the British workers, the miners' strike definitely marked an epoch.

Despite the "war" preparations of the ruling classes, and despite the strenuous efforts of the bourgeoisie to crush the resistance of the rebellious slaves of capital, the strike was a success. The miners displayed exemplary organisation. There was not a trace of blacklegging. Coal-mining by soldiers or inexperienced labourers was out of the question. And after six weeks of struggle the bourgeois government of Britain saw that the country's entire industrial activity was coming to a standstill and that the words of the workers' song, "All wheels cease to whirl when thy hand wills it",<sup>113</sup> were coming true.

The government made concessions.

"The Prime Minister of the most powerful empire the world has ever seen attended a delegate meeting of the mine-owners' striking slaves and pleaded with them to agree to a compromise." That is how a well-informed Marxist summed up the struggle.

The British Government, which year after year usually feeds its workers with promises of reform "some day", this time acted with real dispatch. In *five days* a new law was rushed through Parliament! This law introduced a *minimum*



wage, i.e., regulations establishing rates of pay *below* which wages cannot be reduced.

It is true that this law, like all bourgeois reforms, is a miserable half-measure and in part a mere deception of the workers, because while fixing the lowest rate of pay, the employers keep their wage-slaves down all the same. Nevertheless, those who are familiar with the British labour movement say that since the miners' strike the British proletariat *is no longer the same*. The workers have learned to fight. They have come to see the *path* that will lead them to victory. They have become aware of their strength. They have ceased to be the meek lambs they seemed to be for so long a time to the joy of all the defenders and extollers of wage-slavery.

In Britain a change has taken place in the balance of social forces, a change that cannot be expressed in figures but is felt by all.

Unfortunately, there is not much progress in Party affairs in Britain. The split between the British Socialist Party<sup>114</sup> (formerly the Social-Democratic Federation) and the Independent (of socialism) Labour Party persists. The opportunist conduct of the M.P.s belonging to the latter party is giving rise, as always happens, to *syndicalist* tendencies among the workers. Fortunately, these tendencies are not strong.

The British trade unions are slowly but surely turning towards socialism, in spite of the many Labour M.P.s who stubbornly champion the old line of liberal labour policy. But it is beyond the power of these last of the Mohicans to retain the old line!

*Pravda* No. 1  
January 1, 1913  
Signed: W.

*Collected Works*, Vol. 18,  
pp. 467-68

---

## Experience Teaches

Anyone who is sincerely interested in the fortunes of the emancipation movement in our country cannot fail to be interested primarily in our *working-class* movement. The years of upswing, as well as those of counter-revolution, showed beyond all doubt that the working class is marching *at the head of all* the liberation forces and that therefore the fortunes of the working-class movement are most closely interwoven with those of the Russian social movement in general.

Take the curve indicating the workers' *strike movement* during the past eight years! And try to draw a similar curve showing the growth and decline of Russia's entire emancipation movement in general during these years. The two curves will coincide perfectly. There is a very close, an inseparable connection between the emancipation movement as a whole, on the one hand, and the working-class movement, on the other.

Look closely at the data on the strike movement in Russia since 1905.

Year	Number of strikes	Number of strikers (thousands)
1905	13,995	2,863
1906	6,114	1,108
1907	3,573	740
1908	892	176
1909	340	64
1910	222	47
1911	466	105
1912 approximately	1,500,000 (economic and political)	

Surely these data show most clearly that the Russian workers' strike movement is the best barometer of the entire nation-wide emancipation struggle in Russia.

There were about three million strikers in the peak year (1905). In 1906 and 1907 the movement ebbed but continued at a very high level, averaging one million strikers. Then it headed downwards and kept on declining to 1910 inclusive: the year 1911 was the turning-point, for the curve began to rise, even though timidly. The year 1912 saw a new major upswing. The curve rose confidently and steadily to the 1906 level, making plainly for the year when, at the figure of three million, it established a *world* record.

A *new epoch* has come. This is now beyond all question. The beginning of 1913 is the best evidence of it. The *mass* of the workers is advancing from individual *partial* issues to the point where it will raise the *general* issue. The attention of the widest masses is now centred on something more than particular defects in our Russian life. It is now a question of the *totality* of these defects, taken as a whole; it is now a question of reform, not reforms.

Experience teaches. The actual struggle is the best solver of the problems which until recently were so debatable. Take a look now, after 1912, at, say, our disputes over the "petitioning campaign"<sup>115</sup> and the slogan "freedom of association". What has experience shown?

It turned out to be impossible to collect even a few tens of thousands of workers' signatures to a very moderate petition. On the other hand, it is a fact that *political* strikes alone involved a *million* people. The talk that one should not go beyond the slogan "freedom of association", because if one did the masses would allegedly not understand us and would refuse to mobilise, turned out to be meaningless and idle talk by people isolated from the realities of life. The living, real millions of the masses, however, mobilised precisely in support of the broadest, the old, uncurtailed formulas. It was only these formulas that fired the masses with enthusiasm. It has now been shown convincingly enough who has actually been advancing with the masses and who without or against them.

A fresh, vigorous and mighty movement of the masses themselves is sweeping aside as worthless rubbish the arti-

ficial formulas hatched in government offices, and marches on and on.

That is what constitutes the historic significance of the great movement taking place under our own eyes.

*Pravda* No. 15  
January 19, 1913

*Collected Works*, Vol. 18,  
pp. 519-21

---

## In Britain

(The Sad Results of Opportunism)

The British Labour Party, which must be distinguished from the *two* socialist parties in Britain, the British Socialist Party and the Independent Labour Party, is the workers' organisation that is most opportunist and soaked in the spirit of liberal-labour policy.

In Britain there is full political liberty and the socialist parties exist quite openly. But the Labour Party is the parliamentary representative of workers' organisations, of which some are non-political, and others liberal, a regular mixture of the kind our liquidators want, those who hurl so much abuse at the "underground".

The opportunism of the British Labour Party is to be explained by the specific historical conditions of the latter half of the nineteenth century in Britain, when the "aristocracy of labour" shared to some extent in the particularly high profits of British capital. Now these conditions are becoming a thing of the past. Even the Independent Labour Party, i.e., the *socialist* opportunists in Britain, realises that the Labour Party has landed in a morass.

In the last issue of *The Labour Leader*, the organ of the Independent Labour Party, we find the following edifying communication. Naval estimates are being discussed in the British Parliament. The socialists introduce a motion to *reduce* them. The bourgeoisie, of course, quash it by voting *for* the government.

And the Labour M.P.s?

Fifteen vote for the reduction, i.e., against the government; 21 *are absent*; 4 vote *for the government*, i.e., against the reduction!!

Two of the four try to justify their action on the grounds that the workers in their constituencies earn their living in the armament industries.

There you have a striking example of how opportunism leads to the *betrayal* of socialism, the *betrayal* of the workers' cause. As we have already indicated, condemnation of this treachery is spreading ever wider among British socialists. From the example of other people's mistakes, the Russian workers, too, should learn to understand how fatal are opportunism and liberal-labour policy.

*Pravda* No. 85  
April 12, 1913  
Signed: W.

*Collected Works*, Vol. 19,  
pp. 55-56

---

## Lessons of the Belgian Strike

The general strike of the Belgian workers has ended, as readers will know, in a half-victory.<sup>116</sup> *So far* the workers have secured only a *promise* by the clerical government to appoint a commission to examine the question, not only of the local but also of the national franchise. The other day, the Belgian Prime Minister promised in the Chamber of Deputies that the commission would be appointed in May.

Of course, a ministerial promise (like any other promise "from above") is something that can by no means be taken seriously. One could not even speak of a partial victory, if the general political situation did not bear witness to a certain breach made by the general strike in the old, diehard, unyielding and stubborn clerical (i.e., reactionary and obscurantist) "order".

The achievement of the strike is not so much this fragment of a victory over the government as the success of the organisation, discipline, fighting spirit and enthusiasm for the struggle displayed by the mass of the Belgian working class. The working class of Belgium has proved that it is capable of steadfast struggle at the call of its Socialist Party. "We shall repeat the strike once again, if necessary!" This was said by a workers' leader during the strike and is an expression of the fact that the masses are aware of holding their weapons firmly in their hands, and of being ready to make use of them once again. The strike proved to the Belgian capitalists that it inflicts vast losses on them, and

that concessions are essential, if Belgian capital is not to fall hopelessly behind German capital, etc.

In Belgium, stable constitutional practices have long since been established, and political liberty is an old achievement of the people. Given political liberty, the workers have a broad and open road before them.

Why, in that case, has the strike had such *little* success? There are two main reasons.

The first is the domination of opportunism and reformism in a section of the Belgian Socialists, especially those in parliament. Being accustomed to move in alliance with the Liberals, these members of parliament feel themselves dependent on the Liberals in all their activity. As a result, there was hesitation in calling the strike, and hesitation could not but limit the success, strength and scope of the whole proletarian struggle.

The first lesson of the Belgian strike is: look less to the Liberals, trust them less, and have more confidence in the independent and whole-hearted struggle of the proletariat.

The second cause of its partial failure is the weakness of the workers' organisations and the weakness of the *party* in Belgium. The Workers' Party in Belgium is an alliance of politically organised workers with politically unorganised workers, "pure and simple" co-operators, trade-unionists, etc. This is a big drawback of Belgium's labour movement, which Mr. Yegorov in *Kievskaya Mysl*<sup>117</sup> and the liquidators in *Luch*<sup>118</sup> have done wrong to ignore.

The second lesson of the Belgian strike is: pay more attention to socialist propaganda, work more to build up a strong, highly principled and strictly party organisation which is true to socialism.

Written May 2 (15), 1913

Published May 8, 1913

in *Pravda* No. 104

Signed: K. O.

*Collected Works*, Vol. 36,  
pp. 234-35



---

## Holidays for Workers

The metalworkers in Germany, as in other countries, are in the van of class-conscious and organised proletarians. They have raised the question, among other things, of regular *annual holidays* for workers.

The manufacturers resist this measure with all their strength, pleading the "heavy burden" of the cost involved. But the German metalworkers, in a special pamphlet published by their union, have given exact figures to refute these selfish and hypocritical evasions. The workers have proved that between 1905 and 1910 the net profit in 93 joint-stock companies in the German metallurgical industry averaged 13.4 per cent!

It would be sufficient to reduce this profit by no more than 2 per cent to give all workers regular holidays.

But at the present time the system of holidays is still quite inadequately developed, and for the most part is being applied by the capitalists to further indenture the workers. The German metalworkers have taken two polls on the question of holidays, in 1908 and 1912.

In 1908, workers had holidays at 138 factories. Of the 75,591 workers engaged in these factories, 13,579, i.e., 17.9 per cent, had holidays.

In 1912, workers had holidays at 389 factories. Of the 233,927 workers employed there, 34,257, i.e., 14 per cent, had holidays.

In all, only *three* factories in a thousand in the metallurgical industry had a system of holidays! Of the total number of metalworkers only 1.8 per cent, i.e., less than *one-fiftieth*, had holidays.

Most factories allowing holidays—namely, more than nine-tenths of them—grant holidays only to workers who have been employed a fairly long time at the works. Of the 389 factories (with 233,927 workers), 84 factories employing 140,209 workers require a length of service from *five to ten* years (!) before a worker gets the right to a holiday.

Such holidays are obviously a ridiculously small improvement for the workers, and are *mainly* a bait to keep the workers in the factory and a means of combating strikes!

In most cases (for 72 per cent of the workers in the factories mentioned) the length of the holiday does not exceed *one week*. For 10 per cent, the period is *less than a week*, and only for 16 per cent is it *more than a week* (up to two weeks).

In most factories allowing holidays (97 per cent), workers going on holiday are paid their previous wages, or an average weekly wage.

We find, therefore, that even in the leading industry of an advanced country the system of holidays for workers is disgracefully inadequate. But the workers are coming to realise the need for regular and adequate rest and by their insistence the organised workers will be able to achieve success in this sphere too.

Written May 20 (June 2), 1913

Published May 31, 1913

in *Pravda* No. 124

Signed: N.N.

*Collected Works*, Vol. 36,  
pp. 247-48

---

## The Results of Strikes in 1912 as Compared With Those of the Past

The Association of Factory Owners in the Moscow Area has issued statistics on the results of strikes during the last seven months of 1912. These statistics embraced 131,625 workers out of a total of 211,595 who participated (according to the factory owners' figures, undoubtedly reduced) in economic strikes over the whole year of 1912.

We have the figures for the results of strikes in previous years in the official publications of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry covering the decade preceding the revolution (1895-1904) and the three revolutionary years (1905-07).

The data, unfortunately, are not similar weights, and those gathered by the factory owners' association are not so well processed. Official statistics on the results of strikes divide them into three categories: 1) ending to the advantage of the workers, 2) to the advantage of the owners and 3) in a compromise. The statistics of the factory owners divide them into: 1) ending in the defeat of the workers, 2) the complete or partial satisfaction of the workers and 3) strikes whose results are unspecified.

The two sets of data may be compared (even relatively) only in the following way. The workers taking part in strikes that ended in a compromise or whose results are unspecified, are divided into two equal parts between the

strikes *won* and *lost*, obtaining as a result only these two headings (approximate, of course). Here are the results of the comparison:

		Number of strikers	Number of strikers in strikes won (thou- sands)	Percentage won
For ten years before the revolution . . . . .	1895-1904	424	159	37.5
Three revolutionary years	1905	1,439	705	48.9
	1906	458	233	50.9
	1907	200	59	29.5
For all . . . . .	1911	96	49	51.0
For last 7 months of . .	1912	132	55	41.6

All these figures refer only to economic strikes, and the data for 1911 and 1912, furthermore, are incomplete. The number of workers for the whole of 1912 who took part in economic strikes (212,000) *exceeded* the number for 1907.

As can be seen, the year 1911 was a record year for the success of economic strikes, even surpassing the most successful revolutionary year of 1906. In 1906 the percentage of strikers who won their strikes was 50.9 per cent and in 1911 it was 51 per cent.

Strikes in 1912 were less successful than they were in 1905 (1905—48.9 per cent won, 1912—41.6 per cent won), but they were more successful than were, on the average, those of the *decade* 1895-1904 (37.5 per cent), to say nothing of 1907 (29.5 per cent won).

It is interesting to compare these figures with those of Western Europe. In Germany, during the entire first decade of the twentieth century (1900-09) there were 1,897,000 strikers (in Russia the *two years* of the revolution *alone*, counting only economic strikes, yielded as many). Of these, 698,000 or 36.8 per cent won their strikes, i.e., somewhat less than in Russia in the decade preceding the revolution. In Britain for the ten years, 1900-09, the number of strikers was 1,884,000. Out of 1,234,000 strikers, 588,000, or 47.5 per cent, won their strikes, i.e., many more than in Russia in the pre-revolutionary decade, but fewer than in 1905, 1906 and 1911. (The number of strikers winning their strikes was calculated for Germany and Britain on the same basis as for Russia.)

The number of strikers in Russia who won their strikes in 1905 *alone*, was *greater* than the number *for ten years* in Germany or Britain. One may judge from this how much of the proletariat's latent strength is still untapped.

Written May 25 (June 7), 1913

Published in *Pravda* No. 133

June 12, 1913

Signed: *N.*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 19,  
pp. 213-15

---

## In Australia

A general election recently took place in Australia. The Labour Party, which had a majority in the Lower House—44 seats out of 75—was defeated. It now has only 36 seats out of 75. The majority has passed to the Liberals, but this majority is a very unstable one, because 30 of the 36 seats in the Upper House are held by Labour.

What sort of peculiar capitalist country is this, in which the workers' representatives predominate in the *Upper* House and, till recently, did so in the Lower House as well, and yet the capitalist system is in no danger?

An English correspondent of the German labour press recently explained the situation, which is very often misrepresented by bourgeois writers.

The Australian Labour Party does not even call itself a socialist party. Actually it is a liberal-bourgeois party, while the so-called Liberals in Australia are really Conservatives.

This strange and incorrect use of terms in naming parties is not unique. In America, for example, the slave-owners of yesterday are called Democrats, and in France, enemies of socialism, petty bourgeois, are called radical socialists! In order to understand the real significance of parties, one must examine not their signboards but their class character and the historical conditions of each individual country.

Australia is a young British colony.

Capitalism in Australia is still quite youthful. The country is only just taking shape as an independent state. The workers are for the most part emigrants from Britain. They left the country at the time when the liberal-labour policy held almost undivided sway there, when the masses of the British workers were *Liberals*. Even now the majority of the skilled factory workers in Britain are Liberals or semi-Liberals. This is the result of the exceptionally favourable, monopolist position enjoyed by Britain in the second half of the last century. Only now are the masses of the workers in Britain turning (but turning slowly) towards socialism.

And while in Britain the so-called Labour Party is an *alliance* between the non-socialist trade unions and the extremely opportunist Independent Labour Party, in Australia the Labour Party is the *unalloyed* representative of the non-socialist workers' trade unions.

The leaders of the Australian Labour Party are trade union officials, everywhere the most moderate and "capital-serving" element, and in Australia, altogether peaceable, purely liberal.

The ties binding the separate states into a united Australia are still very weak. The Labour Party has had to concern itself with developing and strengthening these ties, and with establishing central government.

In Australia the Labour Party has done what in other countries was done by the Liberals, namely, introduced a uniform tariff for the whole country, a uniform educational law, a uniform land tax and uniform factory legislation.

Naturally, when Australia is finally developed and consolidated as an independent capitalist state, the condition of the workers will change, as also will the *liberal* Labour Party, which will make way for a *socialist* workers' party. Australia is an illustration of the conditions under which *exceptions* to the rule are possible. The rule is: a socialist workers' party in a capitalist country. The exception is a liberal Labour Party which arises only for a short time by virtue of specific conditions that are abnormal for capitalism in general.

Those Liberals in Europe and in Russia who try to "teach" the people that class struggle is unnecessary by citing the example of Australia, only deceive themselves

and others. It is ridiculous to think of transplanting Australian conditions (an undeveloped, young colony, populated by liberal British workers) to countries where the state is long established and capitalism well developed.

Written June 8 (21), 1913

Published June 13, 1913

in *Pravda* No. 134

Signed: W.

*Collected Works*, Vol. 19,  
pp. 216-17



---

## May Day Action by the Revolutionary Proletariat

A year has passed since the Lena events<sup>119</sup> and the first, decisive upsurge in the revolutionary working-class movement since the June Third coup. The tsar's Black Hundreds<sup>120</sup> and the landowners, the mob of officials and the bourgeoisie have celebrated the 300th anniversary of plunder, Tatar incursions, and the disgracing of Russia by the Romanovs. The Fourth Duma has convened and begun its "work", though it has no faith in that work and has quite lost its former counter-revolutionary vigour. Confusion and tedium have beset liberal society, which is listlessly making appeals *for reforms* while admitting the impracticability of anything even approximating reform.

And now comes a May Day action by Russia's working class, who first held a rehearsal in Riga, then went into resolute action in St. Petersburg on May 1 (O.S.); this action has rent the dim and dreary atmosphere like a thunderbolt. The tasks of the approaching revolution have come to the fore again in all their grandeur, and the forces of the advanced class leading it stand out in bold relief before hundreds of old revolutionaries, whom persecution by hangmen and desertion by friends have not defeated or broken, and before millions of people of the new generation of democrats and socialists.

Weeks before May Day, the government appeared to have lost its wits, while the gentlemen who own factories behaved as if they had never had any wits at all. The arrests and

searches seemed to have turned all the workers' districts in the capital upside down. The provinces did not lag behind the centre. The harassed factory owners called conferences and adopted contradictory slogans, now threatening the workers with punishment and lock-outs, now making concessions in advance and consenting to stop work, now inciting the government to commit atrocities, now reproaching the government and calling on it to include May Day in the number of official holidays.

But even though the gendarmes showed the utmost zéal, even though they "purged" the industrial suburbs, even though they made arrests right and left according to their latest "lists of suspects", it was no use. The workers laughed at the impotent rage of the tsar's gang and the capitalist class and derided the governor's menacing and pitiful "announcements"; they wrote satirical verses and circulated them by hand or passed them on by word of mouth; they produced, as if from nowhere, fresh batches of small, poorly printed "leaflets", short and plain, but very instructive, calling for strikes and demonstrations, and reminding the people of the old, uncurtailed, revolutionary slogans of the Social-Democrats, who in 1905 led the first onslaught of the masses against the autocracy and against monarchy.

A hundred thousand on strike on May Day, said the government press the next day. Bourgeois newspapers, using the first telegraphed information, reported a hundred and twenty-five thousand (*Kievskaya Mysl*). A correspondent of the central organ of the German Social-Democrats wired from St. Petersburg that it was a hundred and fifty thousand. And the day after the whole bourgeois press quoted a figure of 200,000-220,000. Actually the number of strikers reached 250,000!

But, apart from the number of May Day strikers, much more impressive—and much more significant—were the revolutionary street demonstrations held by the workers. Everywhere in and around the capital crowds of workers singing revolutionary songs, calling loudly for revolution and carrying red flags fought for several hours against police and security forces frantically mobilised by the government. And those workers made the keenest of the tsar's henchmen feel that the struggle was in earnest, that

the police were not faced with a handful of individuals engaged in a trivial Slavophil affair,<sup>121</sup> that it was actually the *masses* of the capital's working class who had risen.

This was a really brilliant, open demonstration of the proletariat's revolutionary aspirations, of its revolutionary forces steeled and reinforced by new generations, of revolutionary appeals to the people and the peoples of Russia. Last year the government and the manufacturers were able to take comfort from the fact that the Lena explosion could not have been foreseen, that they could not have made immediate preparations to combat its consequences; this time, however, the monarchy had displayed acute foresight, there had been ample time for preparation and the "measures" taken were most "vigorous"; the result was that the tsarist monarchy revealed its complete *impotence* when faced with a revolutionary awakening of the proletarian masses.

Indeed, one year of strike struggle since Lena has shown, despite the pitiful outcries of the liberals and their yes-men against the "craze for striking", against "syndicalist" strikes, against combining economic with political strikes and vice versa—this year has shown what a great and irreplaceable weapon for agitation among the masses, for rousing them, for drawing them into the struggle the Social-Democratic proletariat had forged for itself in the revolutionary epoch. The revolutionary mass-scale strike allowed the enemy neither rest nor respite. It also hit the enemy's purse, and in full view of the whole world it trampled into the mud the political prestige of the allegedly "strong" tsarist government. It enabled more and more sections of the workers to regain at least a small part of what had been achieved in 1905 and drew fresh sections of the working people, even the most backward, into the struggle. It did not exhaust the capacity of the workers, it was frequently demonstrative action of short duration, and at the same time it paved the way for further, still more impressive and more revolutionary open action by the masses in the shape of street demonstrations.

During the last year, no country in the world has seen so many people on strike for political ends as Russia, or such perseverance, such variety, such vigour in strikes. This circumstance alone shows to the full the pettiness, the

contemptible stupidity of those liberal and liquidationist sages who tried to "adjust" the tactics of the Russian workers in 1912-13, using the yardstick of "European" constitutional periods, periods that were mainly devoted to the preparatory work of bringing socialist education and enlightenment to the masses.

The colossal superiority of the Russian strikes over those in the European countries, the most advanced countries, demonstrates not the special qualities or special abilities of Russia's workers, but the *special* conditions in present-day Russia, the existence of a revolutionary situation, the growth of a directly revolutionary crisis. When the moment of a similar growth of revolution approaches in Europe (there it will be a socialist and not a bourgeois-democratic revolution, as in our country), the proletariat of the most developed capitalist countries will launch far more vigorous revolutionary strikes, demonstrations, and armed struggle against the defenders of wage-slavery.

This year's May Day strike, like the series of strikes in Russia during the last eighteen months, was revolutionary in character as distinguished not only from the usual economic strikes but from demonstration strikes and from political strikes demanding constitutional reforms, like, for instance, the last Belgian strike. Those who are in bondage to a liberal world outlook and no longer able to consider things from the revolutionary standpoint, cannot possibly understand this distinctive character of the Russian strikes, a character that is due entirely to the revolutionary state of Russia. The epoch of counter-revolution and of free play for renegade sentiment has left behind it too many people of this kind even among those who would like to be called Social-Democrats.

Russia is experiencing a revolutionary situation because the oppression of the vast majority of the population—not only of the proletariat but of nine-tenths of the small producers, particularly the peasants—has intensified to the maximum, and this intensified oppression, starvation, poverty, lack of rights, humiliation of the people is, furthermore, glaringly inconsistent with the state of Russia's productive forces, inconsistent with the level of the class-consciousness and the demands of the masses roused by the

year 1905, and inconsistent with the state of affairs in all neighbouring—not only European but Asian—countries.

But that is not all. Oppression alone, no matter how great, does not always give rise to a revolutionary situation in a country. In most cases it is not enough for revolution that *the lower classes should not want to live in the old way*. It is also necessary that *the upper classes should be unable to rule and govern in the old way*. This is what we see in Russia today. A political crisis is maturing before our very eyes. The bourgeoisie has done *everything* in its power to back counter-revolution and ensure “peaceful development” on this counter-revolutionary basis. The bourgeoisie gave hangmen and feudal lords as much money as they wanted, the bourgeoisie reviled the revolution and renounced it, the bourgeoisie licked the boots of Purishkevich and the knout of Markov the Second and became their lackey, the bourgeoisie evolved theories based on “European” arguments, theories that revile the Revolution of 1905 as an “intellectualist” revolution and describe it as wicked, criminal, treasonous, and so on and so forth.

And yet, despite all this sacrificing of its purse, its honour and its conscience, the bourgeoisie—from the Cadets to the Octobrists—*itself* admits that the autocracy and landowners *were unable to ensure “peaceful development”*, were unable to provide the basic conditions for “law” and “order”, without which a capitalist country cannot, in the twentieth century, live side by side with Germany and the new China.

A nation-wide political crisis is in evidence in Russia, a crisis which affects the very *foundation* of the state system and not just parts of it, which affects the *foundation* of the edifice and not an outbuilding, not merely one of its storeys. No matter how many glib phrases our liberals and liquidators trot out to the effect that “we have, thank God, a constitution” and that political *reforms* are on the order of the day (only very limited people do not see the close connection between these two propositions), no matter how much of this reformist verbiage is poured out, the fact remains that not a single liquidator or liberal can point to any reformist way out of the situation.

The condition of the mass of the population in Russia, the aggravation of their position owing to the new agrar-

ian policy (to which the feudal landowners had to snatch at as their last means of salvation), the international situation, and the nature of the general political crisis that has taken shape in our country—such is the sum total of the objective conditions making Russia's situation a revolutionary one because of the impossibility of carrying out the tasks of a bourgeois revolution by following the present course and by the means available to the government and the exploiting classes.

Such is the social, economic, and political situation, such is the class relationship in Russia that has given rise to a specific type of strike impossible in modern Europe, from which all sorts of renegades would like to borrow the example, not of yesterday's bourgeois revolutions (through which shine gleams of tomorrow's proletarian revolution), but of today's "constitutional" situation. Neither the oppression of the lower classes nor a crisis among the upper classes can cause a revolution; they can only cause the decay of a country, unless that country has a revolutionary class capable of transforming the passive state of oppression into an active state of revolt and insurrection.

The role of a truly advanced class, a class really able to rouse the masses to revolution, really capable of saving Russia from decay, is played by the industrial proletariat. This is the task it fulfils by means of its revolutionary strikes. These strikes, which the liberals hate and the liquidators cannot understand, are (as the February resolution of the R.S.D.L.P. puts it) "one of the most effective means of overcoming the apathy, despair and disunity of the agricultural proletariat and the peasantry, ... and *drawing them into the most concerted, simultaneous, and extensive revolutionary actions*".\*

The working class draws into revolutionary action the masses of the working and exploited people, who are deprived of basic rights and driven to despair. The working class teaches them revolutionary struggle, trains them for revolutionary action, and explains to them where to find the way out and how to attain salvation. The working class teaches them, not merely by words, but by deeds, by

\* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 457.—Ed.

example, and the example is provided not by the adventures of solitary heroes but by *mass* revolutionary action combining political and economic demands.

How plain, how clear, how close these thoughts are to every honest worker who grasps even the rudiments of the theory of socialism and democracy! And how alien they are to those traitors to socialism and betrayers of democracy from among the intelligentsia, who revile or deride the "underground" in liquidationist newspapers, assuring naïve simpletons that they are "also Social-Democrats".

The May Day action of the proletariat of St. Petersburg, supported by that of the proletariat of all Russia, clearly showed once again to those who have eyes to see and ears to hear the great historic importance of the revolutionary underground in present-day Russia. The only R.S.D.L.P. Party organisation in St. Petersburg, the St. Petersburg Committee, compelled even the bourgeois press, before the May Day action as well as on the eve of January 9,<sup>122</sup> and on the eve of the Tercentenary of the Romanovs as well as on April 4,<sup>123</sup> to note that St. Petersburg Committee leaflets had appeared again and again in the factories.

Those leaflets cost colossal sacrifices. Sometimes they are quite unattractive in appearance. Some of them, the appeals for demonstration on April 4, for instance, merely announce the hour and place of the demonstration, in six lines evidently set in secret and with extreme haste in different printing shops and in different types. We have people ("also Social-Democrats") who, when alluding to these conditions of "underground" work, snigger maliciously or curl a contemptuous lip and ask: "If the entire Party were limited to the underground, how many members would it have? Two or three hundred?" [See No. 95 (181) of *Luch*, a renegade organ, in its *editorial* defence of Mr. Sedov, who has the sad courage to be an outspoken liquidator. This issue of *Luch* appeared five days before the May Day action, i.e., at the very time the underground was preparing the leaflets!]

Messrs. Dan, Potresov and Co., who make these disgraceful statements, must know that there were thousands of proletarians in the Party ranks as early as 1903, and 150 thousand in 1907, that even now thousands and tens of

thousands of workers print and circulate *underground* leaflets, as members of *underground* R.S.D.L.P. cells. But the liquidationist gentlemen know that they are protected by Stolypin "legality" from a legal refutation of their foul lies and their "grimaces", which are fouler still, at the expense of the underground.

See to what extent these despicable people have lost touch with the mass working-class movement and with revolutionary work in general! Use even their own yardstick, deliberately falsified to suit the liberals. You may assume for a moment that "two or three hundred" workers in St. Petersburg took part in printing and distributing those underground leaflets.

What is the result? "Two or three hundred" workers, the flower of the St. Petersburg proletariat, people who not only call themselves Social-Democrats but work as Social-Democrats, people who are esteemed and appreciated for it by the *entire* working class of Russia, people who do not prate about a "broad party" but make up in actual fact the only underground Social-Democratic Party existing in Russia, these people print and circulate underground leaflets. The *Luch* liquidators (protected by Stolypin censors) laugh contemptuously at the "two or three hundred", the "underground" and its "exaggerated" importance, etc.

And suddenly, a miracle occurs! In accordance with a decision drawn up by *half a dozen* members of the Executive Commission of the St. Petersburg Committee—a leaflet printed and circulated by "two or three hundred"—*two hundred and fifty thousand* people rise as one man in St. Petersburg.

The leaflets and the revolutionary speeches by workers at meetings and demonstrations do not speak of an "open working-class party", "freedom of association" or reforms of that kind, with the phantoms of which the liberals are fooling the people. They speak of revolution as the only way out. They speak of the republic as the only slogan which, in contrast to liberal lies about reforms, indicates the change needed to ensure freedom, indicates the forces capable of rising consciously to defend it.

The two million inhabitants of St. Petersburg see and hear these appeals for revolution which go to the hearts of



all toiling and oppressed sections of the people. All St. Petersburg sees from a real, mass-scale example what is the real way out and what is lying liberal talk about reforms. Thousands of workers' contacts—and hundreds of bourgeois newspapers, which are compelled to report the St. Petersburg mass action at least in snatches—spread throughout Russia the news of the stubborn strike campaign of the capital's proletariat. Both the mass of the peasantry and the peasants serving in the army hear this news of strikes, of the revolutionary demands of the workers, of their struggle for a republic and for the confiscation of the landed estates for the benefit of the peasants. Slowly but surely, the revolutionary strikes are stirring, rousing, enlightening, and organising the masses of the people *for revolution*.

The "two or three hundred" "underground people" express the interests and needs of *millions and tens of millions*, they tell them the truth about their hopeless position, open their eyes to the necessity of revolutionary struggle, imbue them with faith in it, provide them with the correct slogans, and win these masses away from the influence of the high-sounding and thoroughly spurious, reformist slogans of the bourgeoisie. And "two or three" dozen liquidators from among the intelligentsia, using money collected abroad and among liberal merchants to fool unenlightened workers, are carrying the slogans of that bourgeoisie into the workers' midst.

The May Day strike, like all the revolutionary strikes of 1912-13, has made clear the three political camps into which present-day Russia is divided. The camp of hangmen and feudal lords, of monarchy and the secret police. It has done its utmost in the way of atrocities and is already impotent against the masses of the workers. The camp of the bourgeoisie, all of whom, from the Cadets to the Octobrists, are shouting and moaning, calling for reforms and making fools of themselves by thinking that reforms are possible in Russia. The camp of the revolution, the only camp expressing the interests of the oppressed masses.

All the ideological work, all the political work in this camp is carried out by underground Social-Democrats alone, by those who know how to use every legal opportunity in the spirit of Social-Democracy and who are inseparably

bound up with the advanced class, the proletariat. No one can tell beforehand whether this advanced class will succeed in leading the masses all the way to a victorious revolution. But this class is fulfilling its duty—*leading* the masses to that solution—despite all the vacillations and betrayals on the part of the liberals and those who are “also Social-Democrats”. All the living and vital elements of Russian socialism and Russian democracy are being educated solely by the example of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, and under its guidance.

This year's May Day action has shown to the whole world that the Russian proletariat is steadfastly following its revolutionary course, apart from which there is no salvation for a Russia that is suffocating and decaying alive.

*Sotsial-Demokrat* No. 31  
June 15 (28), 1913

*Collected Works*, Vol. 19  
pp. 218-27

---

## Class War in Dublin

In Dublin, the capital of Ireland—a city of a not highly industrial type, with a population of half a million—the class struggle, which permeates the whole life of capitalist society everywhere, has become accentuated to the point of class war. The police have positively gone wild; drunken policemen assault peaceful workers, break into houses, torment the aged, women and children. Hundreds of workers (over 400) have been injured and *two killed*—such are the casualties of this war. All prominent workers' leaders have been arrested. People are thrown into prison for making the most peaceful speeches. The city is like an armed camp.

What has happened? How could such a war have flared up in a peaceable, cultured, civilised free state?

Ireland is something of a British Poland, only rather more like Galicia than the Poland represented by Warsaw, Lodz and Dombrowski. National oppression and Catholic reaction have turned the proletarians of this unhappy country into paupers, the peasants into toilworn, ignorant and dull slaves of the priesthood, and the bourgeoisie into a phalanx, masked by nationalist phrases, of capitalists, of despots over the workers; finally, the administration has been turned into a gang accustomed to every kind of violence.

At the present moment the Irish nationalists (i.e., the Irish bourgeoisie) are the victors. They are buying up the lands of the English landlords; they are getting national *self-government* (the famous Home Rule<sup>124</sup> for which such

a long and stubborn struggle has been going on between Ireland and England); they will freely govern "their own" country jointly with "their own" Irish priests.

Well, this Irish nationalist bourgeoisie is celebrating its "national" victory, its maturity in "affairs of state" by declaring a war to the death on the Irish labour movement.

An English Lord Lieutenant lives in Dublin, but in fact he has less power than the Dublin capitalist leader, a certain Murphy, publisher of the *Independent* ("Independent" —my eye!),<sup>125</sup> principal shareholder and director of the Dublin tramways, and a shareholder in many capitalist enterprises in Dublin. Murphy has declared, on behalf of all the Irish capitalists, of course, that he is ready to spend three-quarters of a million pounds (nearly seven million rubles) to destroy the Irish trade unions.

And these unions have begun to develop magnificently. The Irish proletariat, awakening to class-consciousness, is pressing the Irish bourgeois scoundrels engaged in celebrating their "national" victory. It has found a talented leader in the person of Comrade *Larkin*, Secretary of the Irish Transport Workers' Union. Larkin is a remarkable speaker, a man of seething Irish energy, who has performed miracles among the unskilled workers—that mass of the British proletariat which in Britain is so often cut off from the advanced workers by the cursed petty-bourgeois, liberal, aristocratic spirit of the British skilled worker.

A new spirit has been aroused in the Irish workers' unions. The unskilled workers have brought unparalleled animation into the trade unions. Even the women have begun to organise—a thing hitherto unknown in Catholic Ireland. So far as organisation of the workers is concerned Dublin looks like becoming one of the foremost towns in the whole of Great Britain. The country that used to be typified by the fat, well-fed Catholic priest and the poor, starving, ragged worker who wore his rags even on Sunday because he could not afford Sunday clothes, that country, though it bears a double and triple national yoke, has begun to turn into a country with an organised army of the proletariat.

Well, Murphy proclaimed a crusade of the bourgeoisie against Larkin and "Larkinism". To begin with, 200 tramwaymen were dismissed in order to provoke a strike during

the exhibition and *embitter* the whole struggle. The Transport Workers' Union declared a strike and demanded the reinstatement of the discharged men. Murphy engineered lock-outs. The workers retaliated by downing tools. War raged all along the line. Passions flared up.

Larkin—incidentally, he is the grandson of the famous Larkin executed in 1867 for participating in the Irish liberation movement—delivered fiery speeches at meetings. In these speeches he pointed out that the party of the English bourgeois enemies of Irish Home Rule was openly calling for resistance to the government, was threatening revolution, was organising armed resistance to Home Rule and with absolute impunity was flooding the country with revolutionary appeals.

But what the reactionaries, the *English* chauvinists Carson, Londonderry and Bonar Law (the English Purishkeviches, the nationalists who are persecuting Ireland), may do the proletarian socialist may not. Larkin was arrested. A meeting called by the workers was banned.

Ireland, however, is not Russia. The attempt to suppress the right of assembly evoked a storm of indignation. Larkin *had to be* tried. At the trial Larkin became the accuser and, in effect, put Murphy in the dock. By cross-questioning witnesses Larkin proved that Murphy had had long conversations with the Lord Lieutenant on the eve of his, Larkin's, arrest. Larkin declared the police to be in Murphy's pay, and no one dared gainsay him.

Larkin was released on bail (political liberty cannot be abolished at one stroke). Larkin declared that he would appear at a meeting no matter what happened. And indeed, he came to one disguised, and began to speak to the crowd. The police recognised him, seized him and beat him up. For two days the dictatorship of the police truncheon raged, crowds were clubbed, women and children were brutally treated. The police broke into workers' homes. A worker named *Nolan*, a member of the Transport Workers' Union, was beaten to death. Another died of injuries.

On Thursday, September 4 (August 22, O.S.), Nolan's funeral took place. The proletariat of Dublin followed in a procession 50,000 strong behind the body of their comrade. The police brutes lay low, not daring to annoy the crowd,

and exemplary order prevailed. "This is a more magnificent demonstration than when they buried Parnell" (the celebrated Irish nationalist leader), said an old Irishman to a German correspondent.

The Dublin events mark a turning-point in the history of the labour movement and of socialism in Ireland. Murphy has threatened to destroy the Irish trade unions. He has succeeded only in destroying the last remnants of the influence of the Irish nationalist bourgeoisie over the Irish proletariat. He has helped to steel the independent revolutionary working-class movement in Ireland, which is free of nationalist prejudices.

This was seen immediately at the Trades Union Congress which opened on September 1 (August 19, O.S.), in Manchester. The Dublin events inflamed the delegates—despite the resistance of the opportunist trade union leaders with their petty-bourgeois spirit and their admiration for the bosses. The Dublin workers' delegation was given an ovation. Delegate Partridge, Chairman of the Dublin branch of the Engineers' Union, spoke about the abominable outrages committed by the police in Dublin. A young working girl had just gone to bed when the police raided her house. The girl hid in the closet, but was dragged out by the hair. The police were drunk. These "men" (if one may call them such) beat up ten-year-old lads and even five-year-old children!

Partridge was twice arrested for making speeches which the judge himself admitted were peaceful. "I am sure," said Partridge, "that I would now be arrested if I were to recite the Lord's Prayer in public."

The Manchester Congress sent a delegation to Dublin. The bourgeoisie there again took up the weapon of nationalism (just like the bourgeois nationalists in Poland, or in the Ukraine, or among the Jews!) declaring that "Englishmen have no business on Irish soil!" But, *fortunately*, the nationalists have already lost their influence over the workers.\*

Speeches delivered at the Manchester Congress were of a kind that had not been heard for a long time. A resolution was moved to transfer the whole congress to Dublin, and

---

\* The Irish nationalists are already expressing the fear that Larkin will organise an independent Irish workers' party, which will have to be reckoned with in the first Irish national parliament.

to organise a general strike throughout Britain. Smillie, the Chairman of the Miners' Union, stated that the Dublin methods would compel all British workers to resort to revolution and that they would be able to learn the use of arms.

The masses of the British workers are slowly but surely taking a new path—they are abandoning the defence of the petty privileges of the labour aristocracy for their own great heroic struggle for a new system of society. And once on this path the British proletariat, with their energy and organisation, will bring socialism about more quickly and securely than anywhere else.

*Severnaya Pravda* No. 23  
August 29, 1913  
*Nash Put* No. 5  
August 30, 1913  
Signed: V.

*Collected Works*, Vol. 19,  
pp. 332-36

---

## Work in Legal Associations

(Resolution of the Summer, 1913, Joint Conference  
of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.  
and Party Officials)

1. In the present period of revival of the economic and political struggle of the working class it is particularly necessary to intensify activities in all the legal working-class associations (trade unions, clubs, sick benefit societies, co-operative societies, and so forth).

2. All activities in legal working-class associations must be conducted not in a neutral spirit, but in keeping with the spirit of the decisions of the London Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. and of the International Congress in Stuttgart. Social-Democrats should recruit members for all working-class associations from the widest possible working-class circles, and urge all workers to join them irrespective of their party opinions. But the Social-Democrats in these associations should form themselves into Party groups and by prolonged and systematic activities secure the establishment of the closest relations between the associations and the Social-Democratic Party.

3. The experience of the international and of our Russian working-class movement teaches that it is necessary from the very inception of such working-class organisations (trade unions, co-operative societies, clubs, etc.) to strive to convert every one of them into a stronghold of the Social-Democratic Party. This conference urges all Party members to bear this important task in mind, for it is a particularly urgent one in Russia, where the liquidators<sup>126</sup> are making systematic efforts to utilise the legal societies *against* the Party.



4. This conference is of the opinion that in electing delegates to the sick benefit societies, in all trade union activities, etc., it is necessary, while upholding the complete unity of the movement and the submission of the minority to the majority, to pursue the Party line, secure the election of supporters of the Party for all responsible posts, etc.

5. For the purpose of summing up the experience of practical activities in legal working-class societies it is desirable to arrange more frequent conferences with active participants in the work of local legal working-class organisations and to invite to general Party conferences as large a number as possible of representatives of Party groups operating in these legal societies.

Written in September 1913

Published in December 1913  
in the pamphlet

*Notification and Resolutions  
of the Summer, 1913,*

*Joint Conference of the Central  
Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.  
and Party Officials,*

issued by the C.C., R.S.D.L.P., Paris

*Collected Works, Vol. 19,  
pp. 426-27*

---

## ***From Material on the Conflict Within the Social-Democratic Duma Group***

### **What Is the Will of the Workers as Shown by the St. Petersburg Trade Unions?**

It is common knowledge that the metalworkers are the most developed and most advanced section of the working class not only in St. Petersburg, but throughout Russia, and not only Russia, but throughout the world.

Nobody can deny—and on the day the metalworkers assembled the liquidators *themselves* admitted it—that the metalworkers are the *vanguard* of the entire Russian proletariat.

What did the metalworkers' meeting in St. Petersburg prove?

The occasion was the election of the Executive Committee. There were two lists of candidates.

One list, published in the liquidators' newspaper and backed by the latter, contained the *names of a number of* well-known liquidators.

The other list, published in *Pravda*,<sup>127</sup> was *anti-liquidationist*.

The liquidators fraudulently gave out their list as the decision of the union, but their fraud did not help them.

The metalworkers' meeting was attended by about 3,000 people. Of these, only some 150 cast their votes for the liquidators' list of candidates.

Obviously, this quite clearly revealed the will of the class-conscious and advanced workers. The workers will not allow any mention of liquidationism.

Of all the trade unions in St. Petersburg, the Printers' Union alone still supports the liquidators,\* thereby isolating itself from the rest of the St. Petersburg proletariat. But even there, it must be observed, not everything is "favourable" for the liquidators. Are there many admirers of the liquidators to be found among the shop assistants, woodworkers, gold- and silversmiths, tailors, bakers, builders, tavern employees, and so forth? How many are there, and where are they? Are many of these admirers to be found in the cultural and educational institutions? There is little evidence of them! And yet the liquidators, in denouncing the "underground" and the "strike craze", in pleading for legality in the shelter of Stolypin reforms, assert that everything legal supports them! Whom are the working-class intelligentsia supporting? In our last issue *106 working-class students* expressed their greetings to the six<sup>128</sup> and denounced the liquidators!

In following the lead of the liquidators the seven deputies are *flouting the will* of the majority of the workers. This has been proved by the Duma elections, by the collections for the newspapers, by the meetings of the metalworkers, by all the activities in the legal movement, and by the present insurance campaign (the support rendered the insurance weekly in response to the appeal of the six workers' deputies).

The seven deputies who are *flouting* the will of the majority of the workers must bear in mind the inevitable consequences if they insist on pursuing *their own will in opposition* to the majority of the workers.

*Za Pravdu* No. 22  
October 29, 1913

*Collected Works*, Vol. 19,  
pp. 465-66

---

\* In the symposium *Marxism and Liquidationism* there is a footnote to this passage:

"Evidently, even this union is now beginning to shift away from the liquidators."—*Ed.*

---

## Narodniks and Liquidators in the Trade Union Movement

(A Valuable Admission)

In recent issues of the Left-Narodnik newspaper, we find, side by side with complaints about our (the Pravdists') "factionalism", valuable admissions by several Narodniks<sup>129</sup> about their views on important issue of the trade union movement coinciding with those of the liquidators. We have always said it, but it is pleasant indeed to hear this confession from our opponents' lips.

"On this question we differ sharply from the Bolsheviks, who regard the union as their special preserve [!]. The Mensheviks' view [for some reason the Narodniks say "Mensheviks" instead of "liquidators"] of the union as an extra-factional organisation is identical with ours [the Narodniks']. This, perhaps, accounts for our good relations with the Mensheviks in past activities." This was written in *Vernaya Mysl* No. 6.

"The line of conduct taken by the executives of those unions in which the Left Narodniks have been in control all the time in no way differs from the line of conduct of the so-called liquidationist unions," the same Left-Narodnik newspaper added.

An extraordinarily frank and valuable admission! On their own showing, it appears that our "frightfully Left" Narodniks behave in the trade union movement exactly like the liquidators.

Hence, the blocs (alliances, agreements) between the liquidators and the Narodniks against the Marxists, which have been repeatedly mentioned in our press.

The Narodnik *Stoikaya Mysl*<sup>130</sup> even frankly defends these blocs between the Left Narodniks and the liquidators against the Marxists.

"During the present period of Pravdist preponderance in the trade union organisations ... there is nothing terrible or strange in temporary agreements between the Narodniks and the *Luchists*," writes *Stoikaya Mysl* No. 2.\*

The liquidators are not so candid. They know that "such things" are done, but not spoken of. To call oneself a Social-Democrat while at the same time allying with an alien party against the Social-Democrats is "tactics" that can be pursued only underhandedly.

But this does not change anything. The alliance between the liquidators and the Narodniks in the trade union movement (and in the educational societies) is a *fact*. And in the present state of affairs it is inevitable. The liquidators and the Narodniks are united by their common hostility towards consistent Marxism, in all spheres of activity. In trade union activity they are united in both being representatives of the "neutralism of weakness", "willy-nilly neutralism". Neither the liquidators nor the Narodniks have any real influence in the trade union movement. Although a feeble minority, they demand "equality" with the Marxists. This demand is "theoretically" defensible only from the neutralist point of view. Hence the "neutralism" of all groups with little influence in the working-class movement.

The Narodniks say that they are uniting with the liquidators "*solely for the purpose of protecting the non-factionalism of the workers' organisations against the extravagant claims of the Pravdists*" (*Stoikaya Mysl* Nos. 2 and 4).

What are these "claims" of the Pravdists? Have they shut the door of any union or society to workers who hold political views different from their own? Have they stuck

\* Mr. Boris Voronov, the author of the article, his eyes big with surprise, quotes as an example of incredible "factionalism" the fact that at the meetings of the executive of one of the unions "they discussed the question of assisting the Pravdist press, and technical editorial questions (how to improve the correspondence department, etc.)." Oh, horror! What a crime it is to assist a newspaper, which unites nine-tenths of the advanced workers, with correspondence and the like! How, after this, can the Narodniks help throwing themselves into the arms of the liquidators?...

any "label" on any of the unions? Have they split any organisation? They have done nothing of the kind! Our opponents have not quoted a single *fact* of this kind, nor can they do so. By the "extravagant claims" of the Pravdists they mean that the Pravdists do not want to associate themselves with the petty-bourgeois policy of the Narodniks and liquidators, and, while loyally submitting to the majority of the workers *within a single union*, they fight for influence for their Marxist ideas.

We have never been guilty of the sins ascribed to us. It is the Narodniks and the liquidators who are guilty of them. Here are the facts. Several years ago the Narodniks obtained a majority in the Railwaymen's Union. This happened because they had the backing, not of the workers, but of the railway clerks, and because of other fortuitous circumstances. What did the Narodniks do? They immediately "stuck a label" on that union, compelled it to adopt its own special "platform", ousted the Social-Democrats and non-Party workers, and compelled them to form a parallel union of their own.

Now that was a really "extravagant claim". They hastened to make good their first chance victory by affixing a label. The fact that the Narodniks do not do this in other unions is not because they are so virtuous, but because their influence everywhere among the workers is *very slight*.

The same thing applies to the liquidators. When they controlled the Metalworkers' Union they turned it into a branch of the liquidators' organisation. The organ of the union published provocative articles against the "underground" (see *Nash Put* No. 20,<sup>131</sup> p. 2, *Metallist* No. 3, etc.<sup>132</sup>), although no general meeting of the members ever expressed approval of the liquidator line.

Such are the actual facts. By the "extravagant claims" of the Pravdists they mean that the Pravdists try to get the workers to settle their affairs themselves by a majority vote. If at a general meeting of metalworkers 3,000 vote for the Pravdists and a hundred or two vote for the liquidators and the Narodniks combined, then, in the name of so-called "non-factionalism" we are supposed to admit that 3,000 is equal to 200! This is what liquidator-Narodnik "non-factionalism" means.

We do not defend neutralism; we are opposed to it. But we do not behave like the Narodniks and liquidators when they obtain a chance majority in some union. Only feeble groups with no principles lose their heads at the first "victory" and hasten to "consolidate" their victory by a majority of a score or so of votes. Excited and in a hurry not to miss such a golden opportunity, they hastily revise their "principles", forget their neutralism, and stick on a label. Marxists do not behave like that. They are not stray visitors in the working-class movement. They know that sooner or later all the unions will take their stand on the basis of Marxism. They are convinced that the future belongs to their ideas and, therefore, they do not force events, do not goad the unions on, and do not stick labels on them or split them.

Steadily and confidently they carry on their Marxist propaganda. They patiently teach Marxism to the workers, drawing on the lessons of life, and no deals between unprincipled groups will divert them from that path.

There was a time when the present-day liquidators demanded that the trade unions should be Party unions and have official representation in the Party. There was a time when the Narodniks compelled the Railwaymen's Union to officially swear allegiance to their programme. Today both have swung to the opposite extreme, and stand for neutralism. They have been compelled to do this by the political weakness of their positions.

We are following our old road, proclaimed long ago and upheld by the entire body of Marxists. The liquidators have a full right to enter into an alliance with the Narodniks. But it is an alliance based on abandonment of principles and on weakness. The road which the liquidator-Narodnik bloc proposes to the unions is not the road of the advanced workers.

---

## Forms of the Working-Class Movement

(The Lock-Out and Marxist Tactics)

Lock-outs, i.e., the mass discharge of workers by common agreement among employers, is as necessary and inevitable a phenomenon in capitalist society as strikes are. Capital, which throws the whole of its crushing weight upon the ruined small producers and the proletariat, constantly threatens to force the conditions of the workers down to starvation level and condemn them to death from starvation. And in all countries there have been cases, even whole periods in the life of nations, when the failure of the workers to fight back has led to their being reduced to incredible poverty and all the horrors of starvation.

The workers' resistance springs from their very conditions of life—the sale of labour-power. Only as a result of this resistance, despite the tremendous sacrifices the workers have to make in the struggle, are they able to maintain anything like a tolerable standard of living. But capital is becoming more and more concentrated, manufacturers' associations are growing, the number of destitute and unemployed people is increasing, and so also is want among the proletariat; consequently, it is becoming harder than ever to fight for a decent standard of living. The cost of living, which has been rising rapidly in recent years, often nullifies all the workers' efforts.

By drawing larger and larger masses of the proletariat into the organised struggle, the workers' organisations, and



first and foremost the trade unions, make the workers' resistance more planned and systematic. With the existence of mass trade unions of different types, strikes become more stubborn: they occur less often, but each conflict is of bigger dimensions.

Lock-outs are caused by a sharpening of the struggle, and in their turn, sharpen that struggle. Rallying in the struggle and developing its class-consciousness, its organisation and experience in that struggle, the proletariat becomes more and more firmly convinced that the complete economic reconstruction of capitalist society is essential.

Marxist tactics consist in combining the *different* forms of struggle, in the skilful transition from one form to another, in steadily enhancing the consciousness of the masses and extending the area of their collective actions, each of which, taken separately, may be aggressive or defensive, and all of which, taken together, lead to a more intense and decisive conflict.

Russia lacks the fundamental conditions for *such* a development of the struggle as we see in the West-European countries, namely, a struggle waged through the medium of firmly established and systematically developing trade unions.

Unlike Europe, which has enjoyed political freedom for a long time, the strike movement in Russia in 1912-14 extended beyond the narrow trade union limits. The liberals *denied* this, while the liberal-labour politicians (liquidators) failed to understand it, or shut their eyes to it. But the fact compelled them to admit it. In Milyukov's Duma speech during the interpellation on the Lena events, this *forced*, belated, half-hearted, platonic (i.e., accompanied, not by effective assistance, but only by sighs) admission of the *general* significance of the working-class movement was quite definite. By their liberal talk about the "strike craze" and their *opposition* to combining economic and other motives in the strike movement (we would remind our readers that Messrs. Yezhov and Co. began to talk *in this fashion* in 1912!) the liquidators aroused the legitimate disgust of the workers. That is why the workers firmly and deliberately had the liquidators "removed from office" in the working-class movement.

'The Marxists' attitude towards the strike movement caused no wavering or dissatisfaction among the workers. Moreover, the significance of lock-outs was formally and officially appraised by the organised Marxists *as far back as February 1913*<sup>133</sup> (true, in an arena which the liquidators, those slaves of the liberals, do not see). Already in February 1913 the formal decision of the Marxists definitely and clearly spoke of lock-outs and the necessity of *taking them into account* in our tactics. How are they to be taken into account? By going more carefully into the expediency of any given action, by changing the form of struggle, substituting (it was precisely substitution that was proposed!) one form for another, the general tendency being to *rise to higher forms*. The class-conscious workers are well acquainted with certain concrete cases when the movement rose to higher forms which were historically subjected to repeated test, and which are "intelligible" and "alien" only to the liquidators.

On March 21, immediately after the lock-out was declared, the Pravdists issued their clear-cut slogan: *Do not* let the employers choose for us the time and form of action; do not go on strike now! The labour unions and the organised Marxists knew and saw that this slogan was *their own*, drawn up by that same majority of the advanced proletariat which had secured the election of its representatives to the Insurance Board,<sup>134</sup> and which is guiding *all* the activities of the St. Petersburg workers *in the face* of the disruptive and liberal outcries of the liquidators.

The slogan of March 21—do not go on strike now—was the slogan of the workers, who knew that they would be able to *substitute* one form for another, that they were striving and would continue to strive—through the constantly changing forms of the movement—for a general rise to a higher level.

The workers knew that the disrupters of the working-class movement—the liquidators and the Narodniks—would try to disrupt the workers' cause in this case, too, and they were prepared in advance to offer resistance.

On March 26, both the liquidator and Narodnik groups of disrupters and violators of the will of the *majority* of the class-conscious workers of St. Petersburg and of Russia, published in their newspapers the bourgeois banalities that

are common to these camps. The Narodniks (to the delight of the liquidators) chattered about "thoughtlessness" (the class-conscious workers have long been aware that nobody is so thoughtless as the Narodniks), while the liquidators delivered liberal speeches (already analysed and condemned in *Put Pravdy* No. 47) and urged that instead of strikes the workers should resort to ... no, not the corresponding higher forms, but to ... petitions and "resolutions"!

Brushing aside this shameful liberal advice of the liquidators, and brushing aside the thoughtless chatter of the Narodniks, the advanced workers firmly proceeded along their own road.

The old decision, which called, in *certain* cases of lock-outs, for strikes to be superseded by *certain* higher forms of struggle corresponding to them, was well known to the workers and correctly applied by them.

The employers failed to achieve the provocative purpose of their lock-out. The workers did not accept battle on the ground chosen by their enemies; in due time, the workers applied the decision of the organised Marxists and, with greater energy and more demonstratively, conscious of the importance of their movement, continue to march along the old road.

*Put Pravdy* No. 54  
April 4, 1914

*Collected Works*, Vol. 20,  
pp. 209-12

---

## Our Tasks

We have given a brief review of the history of the working-class press in Russia and of the origin of *Pravda*. We have tried to show how the age-long history of democratic movements in Russia led to the formation of an independent working-class democratic movement under the ideological banner of Marxism—and how the twenty years' history of Marxism and the working-class movement in Russia, as a result of the long struggle of the workers' vanguard against petty-bourgeois opportunist trends, led to the rallying of the vast majority of class-conscious workers around *Pravda*, which was created by the famous upsurge of the working-class movement in the spring of 1912.

We have seen how, during the paper's two years, class-conscious Pravdist workers united ideologically, and to a certain extent also organisationally, by their efforts creating and supporting, strengthening and developing a consistently Marxist workers' press. Strictly insisting on their continuity with the organised Marxists of the preceding historical epoch, not breaking any of their decisions, building the new on the foundations of the old, and going systematically, unswervingly ahead to the firmly and precisely stated aim of consistent Marxism, the Pravdist workers have begun the solution of an unusually difficult historic task.

A whole host of enemies, a whole mass of difficulties, both external and internal, arose in the way of the labour movement in the 1908-11 epoch. In no country in the world has

the working-class movement hitherto succeeded in emerging from *such* crises while maintaining its continuity, its organised character, its loyalty to the old decisions, programme and tactics.

But the Russian workers—or more exactly the workers of Russia—*succeeded* in this; they succeeded in emerging with flying colours from an incredibly painful crisis, remaining loyal to the past and maintaining continuity of organisation, while mastering *new* forms of training for their forces, *new* methods of education and mobilisation of fresh generations of the proletariat for the solution by old methods of old but still outstanding historic problems.

Of all the classes of Russian society, the working class of Russia alone succeeded in this—not, of course, because it stood higher than the workers of other countries; on the contrary, it is still far behind them in organisation and class-consciousness. It succeeded in this because it *relied* at once on the *experience* of the workers of the whole world, both on their theoretical experience, on the achievements of their class-consciousness, their science and experience summed up by *Marxism* and on the practical experience of the proletarians of neighbouring countries, with their magnificent workers' press and their mass organisations.

The Pravdist workers, having safeguarded *their own* line in the most difficult and painful of periods against persecution from without and against despondency, scepticism, timidity and betrayal within, can now say to themselves, with full awareness and resolution: we know that we are on the right path, but we are taking only the first steps along that path, and the principal difficulties still lie ahead of us, we still have to do a great deal to consolidate our own position completely, and to raise to conscious activity millions of backward, dormant and downtrodden proletarians.

Let the petty-bourgeois "fellow-travellers" of the proletariat, slavishly following the liberals, hold forth contemptuously against "the underground", against "advertising the illegal press"; let them cherish illusions about the June Third "legality". We know the fragile nature of that "legality", we shall not forget the historic lessons of the importance of an illegal press.

Developing further our "Pravdist" work, we shall push

ahead with the purely newspaper side hand in hand with all sides of the workers' cause.

*Put Pravdy*<sup>135</sup> must be circulated in three, four and five times as many copies as today. We must put out a trade union supplement, and have representatives of all trade unions and groups on the editorial board. Our paper must have regional (Moscow, Urals, Caucasian, Baltic, Ukrainian) supplements. We must consolidate—despite all the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalists of all nations without exception—the unity of the workers of *all* the nationalities of Russia, and for this purpose, incidentally, start supplements in our paper devoted to the workers' movement of the various nationalities of Russia.

Both the foreign department of *Put Pravdy* and the chronicle of the *organisational*, ideological and political life of the class-conscious workers should be expanded many times over.

We must create a kopek *Vechernaya Pravda*. *Put Pravdy* in its present shape is essential for the class-conscious worker and should be still further enlarged, but it is too dear, too difficult, too big for the worker in the street, for the rank-and-filer, for any of the millions not yet drawn into the movement. The advanced worker will never forget about them, for he knows that craft isolation, the emergence of a labour aristocracy and its separation from the masses mean degradation and brutalisation of the proletarian and his transformation into a miserable philistine, a pitiful flunkey; it means loss of all hope of his emancipation.

There is need to start a kopek *Vechernaya Pravda*, with a circulation of 200,000 or 300,000 copies in the very thick of the proletarian and semi-proletarian masses, showing them the light of the world-wide working-class movement, inspiring them with faith in their strength, impelling them towards unity and helping them to rise to full class-consciousness.

We must secure a much greater degree of organisation on the part of the readers of *Put Pravdy* than there is now, in their various factories, districts, etc., and more active participation in correspondence and running and circulating the paper. We must get the workers to take a regular part in editorial work.

We must have—there is in fact a great deal more that we must have! We cannot list here everything that we need; we would even be ridiculous (and worse) if we attempted here to enumerate all spheres, or even the principal fields of our work!

We know that we are on the right path. We know that we are marching hand in hand with the forward-looking workers of all countries. We know that this field of our work is only a small part of the whole, and that we are still at the beginning of our great road to emancipation. But we also know that nothing on earth can stop us on that road.

*Rabochy* No. 1  
April 22, 1914

*Collected Works*, Vol. 36,  
pp. 281-84

---

## What Should Not Be Copied from the German Labour Movement

Karl Legien, one of the most prominent and responsible representatives of the German trade unions, recently published a report of his visit to America in the form of a rather bulky book entitled *The Labour Movement in America*.

As a very prominent representative of the international as well as German trade union movement, K. Legien gave his visit the nature of a special occasion, one of state importance, one might say. For years he conducted negotiations on this visit with the Socialist Party of America<sup>136</sup> and the American Federation of Labor,<sup>137</sup> the labour union organisation led by the famous (or rather infamous) Gompers. When Legien heard that Karl Liebknecht was going to America, he refused to go at the same time "so as to avoid the simultaneous appearance in the United States of two spokesmen whose views on the party's tactics and on the importance and value of certain branches of the labour movement did not entirely coincide".

K. Legien collected a vast amount of material on the labour-union movement in America, but failed to digest it in his book, which is cluttered up with patchy descriptions of his journey, trivial in content and trite in style. Even the labour-union rules of America, in which Legien was particularly interested, are not studied or analysed, but merely translated incompletely and without system.

There was a highly instructive episode in Legien's tour, which strikingly revealed the *two tendencies* in the international and particularly in the German labour movement.



Legien visited the chamber of deputies of the United States, known as the Congress. Brought up in the police-ridden Prussian state, he was favourably impressed by the democratic customs of the Republic, and he remarks with understandable pleasure that in America the government provides every congressman not only with a private office fitted with all modern conveniences, but also with a paid secretary to help him cope with a congressman's manifold duties. The simplicity and easy manners of the congressmen and the Speaker of the House were in striking contrast with what Legien had seen in European parliaments, and especially in Germany. In Europe, a Social-Democrat could not even think of delivering to a bourgeois parliament at an official session a speech of greeting! But in America this was done very simply, and the name of Social-Democrat did not frighten anybody ... except *that Social-Democrat himself!*

We have here an example of the American bourgeois method of killing unsteady socialists with kindness, and the German opportunist method of renouncing socialism in deference to the "kindly", suave and democratic bourgeoisie.

Legien's speech of greeting was translated into English (democracy was not in the least averse to hearing a "foreign" language spoken in its parliament); all two hundred odd congressmen shook hands in turn with Legien as the "guest" of the Republic, and the Speaker expressed his thanks.

"The form and content of my speech of greeting," writes Legien, "were sympathetically received by the socialist press both in the United States and Germany. Certain editors in Germany, however, could not resist pointing out that my speech proved once again what an impossible task it is for a Social-Democrat to deliver a Social-Democratic speech to a bourgeois audience. Well, in my place, these editors would, no doubt, have delivered a speech against capitalism and in favour of a mass strike, but I considered it important to emphasise to this parliament that the Social-Democratic and industrially organised workers of Germany want peace among the nations, and through peace, the development of culture to the highest degree attainable."

Poor "editors", whom our Legien has annihilated with his "statesmanlike" speech! The opportunism of trade union leaders in general, and of Legien in particular, has long been common knowledge in the German labour movement, and has been duly appraised by a great many class-conscious

workers. But with us in Russia, where far too much is spoken about the "model" of *European* socialism with precisely the worst, most objectionable features of this "model" being chosen, it would be advisable to deal with Legien's speech in somewhat greater detail.

When he addressed the highest body of representatives of capitalist America, this leader of a two-million-strong army of German trade unionists—namely, the Social-Democratic trade unions—this member of the Social-Democratic group in the German Reichstag, delivered a purely liberal, bourgeois speech. Needless to say, not a single liberal, not even an Octobrist, would hesitate to subscribe to a speech about "peace" and "culture".

And when German socialists remarked that this was not a Social-Democratic speech, this "leader" of capital's wage-slaves treated them with scathing contempt. What are "editors" compared to a "practical politician" and collector of workers' pennies! Our philistine Narcissus has the same contempt for editors as the police panjandrums in a certain country have for the third element.<sup>138</sup>

"These editors" would no doubt have delivered a speech "against capitalism".

Just think what this quasi-socialist is sneering at! He is sneering at the idea that a socialist should think it necessary to speak *against* capitalism. To the "statesmen" of German opportunism such an idea is utterly alien; they talk in such a way as *not to offend* "capitalism". Disgracing themselves by this servile renunciation of socialism, they brag of their disgrace.

Legien is not just anybody. He is a representative of the army of trade unions, or rather, the officers' corps of that army. His speech was no accident, no slip of the tongue, no casual whimsy, no blunder of a provincial German office clerk overawed by American capitalists, who were polite and revealed no trace of police arrogance. If it were *only* this, Legien's speech would not be worthy of note.

But it was obviously not that.

At the International Congress in Stuttgart, half the German delegation turned out to be sham socialists of this type, who voted for the ultra-opportunist resolution on the colonial question.

Take the German magazine *Sozialistische* (??) *Monatshefte*<sup>139</sup> and you will always find in it utterances by men like Legien, which are thoroughly opportunist, and have *nothing* in common with socialism, utterances touching on *all* the vital issues of the labour movement.

The "official" explanation of the "official" German party is that "nobody reads" *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, that it has no influence, etc.; but that is *not true*. The Stuttgart "incident" proved that it is not true. The most prominent and responsible people, members of parliament and trade union leaders who write for *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, constantly and undeviatingly propagate their views among the masses.

The "official optimism" of the German party has long been noted in its own camp by those people who earned Legien's appellation of "these editors"—an appellation contemptuous from the point of view of the bourgeois and honourable from the point of view of a socialist. And the more often the liberals and the liquidators in Russia (including Trotsky, of course) attempt to *transplant* this amiable characteristic *to our soil*, the more determinedly must they be resisted.

German Social-Democracy has many great services to its credit. Thanks to Marx's struggle against all the Höchbergs, Dührings, and Co., it possesses a strictly formulated theory, which our Narodniks vainly try to evade or touch up along opportunist lines. It has a mass organisation, newspapers, trade unions, political associations—that same mass organisation which is so definitely building up in our country in the shape of the victories the *Pravda* Marxists are winning everywhere—in Duma elections, in the daily press, in Insurance Board elections, and in the trade unions. The attempts of our liquidators, whom the workers have "removed from office", to evade the question of the growth of this mass organisation in Russia in a form adapted to Russian conditions are as vain as those of the Narodniks, and imply a similar intellectualist *breakaway* from the working-class movement.

But the merits of German Social-Democracy are merits, not because of shameful speeches like those delivered by Legien or the "utterances" (in the press) by the contribu-

tors to *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, but *despite* them. We must not try to play down the *disease* which the German party is undoubtedly suffering from, and which reveals itself in phenomena of this kind; nor must we play it down with "officially optimistic" phrases. We must lay it bare to the Russian workers, so that we may learn from the experience of the older movement, learn what should not be copied from it.

*Prosveshcheniye* No. 4  
April 1914  
Signed: V.I.

*Collected Works*, Vol. 20,  
pp. 254-58

---

***From Report of the C. C., R.S.D.L.P.  
to the Brussels Conference  
and Instructions to the C. C. Delegation***

Here are the objective figures concerning the election of workers' representatives to the insurance bodies. We reject as mere liberalism all talk about political, constitutional reforms in present-day tsarist Russia and will have nothing to do with it; but we take advantage of *real* reforms, such as insurance, *in deed* and not in word. The *entire* workers' group on the All-Russia Insurance Board consists of *Pravda* supporters, i.e., of workers who have condemned and rejected liquidationism. During the election to this All-Russia Insurance Board, 47 out of the 57 delegates, i.e., 82 per cent, were Pravdists. During the election of the metropolitan, St. Petersburg, Insurance Board, 37 of the delegates were Pravdists and 7 were liquidators, the Pravdists constituting 84 per cent.

The same can be said about the trade unions. When they hear the talk of the Russian Social-Democrats abroad about the "chaos of factional strife" in Russia (indulged in by Rosa Luxemburg, Plekhanov, Trotsky, and others), our foreign comrades perhaps imagine that the trade union movement in our country is split up.

Nothing of the kind.

In Russia there are no duplicate unions. Both in St. Petersburg and in Moscow, the trade unions are *united*. The point is that in these unions the *Pravdists* completely *predominate*.

Not one of the thirteen trade unions in Moscow is liquidationist.

Of the twenty trade unions in St. Petersburg listed in our Workers' Calendar together with their membership, only the Draftsmen's, Druggist Employees' and Clerks' Unions, and half the members of the Printers' Union, are liquidationist. In all the other unions—Metalworkers', Textile Workers', Tailors', Woodworkers', Shop Assistants', and so forth—the Pravdists *completely* predominate.

And we say plainly: if the liquidators do not want drastically to change their tactics and put a stop to their disruptive struggle against the organised majority of the class-conscious workers in Russia, let them stop talking about "unity".

Written June 23-30

(July 6-13), 1914

First published in 1929

in the 2nd and 3rd editions

of V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,  
Vol. XVII

*Collected Works*, Vol. 20,  
pp. 507-508

---

## *From Karl Marx*

After examining, as early as 1844-45, one of the main shortcomings in the earlier materialism, namely, its inability to understand the conditions or appreciate the importance of practical revolutionary activity, Marx, along with his theoretical work, devoted unremitting attention, throughout his lifetime, to the tactical problems of the proletariat's class struggle. An immense amount of material bearing on this is contained in *all* the works of Marx, particularly in the four volumes of his correspondence with Engels, published in 1913. This material is still far from having been brought together, collected, examined and studied. We shall therefore have to confine ourselves here to the most general and brief remarks, emphasising that Marx justly considered that, without *this* aspect, materialism is incomplete, one-sided, and lifeless. The fundamental task of proletarian tactics was defined by Marx in strict conformity with all the postulates of his materialist-dialectical *Weltanschauung*. Only an objective consideration of the sum total of the relations between absolutely all the classes in a given society, and consequently a consideration of the objective stage of development reached by that society and of the relations between it and other societies, can serve as a basis for the correct tactics of an advanced class. At the same time, all classes and all countries are regarded, not statically, but dynamically, i.e., not in a state of immobility, but in motion (whose laws are determined by the

economic conditions of existence of each class). Motion, in its turn, is regarded from the standpoint, not only of the past, but also of the future, and that not in the vulgar sense it is understood in by the "evolutionists", who see only slow changes, but dialectically: "...in developments of such magnitude twenty years are no more than a day," Marx wrote to Engels, "though later on there may come days in which twenty years are embodied" (*Briefwechsel*, Vol. 3, p. 127).<sup>140</sup> At each stage of development, at each moment, proletarian tactics must take account of this objectively inevitable dialectics of human history, on the one hand, utilising the periods of political stagnation or of sluggish, so-called "peaceful" development in order to develop the class-consciousness, strength and militancy of the advanced class, and, on the other hand, directing all the work of this utilisation towards the "ultimate aim" of that class's advance, towards creating in it the ability to find practical solutions for great tasks in the great days, in which "twenty years are embodied". Two of Marx's arguments are of special importance in this connection: one of these is contained in *The Poverty of Philosophy* and concerns the economic struggle and economic organisations of the proletariat; the other is contained in the *Communist Manifesto* and concerns the political tasks of the proletariat. The former runs as follows: "Large-scale industry concentrates in one place a crowd of people unknown to one another. Competition divides their interests. But the maintenance of wages, this common interest which they have against their boss, unites them in a common thought of resistance—combination.... Combinations, at first isolated, constitute themselves into groups ... and in face of always united capital, the maintenance of the association becomes more necessary to them [i.e., the workers] than that of wages.... In this struggle—a veritable civil war—all the elements necessary for a coming battle unite and develop. Once it has reached this point, association takes on a political character."<sup>141</sup> Here we have the programme and tactics of the economic struggle and of the trade union movement for several decades to come, for all the lengthy period in which the proletariat will prepare its forces for the "coming battle". All this should be compared with numerous references by Marx and Engels



to the example of the British labour movement, showing how industrial "prosperity" leads to attempts "to buy the proletariat" (*Briefwechsel*, Vol. 1, p. 136),<sup>142</sup> to divert them from the struggle; how this prosperity in general "demoralises the workers" (Vol. 2, p. 218); how the British proletariat becomes "bourgeoisified"— "this most bourgeois of all nations is apparently aiming ultimately at the possession of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat alongside the bourgeoisie" (Vol. 2, p. 290)<sup>143</sup>; how its "revolutionary energy" oozes away (Vol. 3, p. 124); how it will be necessary to wait a more or less lengthy space of time before "the British workers will free themselves from their apparent bourgeois infection" (Vol. 3, p. 127); how the British labour movement "lacks the mettle of the Chartists" (1866; Vol. 3, p. 305)<sup>144</sup>; how the British workers' leaders are becoming a type midway between "a radical bourgeois and a worker" (in reference to Holyoak, Vol. 4, p. 209); how, owing to Britain's monopoly, and as long as that monopoly lasts, "the British workingman will not budge" (Vol. 4, p. 433).<sup>145</sup> The tactics of the economic struggle, in connection with the general course (*and outcome*) of the working-class movement, are considered here from a remarkably broad, comprehensive, dialectical, and genuinely revolutionary standpoint.

Written July-November 1914

Published in 1915

in the *Granat*

*Encyclopaedia*,

Seventh Edition, Vol. 28

*Collected Works*, Vol. 21,  
pp. 74-76

---

## ***From Imperialism and the Split in Socialism***

The proletariat is the child of capitalism—of world capitalism, and not only of European capitalism, or of imperialist capitalism. On a world scale, fifty years sooner or fifty years later—measured on a *world* scale this is a minor point—the “proletariat” of course “will be” united, and revolutionary Social-Democracy will “inevitably” be victorious within it. But that is not the point, Messrs. Kautskyites. The point is that at the present time, in the imperialist countries of Europe, *you are fawning* on the opportunists, who are *alien* to the proletariat as a class, who are the servants, the agents of the bourgeoisie and the vehicles of its influence, and *unless* the labour movement *rids* itself of them, it will remain a *bourgeois labour movement*. By advocating “unity” with the opportunists, with the Legiens and Davids, the Plekhanovs, the Chkhenkelis and Potresovs, etc., you are, objectively, defending the *enslavement* of the workers by the imperialist bourgeoisie with the aid of its best agents in the labour movement. The victory of revolutionary Social-Democracy on a world scale is absolutely inevitable, only it is moving and will move, is proceeding and will proceed, *against* you, it will be a victory *over* you.

These two trends, one might even say *two* parties, in the present-day labour movement, which in 1914-16 so obviously parted ways all over the world, were *traced by Engels and Marx in England* throughout the course of *decades*, roughly from 1858 to 1892.

Neither Marx nor Engels lived to see the imperialist epoch of world capitalism, which began not earlier than 1898-1900. But it has been a peculiar feature of England that even in the middle of the nineteenth century she already revealed at least *two* major distinguishing features of imperialism: (1) vast colonies, and (2) monopoly profit (due to her monopoly position in the world market). In both respects England at that time was an exception among capitalist countries, and Engels and Marx, analysing this exception, quite clearly and definitely indicated its *connection* with the (temporary) victory of opportunism in the English labour movement.

In a letter to Marx, dated October 7, 1858, Engels wrote: "...The English proletariat is actually becoming more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of all nations is apparently aiming ultimately at the possession of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat *alongside* the bourgeoisie. For a nation which exploits the whole world this is of course to a certain extent justifiable." In a letter to Sorge, dated September 21, 1872, Engels informs him that Hales kicked up a big row in the Federal Council of the International and secured a vote of censure on Marx for saying that "the English labour leaders had sold themselves". Marx wrote to Sorge on August 4, 1874: "As to the urban workers here [in England], it is a pity that the whole pack of leaders did not get into Parliament. This would be the surest way of getting rid of the whole lot." In a letter to Marx, dated August 11, 1881, Engels speaks about "those very worst English trade unions which allow themselves to be led by men sold to, or at least paid by, the bourgeoisie". In a letter to Kautsky, dated September 12, 1882, Engels wrote: "You ask me what the English workers think about colonial policy. Well, exactly the same as they think about politics in general. There is no workers' party here, there are only Conservatives and Liberal-Radicals, and the workers gaily share the feast of England's monopoly of the world market and the colonies."

On December 7, 1889, Engels wrote to Sorge: "The most repulsive thing here [in England] is the bourgeois 'respectability', which has grown deep into the bones of the workers.... Even Tom Mann, whom I regard as the best of the

lot, is fond of mentioning that he will be lunching with the Lord Mayor. If one compares this with the French, one realises what a revolution is good for, after all." In a letter, dated April 19, 1890: "But *under* the surface the movement [of the working class in England] is going on, is embracing ever wider sections and mostly just among the hitherto stagnant *lowest* [Engels's italics] strata. The day is no longer far off when this mass *will* suddenly *find itself*, when it will dawn upon it that it itself is this colossal mass in motion." On March 4, 1891: "The failure of the collapsed Dockers' Union; the 'old' conservative trade unions, *rich* and therefore cowardly, remain lone on the field...." September 14, 1891: at the Newcastle Trade Union Congress the old unionists, opponents of the eight-hour day, were defeated "and the bourgeois papers recognise the defeat of the *bourgeois labour party*" (Engels's italics throughout)....

That these ideas, which were repeated by Engels over the course of decades, were also expressed by him publicly, in the press, is proved by his preface to the second edition of *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, 1892. Here he speaks of an "aristocracy among the working class", of a "privileged minority of the workers", in contradistinction to the "great mass of working people". "A small, privileged, protected minority" of the working class alone was "permanently benefited" by the privileged position of England in 1848-68, whereas "the great bulk of them experienced at best but a temporary improvement".... "With the break-down of that [England's industrial] monopoly, the English working class will lose that privileged position...." The members of the "new" unions, the unions of the unskilled workers, "had this immense advantage, that their minds were virgin soil, entirely free from the inherited 'respectable' bourgeois prejudices which hampered the brains of the better situated 'old unionists' ".... "The so-called workers' representatives" in England are people "who are forgiven their being members of the working class because they themselves would like to drown their quality of being workers in the ocean of their liberalism...."

We have deliberately quoted the direct statements of Marx and Engels at rather great length in order that the reader may study them *as a whole*. And they should be

studied, they are worth carefully pondering over. For they are the *pivot* of the tactics in the labour movement that are dictated by the objective conditions of the imperialist era.

Here, too, Kautsky has tried to "befog the issue" and substitute for Marxism sentimental conciliation with the opportunists. Arguing against the avowed and naive social-imperialists (men like Lensch) who justify Germany's participation in the war as a means of destroying England's monopoly, Kautsky "*corrects*" this obvious falsehood by another equally obvious falsehood. Instead of a cynical falsehood he employs a suave falsehood! The *industrial* monopoly of England, he says, has long ago been broken, has long ago been destroyed, and there is nothing left to destroy.

Why is this argument false?

Because, firstly, it overlooks England's *colonial* monopoly. Yet Engels, as we have seen, pointed to this very clearly as early as 1882, thirty-four years ago! Although England's industrial monopoly may have been destroyed, her colonial monopoly not only remains, but has become extremely accentuated, for the whole world is already divided up! By means of this suave lie Kautsky smuggles in the bourgeois-pacifist and opportunist-philistine idea that "there is nothing to fight about". On the contrary, not only have the *capitalists* something to fight about now, but they *cannot help* fighting if they want to preserve capitalism, for without a forcible redivision of colonies the *new* imperialist countries cannot obtain the privileges enjoyed by the older (*and weaker*) imperialist powers.

Secondly, why does England's monopoly explain the (temporary) victory of opportunism in England? Because monopoly yields *superprofits*, i.e., a surplus of profits over and above the capitalist profits that are normal and customary all over the world. The capitalists *can* devote a part (and not a small one, at that!) of these superprofits to bribe *their own* workers, to create something like an alliance (recall the celebrated "alliances" described by the Webbs of English trade unions and employers) between the workers of the given nation and their capitalists *against* the other countries. England's industrial monopoly was already destroyed by the

end of the nineteenth century. That is beyond dispute. But *how* did this destruction take place? Did *all* monopoly disappear?

If that were so, Kautsky's "theory" of conciliation (with the opportunists) would to a certain extent be justified. But it is *not* so, and that is just the point. Imperialism is monopoly capitalism. Every cartel, trust, syndicate, every giant bank is a monopoly. Superprofits have not disappeared; they still remain. The exploitation of *all* other countries by one privileged, financially wealthy country remains and has become more intense. A handful of wealthy countries—there are only four of them, if we mean independent, really gigantic, "modern" wealth: England, France, the United States and Germany—have developed monopoly to vast proportions, they obtain *superprofits* running into hundreds, if not thousands, of millions, they "ride on the backs" of hundreds and hundreds of millions of people in other countries and fight among themselves for the division of the particularly rich, particularly fat and particularly easy spoils.

This, in fact, is the economic and political essence of imperialism, the profound contradictions of which Kautsky glosses over instead of exposing.

The bourgeoisie of an imperialist "Great" Power *can* economically bribe the upper strata of "its" workers by spending on this a hundred million or so francs a year, for its *superprofits* most likely amount to about a thousand million. And how this little sop is divided among the labour ministers, "labour representatives" (remember Engels' splendid analysis of the term), labour members of war industries committees, labour officials, workers belonging to the narrow craft unions, office employees, etc., etc., is a secondary question.

Between 1848 and 1868, and to a certain extent even later, only England enjoyed a monopoly: *that is why* opportunism could prevail there for decades. *No* other countries possessed either very rich colonies or an industrial monopoly.

The last third of the nineteenth century saw the transition to the new, imperialist era. Finance capital *not* of one, but of several, though very few, Great Powers enjoys a

monopoly. (In Japan and Russia the monopoly of military power, vast territories, or special facilities for robbing minority nationalities, China, etc., partly supplements, partly takes the place of, the monopoly of modern, up-to-date finance capital.) This difference explains why England's monopoly position *could* remain *unchallenged* for decades. The monopoly of modern finance capital is being frantically challenged; the era of imperialist wars has begun. It was possible in those days to bribe and corrupt the working class of *one* country for decades. This is now improbable, if not impossible. But on the other hand, *every* imperialist "Great" Power can and does bribe *smaller* strata (than in England in 1848-68) of the "labour aristocracy". Formerly a "*bourgeois labour party*", to use Engels' remarkably profound expression, could arise only in one country, because it alone enjoyed a monopoly, but, on the other hand, it could exist for a long time. Now a "*bourgeois labour party*" is *inevitable* and typical in *all* imperialist countries; but in view of the desperate struggle they are waging for the division of spoils, it is improbable that such a party can prevail for long in a number of countries. For the trusts, the financial oligarchy, high prices, etc., while *enabling* the bribery of a handful in the top layers, are increasingly oppressing, crushing, ruining and torturing the *mass* of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat.

On the one hand, there is the tendency of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists to convert a handful of very rich and privileged nations into "eternal" parasites on the body of the rest of mankind, to "rest on the laurels" of the exploitation of Negroes, Indians, etc., keeping them in subjection with the aid of the excellent weapons of extermination provided by modern militarism. On the other hand, there is the tendency of the *masses*, who are more oppressed than before and who bear the whole brunt of imperialist wars, to cast off this yoke and to overthrow the bourgeoisie. It is in the struggle between these two tendencies that the history of the labour movement will now inevitably develop. For the first tendency is not accidental; it is "substantiated" economically. In *all* countries the bourgeoisie has already begotten, fostered and secured for itself "bourgeois labour parties" of social-chauvinists. The difference between a

definitely formed party, like Bissolati's in Italy, for example, which is fully social-imperialist, and, say, the semi-formed near-party of the Potresovs, Gvozdyovs, Bulkins, Chkhaidzes, Skobelevs and Co., is an immaterial difference. The important thing is that, economically, the desertion of a stratum of the labour aristocracy to the bourgeoisie has matured and become an accomplished fact; and this economic fact, this shift in class relations, will find political form, in one shape or another, without any particular "difficulty".

On the economic basis referred to above, the political institutions of modern capitalism—press, parliament, associations, congresses, etc.—have created *political* privileges and sops for the respectful, meek, reformist and patriotic office employees and workers, corresponding to the economic privileges and sops. Lucrative and soft jobs in the government or on the war industries committees, in parliament and on diverse committees, on the editorial staffs of "respectable", legally published newspapers or on the management councils of no less respectable and "bourgeois law-abiding" trade unions—this is the bait by which the imperialist bourgeoisie attracts and rewards the representatives and supporters of the "bourgeois labour parties".

The mechanics of political democracy works in the same direction. Nothing in our times can be done without elections; nothing can be done without the masses. And in this era of printing and parliamentarism it is *impossible* to gain the following of the masses without a widely ramified, systematically managed, well-equipped system of flattery, lies, fraud, juggling with fashionable and popular catchwords, and promising all manner of reforms and blessings to the workers right and left—as long as they renounce the revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. I would call this system Lloyd-Georgism, after the English Minister Lloyd George, one of the foremost and most dexterous representatives of this system in the classic land of the "bourgeois labour party". A first-class bourgeois manipulator, an astute politician, a popular orator who will deliver any speeches you like, even r-r-revolutionary ones, to a labour audience, and a man who is capable of obtaining sizable sops for docile workers in the shape of social reforms (insurance, etc.), Lloyd George serves the bour-



geoisie splendidly,\* and serves it precisely *among* the workers, brings its influence *precisely* to the proletariat, to where the bourgeoisie needs it most and where it finds it most difficult to subject the masses morally.

And is there such a great difference between Lloyd George and the Scheidemanns, Legiens, Hendersons and Hyndmans, Plekhanovs, Renaudels and Co.? Of the latter, it may be objected, some will return to the revolutionary socialism of Marx. This is possible, but it is an insignificant difference in degree, if the question is regarded from its political, i.e., its mass aspect. Certain individuals among the present social-chauvinist leaders may return to the proletariat. But the social-chauvinist or (what is the same thing) opportunist *trend* can neither disappear nor "return" to the revolutionary proletariat. Wherever Marxism is popular among the workers, this political trend, this "bourgeois labour party", will swear by the name of Marx. It cannot be prohibited from doing this, just as a trading firm cannot be prohibited from using any particular label, sign or advertisement. It has always been the case in history that after the death of revolutionary leaders who were popular among the oppressed classes, their enemies have attempted to appropriate their names so as to deceive the oppressed classes.

The fact is that "bourgeois labour parties", as a political phenomenon, have already been formed in *all* the foremost capitalist countries, and that unless a determined and relentless struggle is waged all along the line against these parties—or groups, trends, etc., it is all the same—there can be no question of a struggle against imperialism, or of Marxism, or of a socialist labour movement. The Chkhaidze faction,<sup>146</sup> *Nashe Dyelo* and *Golos Truda*<sup>147</sup> in Russia, and the O. C.<sup>148</sup> supporters abroad are nothing but varieties of one *such* party. There is not the slightest reason for thinking that these parties will disappear *before* the social revolution. On the contrary, the nearer the revolution approaches, the more strongly it flares up and the more sudden and violent

---

\* I recently read an article in an English magazine by a Tory, a political opponent of Lloyd George, entitled "Lloyd George from the Standpoint of a Tory". The war opened the eyes of this opponent and made him realise what an excellent servant of the bourgeoisie this Lloyd George is! The Tories have made peace with him!

the transitions and leaps in its progress, the greater will be the part the struggle of the revolutionary mass stream against the opportunist petty-bourgeois stream will play in the labour movement. Kautskyism is not an independent trend, because it has no roots either in the masses or in the privileged stratum which has deserted to the bourgeoisie. But the danger of Kautskyism lies in the fact that, utilising the ideology of the past, it endeavours to reconcile the proletariat with the "bourgeois labour party", to preserve the unity of the proletariat with that party and thereby enhance the latter's prestige. The masses no longer follow the avowed social-chauvinists: Lloyd George has been hissed down at workers' meetings in England; Hyndman has left the party; the Renaudels and Scheidemanns, the Potresovs and Gvozdyovs are protected by the police. The Kautskyites' masked defence of the social-chauvinists is much more dangerous.

One of the most common sophistries of Kautskyism is its reference to the "masses". We do not want, they say, to break away from the masses and mass organisations! But just think how Engels put the question. In the nineteenth century the "mass organisations" of the English trade unions were on the side of the bourgeois labour party. Marx and Engels did not reconcile themselves to it on this ground; they exposed it. They did not forget, firstly, that the trade union organisations directly embraced a *minority of the proletariat*. In England then, as in Germany now, not more than one-fifth of the proletariat was organised. No one can seriously think it possible to organise the majority of the proletariat under capitalism. Secondly—and this is the main point—it is not so much a question of the size of an organisation, as of the real, objective significance of its policy: does its policy represent the masses, does it serve them, i.e., does it aim at their liberation from capitalism, or does it represent the interests of the minority, the minority's reconciliation with capitalism? The latter was true of England in the nineteenth century, and it is true of Germany, etc., now.

Engels draws a distinction between the "bourgeois labour party" of the *old* trade unions—the privileged minority—and the "*lowest mass*", the real majority, and appeals to the

latter, who are *not* infected by "bourgeois respectability". This is the essence of Marxist tactics!

Written in October 1916

Published in *Sbornik Sotsial-Demokrata*

No. 2, December 1916

Signed: *N. Lenin*

*Collected Works*. Vol. 23,  
pp. 111-20

---

## ***From Tasks of the Left Zimmerwaldists in the Swiss Social-Democratic Party***

22. A decisive break with the theory of "neutrality" of the industrial organisations of the working class, office employees, etc. A truth most strikingly confirmed by the war should be brought home to the masses, namely, that so-called "neutrality" is bourgeois deception or hypocrisy, that in fact it means *passive* submission to the bourgeoisie and to such of its particularly disgusting undertakings as imperialist war. Social-Democratic activity in every organisation of the working class and of the poor strata of the petty bourgeoisie or office workers must be intensified. Special Social-Democratic groups must be formed within all such organisations; systematic efforts must be made to create a situation in which revolutionary Social-Democracy shall have the majority in and leadership of these organisations. The special importance of this condition for the success of the revolutionary struggle must be explained to the masses.

Written in late October-  
early November 1916

First published (in French)  
in pamphlet form in 1918

First published in Russian  
in 1924 in *Proletarskaya Revolutsia*  
No. 4.

*Collected Works*, Vol. 23,  
pp. 143-44

---

## *From Lecture on the 1905 Revolution*

It is in this awakening of tremendous masses of the people to political consciousness and revolutionary struggle that the historic significance of January 22, 1905 lies.<sup>149</sup>

"There is not yet a revolutionary people in Russia," wrote Mr. Pyotr Struve, then leader of the Russian liberals and publisher abroad of an illegal, uncensored organ, *two days* before "Bloody Sunday". The idea that an illiterate peasant country could produce a revolutionary people seemed utterly absurd to this "highly educated", supercilious and extremely stupid leader of the bourgeois reformists. So deep was the conviction of the reformists of those days—as of the reformists of today—that a real revolution was impossible!

Prior to January 22 (or January 9, old style), 1905, the revolutionary party of Russia consisted of a small group of people, and the reformists of those days (exactly like the reformists of today) derisively called us a "sect". Several hundred revolutionary organisers, several thousand members of local organisations, half a dozen revolutionary papers appearing not more frequently than once a month, published mainly abroad and smuggled into Russia with incredible difficulty and at the cost of many sacrifices—such were the revolutionary parties in Russia, and the revolutionary Social-Democracy in particular, prior to January 22, 1905. This circumstance gave the narrow-minded and overbearing reformists formal justification for their claim that there was not yet a revolutionary people in Russia.

Within a few months, however, the picture changed completely. The hundreds of revolutionary Social-Democrats "suddenly" grew into thousands; the thousands became the leaders of between two and three million proletarians. The proletarian struggle produced widespread ferment, often revolutionary movements among the peasant masses, fifty to a hundred million strong; the peasant movement had its reverberations in the army and led to soldiers' revolts, to armed clashes between one section of the army and another. In this manner a colossal country, with a population of 130,000,000, went into the revolution; in this way, dormant Russia was transformed into a Russia of a revolutionary proletariat and a revolutionary people.

It is necessary to study this transformation, understand why it was possible, its methods and ways, so to speak.

The principal factor in this transformation was the *mass strike*. The peculiarity of the Russian revolution is that it was a *bourgeois-democratic* revolution in its social content, but a *proletarian* revolution in its methods of struggle. It was a bourgeois-democratic revolution since its immediate aim, which it could achieve directly and with its own forces, was a democratic republic, the eight-hour day and confiscation of the immense estates of the nobility—all the measures the French bourgeois revolution in 1792-93 had almost completely achieved.

At the same time, the Russian revolution was also a proletarian revolution, not only in the sense that the proletariat was the leading force, the vanguard of the movement, but also in the sense that a specifically proletarian weapon of struggle—the strike—was the principal means of bringing the masses into motion and the most characteristic phenomenon in the wave-like rise of decisive events.

The Russian revolution was the *first*, though certainly not the last, great revolution in history in which the mass political strike played an extraordinarily important part. It may even be said that the events of the Russian revolution and the sequence of its political forms cannot be understood without a study of the *strike statistics* to disclose the *basis* of these events and this sequence of forms.

I know perfectly well that dry statistics are hardly suitable in a lecture and are likely to bore the hearer. Never-

theless, I cannot refrain from quoting a few figures, in order that you may be able to appreciate the real objective basis of the whole movement. The average annual number of strikers in Russia during the ten years preceding the revolution was 43,000, which means 430,000 for the decade. In January 1905, the first month of the revolution, the number of strikers was 440,000. In other words, there were *more strikers in one month* than in the whole of the preceding decade!

In no capitalist country in the world, not even in the most advanced countries like England, the United States of America, or Germany, has there been anything to match the tremendous Russian strike movement of 1905. The total number of strikers was 2,800,000, more than two times the number of factory workers in the country! This, of course, does not prove that the urban factory workers of Russia were more educated, or stronger, or more adapted to the struggle than their brothers in Western Europe. The very opposite is true.

But it does show how great the dormant energy of the proletariat can be. It shows that in a revolutionary epoch—I say this without the slightest exaggeration, on the basis of the most accurate data of Russian history—the proletariat *can generate fighting energy a hundred times greater* than in ordinary, peaceful times. It shows that up to 1905 mankind did not yet know what a great, what a tremendous exertion of effort the proletariat is, and will be, capable of in a fight for really great aims, and one waged in a really revolutionary manner!

The history of the Russian revolution shows that it was the vanguard, the finest elements of the wage-workers, that fought with the greatest tenacity and the greatest devotion. The larger the mills and factories involved, the more stubborn were the strikes, and the more often did they recur during the year. The bigger the city, the more important was the part the proletariat played in the struggle. Three big cities, St. Petersburg, Riga and Warsaw, which have the largest and most class-conscious working-class element, show an immeasurably greater number of strikers, in relation to all workers, than any other city, and, of course, much greater than the rural districts.

In Russia—as probably in other capitalist countries—the metalworkers represent the vanguard of the proletariat. In this connection we note the following instructive fact: taking all industries, the number of persons involved in strikes in 1905 was 160 per hundred workers employed, but in the *metal industry* the number was 320 per hundred! It is estimated that in consequence of the 1905 strikes every Russian factory worker lost an average of ten rubles in wages—approximately 26 francs at the pre-war rate of exchange—sacrificing this money, as it were, for the sake of the struggle. But if we take the metalworkers, we find that the loss in wages was *three times as great*! The finest elements of the working class marched in the forefront, giving leadership to the hesitant, rousing the dormant and encouraging the weak.

A distinctive feature was the manner in which economic strikes were interwoven with political strikes during the revolution. There can be no doubt that only this very close link-up of the two forms of strike gave the movement its great power. The broad masses of the exploited could not have been drawn into the revolutionary movement had they not been given daily examples of how the wage-workers in the various industries were forcing the capitalists to grant immediate, direct improvements in their conditions. This struggle imbued the masses of the Russian people with a new spirit. Only then did the old serf-ridden, sluggish, patriarchal, pious and obedient Russia cast out the old Adam; only then did the Russian people obtain a really democratic and really revolutionary education.

When the bourgeois gentry and their uncritical echoers, the social-reformists, talk priggishly about the “education” of the masses, they usually mean something schoolmasterly, pedantic, something that demoralises the masses and instils in them bourgeois prejudices.

The real education of the masses can never be separated from their independent political, and especially revolutionary, struggle. Only struggle educates the exploited class. Only struggle discloses to it the magnitude of its own power, widens its horizon, enhances its abilities, clarifies its mind, forges its will. That is why even reactionaries had to admit that the year 1905, the year of struggle, the “mad year”, definitely buried patriarchal Russia.



Let us examine more closely the relation, in the 1905 strike struggles, between the metalworkers and the textile workers. The metalworkers are the best paid, the most class-conscious and best educated proletarians. The textile workers, who in 1905 were two and a half times more numerous than the metalworkers, are the most backward and the worst paid body of workers in Russia, and in very many cases have not yet definitely severed connections with their peasant kinsmen in the village. This brings us to a very important circumstance.

Throughout the whole of 1905, the metalworkers' strikes show a preponderance of political over economic strikes, though this preponderance was far greater toward the end of the year than at the beginning. Among the textile workers, on the other hand, we observe an overwhelming preponderance of economic strikes at the beginning of 1905, and it is only at the end of the year that we get a preponderance of political strikes. From this it follows quite obviously that the economic struggle, the struggle for immediate and direct improvement of conditions, is alone capable of rousing the most backward strata of the exploited masses, gives them a real education and transforms them—during a revolutionary period—into an army of political fighters within the space of a few months.

Of course, for this to happen, it was necessary for the vanguard of the workers not to regard the class struggle as a struggle in the interests of a thin upper stratum—a conception the reformists all too often try to instil—but for the proletariat to come forward as the real vanguard of the majority of the exploited and draw that majority into the struggle, as was the case in Russia in 1905, and as must be, and certainly will be, the case in the impending proletarian revolution in Europe.

Written in German  
prior to January 9 (22), 1917  
First published in *Pravda* No. 18  
January 22, 1925

*Collected Works*, Vol. 23,  
pp. 237-42

---

## Resolution on Measures to Cope with Economic Disorganisation

1. The complete disruption of Russia's economic life has now reached a point where catastrophe is unavoidable, a catastrophe of such appalling dimensions that a number of essential industries will be brought to a standstill, the farmer will be prevented from conducting farming on the necessary scale, and railway traffic will be interrupted with a consequent stoppage of grain deliveries to the industrial population and the cities, involving millions of people. What is more, the break-down has already started, and has affected various industries. Only by the greatest exertion of all the nation's forces and the adoption of a number of immediate revolutionary measures, both in the local areas and at the centre of government, can this débâcle be effectively coped with.

2. Neither by bureaucratic methods, i.e., the setting up of institutions in which the capitalists and officials preponderate, nor by preserving the profits of the capitalists, their supreme rule in industry, their supremacy over finance capital, and their commercial secrets as regards their banking, commercial, and industrial transactions, can the disaster be averted. This has been amply proved by the partial effects of the crisis as revealed in a number of industries.

3. The only way to avert disaster is to establish effectual workers' control over the production and distribution of goods. For the purpose of such control it is necessary, first

of all, that the workers should have a majority of not less than three-fourths of all the votes in all the decisive institutions and that the owners who have not withdrawn from their business and the engineering staffs should be enlisted without fail; secondly, that shop committees, the central and local Soviets, as well as the trade unions, should have the right to participate in this control, that all commercial and bank books be open to their inspection, and that the management supply them with all the necessary information; third, that a similar right should be granted to representatives of all the major democratic and socialist parties.

4. Workers' control, which the capitalists in a number of conflict cases have already accepted, should, by means of various well-considered measures be introduced gradually but without any delay, be developed into full regulation of the production and distribution of goods by the workers.

5. Workers' control should similarly be extended to all financial and banking operations with the aim of discovering the true financial state of affairs; such control to be participated in by councils and conventions of bank, syndicate and other employees, which are to be organised forthwith.

6. To save the country from disaster the workers and peasants must first of all be inspired with absolute and positive assurance, conveyed by deeds and not by words, that the governing bodies both in the local areas and at the centre will not hesitate to hand over to the people the bulk of the profits, incomes, and property of the great banking, financial, commercial, and industrial magnates of capitalist economy. Unless this measure is carried out, it is futile to demand or expect real revolutionary measures or any real revolutionary effort on the part of the workers and peasants.

7. In view of the break-down of the whole financial and monetary system and the impossibility of rehabilitating it while the war is on, the aim of the state organisation should be to organise on a broad, regional, and subsequently country-wide scale the exchange of agricultural implements, clothes, boots and other goods for grain and other farm products. The services of the town and rural co-operative societies should be widely enlisted.

8. Only when these measures have been carried out will it be possible and necessary to introduce general and compulsory labour service. This measure, in turn, calls for the establishment of a workers' militia, in which the workers are to serve without pay after their regular eight-hour day; this to be followed by the introduction of a nation-wide people's militia in which the workers and other employees shall be paid by the capitalists. Only such a workers' militia and the people's militia that will grow out of it could and should introduce universal compulsory labour service, not by bureaucratic means and in the interests of the capitalists, but to save the country from the impending débâcle. Only such a militia could and should introduce real revolutionary discipline and get the whole people to make that supreme effort necessary for averting disaster. Only universal compulsory labour service is capable of ensuring the maximum economy in the expenditure of labour-power.

9. Among the measures aimed at saving the country from disaster, one of the most important tasks is that of engaging a large labour force in the production of coal and raw materials, and for work in the transport services. No less important is it that the workers employed in producing ammunition should be gradually switched over to producing goods necessary for the country's economic rehabilitation.

10. The systematic and effective implementation of all these measures is possible only if all the power in the state passes to the proletarians and semi-proletarians.

*Sotsial-Demokrat* No. 64  
May 25 (June 7), 1917

*Collected Works*, Vol. 24,  
pp. 513-15

---

## The Need for an Agricultural Labourers' Union in Russia

### Article One

There is a highly important question which the All-Russia Trade Union Conference now in session in Petrograd<sup>150</sup> should consider. It is the question of founding an all-Russia union of *agricultural labourers*.

All classes in Russia are organising. Only the class which is the most exploited and the poorest of all, the most dis-united and downtrodden—the class of Russia's agricultural wage-labourers—seems to have been forgotten. In some non-Russian border regions, such as the Latvian territory, there are organisations of agricultural wage-labourers. The rural proletariat in the vast majority of the Great-Russian and Ukrainian gubernias has no class organisations.

It is the indisputable and paramount duty of the vanguard of Russia's proletariat, the industrial workers' trade unions, to come to the aid of their brothers, the rural workers. The difficulties involved in organising the rural workers are clearly enormous, as is borne out by the experience of other capitalist countries.

This makes it all the more necessary to set about using political liberty in Russia as speedily and vigorously as possible and to immediately found a country-wide union of agricultural labourers. This can and must be done by the trade union conference. It is the more experienced, more developed, more class-conscious representatives of the proletariat gathered at this conference who can and must issue a call to the rural workers, urging the latter to join them

in the ranks of the independently organising workers, in the ranks of their trade unions. It is the wage-workers at the factories who must take the initiative and use the trade union cells, groups and branches scattered all over Russia to awaken the rural worker to independent action and to active participation in the struggle to improve his position and uphold his class interests.

It may seem to many, and perhaps even to most at the moment, that with the peasants organising throughout Russia and calling for the abolition of private ownership of land and for "equalised" land tenure, this is not the right time to set up a rural workers' union.

Quite the contrary. This is precisely the time when it is particularly opportune and urgent. Those who share the proletarian class point of view can have no doubt as to the correctness of the proposition which the Mensheviks approved at the Stockholm Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party in 1906 on the initiative of the Bolsheviks, and which has ever since been part of the R.S.D.L.P. programme. That proposition reads:

"The Party should in *all* eventualities, and *whatever* the situation with regard to democratic agrarian reforms, consider it as its task to *steadfastly* strive for *independent class* organisation of the *rural proletariat* and explain to it the irreconcilable antithesis between its interests and the interests of the peasant bourgeoisie, to warn it against illusions about the small-holding system, which can never, as long as commodity production exists, do away with the poverty of the masses, and, lastly, to point to the need for a complete socialist revolution as the only means of abolishing all poverty and exploitation."

Every class-conscious worker, every union member, would agree that these propositions are correct. They must be carried out by the trade unions, since it is a question of *independent class organisation of the rural workers*.

We hope that at this revolutionary moment, when the urge to express themselves, to chart their own path, to see that life is not shaped anew without the workers themselves independently deciding labour issues, is making itself felt among the working people in general and the workers in particular—that at this time the trade unions will not confine themselves to narrow craft interests and forget their weaker brethren, the rural workers, but will exert all their

energy to help them by founding a union of Russia's rural workers.

In the next article, we shall try to outline some practical steps in this direction.

### Article Two

In the previous article we dealt with the fundamental significance of a rural workers' union in Russia. Here we shall touch upon certain practical aspects of the question.

A union of Russia's rural workers should group all who are engaged mainly, *or even partly*, as labourers at agricultural undertakings.

Experience will show whether or not it will be necessary to subdivide these unions into those of pure agricultural labourers and those of part-time labourers. At any rate, this is not the main thing. The main thing is that the fundamental class interests of *all* who sell their labour-power are identical and that the unity of *all* who gain at least part of their livelihood by hiring themselves out is absolutely necessary.

The wage-workers in the cities, in the factories, are bound by thousands and millions of ties with the wage-workers in the countryside. A call issued by the former to the latter cannot go unheeded. But issuing a call is not the only thing to be done. The urban workers have far more experience, knowledge, means and forces. *Some of their forces* should be directly used to *help* the rural workers *on to their feet*.

All organised workers should give one day's wages to promote and strengthen the unity of town and country wage-workers. Let a certain part of this sum be fully used as a contribution from the urban workers to the class unity of the rural workers. Let this fund be drawn on to cover the expenses of putting out a series of the most popular leaflets, of publishing a rural workers' newspaper—at least a weekly to begin with—and of sending at least a few agitators and organisers to the countryside *to immediately set up* unions of agricultural labourers in the various localities.

Only the experience gained by those unions themselves will help find the right method of furthering this work. Each

union should first of all try to improve the condition of those who sell their labour-power to agricultural undertakings and to secure higher pay, better housing conditions, better food, etc.

A most determined war must be declared on the preconceived notion that the coming abolition of private landownership can "give land" to every farm-hand and day-labourer and undermine the very foundations of wage-labour in agriculture. This is a preconceived notion and, moreover, an extremely harmful one. The abolition of private landownership is a tremendous and unquestionably progressive reform that unquestionably meets the interests of economic development and the interests of the proletariat, a reform which every wage-worker will back to the utmost but which in no way eliminates wage-labour.

You cannot eat land. You cannot farm without livestock, implements, seed, a reserve of produce, or money. To rely on "promises" from anyone—that the wage-workers in the countryside will be "helped" to acquire livestock, implements, etc.—would be the worst kind of error, unpardonable naïveté.

The basic rule, the first commandment, of any trade union movement is not to rely on the "state" but to rely only on the *strength of one's own class*. The state is an organisation of the ruling class.

Don't rely on promises. Rely only on the strength of the unity and political consciousness of your class!

That is why it must be made the immediate task of the rural workers' trade union not only to fight for better conditions for the workers in general, but in particular to *defend their interests as a class* during the coming great land reform.

Many peasants and Socialist-Revolutionaries maintain that "labour-power must be put at the disposal of the volost committees". The class of agricultural labourers holds the opposite view—it wants the volost committees to be put at the disposal of labour-power! It is clear enough where the master and the labourer stand.

"Land for the whole people." This is correct. *But the people are divided into classes*. Every worker knows, sees, feels, experiences this truth which the bourgeoisie deliberately obscures and the *petty bourgeoisie always forget*.



When alone, a poor man is helpless. No "state" will help the rural wage-worker, the farm-hand, the day-labourer, the poor peasant, the semi-proletarian, *if he does not help himself*. The first step in this direction is independent class organisation of the rural proletariat.

We hope the all-Russia trade union conference will tackle this task with the greatest energy, will issue a call to all Russia and hold out a helping hand, the mighty hand of the organised vanguard of the proletariat, to the rural workers.

*Pravda* Nos. 90 and 91,  
July 7 (June 24) and July 8  
(June 25), 1917  
Signed: *N. Lenin*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 25,  
pp. 122-26

---

## Violations of Democracy in Mass Organisations

We must pass a resolution branding as a *fraud*\* worthy of Nicholas II such practices as those of the Soviet of *Soldiers'* Deputies (the soldiers have one representative to every 500 people, while the workers have 1:1,000)<sup>151</sup> or the Trade Union Bureau (1 representative to a members in the small unions and 1 to a-b members in the large ones).

What sort of *democrats* are we if we tacitly put up with this *fraud*?

What is wrong with Nicholas II, for that matter, who also "allowed" *unequal* representation from the peasants and from the landowners??

By tolerating such things, we are prostituting democracy.

We must pass a resolution demanding *equal* suffrage (both in the Soviets and at trade union congresses), branding the *slightest* departure from equality as a *fraud*—using exactly this word—as a *Nicholas II method*. This resolution of the plenary meeting of the Central Committee must be written in a language everybody can understand and spread in leaflet form among the mass of the workers.

We cannot tolerate a *fraud* of democracy if we call ourselves "democrats". We are not democrats but unprincipled people if we tolerate this!!

Written not later than  
September 3 (16), 1917

First published in 1928  
in *Lenin Miscellany VII*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 25,  
p. 304

---

\* "One representative, everywhere, to an *equal* number of electors" is the ABC of democracy. Anything else is a *fraud*.

---

## ***From Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?***

The chief difficulty facing the proletarian revolution is the establishment on a country-wide scale of the most precise and most conscientious accounting and control, of *workers' control* of the production and distribution of goods.

When the writers of *Novaya Zhizn*<sup>152</sup> argued that in advancing the slogan "workers' control" we were slipping into syndicalism, this argument was an example of the stupid school-boy method of applying "Marxism" without studying it, just *learning it by rote* in the Struve manner. Syndicalism either repudiates the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, or else relegates it, as it does political power in general, to a back seat. We, however, put it in the forefront. If we simply say in unison with the *Novaya Zhizn* writers: *not workers' control but state control*, it is simply a bourgeois-reformist phrase, it is, in essence, a purely Cadet formula, because the Cadets have no objection to the workers *participating* in "state" control. The Kornilovite Cadets know perfectly well that such participation offers the bourgeoisie the best way of fooling the workers, the most subtle way of politically *bribing* all the Gvozdyovs, Nikitins, Prokopoviches, Tseretelis and the rest of that gang.

When we say: "workers' control", always *juxtaposing* this slogan to dictatorship of the proletariat, always putting it *immediately after* the latter, we thereby explain what kind of state we mean. The state is the organ of *class* domination. Of which class? If of the bourgeoisie, then it is the Cadet-

Kornilov-"Kerensky" state which has been "Kornilovising" and "Kerenskyising" the working people of Russia for more than six months. If it is of the proletariat, if we are speaking of a proletarian state, *that is*, of the proletarian dictatorship, then workers' control *can* become the country-wide, all-embracing, omnipresent, most precise and most conscientious *accounting* of the production and distribution of goods.

This is the chief difficulty, the chief task that faces the proletariat, i.e., socialist, revolution. Without the Soviets, this task would be impracticable, at least in Russia. The Soviets *indicate* to the proletariat the organisational work which *can* solve this historically important problem.

This brings us to another aspect of the question of the state apparatus. In addition to the chiefly "oppressive" apparatus—the standing army, the police and the bureaucracy—the modern state possesses an apparatus which has extremely close connections with the banks and syndicates, an apparatus which performs an enormous amount of accounting and registration work, if it may be expressed this way. This apparatus must not, and should not, be smashed. It must be wrested from the control of the capitalists; the capitalists and the wires they pull must be *cut off, lopped off, chopped away from* this apparatus; it must be *subordinated* to the proletarian Soviets; it must be expanded, made more comprehensive, and nation-wide. And this *can* be done by utilising the achievements already made by large-scale capitalism (in the same way as the proletarian revolution can, in general, reach its goal only by utilising these achievements).

Capitalism has created an accounting *apparatus* in the shape of the banks, syndicates, postal service, consumers' societies, and office employees' unions. *Without big banks socialism would be impossible.*

The big banks *are* the "state apparatus" which we *need* to bring about socialism, and which we *take ready-made* from capitalism; our task here is merely to *lop off* what *capitalistically mutilates* this excellent apparatus, to make it *even bigger*, even more democratic, even more comprehensive. Quantity will be transformed into quality. A single State Bank, the biggest of the big, with branches in every rural district, in every factory, will constitute as much as

nine-tenths of the *socialist* apparatus. This will be country-wide *book-keeping*, country-wide *accounting* of the production and distribution of goods, this will be, so to speak, something in the nature of the *skeleton* of socialist society.

We can "lay hold of" and "set in motion" this "state apparatus" (which is not fully a state apparatus under capitalism, but which will be so with us, under socialism) at one stroke, by a single decree, because the actual work of book-keeping, control, registering, accounting and counting is performed by *employees*, the majority of whom themselves lead a proletarian or semi-proletarian existence.

By a single decree of the proletarian government these employees can and must be transferred to the status of state employees, in the same way as the watchdogs of capitalism like Briand and other bourgeois ministers, by a single decree, transfer railwaymen on strike to the status of state employees. We shall need many more state employees of this kind, and more *can* be obtained, because capitalism has simplified the work of accounting and control, has reduced it to a comparatively simple system of *book-keeping*, which any literate person can do.

The conversion of the bank, syndicate, commercial, etc., etc., rank-and-file employees into state employees is quite feasible both technically (thanks to the preliminary work performed for us by capitalism, including finance capitalism) and politically, provided the *Soviets* exercise control and supervision.

As for the higher officials, of whom there are very few, but who gravitate towards the capitalists, they will have to be dealt with in the same way as the capitalists, i.e., "severely". Like the capitalists, they will offer *resistance*. This resistance will have to be *broken*, and if the immortal-naïve Peshekhonov, as early as June 1917, lisped like the infant that he was in state affairs, that "the resistance of the capitalists has been broken", this childish phrase, this childish boast, this childish swagger, *will be converted by the proletariat into reality*.

We can do this, for it is merely a question of breaking the resistance of an insignificant minority of the population, literally a handful of people, over each of whom the employees' unions, the trade unions, the consumers' soci-

eties and the Soviets will institute such *supervision* that every Tit Titych<sup>153</sup> will be *surrounded* as the French were at Sedan.<sup>154</sup> We know these Tit Tityches by name: we only have to consult the lists of directors, board members, large shareholders, etc. There are several hundred, at most several thousand of them in the *whole* of Russia, and the proletarian state, with the apparatus of the Soviets, of the employees' unions, etc., will be able to appoint ten or even a hundred supervisors to each of them, so that instead of "breaking resistance" it may even be possible, by means of *workers' control* (over the capitalists), to make all resistance *impossible*.

The important thing will not be even the confiscation of the capitalists' property, but country-wide, all-embracing workers' control over the capitalists and their possible supporters. Confiscation alone leads nowhere, as it does not contain the element of organisation, of accounting for proper distribution. Instead of confiscation, we could easily impose a *fair tax* (even on the Shingaryov scale, for instance), taking care, of course, to preclude the possibility of anyone evading assessment, concealing the truth, evading the law. And this possibility can be *eliminated only* by the workers' control of the *workers' state*.

*Compulsory syndication*, i.e., compulsory amalgamation in associations under state control—this is what capitalism has prepared the way for, this is what has been carried out in Germany by the Junkers' state, this is what can be easily carried out in Russia by the Soviets, by the proletarian dictatorship, and this is what will *provide us with a state apparatus* that will be universal, up-to-date, and non-bureaucratic.\*

The fourth plea of the counsels for the bourgeoisie is that the proletariat will not be able "to set the state apparatus in motion". There is nothing new in this plea compared

---

\* For further details of the meaning of compulsory syndication see my pamphlet: *The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It*. (See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 342-45.—Ed.)

with the preceding one. We could not, of course, either lay hold of or set in motion the old apparatus. The new apparatus, the Soviets, *has already* been set in motion by "a mighty burst of creative enthusiasm that stems from the people themselves". We only have to free it from the *shackles* put on it by the domination of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik leaders. This apparatus is *already* in motion; we only have to free it from the monstrous, petty-bourgeois impediments preventing it from going full speed ahead.

Two circumstances must be considered here to supplement what has already been said. In the first place, the new means of control have been created *not* by us, but by capitalism in its military-imperialist stage; and in the second place, it is important to introduce more democracy into the *administration* of a proletarian state.

The grain monopoly and bread rationing were introduced not by us, but by the capitalist state in war-time. It had already introduced universal labour conscription within the framework of capitalism, which is war-time penal servitude for the workers. But here too, as in all its history-making activities, the proletariat takes its weapons from capitalism and does not "invent" or "create them out of nothing".

The grain monopoly, bread rationing and labour conscription in the hands of the proletarian state, in the hands of sovereign Soviets, will be the most powerful means of accounting and control, means which, applied to the capitalists, and to *the rich in general*, applied to them by the *workers*, will provide a force unprecedented in history for "setting the state apparatus in motion", for overcoming the resistance of the capitalists, for subordinating them to the proletarian state. These means of control and of *compelling people to work* will be more potent than the laws of the Convention and its guillotine. The guillotine *only* terrorised, only broke *active* resistance. *For us, this is not enough.*

For us, this is not enough. We must not only "terrorise" the capitalists, i.e., make them feel the omnipotence of the proletarian state and give up all idea of actively resisting it. We must also break *passive* resistance, which is undoubtedly more dangerous and harmful. We must not only break resistance of every kind. We must also *compel the capitalists*

to work within the framework of the new state organisation. It is not enough to "remove" the capitalists; we must (after removing the undesirable and incorrigible "resisters") employ them *in the service of the new state*. This applies both to the capitalists and to the upper section of the bourgeois intellectuals, office employees, etc.

And we have the means to do this. The means and instruments for this have been placed in our hands by the capitalist state in the war. These means are the grain monopoly, bread rationing and labour conscription. "He who does not work, neither shall he eat"—this is the fundamental, the first and most important rule the Soviets of Workers' Deputies can and will introduce when they become the ruling power.

Every worker has a work-book. This book does not degrade him, although *at present* it is undoubtedly a document of capitalist wage-slavery, certifying that the workman belongs to some parasite.

The Soviets will introduce work-books *for the rich* and *then* gradually for the whole population (in a peasant country work-books will probably not be needed for a long time for the overwhelming majority of the peasants). The work-book will cease to be the badge of the "common herd", a document of the "lower" orders, a certificate of wage-slavery. It will become a document certifying that in the new society there are no longer any "workmen", nor, on the other hand, are there any longer men *who do not work*.

The rich will be obliged to get a work-book from the workers' or office employees' union with which their occupation is most closely connected, and every week, or other definite fixed period, they will have to get from that union a certificate to the effect that they are performing their work conscientiously; without this they will not be able to receive bread ration cards or provisions in general. The proletarian state will say: we need good organisers of banking and the amalgamation of enterprises (in this matter the capitalists have more experience, and it is easier to work with experienced people), and we need far, far more engineers, agronomists, technicians and scientifically trained specialists of every kind than were needed before. We shall give all these specialists work to which they are accustomed



and which they can cope with; in all probability we shall introduce complete wage equality only gradually and shall pay these specialists higher salaries during the transition period. We shall place them, however, under comprehensive workers' control and we shall achieve the complete and absolute operation of the rule "He who does not work, neither shall he eat." We shall not invent the organisational form of the work, but take it ready-made from capitalism—we shall take over the banks, syndicates, the best factories, experimental stations, academies, and so forth; all that we shall have to do is to borrow the best models furnished by the advanced countries.

Of course, we shall not in the least descend to a utopia, we are not deserting the soil of most sober, practical reason when we say that the entire capitalist class will offer the most stubborn resistance, but this resistance will be broken by the organisation of the entire population in Soviets. Those capitalists who are exceptionally stubborn and recalcitrant will, of course, have to be punished by the confiscation of their whole property and by imprisonment. On the other hand, however, the victory of the proletariat will bring about *an increase* in the number of cases of the kind that I read about in today's *Izvestia*,<sup>155</sup> for example:

"On September 26, two engineers came to the Central Council of Factory Committees to report that a group of engineers had decided to form a union of socialist engineers. The Union believes that the present time is actually the beginning of the social revolution and places itself at the disposal of the working people, desiring, in defence of the workers' interests, to work in complete unity with the workers' organisations. The representatives of the Central Council of Factory Committees answered that the Council will gladly set up in its organisation an Engineers' Section which will embody in its programme the main theses of the First Conference of Factory Committees on workers' control over production. A joint meeting of delegates of the Central Council of Factory Committees and of the initiative group of socialist engineers will be held within the next few days." (*Izvestia*, September 27, 1917.)

Written at the end of September-  
October 1 (14), 1917

Published in October 1917  
in *Prosveshcheniye* No. 1-2

Collected Works, Vol. 26,  
pp. 104-11.

---

## *From Original Version of the Article The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government*

The extent to which the changes in the formulation of our tasks are sometimes still not understood is evident incidentally from the recent discussion on the role of the trade unions.<sup>156</sup> The view was expressed (supported by the Mensheviks, of course, with obviously provocative aims, that is to say, with the aim of provoking us to take steps advantageous only to the bourgeoisie) that in the interests of preserving and strengthening the class independence of the proletariat the trade unions should not become state organisations. This view was camouflaged by specious and quite customary phrases learnt by heart about the struggle of labour against capital and the necessity for the class independence of the proletariat. In actual fact, however, this view was and is either a bourgeois provocation of the crudest kind or an extreme misunderstanding, a slavish repetition of the slogans of yesterday, as is shown by an analysis of the altered conditions of the present period of history. Yesterday the chief task of the trade unions was the struggle against capital and defence of the class independence of the proletariat. Yesterday the slogan of the day was distrust of the state, for it was the bourgeois state. Today the state is becoming and has become proletarian. The working class is becoming and has become the ruling class in the state. The trade unions are becoming and must become state organisations which have prime responsibility for the reorganisation of all economic life on a socialist basis. Hence to apply the

slogans of the old trade unionism to the present epoch would mean renouncing the socialist tasks of the working class.

Dictated between March 23  
and 28, 1918

First published April 14, 1929  
in *Pravda* No. 86

*Collected Works*, Vol. 27,  
p. 215

---

## Tasks of the Trade Unions

### I

The theses by Tomskey, Radus-Zenkovich and Nogin each express the viewpoint of the particular job they represent: trade unions, commissariat and co-operatives with mutual benefit societies.

Each group of theses therefore suffers from a lopsided emphasis of only one side of the picture and an overshadowing and suppression of the fundamental points at issue.

A correct picture of these fundamental issues concerning the trade union movement today and its attitude towards the Soviet government requires above all proper consideration for the specific features of the *present, given* situation in the transition from capitalism to socialism.

All three gave insufficient attention or virtually no attention at all to this vital aspect of the matter.

### II

The chief feature of the present situation in this respect is as follows.

The Soviet government as the dictatorship of the proletariat is victorious both among the urban proletariat and among the poor peasants but has far from won over by communist propaganda and strong organisation all trades and the whole mass of semi-proletarians.

Hence the special importance, particularly at the moment, of stepping up our propaganda and organisational work so that, on the one hand, we extend our influence over those

workers and employees who are the *least Soviet* (that is, the furthest from fully accepting Soviet policy), and subordinate them to the general proletarian movement. And so that, on the other hand, we shake up and rouse ideologically, and rally organisationally, the most backward sections and individuals among the proletariat and semi-proletariat, such as the unskilled workers, the town servants, rural semi-proletariat, and so on.

Then, the second principal feature of the present situation is that the construction of socialist society is based on a solid foundation, that is, we have not only done more than map it out and set it as our immediate practical goal; we have formed several highly important bodies of this construction (the Economic Councils, for example), had certain experience of their relationship with mass organisations (trade unions, co-operatives), and obtained certain practical results. All the same, however, our construction is not yet finished by any means, we still have very many flaws to iron out, the very essentials are not yet guaranteed (for instance, proper collection and distribution of grain, production and distribution of fuel), and the main body of working people are still not playing a big enough part in the construction.

### III

With this in view, the trade unions have the following tasks at present.

There can be no talk of any sort of trade union "neutrality". Any campaign for neutrality is either a hypocritical screen for counter-revolution or a complete lack of class-consciousness.

We are now strong enough in the basic core of the trade union movement to be able to bring under our influence and proletarian discipline both the backward and the passive non-Communists inside the unions, and those workers who are still in some respects petty-bourgeois.

So the chief aim now is, not to break the resistance of a strong enemy, for Soviet Russia no longer has such an enemy among the proletarians and semi-proletarians, but to overcome by stubborn, persistent, more extensive educational and organisational work the prejudices of certain petty-

bourgeois sections of the proletariat and semi-proletariat. The unions must steadily extend the insufficiently wide base of the Soviet government (that is, increase the number of workers and poor peasants directly taking part in state administration), educate the backward working people (by practical experience in management as well as by books, lectures and newspapers), and discover *new organisational forms* both for these new tasks of the trade union movement in general, and for attracting a far more numerous mass of semi-proletarians, like the poor peasants, for example.

Thus, they must attract *all* trade union members into state administration—through the system of commissars, through participation in lightning control groups, and so on and so forth. They must attract the housemaid, first into co-operative work, in supplying the population with provisions, supervising their production, etc., and then into more responsible and less “narrow” work—but of course with the necessary gradualness.

They must get the specialists into state work together with the workers and keep an eye on them.

Transitional forms demand new bounds of organisation. Thus, for instance, the Poor Peasants' Committees<sup>157</sup> are playing a tremendous role. There may be a danger that their merging with the Soviets would somewhere end up by leaving the *mass* of semi-proletarians *outside* of the bounds of permanent organisation. But we cannot forgo the task of organising the poor peasants under the pretext that they are not hired hands. It is possible and even necessary to search, search and search again for new forms, if only, for example, by forming unions of poor peasants (perhaps the very same Poor Peasants' Committees) as unions of the *very poor* ( $\alpha$ ) uninterested in grain profiteering and high grain prices, ( $\beta$ ) interested in improving their lot by common measures for everyone, ( $\gamma$ ) interested in strengthening socialised farming, ( $\delta$ ) interested in a permanent alliance with the urban workers, etc.

Such a poor peasant union could make up a *special section* of the All-Russia Trade Union Council to prevent it overwhelming the completely proletarian elements. The form can be modified and must be sought through applying it to practice, to the new task of embracing the new, transitional

social types (the village poor are not the proletariat, and now not even semi-proletariat, but *those who* stand closest to the semi-proletariat since capitalism is not yet dead, and at the same time *those who* are most sympathetic to the transition to socialism)....\*

Written in December 1918-  
early January 1919

First published in 1933  
in *Lenin Miscellany XXIV*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 28,  
pp. 382-85

---

\* Here the manuscript ends.—Ed.

---

**From Report at the Second  
All-Russia Trade Union Congress<sup>158</sup>  
January 20, 1919**

Nevertheless, bearing in mind the difficult conditions of the struggle in which the trade union movement of Russia has so recently arisen and grown up—and it has now almost reached full growth—we must, in passing, glance back and recall recent events. Such recollections and reminders are, I think, all the more necessary since the trade union movement, as such, is having to undergo a particularly abrupt change now that world-wide socialist revolution has begun.

It was in the trade union movement especially that the ideologists of the bourgeoisie tried to fish in troubled waters. They endeavoured to make the economic struggle, which is the basis of the trade union movement, independent of the political struggle. But now, precisely now, especially after the political revolution, which has transferred power to the proletariat, the time has come for the trade unions, as the broadest organisation of the proletariat on a class scale, to play a very great role, to take the centre of the political stage, to become, in a sense, the chief political organ. For all the old concepts and categories of politics have been upset and reversed by the political revolution which has turned power over to the proletariat. The old state, even the best and most democratic bourgeois republics, was never, I repeat, and never could be, anything but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, that is, of those who own the factories, the implements of production, the land, the railways—in a word, all the material means, all the instruments of labour,



without the possession of which labour remains in slavery.

That is why, when political power passed into the proletariat's hands the trade unions had increasingly to take on the task of builders of working-class politics, the task of people whose class organisation was to replace the old exploiting class after upsetting all the old traditions and prejudices of the old science which, in the words of one scholar, told the proletariat: "You look after your economic affairs and the party of the bourgeoisie will look after politics." All these ideas have proved to be a direct weapon in the hands of the exploiting class and its thugs for keeping down the proletariat, which is beginning to revolt and struggle everywhere.

And here the trade unions must take up an entirely new question in their state organisation work—the question of "governmentalising" the trade unions, as it is termed in the Communist group's resolution. In this connection the trade unions must give very serious thought to the profound and famous words of the founders of modern communism to the effect that "the broader and deeper the revolution going on in society, the larger should be the number of people who make the revolution, who are its makers in the true sense of the word".<sup>159</sup> Take the old society of the feudal nobility. There revolutions were absurdly easy, as long as it was only a matter of taking power from one handful of nobles or feudal lords and turning it over to another. Take bourgeois society, which boasts of its universal suffrage. In actual fact, as we know, this universal suffrage, this whole machine, becomes a fraud, for even in the most advanced, cultured and democratic countries the overwhelming majority of the working people are downtrodden and crushed—crushed by the hell of capitalism, so that actually they do not and cannot take any part in politics.

Now for the first time in history a revolution has begun which can lead to the complete victory of socialism—provided only that new and large masses of people set about the work of governing independently. The socialist revolution does not imply a change in the form of state, not the replacement of a monarchy by a republic, nor new elections in which people are assumed to be absolutely "equal" but which

are actually nothing but an artificial obfuscation, a screen for the fact that some own property and others do not. From the point of view of bourgeois society, once there is "democracy", and once capitalist and proletarian alike take part in the voting, this is the "popular will", this is "equality" and an expression of the people's will. We know what an abominable fraud this talk is, which only serves as a cover for butchers and murderers like Ebert and Scheidemann. In bourgeois society, the mass of the working people are governed by the bourgeoisie with the help of more or less democratic forms. They are governed by a minority, the property-owners, those who have a share in capitalist property and who have turned education and science, that supreme bulwark and flower of capitalist civilisation, into an instrument of exploitation, into a monopoly, in order to keep the overwhelming majority of the people in slavery. The revolution we have begun and have been making for two years, and which we are firmly determined to carry through to the end (*applause*), is possible and feasible only provided we manage to transfer power to the new class, provided the bourgeoisie, the capitalist slaveowners, the bourgeois intellectuals, the representatives of all the owners and property-holders are replaced by the new class in all spheres of government, in all state affairs in the entire business of running the new life, from top to bottom. (*Applause.*)

That is the task before us now. The socialist revolution can only be lasting when this new class learns, not from books, not from meetings or lectures, but from the practical work of government. Only when it enlists the vast mass of working people for this work, when it elaborates forms which will enable all working people to adapt themselves easily to the work of governing the state and establishing law and order. Only on this condition is the socialist revolution bound to be lasting. Given this condition, it will constitute a force which will brush away capitalism and all its survivals as easily as straw or dust.

From the class standpoint, generally speaking, that is the task before us as a condition for the victory of the socialist revolution. It is a task closely and directly associated with the tasks of those organisations which even under capitalist society worked for the broadest possible mass struggle to

destroy that society. And of the organisations that then existed, the trade unions were the broadest. And now, while formally remaining independent organisations, they can and should, as one of the passages in the resolution before you states, take an active part in the work of the Soviet government by directly working in all government bodies, by organising mass control over their activities, etc., and by setting up new bodies for the registration, control and regulation of all production and distribution, relying on the organised initiative of the broad mass of the interested working people themselves.

The trade unions have never embraced more than one-fifth of the wage-workers in capitalist society, even under the most favourable circumstances, even in the most advanced countries, after decades and sometimes even centuries of development of bourgeois-democratic civilisation and culture. Only a small upper section were members, and of them only a very few were lured over and bribed by the capitalists to take their place in capitalist society as workers' leaders. The American socialists called these people "labour lieutenants of the capitalist class". In that country of the freest bourgeois culture, in that most democratic of bourgeois republics, they saw most clearly the role played by this tiny upper section of the proletariat who had virtually entered the service of the bourgeoisie as its deputies, who were bribed and bought by it, and who came to form those groups of social-patriots and defence advocates of which Ebert and Scheidemann will always remain the perfect heroes.

In our country things are now different. The trade unions are in a position to start the economic development of the state on new lines, making use of everything created by capitalist culture and capitalist production. They can build socialism on that material basis, on that large-scale industry, whose burden used to weigh on us, which was created against our interests, was made for the endless oppression of the working people, but which united and welded them, and thus created the vanguard of the new society. And since the October Revolution, since the transfer of power to the proletariat, this vanguard has begun to perform its real task—to educate the working and exploited people, to enlist them

in the work of governing the state and administering industry without officials, without the bourgeoisie and without capitalists. That is why the resolution we submit to you rejects all bourgeois plans and all that treacherous talk. That is why it declares the governmentalisation of the trade unions to be unavoidable. It also takes a step forward. We are no longer raising the question of the governmentalisation of the trade unions merely in its theoretical aspect. We have, thank God, passed the stage when such questions were raised purely as subjects for theoretical discussion. We may even forget at times the days when we used to engage in such free discussions on purely theoretical themes. Those times have long since passed, and today we are raising these questions on the basis of a year's experience of the trade unions, which, in their role as organisers of production, have created such organisations as the Supreme Economic Council. In this incredibly difficult business, the trade unions have committed innumerable blunders, and constantly still are committing them, but they are not deterred by the malicious sneers of the bourgeoisie, who say the proletarians decided to do things themselves and are making a mess of it.

The bourgeoisie imagine they made no blunders when they took over from the tsar and the nobles. They imagine the 1861 Reform, which attempted to repair the edifice of serfdom, and left power and abundant sources of revenue in the hands of the serfowners, went off quite smoothly and that it was not followed by chaos in Russia for several decades. There is no country in the world in which the nobility did not scoff at the upstart bourgeoisie and commoners<sup>160</sup> when they set out to govern the state.

It goes without saying that the entire flower, or, rather, sterile blossom, of the bourgeois intellectuals is now also scoffing at every mistake the new government is making, especially since the new class, the alliance of all working people, has had to make its revolution at a furious rate because of the frantic resistance of the exploiters and the campaign of the world alliance of exploiters against Russia—one of the weakest and least prepared of countries. We had to act under conditions in which we had to think not so much of making the course of revolution smooth, as of holding on as best we could until the West-European prole-

tariat came to life. We have accomplished this task. In this respect, we can already say we have done far better than the men who made the French Revolution, which was defeated by an alliance of monarchical and backward countries. The French Revolution, in the form of the power of the lower ranks of the bourgeoisie of that time, held on for a year only, and did not at once evoke a similar movement in other countries. Nevertheless, it did so much for the bourgeoisie, for the bourgeois democracy, that the entire development of civilised humanity throughout the nineteenth century sprang from the great French Revolution, and was indebted to it for everything.

We have done much better. What was done in a year for the development of the bourgeois democracy at that time, we have done on a far larger scale for the new proletarian regime in about the same time. And we have done it so successfully that already now the movement in Russia, whose beginning was due to a special set of circumstances rather than any merit of ours, to special conditions that put Russia between two imperialist giants of the modern civilised world—that the effect of this movement and the victory of the Soviet system during the past year has been to make the movement international. The Communist International<sup>161</sup> has been founded, the slogans and ideals of the old bourgeois democracy have been shattered, and today there is no intelligent politician anywhere in the world, whatever his party may be, who can fail to see that the world socialist revolution has begun, really is taking place. (*Applause.*)

I have digressed somewhat in speaking about how we have left the theoretical aspect of the question far behind and are now about to tackle its practical solution. We have had a year's experience, and we have already accomplished incomparably more for the victory of the proletariat and its revolution than was accomplished by a year's dictatorship of bourgeois democrats for the victory of bourgeois democracy all over the world at the end of the century before last. But, besides this, we have, during this year, acquired a vast amount of practical experience. This enables us, if not to calculate every one of our steps with absolute precision, at least to indicate the rate of development, its speed, to see its practical difficulties and take the practical steps

which will lead from one partial victory in overthrowing the bourgeoisie to another.

Looking back, we can see the mistakes we have to correct. We can clearly see what we have to build and how we have to build in the future. That is why our resolution is not confined to proclaiming the governmentalisation of the trade unions, to proclaiming the dictatorship of the proletariat in principle and the need for us to proceed, as one passage in the resolution states, "inevitably to the fusion of the trade union organisations with state bodies". That we already know from theory, we outlined it before October, and we should have outlined it even sooner. But it is not enough. The whole crux of the question has changed for a party which is now about to tackle the practical job of building socialism, for trade unions which have already set up bodies to run industry on a country-wide, state scale, which have already formed a Supreme Economic Council, and which have at a cost of thousands of mistakes acquired thousands of useful bits of experience in organisation.

Today we can no longer confine ourselves to proclaiming the dictatorship of the proletariat. The trade unions have to be governmentalised; they have to be fused with state bodies. The work of building up large-scale industry has to be entrusted entirely to them. But all that is not enough.

We must also learn from our practical experience to determine the next immediate step. That is the essence of our task just now. And that is what the resolution has in mind when it says that if the trade unions were arbitrarily to attempt to take over government functions now, they would only make a mess of it. We have suffered enough from this sort of thing. We have fought hard enough against the survivals of the accursed bourgeois system, against the anarchistic and selfish tendencies of the small holder, which are so deeply ingrained even among the workers.

The workers were never separated by a Chinese Wall from the old society. And they have preserved a good deal of the traditional mentality of capitalist society. The workers are building a new society without themselves having become new people or cleansed of the filth of the old world; they are still standing up to their knees in that filth. We can only dream of clearing the filth away. It would be utterly

utopian to think this could be done all at once. It would be so utopian that in practice it would only postpone socialism to kingdom come.

No, that is not the way we intend to build socialism. We are building while still standing on the soil of capitalist society, combating all those weaknesses and shortcomings which also affect the working people and which tend to drag the proletariat down. There are many old separatist habits and customs of the small holder in this struggle, and we still feel the effects of the old maxim: "Every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost." There used to be quite enough of that in every trade union, in every factory, which often thought only of itself, and left everything else to the tender care of the Lord and our betters. We have been through all that, and know the cost. It has been the cause of so many mistakes, so many dreadful mistakes, that now, on the strength of that experience, we give our comrades a most emphatic warning against any arbitrary action in this field. Instead of building socialism, it would mean we had all succumbed to the weaknesses of capitalism.

We have now learnt to appreciate the difficulties of the task in front of us. We stand at the very heart of the work of building socialism, and in the interests of this cardinal work we are against all arbitrary actions. The class-conscious workers must be warned against arbitrary actions of this kind. They must be told that we cannot merge the trade unions with the state bodies at once, at one stroke. It would be a mistake. That is not the way to tackle the job.

We know that the proletariat has promoted several thousands, perhaps several tens of thousands of workers to state administration. We know that the new class—the proletariat—now has its representatives in every branch of state administration, in every section of the enterprises already socialised or about to be socialised, and in every branch of the economy. The proletariat knows this. It has set about the job practically. It can now see that we must continue along the same lines, that we shall have to take quite a number of steps more before we are in a position to say that the trade union organisations of the working people have definitely merged with the entire state apparatus. That will be so when the workers completely take over the organs

of suppression of one class over the other. And we are quite certain that will be so.

I now want to focus your attention on the next practical job. We must go on extending the participation of the working people in economic administration and in building a new economy. We shall never bring the work of communist construction to its completion unless we cope with this task, unless we convert the trade unions into organs for training ten times as many people as at present for direct participation in state administration. That we realise quite clearly. It is dealt with in our resolution, and it is a matter I want to direct your attention to particularly.

In this greatest revolution in history, when the proletariat has taken state power into its own hands, all the functions of the trade unions are undergoing a profound change. The trade unions are becoming the chief builders of the new society, for only the millions can build this society. In the era of serfdom these builders numbered hundreds; in the capitalist era the builders of the state numbered thousands and tens of thousands. The socialist revolution can be made only with the active and direct practical participation of tens of millions in state administration. That is our goal but we are not there yet.

The trade unions should know that there is a higher and more important task than those tasks which are partly still in force and partly have already lapsed, and which, at any rate, even if they are still in force, can only be minor ones in our eyes: registration, establishing work standards, amalgamation of organisations. This task is to teach the people the art of administration, not from books, not from lectures or meetings, but from practical experience, so that instead of just the vanguard of the proletariat which has been set to command and organise, more and more fresh blood may enter the departments, and this new section may be reinforced by ten others like it. This may seem an immense and difficult task. But it will not seem so overpowering if we stop to think how rapidly the experience of the revolution has enabled us to cope with the immense tasks that have cropped up since the October Revolution, and how the working people who had had no access to and no use for knowledge are now thirsting for it.



We shall find that we can cope with this task and teach vast numbers of working people how to run the state and industry. We shall discover we can develop practical activity, and shatter that pernicious prejudice which for decades and centuries has been implanted among the working people, namely, that state administration is the preserve of the privileged few, that it is a special art. That is not true. We shall inevitably make mistakes; but now every mistake will serve to teach, not handfuls of students taking some course of theory in state administration, but millions of working people who will personally suffer the consequences of every mistake. They will themselves see that they are faced with the urgent task of registering and distributing products, of increasing labour productivity, and will see from experience that power is in their own hands and that nobody will help them if they do not help themselves. That is the new mentality which is awakening in the working class. That is the new task of tremendous historical importance which faces the proletariat and which must, more than any other, strike root in the minds of trade unionists and the leaders of the trade union movement. They are not only trade unions. Today they are trade unions only to the extent that they are constituted within the only possible framework linked with the old capitalist system, and embrace the largest number of working people. But their task is to advance these millions and tens of millions of working people from simple to higher forms of activity, untiringly drawing new forces from the reserve of working people and advancing them to the most difficult tasks. In this way they will teach more and more people the art of state administration. It is their job to identify themselves with the struggle of the proletariat, which has established the dictatorship and is retaining it in the face of the whole world, every day winning over more industrial workers and socialists everywhere who only yesterday tolerated the orders of the social-traitors and social-defence advocates, but who are today coming more and more to accept the banner of communism and the Communist International.

Hold on to this banner, and at the same time steadily enlarge the ranks of the builders of socialism. Remember that the tasks of the trade unions are to build the new life

and train millions and tens of millions, who will learn by experience not to make mistakes and will discard the old prejudices, who will learn by their own experience how to run the state and industry. That is the only sure guarantee that the cause of socialism will completely triumph, precluding any chance of a reversion to the past.

Newspaper report published  
January 21, 1919  
in *Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn* No. 14  
and in *Pravda* Nos. 15, 16, 17  
for January 22, 24, 25

Published in 1921 in the book  
*Second All-Russia Trade Union  
Congress. Verbatim Report*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 28,  
pp. 418-28

Comrades, I am very glad to be able to report to the  
Council of People's Commissars to meet this Congress in  
from Labour, the object of which is to train a new  
labourers' union.  
Comrades, the Labour Councils of our Party and the  
All-Russia Council of Trade Unions have been working for some  
sessions held jointly with the Council of People's Commissars  
People's Commissars for Labour, members of the All-Russia  
Council of Trade Unions and others, to discuss how to set  
about organizing trade union activity in the world, even  
in the most advanced capitalist countries, where it has  
not only existed but has been organized for a long time.  
I am glad to say that the results of the present  
trade union movement. You know how the results of the  
the present and future of the labour movement in the world  
that they are not only a great victory but a great victory  
that it is the most difficult, but that for a long time  
to enter into a trade union.  
The workers and peasants' movement, however, has  
not to work all alone, but to work in the hands of the Party  
has not only set out to work in the hands of the Party  
and to organize it in the hands of the Party, but to  
but has set out to do it in the hands of the Party.

---

## **Speech on the Organisation of a Farm Labourers' Union at the Session of the First Congress of Farm Labourers of Petrograd Gubernia**

**March 13, 1919**

Comrades, I am very glad to be able on behalf of the Council of People's Commissars to greet this Congress of Farm Labourers, the object of which is to form a farm labourers' union.

Comrades, the Central Committee of our Party and the All-Russia Council of Trade Unions have on more than one occasion held joint conferences with Comrade Schmidt, People's Commissar for Labour, members of the All-Russia Council of Trade Unions and others, to discuss how to set about organising farm labourers. Nowhere in the world, even in the most advanced capitalist countries, where trade unions have existed not only for decades but for centuries, have farm labourers succeeded in forming anything like permanent trade unions. You know how the conditions of life of the peasants and farm labourers hamper this and the fact that they are scattered and disunited is a great obstacle, so that it is far more difficult for them than for urban workers to unite in a trade union.

The workers' and peasants' government, however, has set to work all along the line to build communist society. It has not only set out to make a clean sweep of the landowners and capitalists—this has been almost completely achieved—but has set out to build a society in which there will never

again be landowners and capitalists. There has been more than one instance in the history of revolutions where, soon after the old landowners and capitalists were swept away, new capitalists sprang up from the ranks of the kulaks, the wealthy peasants, profiteers, who, in many cases, exploited the workers more than the old landowners and capitalists did. The task that confronts us is to sweep away the old capitalists and to make it impossible for new ones to emerge; to see to it that power remains fully, entirely and exclusively in the hands of those who work, who live by their own labour. How can this be done? There is only one way, and that is by organising the rural workers, the proletarians. This organisation must be permanent. Only in a permanent, mass organisation can farm labourers learn the business of managing large-scale farms; for if they do not learn to do this themselves, nobody will do it for them. You remember the words to this effect in our anthem, the *Internationale*. The most the Soviet government can do is to give such an organisation every assistance. The capitalist organisations did everything in their power, resorted to every lawful means, various ruses, police devices, honest and dishonest schemes to prevent labourers from organising. To this day in Germany, the most advanced country in Europe, farm labourers are deprived of the right to organise. There, the ancient master and servant law is still in force, and farm labourers continue to have the status of servants. Quite recently I had a conversation with a prominent Englishman who came to Russia during the war. In the past he sided with capitalism, but in the course of our revolution he developed splendidly, first into a Menshevik and later into a Bolshevik. During our conversation we discussed labour conditions in England—there are no peasants in England, there are only big capitalists and farm workers—and he said, "I am not hopeful, because our farm labourers live under feudal and not capitalist conditions; they are so overburdened, crushed and ground down by toil, that it is difficult for them to unite." And this is in a most advanced country, where a certain farm labourer attempted to form a farm labourers' union quite half a century ago.<sup>182</sup> This is what progress amounts to in the free capitalist countries! Our government, however, decided to help to organise the rural and other workers as soon as it came into being. We must

render every assistance. I am particularly pleased to note that here, in Petrograd, where there are so many beautiful buildings, palaces, which were not built for the right purposes, our comrades have quite properly converted them into premises for meetings, congresses and conferences of precisely those classes of the population which worked to build them, which have built them for centuries, but which were never allowed to come within a mile of them! (*Applause.*) I think, comrades, that now that nearly all the palaces in Petrograd have been converted into meeting halls and premises for unions of workers—primarily urban, but also rural workers, the working section of the peasantry—I think that we may regard this as a first step towards providing the working people, the formerly exploited section of the population, with the opportunity to organise. I repeat, the Soviet government will do all in its power immediately and unconditionally to help such an organisation to remould rural life and leave no room for kulaks or profiteers, so that co-operative labour, labour in common, may become the general rule in the countryside. This is the task we have all set ourselves. You know perfectly well how difficult this task is, that it is impossible to change all the conditions of rural life by means of decrees, laws and ordinances. It was possible by means of ordinances and decrees to overthrow the landowners and capitalists, it is possible by this means to curb the kulaks. But if the millions of farm labourers will not have their own organisation, if they do not learn in this organisation, step by step, to manage their own affairs, political and economic—and the economic affairs are most important—if they do not learn to manage large-scale farms and transform them—since they enjoy a number of privileges which other farms do not—from models of exploitation where formerly the workers had their sweat and blood squeezed out of them, into model co-operative farms, the working people themselves will be to blame for it. The old farms cannot now be restored. It is impossible for us to provide ten good horses and ten good ploughs for every hundred dessiatines of land (if we take ten small farms of ten dessiatines each). We have not that number of horses or ploughs left. But if the same hundred dessiatines are cultivated on a large scale on the basis of co-operative or common tillage, or as a voluntary agricultur-

al commune, we shall need, probably, not ten horses and ploughs, but only three. This is how a saving in human labour and better results can be achieved. But there is only one way to achieve this, and that is by an alliance of urban and rural workers. The urban workers have taken power in the cities. All the best that has been created in the cities in the shape of palaces, fine buildings and culture, the workers place at the disposal of the rural population, for they know that their power in the cities cannot be durable unless a sound alliance is established with the farm workers. Only such an alliance, the foundations of which you are here laying down, can make a permanent change possible. The middle peasants, too, will voluntarily join this alliance. It will entail a vast amount of effort, of course, but nothing can be done at one stroke. If your union is formed, if it grows, develops and spreads all over Russia, if it maintains the closest contact with the urban workers' union, we shall fulfil this difficult task by the joint efforts of millions of organised farm and urban workers and thus extricate ourselves from the state of ruin into which we and all other nations were plunged by the four years' war. We shall emerge from this state, but we shall not go back to the old system of individual and scattered production—this system of production condemns man to ignorance, poverty, disunity; we shall organise collective, large-scale, co-operative production. For this, all that human knowledge, human skill and human invention have achieved, all the knowledge of the specialists, must be devoted to the service of the united workers. The workers must become the masters in all fields; they must learn to be managers and to direct those who up to now, like many agronomists, for example, acted as stewards for the capitalists against the workers. This is no easy problem, but in the towns very much has been done to solve it. You are now taking the first steps towards solving this problem in the rural districts. Permit me to conclude by repeating my greetings from the Council of People's Commissars and to express once again the firm conviction that the union of which you are here laying the foundations will in the near future grow into a united All-Russia Farm Labourers' Union. This union will serve as a genuine bulwark of Soviet power in the rural districts, as the vanguard in the struggle to remould rural life in such

a way as to prevent the revival of any exploitation, of the rule of the rich over the poor, on the basis of common, united, co-operative labour. This is what I wish you, comrades. (Applause.)

Brief report published  
in *Severnaya Kommuna* No. 58  
March 14, 1919

First published in full  
in the journal  
*Rabotnik Zemli i Lesa*  
No. 4-5, 1923

*Collected Works*, Vol. 29,  
pp. 38-42

---

## ***From Draft Programme of the R.C.P.(B.)***

(2) To pay particularly great attention to the development and strengthening of comradely discipline among the working people and to stimulate their initiative and sense of responsibility in every field. This is the most important if not the sole means of completely overcoming capitalism and the habits formed by the rule of the private ownership of the means of production. This aim can be achieved only by slow, persistent work to re-educate the masses; this re-education has not only become possible now that the masses have seen that the landowner, capitalist and merchant have really been eliminated, but is actually taking place in thousands of ways through the practical experience of the workers and peasants themselves. It is extremely important in this respect to work for the further organisation of the working people in trade unions; never before has this organisation developed as rapidly anywhere in the world as under Soviet power, and it must be developed until literally all working people are organised in properly constituted, centralised and disciplined trade unions.

We must not confine ourselves to the old, stereotyped forms of the trade union movement, but must, on the one hand, systematically convert the trade unions into organs administering the economy, carefully checking every step we take against the results of practical work; there must be greater and stronger bonds between the trade unions and the Supreme Economic Council, the Commissariat of Labour



and, later, all other branches of the state administration; on the other hand, the trade unions must to a greater degree become organs for the labour and socialist education of the working masses as a whole so that the practical experience of participation in the administration spreads to the more backward sections of the workers, under the control of the vanguard of the workers.

Published February 23, 1919  
in *Petrogradskaya Pravda* No. 43

*Collected Works*, Vol. 29,  
pp. 112-13

---

## Foreword to Henri Guilbeaux's Pamphlet *Socialism and Syndicalism in France During the War*

Comrade *Guilbeaux's* pamphlet is very well timed. The history of the socialist and trade union movements in a number of countries during the war should be summarised for all countries. This history shows as clearly as possible the slow but steady turn to the left, the progress towards revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action by the working class. This history discloses, on the one hand, the deep-going roots of the Third, Communist International, the preparations made for it, specific within each nation, depending upon its concrete historical features. A knowledge of the deep roots of the Third International is essential for an understanding of the inevitability of the International and of the difference in the paths leading the various national socialist parties to it.

On the other hand, the history of the socialist and trade union movements during the war shows us the beginning of the collapse of bourgeois democracy and bourgeois parliamentarism, the beginning of a turn from bourgeois democracy to Soviet, or proletarian, democracy. This tremendous epochal change is what many, very many socialists simply cannot understand yet, tied as they are by the chains of routine, philistine worship of what exists and existed yesterday, philistine blindness which prevents their seeing what is being brought into existence by the history of dying capitalism in all countries.

Comrade *Guilbeaux* undertook the task of writing an essay on the history of the French socialist and trade union

movements during the war. The clear and accurate enumeration of the facts gives the reader a vivid illustration of the beginning of a great turn, of the turning of the tide in the history of socialism. One may be certain that *Guilbeaux's* pamphlet will not only be most widely circulated among all class-conscious workers, but that it will also lead to the publication of a number of similar pamphlets on the war-time history of socialism and the working-class movement in other countries.

Moscow, April 13, 1919

N. Lenin

Published in French in 1919

in the book H. Guilbeaux,

*Le mouvement socialiste*

*et syndicaliste français*

*pendant la guerre*

*(Esquisse historique) 1914-1918*

First published in Russian in 1920

*Collected Works, Vol. 29,*  
pp. 302-03

in the book H. Guilbeaux,

*Socialism and Syndicalism*

*in France During the War.*

*(Historical Sketch),*

Petrograd

---

## **From Greetings to Italian, French and German Communists**

The Kautskyite (or Independent) party<sup>163</sup> is dying. It is bound to die and disintegrate soon as a result of the differences between its predominantly revolutionary membership and its counter-revolutionary "leaders".

The Communist Party, experiencing exactly the same (essentially the same) differences as were experienced by Bolshevism, will grow stronger and become as hard as steel.

The differences among the German Communists boil down, so far as I can judge, to the question of "utilising the legal possibilities" (as the Bolsheviks used to say in the 1910-13 period), of utilising the bourgeois parliament, the reactionary trade unions, the "works' councils law" (*Betriebsratgesetz*), bodies that have been hamstrung by the Scheidemanns and Kautskys; it is a question of whether to participate in such bodies or boycott them.

We Russian Bolsheviks experienced quite similar differences in 1906 and in the 1910-12 period. And for us it is clear that with many of the young German Communists it is simply a case of a lack of revolutionary experience. Had they experienced a couple of bourgeois revolutions (1905 and 1917), they would not be advocating the boycott so unconditionally, nor fall from time to time into the mistakes of syndicalism.

This is a matter of growing pains; the movement is developing in fine style and as it grows they will pass. And these obvious mistakes must be combated openly; the differences

must not be exaggerated since it must be clear to everyone that in the near future the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for Soviet power, will wipe out the greater part of them.

Both from the standpoint of Marxist theory and the experience of three revolutions (1905, February 1917 and October 1917) I regard refusal to participate in a bourgeois parliament, in a reactionary (Legien, Gompers, etc.) trade union, in an ultra-reactionary workers' council hamstrung by the Scheidemanns, etc., as an undoubted mistake.

At times, in individual cases, in individual countries, the boycott is correct, as, for example, was the Bolshevik boycott of the tsarist Duma in 1905. But the selfsame Bolsheviks took part in the much more reactionary and downright counter-revolutionary Duma of 1907. The Bolsheviks contested the elections to the bourgeois Constituent Assembly in 1917, and in 1918 we dispersed it,<sup>164</sup> to the horror of the philistine democrats, the Kautskys and other such renegades from socialism. We worked in the ultra-reactionary, purely Menshevik, trade-unions which (in their counter-revolutionary nature) yielded nothing to the Legien unions—the foulest and most reactionary trade unions in Germany. Even now, two years after the conquest of state power, we have not yet finished fighting the remnants of the Menshevik (i.e., the Scheidemann, Kautsky, Gompers, etc.) trade unions—so long is the process! So strong in some places and in some trades is the influence of petty-bourgeois ideas!

At one time we were in a minority in the Soviets, the trade unions and the co-operatives. By persistent effort and long struggle—both *before and after* the conquest of political power—we won a majority, first in *all* workers' organisations, then in non-worker and, finally, even in small-peasant organisations.

Only scoundrels or simpletons can think that the proletariat must first win a majority in elections carried out *under the yoke of the bourgeoisie*, under the *yoke of wage-slavery*, and must then win power. This is the height of stupidity or hypocrisy; it is substituting elections, under the old system and with the old power, for class struggle and revolution.

The proletariat wages its class struggle and does not wait for elections to begin a strike, although for the complete suc-

cess of a strike it is necessary to have the sympathy of the majority of the working people (and, it follows, of the majority of the population); the proletariat wages its class struggle and overthrows the bourgeoisie without waiting for any preliminary elections (supervised by the bourgeoisie and carried out under its yoke); and the proletariat is perfectly well aware that for the success of its revolution, for the successful overthrow of the bourgeoisie, it is *absolutely necessary* to have the sympathy of the majority of the working people (and, it follows, of the majority of the population).

The parliamentary cretins and latter-day Louis Blancs "insist" absolutely on elections, on elections that are most certainly supervised by the bourgeoisie, to ascertain whether they have the sympathy of the majority of the working people. But this is the attitude of pedants, of living corpses, or of cunning tricksters.

Real life and the history of actual revolutions show that quite often the "sympathy of the majority of the working people" cannot be demonstrated by any elections (to say nothing of elections supervised by the exploiters, with "equality" of exploiters and exploited!). Quite often the "sympathy of the majority of the working people" is demonstrated *not* by elections at all, but by the growth of one of the parties, or by its increased representation in the Soviets, or by the success of a strike which for some reason has acquired enormous significance, or by successes won in civil war, etc., etc.

The history of our revolution has shown, for example, that sympathy for the dictatorship of the proletariat on the part of the majority of the working people in the boundless expanses of the Urals and Siberia was ascertained not by means of elections, but by the experience of a year of the tsarist general Kolchak's rule in that area. Incidentally, Kolchak's rule also began with a "coalition" of the Scheidemann and Kautsky crowd (in Russian they are called Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, supporters of the Constituent Assembly), just as in Germany at the moment the Haases and Scheidemanns, through their "coalition", are paving the way to power for von Goltz or Ludendorff and covering up this power and making it look decent. In

parenthesis it should be said that the Haase-Scheidemann coalition in the government has ended, but the political coalition of these betrayers of socialism remains. Proof: Kautsky's books, Stampfer's articles in *Vorwärts*, the articles by the Kautskys and the Scheidemanns about their "unification", and so on.

The proletarian revolution is impossible without the sympathy and support of the overwhelming majority of the working people for their vanguard—the proletariat. But this sympathy and this support are not forthcoming immediately and are not decided by elections. They are *won* in the course of long, arduous and stern class struggle. The class struggle waged by the proletariat *for* the sympathy and support of the majority of the working people does not end with the conquest of political power by the proletariat. *After* the conquest of power this struggle *continues*, but in *other* forms. In the Russian revolution the circumstances were exceptionally favourable for the proletariat (in its struggle for its dictatorship), since the proletarian revolution took place at a time when all the people were under arms and when the peasantry as a whole, disgusted by the "Kautskyite" policy of the social-traitors, the Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionaries, wanted the overthrow of the rule of the landowners.

But even in Russia, where things were exceptionally favourable at the moment of the proletarian revolution, where a most remarkable unity of the entire proletariat, the entire army and the entire peasantry was achieved at once—even in Russia, the proletariat, exercising its dictatorship, had to struggle for months and years to win the sympathy and support of the majority of the working people. After two years this struggle has practically, but still not completely, ended in favour of the proletariat. In two years we have won the full sympathy and support of the overwhelming majority of the workers and labouring peasants of Great Russia, including the Urals and Siberia, but as yet we have not won the full support and sympathy of the majority of the working peasants (as distinct from the peasant exploiters) of the Ukraine. We *could* be (but shall not be) crushed by the military might of the Entente<sup>165</sup>, but *inside* Russia we *now* have such sound sympathy, and

from such an enormous majority of the working people, that our state is the most democratic state the world has ever seen.

One has only to give some thought to this complex, difficult and long history of proletarian struggle for power—a struggle rich in the extraordinary variety of forms and in the unusual abundance of sharp changes, turns and switches from one form to another—to see clearly the error of those who would “forbid” participation in bourgeois parliaments, reactionary trade unions, tsarist or Scheidemann Shop Stewards Committees or works’ councils, and so on and so forth. This error is due to the lack of revolutionary experience among quite sincere, convinced and valiant working-class revolutionaries. Consequently, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were a thousand times right in January 1919 when they realised this mistake, pointed it out, but nevertheless chose to remain with the proletarian revolutionaries, mistaken though they were on a minor question, rather than side with the traitors to socialism, the Scheidemanns and the Kautskys, who made no mistake on the question of participating in bourgeois parliaments, but had ceased to be socialists and had become philistine democrats and accomplices of the bourgeoisie.

A mistake, however, remains a mistake and it is necessary to criticise it and fight for its rectification.

The fight against the traitors to socialism, the Scheidemanns and the Kautskys, must be waged mercilessly, but not on the issue of for or against participation in bourgeois parliaments, reactionary trade unions, etc. This would be an obvious mistake, and a bigger mistake still would be to retreat from the ideas of Marxism and its practical line (a strong, centralised political party) to the ideas and practice of syndicalism. It is necessary to work for the Party’s participation in bourgeois parliaments, in reactionary trade unions and in “works’ councils” that have been mutilated and castrated in Scheidemann fashion, for the Party to be wherever workers are to be found, wherever it is possible to talk to workers, to influence the working masses. Legal and illegal work must at all costs be combined, the illegal Party, through its *workers’* organisations, must exercise systematic, constant and strict control over legal activity. This



is no easy matter, but the proletarian revolution, generally speaking, knows nothing and can know nothing of "easy" tasks or "easy" means of struggle.

This difficult task must be carried out at all costs. The Scheidemann and Kautsky gang differ from us not only (and not chiefly) because they do not recognise the armed uprising and we do. The chief and radical difference is that in *all* spheres of work (in bourgeois parliaments, trade unions, co-operatives journalistic work, etc.) they pursue an inconsistent, opportunist policy, even a policy of downright treachery and betrayal.

Fight against the social-traitors, against reformism and opportunism—this political line can and must be followed without exception in *all* spheres of our struggle. And then we shall win the working masses. And the vanguard of the proletariat, the Marxist centralised political party together with the working masses, will take the people along the true road to the triumph of proletarian dictatorship, to proletarian instead of bourgeois democracy, to the Soviet Republic, to the socialist system.

Published in October 1919  
in *The Communist International*  
No. 6

*Collected Works*, Vol. 30,  
pp. 57-62

Signed: *N. Lenin*

## **From "Left-Wing" Communism— an Infantile Disorder**

### **VI**

#### **Should Revolutionaries Work in Reactionary Trade Unions?**

The German "Lefts" consider that, as far as they are concerned, the reply to this question is an unqualified negative. In their opinion, declamations and angry outcries (such as uttered by K. Horner in a particularly "solid" and particularly stupid manner) against "reactionary" and "counter-revolutionary" trade unions are sufficient "proof" that it is unnecessary and even inexcusable for revolutionaries and Communists to work in yellow, social-chauvinist, compromising and counter-revolutionary trade unions of the Legien type.

However firmly the German "Lefts" may be convinced of the revolutionism of such tactics, the latter are in fact fundamentally wrong, and contain nothing but empty phrases.

To make this clear, I shall begin with our own experience, in keeping with the general plan of the present pamphlet, which is aimed at applying to Western Europe whatever is universally practicable, significant and relevant in the history and the present-day tactics of Bolshevism.

In Russia today, the connection between leaders, party, class and masses, as well as the attitude of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its party to the trade unions, are concretely as follows: the dictatorship is exercised by the proletariat organised in the Soviets; the proletariat is guided by the Communist Party of Bolsheviks, which, according to the figures of the latest Party Congress (April 1920), has a

membership of 611,000. The membership varied greatly both before and after the October Revolution, and used to be much smaller, even in 1918 and 1919. We are apprehensive of an excessive growth of the Party, because careerists and charlatans, who deserve only to be shot, inevitably do all they can to insinuate themselves into the ranks of the ruling party. The last time we opened wide the doors of the Party—to workers and peasants only—was when (in the winter of 1919) Yudenich was within a few versts of Petrograd, and Denikin was in Orel (about 350 versts from Moscow), i.e., when the Soviet Republic was in mortal danger, and when adventurers, careerists, charlatans and unreliable persons generally could not possibly count on making a profitable career (and had more reason to expect the gallows and torture) by joining the Communists. The Party, which holds annual congresses (the most recent on the basis of one delegate per 1,000 members), is directed by a Central Committee of nineteen elected at the Congress, while the current work in Moscow has to be carried on by still smaller bodies, known as the Organising Bureau and the Political Bureau, which are elected at plenary meetings of the Central Committee, five members of the Central Committee to each bureau. This, it would appear, is a full-fledged "oligarchy". No important political or organisational question is decided by any state institution in our republic without the guidance of the Party's Central Committee.

In its work, the Party relies directly on the *trade unions*, which, according to the data of the last congress (April 1920), now have a membership of over four million and are formally *non-Party*. Actually, all the directing bodies of the vast majority of the unions, and primarily, of course, of the all-Russia general trade union centre or bureau (the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions), are made up of Communists and carry out all the directives of the Party. Thus, on the whole, we have a formally non-communist, flexible and relatively wide and very powerful proletarian apparatus, by means of which the Party is closely linked up with the *class* and the *masses*, and by means of which, under the leadership of the Party, the *class dictatorship* is exercised. Without close contacts with the trade unions, and without their energetic support and devoted efforts,

not only in economic, *but also in military* affairs, it would of course have been impossible for us to govern the country and to maintain the dictatorship for two and a half months, let alone two and a half years. In practice, these very close contacts naturally call for highly complex and diversified work in the form of propaganda, agitation, timely and frequent conferences, not only with the leading trade union workers, but with influential trade union workers generally; they call for a determined struggle against the Mensheviks, who still have a certain though very small following to whom they teach all kinds of counter-revolutionary machinations, ranging from an ideological defence of (*bourgeois*) democracy and the preaching that the trade unions should be "independent" (independent of proletarian state power!) to sabotage of proletarian discipline, etc., etc.

We consider that contacts with the "masses" through the trade unions are not enough. In the course of our revolution, practical activities have given rise to such institutions as *non-Party workers' and peasants' conferences*, and we strive by every means to support, develop and extend this institution in order to be able to observe the temper of the masses, come closer to them, meet their requirements, promote the best among them to state posts, etc. Under a recent decree on the transformation of the People's Commissariat of State Control into the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, non-Party conferences of this kind have been empowered to select members of the State Control to carry out various kinds of investigations, etc.

Then, of course, all the work of the Party is carried on through the Soviets, which embrace the working masses, irrespective of occupation. The district congresses of Soviets are *democratic* institutions, the like of which even the best of the democratic republics of the bourgeois world have never known; through these congresses (whose proceedings the Party endeavours to follow with the closest attention), as well as by continually appointing class-conscious workers to various posts in the rural districts, the proletariat exercises its role of leader of the peasantry, gives effect to the dictatorship of the urban proletariat, wages a systematic struggle against the rich, bourgeois, exploiting and profiteering peasantry, etc.

Such is the general mechanism of the proletarian state power viewed "from above", from the standpoint of the practical implementation of the dictatorship. We hope that the reader will understand why the Russian Bolshevik, who has known this mechanism for twenty-five years and has seen it develop out of small, illegal and underground circles, cannot help regarding all this talk about "from above" or "from below", about the dictatorship of leaders or the dictatorship of the masses, etc., as ridiculous and childish nonsense, something like discussing whether a man's left leg or right arm is of greater use to him.

We cannot but regard as equally ridiculous and childish nonsense the pompous, very learned, and frightfully revolutionary disquisitions of the German Lefts to the effect that Communists cannot and should not work in reactionary trade unions, that it is permissible to turn down such work, that it is necessary to withdraw from the trade unions and create a brand-new and immaculate "Workers' Union" invented by very pleasant (and, probably, for the most part very youthful) Communists, etc., etc.

Capitalism inevitably leaves socialism the legacy, on the one hand, of the old trade and craft distinctions among the workers, distinctions evolved in the course of centuries; on the other hand, trade unions, which only very slowly, in the course of years and years, can and will develop into broader industrial unions with less of the craft union about them (embracing entire industries, and not only crafts, trades and occupations), and later proceed, through these industrial unions, to eliminate the division of labour among people, to educate and school people, give them *all-round development and an all-round training*, so that they are able to do *everything*. Communism is advancing and must advance towards that goal, and *will reach* it, but only after very many years. To attempt in practice, today, to anticipate this future result of a fully developed, fully stabilised and constituted, fully comprehensive and mature communism would be like trying to teach higher mathematics to a child of four.

We can (and must) begin to build socialism, not with abstract human material, or with human material specially

prepared by us, but with the human material bequeathed to us by capitalism. True, that is no easy matter, but no other approach to this task is serious enough to warrant discussion.

The trade unions were a tremendous step forward for the working class in the early days of capitalist development, inasmuch as they marked a transition from the workers' disunity and helplessness to the *rudiments* of class organisation. When the *revolutionary party of the proletariat*, the *highest* form of proletarian class organisation, began to take shape (and the Party will not merit the name until it learns to weld the leaders into one indivisible whole with the class and the masses) the trade unions inevitably began to reveal *certain* reactionary features, a certain craft narrow-mindedness, a certain tendency to be non-political, a certain inertness, etc. However, the development of the proletariat did not, and could not, proceed anywhere in the world otherwise than through the trade unions, through reciprocal action between them and the party of the working class. The proletariat's conquest of political power is a gigantic step forward for the proletariat as a class, and the Party must more than ever and in a new way, not only in the old, educate and guide the trade unions, at the same time bearing in mind that they are and will long remain an indispensable "school of communism" and a preparatory school that trains proletarians to exercise their dictatorship, an indispensable organisation of the workers for the gradual transfer of the management of the whole economic life of the country to the working *class* (and not to the separate trades), and later to all the working people.

In the sense mentioned above, a *certain* "reactionism" in the trade unions is *inevitable* under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Not to understand this means a complete failure to understand the fundamental conditions of the *transition* from capitalism to socialism. It would be egregious folly to fear *this* "reactionism" or to try to *evade* or leap over it, for it would mean fearing that function of the proletarian vanguard which consists in training, educating, enlightening and drawing into the new life the most backward strata and masses of the working class and the peasantry. On the other hand, it would be a still graver error to postpone the achieve-

ment of the dictatorship of the proletariat until a time when there will not be a single worker with a narrow-minded craft outlook, or with craft and craft-union prejudices. The art of politics (and the Communist's correct understanding of his tasks) consists in correctly gauging the conditions and the moment when the vanguard of the proletariat can successfully assume power, when it is able—during and after the seizure of power—to win adequate support from sufficiently broad strata of the working class and of the non-proletarian working masses, and when it is able thereafter to maintain, consolidate and extend its rule by educating, training and attracting ever broader masses of the working people.

Further. In countries more advanced than Russia, a certain reactionism in the trade unions has been and was bound to be manifested in a far greater measure than in our country. Our Mensheviks found support in the trade unions (and to some extent still do so in a small number of unions), as a result of the latter's craft narrow-mindedness, craft selfishness and opportunism. The Mensheviks of the West have acquired a much firmer footing in the trade unions; there the *craft-union, narrow-minded, selfish, case-hardened, covetous, and petty-bourgeois "labour aristocracy", imperialist-minded, and imperialist-corrupted*, has developed into a much stronger section than in our country. That is incontestable. The struggle against the Gomperses, and against the Jouhaux, Hendersons, Merrheims, Legiens and Co. in Western Europe is much more difficult than the struggle against our Mensheviks, who are an *absolutely homogeneous* social and political type. This struggle must be waged ruthlessly, and it must unfailingly be brought—as we brought it—to a point when all the incorrigible leaders of opportunism and social-chauvinism are completely discredited and driven out of the trade unions. Political power cannot be captured (and the attempt to capture it should not be made) until the struggle has reached a *certain* stage. This "certain stage" will be *different* in different countries and in different circumstances; it can be correctly gauged only by thoughtful, experienced and knowledgeable political leaders of the proletariat in each particular country. (In Russia the elections to the Constituent Assembly in November 1917,

a few days after the proletarian revolution of October 25, 1917, were one of the criteria of the success of this struggle. In these elections the Mensheviks were utterly defeated; they received 700,000 votes—1,400,000 if the vote in Transcaucasia is added—as against 9,000,000 votes polled by the Bolsheviks. See my article, "The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", in the *Communist International*<sup>166</sup> No. 7-8.)

We are waging a struggle against the "labour aristocracy" in the name of the masses of the workers and in order to win them over to our side; we are waging the struggle against the opportunist and social-chauvinist leaders in order to win the working class over to our side. It would be absurd to forget this most elementary and most self-evident truth. Yet it is this very absurdity that the German "Left" Communists perpetrate when, *because* of the reactionary and counter-revolutionary character of the trade union *top leadership*, they jump to the conclusion that ... we must withdraw from the trade unions, refuse to work in them, and create new and *artificial* forms of labour organisation! This is so unpardonable a blunder that it is tantamount to the greatest service Communists could render the bourgeoisie. Like all the opportunist, social-chauvinist, and Kautskyite trade union leaders, our Mensheviks are nothing but "agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement" (as we have always said the Mensheviks are), or "labour lieutenants of the capitalist class", to use the splendid and profoundly true expression of the followers of Daniel De Leon in America. To refuse to work in the reactionary trade unions means leaving the insufficiently developed or backward masses of workers under the influence of the reactionary leaders, the agents of the bourgeoisie, the labour aristocrats, or "workers who have become completely bourgeois" (cf. Engels' letter to Marx in 1858 about the British workers).

This ridiculous "theory" that Communists should not work in reactionary trade unions reveals with the utmost clarity the frivolous attitude of the "Left" Communists towards the question of influencing the "masses", and their misuse of clamour about the "masses". If you want to help the "masses" and win the sympathy and support of the "masses", you



should not fear difficulties, or pinpricks, chicanery, insults and persecution from the "leaders" (who, being opportunists and social-chauvinists, are in most cases directly or indirectly connected with the bourgeoisie and the police), but must absolutely *work wherever the masses are to be found*. You must be capable of any sacrifice, of overcoming the greatest obstacles, in order to carry on agitation and propaganda systematically, perseveringly, persistently and patiently in those institutions, societies and associations—even the most reactionary—in which proletarian or semi-proletarian masses are to be found. The trade unions and the workers' co-operatives (the latter sometimes, at least) are the very organisations in which the masses are to be found. According to figures quoted in the Swedish paper *Folkets Dagblad Politiken*<sup>167</sup> of March 10, 1920, the trade union membership in Great Britain increased from 5,500,000 at the end of 1917 to 6,600,000 at the end of 1918, an increase of 19 per cent. Towards the close of 1919, the membership was estimated at 7,500,000. I have not got the corresponding figures for France and Germany to hand, but absolutely incontestable and generally known facts testify to a rapid rise in the trade union membership in these countries too.

These facts make crystal clear something that is confirmed by thousands of other symptoms, namely, that class-consciousness and the desire for organisation are growing among the proletarian masses, among the rank and file, among the backward elements. Millions of workers in Great Britain, France and Germany are *for the first time* passing from a complete lack of organisation to the elementary, lowest, simplest, and (to those still thoroughly imbued with bourgeois-democratic prejudices) most easily comprehensible form of organisation, namely, the trade unions; yet the revolutionary but imprudent Left Communists stand by, crying out "the masses", "the masses!" but *refusing to work within the trade unions*, on the pretext that they are "reactionary", and invent a brand-new, immaculate little "Workers' Union", which is guiltless of bourgeois-democratic prejudices and innocent of craft or narrow-minded craft-union sins, a union which, they claim, will be (!) a broad organisation. "Recognition of the Soviet system and the

dictatorship" will be the *only* (!) condition of membership. (See the passage quoted above.)

It would be hard to imagine any greater ineptitude or greater harm to the revolution than that caused by the "Left" revolutionaries! Why, if we in Russia today, after two and a half years of unprecedented victories over the bourgeoisie of Russia and the Entente, were to make "recognition of the dictatorship" a condition of trade union membership, we would be doing a very foolish thing, damaging our influence among the masses, and helping the Mensheviks. The task devolving on Communists is to *convince* the backward elements, to work *among* them, and not to *fence themselves off* from them with artificial and childish "Left" slogans.

There can be no doubt that the Gomperses, the Hendersons, the Jouhaux and the Legiens are very grateful to those "Left" revolutionaries who, like the German opposition "on principle" (heaven preserve us from such "principles"!), or like some of the revolutionaries in the American Industrial Workers of the World<sup>168</sup> advocate quitting the reactionary trade unions and refusing to work in them. These men, the "leaders" of opportunism, will no doubt resort to every device of bourgeois diplomacy and to the aid of bourgeois governments, the clergy, the police and the courts, to keep Communists out of the trade unions, oust them by every means, make their work in the trade unions as unpleasant as possible, and insult, bait and persecute them. We must be able to stand up to all this, agree to make any sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to various stratagems, artifices and illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges, as long as we get into the trade unions, remain in them, and carry on communist work within them at all costs. Under tsarism we had no "legal opportunities" whatsoever until 1905. However, when Zubatov, agent of the secret police, organised Black-Hundred workers' assemblies and workingmen's societies for the purpose of trapping revolutionaries and combating them, we sent members of our Party to these assemblies and into these societies (I personally remember one of them, Comrade Babushkin, a leading St. Petersburg factory worker, shot by order of the tsar's generals in 1906). They established contacts with the masses, were able to

carry on their agitation, and succeeded in wresting workers from the influence of Zubatov's agents.\* Of course, in Western Europe, which is imbued with most deep-rooted legalistic, constitutionalist and bourgeois-democratic prejudices, this is more difficult of achievement. However, it can and must be carried out, and systematically at that.

The Executive Committee of the Third International must, in my opinion, positively condemn, and call upon the next congress of the Communist International to condemn both the policy of refusing to work in reactionary trade unions in general (explaining in detail why such refusal is unwise, and what extreme harm it does to the cause of the proletarian revolution) and, in particular, the line of conduct of some members, of the Communist Party of Holland, who—whether directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly, wholly or partly, it does not matter—have supported this erroneous policy. The Third International must break with the tactics of the Second International; it must not evade or play down points at issue, but must pose them in a straightforward fashion. The whole truth has been put squarely to the "Independents" (the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany); the whole truth must likewise be put squarely to the "Left" Communists.

Written April-May 1920

Published June 1920  
in pamphlet form  
by the State Publishers,  
Petrograd

*Collected Works*, Vol. 31,  
pp. 46-56

---

\* The Gomperses, Hendersons, Jouhaux and Legiens are nothing but Zubatovs, differing from our Zubatov only in their European garb and polish, and the civilised, refined and democratically suave manner of conducting their despicable policy.

---

## Theses for the Second Congress of the Communist International

### *From Theses on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International*

8. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most determined and revolutionary form of the proletariat's class struggle against the bourgeoisie. This struggle can be successful only when the most revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat has the backing of the overwhelming majority of the proletariat. Hence, preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat entails not only explanation of the bourgeois character of all reformism, of all defence of democracy, while private ownership of the means of production is preserved; it entails, not only exposure of such trends, which are in fact a defence of the bourgeoisie within the labour movement; it also calls for old leaders being replaced by Communists in proletarian organisations of absolutely every type—not only political, but also trade union, co-operative, educational, etc. The more complete, lengthy and firmly established the rule of bourgeois democracy has been in a given country, the more the bourgeoisie will have succeeded in securing the appointment to such leading posts of people whose minds have been moulded by it and imbued with its views and prejudices, and who have very often been directly or indirectly bought by it. These representatives of the labour aristocracy, bourgeoisified workers, should be ousted from all their posts a hundred times more sweepingly than hitherto, and replaced by workers—even by wholly inexperienced men, provided they are connected with the exploited masses and enjoy their confidence in the

struggle against the exploiters. The dictatorship of the proletariat will require the appointment of such inexperienced workers to the most responsible posts in the state; otherwise the workers' government will be impotent and will not have the support of the masses.

9. The dictatorship of the proletariat means that all toiling and exploited people, who have been disunited, deceived, intimidated, oppressed, downtrodden and crushed by the capitalist class, come under the full leadership of the only class trained for that leadership by the whole history of capitalism. That is why the following is one of the methods whereby preparations for the dictatorship of the proletariat should be started everywhere and immediately:

In all organisations, unions and associations without exception, and first and foremost in proletarian organisations, but also in those of the non-proletarian toiling and exploited masses (political, trade union, military, co-operative, educational, sports, etc., etc.), groups or cells of Communists should be formed—preferably open groups, but underground groups as well, the latter being essential whenever there is reason to expect their suppression, or the arrest or banishment of their members on the part of the bourgeoisie; these cells, which are to be in close touch with one another and with the Party centre, should, by pooling their experience, carrying on work of agitation, propaganda and organisation, adapting themselves to absolutely every sphere of public life and to every variety and category of the toiling masses, systematically educate themselves, the Party, the class, and the masses by means of such diversified work.

In this connection, it is of the utmost importance that necessary distinctions between the methods of work should be evolved in practice: on the one hand, in relation to the "leaders", or "responsible representatives", who are very often hopelessly beset with petty-bourgeois and imperialist prejudices—such "leaders" must be ruthlessly exposed and expelled from the working-class movement—and, on the other hand, in relation to the masses, who, particularly after the imperialist holocaust, are for the most part inclined to listen to and accept the doctrine that the guidance from the

proletariat is essential, as the only way of escape from capitalist slavery. We must learn to approach the masses with particular patience and caution so as to be able to understand the distinctive features in the mentality of each stratum, calling, etc., of these masses.

11. One of the chief causes hampering the revolutionary working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries is the fact that because of their colonial possessions and the super-profits gained by finance capital, etc., the capitalists of these countries have been able to create a relatively larger and more stable labour aristocracy, a section which comprises a small minority of the working class. This minority enjoys better terms of employment and is most imbued with a narrow-minded craft spirit and with petty-bourgeois and imperialist prejudices. It forms the real social pillar of the Second International, of the reformists and the "Centrists"; at present it might even be called the social mainstay of the bourgeoisie. No preparation of the proletariat for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie is possible, even in the preliminary sense, unless an immediate, systematic, extensive and open struggle is waged against this stratum, which, as experience has already fully shown, will no doubt provide the bourgeois White guards with many a recruit after the victory of the proletariat. All parties affiliated to the Third International must at all costs give effect to the slogans: "Deeper into the thick of the masses", "Closer links with the masses"—meaning by the masses all those who toil and are exploited by capital, particularly those who are least organised and educated, who are most oppressed and least amenable to organisation.

The proletariat becomes revolutionary only insofar as it does not restrict itself to the narrow framework of craft interests, only when in all matters and spheres of public life, it acts as the leader of all the toiling and exploited masses; it cannot achieve its dictatorship unless it is prepared and able to make the greatest sacrifices for the sake of victory over the bourgeoisie. In this respect, the experience of Russia is significant both in principle and in practice. The proletariat could not have achieved its dictatorship there, or won the universally acknowledged respect and confidence of all the toiling masses, had it not made

the most sacrifices, or starved more than any other section of those masses at the most crucial moments of the onslaught, war and blockade effected by the world bourgeoisie.

In particular, the Communist Party and all advanced proletarians must give all-round and unstinted support especially to the spontaneous and mass strike movement, which, under the yoke of capital, is alone capable of really rousing, educating and organising the masses, of imbuing them with complete confidence in the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat. Without such preparation, no dictatorship of the proletariat is possible; those who are capable of publicly opposing strikes, such as Kautsky in Germany and Turati in Italy, cannot possibly be tolerated in the ranks of parties affiliated to the Third International. This applies even more, of course, to those trade union and parliamentary leaders who so often betray the workers by using the experience of strikes to teach them reformism, and not revolution (for instance, in Britain and in France in recent years).

18. The Second Congress of the Third International considers erroneous the views on the Party's relation to the class and to the masses, and the view that it is not obligatory for Communist Parties to participate in bourgeois parliaments and in reactionary trade unions. These views have been refuted in detail in special decisions of the present congress, and advocated most fully by the Communist Workers' Party of Germany,<sup>169</sup> and partly by the Communist Party of Switzerland,<sup>170</sup> by *Kommunismus*, organ of the East-European Secretariat of the Communist International in Vienna, by the now dissolved secretariat in Amsterdam, by several Dutch comrades, by several communist organisations in Great Britain, as, for example, the Workers' Socialist Federation,<sup>171</sup> etc., and also by the Industrial Workers of the World in the U.S.A. and the Shop Stewards' Committees<sup>172</sup> in Great Britain, etc.

Nevertheless, the Second Congress of the Third International considers it possible and desirable that those of the above-mentioned organisations which have not yet officially affiliated to the Communist International should do so immediately; for in the present instance, particularly as regards the Industrial Workers of the World in the U.S.A. and Australia, as well as the Shop Stewards' Committees

in Great Britain, we are dealing with a profoundly proletarian and mass movement, which in all essentials actually stands by the basic principles of the Communist International. The erroneous views held by these organisations regarding participation in bourgeois parliaments can be explained, not so much by the influence of elements coming from the bourgeoisie, who bring their essentially petty-bourgeois views into the movement—views such as anarchists often hold—as by the political inexperience of proletarians who are quite revolutionary and connected with the masses.

For this reason, the Second Congress of the Third International requests all communist organisations and groups in the Anglo-Saxon countries, even if the Industrial Workers of the World and the Shop Stewards' Committees do not immediately affiliate to the Third International, to pursue a very friendly policy towards these organisations, to establish closer contacts with them and the masses that sympathise with them, and to explain to them in a friendly spirit—on the basis of the experience of all revolutions, and particularly of the three Russian revolutions of the twentieth century—the erroneous views of their views as set forth above, and not to desist from further efforts to amalgamate with these organisations to form a single Communist Party.

***From the Terms of Admission  
into the Communist International***

9. It is the duty of any party wishing to join the Communist International to conduct systematic and unflagging communist work in the trade unions, co-operative societies and other mass workers' organisations. Communist cells should be formed in the trade unions, and, by their sustained and unflagging work, win the unions over to the communist cause. In every phase of their day-by-day activity these cells must unmask the treachery of the social-patriots and the vacillation of the "Centrists". The cells must be completely subordinate to the party as a whole.

10. It is the duty of any party belonging to the Communist International to wage a determined struggle against the Amsterdam "International" of yellow trade unions.<sup>173</sup>



Its indefatigable propaganda should show the organised workers the need to break with the yellow Amsterdam International. It must give every support to the emerging international federation of Red trade unions<sup>174</sup> which are associated with the Communist International.

Written in June-July 1920

Published on July 20, 1920  
in *The Communist International*  
No. 12

*Collected Works*, Vol. 31,  
pp. 190-92; 193-94; 199-  
-201; 209-10

---

## **Draft Resolution on "The Tasks of the Trade Unions, and the Methods of Their Accomplishment" <sup>175</sup>**

In accordance with the decisions of the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of Russia,<sup>176</sup> the conference once again draws the attention of the trade unions to the necessity of these decisions being scrupulously fulfilled, and points out in particular that the imperative need of a single economic plan establishing the order of priority of objectives in the general scheme of economic construction is indisputable. At the same time, as was recognised by the Party Conference of September 1920, a gradual but steady transition must be effected from urgency procedures to a more even distribution of forces, particularly in the secondment of the individual unions' best organisers to the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions with a view to consolidating that body as a whole, improving the functioning of its apparatus, achieving greater system in the work of all trade unions, and thereby strengthening the entire trade union movement.

This measure should be applied in particular to the Central Committee of the General Transport Workers' Union (*Tsektan*)<sup>177</sup>; an end must be put to its disproportionate growth as compared with the other unions, and the best elements thus released should extend to the entire trade union movement those methods of the broader application of democracy, the promotion of initiative, participation in the management of industry, the development of emulation, and so forth, which have yielded the best practical results.

In conformity with the decisions of the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of Russia, and recognising as absolutely indispensable the development, extension and consolidation of trade union participation in production management, the conference instructs the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions to sum up immediately the practical experience gained in this respect by the leading unions and enterprises, and to draw up detailed instructions, which will help all trade unions make use of that practical experience and will enjoin them to utilise the latter in a more energetic and systematic fashion.

This refers especially to the utilisation of specialists.

Written in November, not  
later than the 8th, 1920

First published in 1950  
in the Fourth Russian edition of  
V. I. Lenin's

*Collected Works*, Vol. 31

*Collected Works*, Vol. 31,  
pp. 374-75

---

## Theses on Production Propaganda

(Rough Draft)

1. In connection with the R.S.F.S.R.'s military victories and its international position in general, production propaganda must now be given special prominence, and be accentuated and organised.

2. The leading newspapers, *Izvestia* and *Pravda* in the first place, should: (a) reduce the space devoted to politics, and increase space for production propaganda; (b) influence all the work of the Party and of Soviet institutions, in the sense of mobilising greater forces for production propaganda; (c) endeavour to work systematically to place production propaganda on a nation-wide footing, and evolve extensive measures for its encouragement and improvement, with a special view to verifying the successes actually achieved in practice.

3. In just the same way, work should be systematised, extended and developed in selecting able administrators, organisers and inventors from the masses of workingmen and peasants.

4. Throughout the R.S.F.S.R. production propaganda should be placed under the direction of a single body, with the aim of economising forces and improving guidance of this work. In this, the greatest autonomy, both local and within each trade, is indispensable. Any marked success should be systematically and judiciously rewarded (bonuses in kind, etc.). Verification of successes to be organised impartially and competently.

5. The editorial board of a mass newspaper with a circulation of between 500,000 and 1,000,000 should be made the sole body guiding production propaganda.

*Bednota*<sup>178</sup> is the right newspaper for the purpose.

It would be harmful to have a division into an industrial newspaper and an agricultural newspaper, since it is the aim of socialism to bring industry and agriculture closer together and unite them. In practice, the guiding role of the industrial proletariat both in the cities and in the rural areas, particularly in the urbanisation of agriculture and the electrification of the entire country, calls precisely for a single newspaper devoted to problems of production (and for a single body in charge of production propaganda) both for the workers and the peasants.

6. This guiding collegiate body should consist of five members representing: 1) the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions; 2) the Supreme Council of the National Economy; 3) the People's Commissariat of Agriculture; 4) the Chief Committee for Political Education; 5) the Central Committee of the R.C.P. (or an editor-in-chief). This collegiate body and the newspaper should be attached to the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions (perhaps there should also be a representative of the Central Board for Vocational Training?).

7. This newspaper, devoted to matters of production, should be a popular one, in the sense of being understood by millions of readers, without falling into vulgarisation. The paper should not descend to the level of the uncultivated reader, but should work steadily—and by very gradual degrees—to promote his development. Little space—not exceeding a quarter of the total—should be devoted to politics. Top priority should be given to a single economic plan, to the labour front, production propaganda, the training of workers and peasants in the work of administration, to seeing that Soviet laws and measures established by Soviet institutions are given due effect, and to an extensive and properly organised exchange of opinions with the rank-and-file reader.

8. Materials published in the newspaper or addressed to it, as well as all other kinds of material, should be systematically and periodically brought out in pamphlet or leaflet form and compulsorily supplied to libraries, as well as to factories and enterprises in the given field of production (the pamphlets and leaflets should systematise all the mate-

rial relating to each particular branch of production). Together with manuals and reviews of foreign technology, this material should serve to spread vocational training and *polytechnical* education.

A more rational distribution of the newspaper, as well as of pamphlets and leaflets dealing with questions of production, among *all* libraries in the R.S.F.S.R. should, in particular, be the object of special attention.

9. It is indispensable that engineers, agronomists, school-teachers, and also Soviet functionaries possessing definite professional qualifications, should be drawn into systematic participation in production propaganda (this in connection with the liquidation of illiteracy).

The organisation of lectures, talks, reports, etc.

Compulsory labour service on the part of all those who are able to acquaint the population with problems of electrification, with the Taylor system,<sup>179</sup> etc.

10. The more extensive and systematic use of films for production propaganda. Joint work with the cinema section.

Soviet gramophone records. Displays of diagrams and cartograms at clubs, village reading-rooms, in streets, etc. Bills and placards to be displayed near factories, workshops, technical schools, etc.

11. The organisation, jointly with the People's Commissariat of Labour and other institutions, of an inspectorate of production. The latter's work to be co-ordinated with that of production propaganda, as well as with the work of instructors, exhibition trains and ships, and the like.

12. Extensive publicity for exemplary enterprises. Organisation of factory workers with foreign industrial experience—this to be done in special workshops, sections or groups, etc. Such workers to be utilised for the training of backward workingmen, for the dissemination of vocational-technical and polytechnical instruction, etc.

18.XI.1920

N. Lenin

First published in 1928  
in the 2nd and 3rd editions of  
V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,  
Vol. XXV

*Collected Works*, Vol. 31,  
pp. 404-06

---

## The Trade Unions, The Present Situation and Trotsky's Mistakes<sup>180</sup>

Speech Delivered at a Joint Meeting  
of Communist Delegates  
to the Eighth Congress of Soviets,  
Communist Members of the All-Russia  
Central Council of Trade Unions  
and Communist Members of the Moscow  
City Council of Trade Unions  
December 30, 1920

Comrades, I must first of all apologise for departing from the rules of procedure, for anyone wishing to take part in the debate should have heard the report, the second report and the speeches. I am so unwell, unfortunately, that I have been unable to do this. But I was able yesterday to read the principal printed documents and to prepare my remarks. This departure from the rules will naturally cause you some inconvenience; not having heard the other speeches, I may go over old ground and leave out what should be dealt with. But I had no choice.

My principal material is Comrade Trotsky's pamphlet, *The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions*. When I compare it with the theses he submitted to the Central Committee, and go over it very carefully, I am amazed at the number of theoretical mistakes and glaring blunders it contains. How could anyone starting a big Party discussion on this question produce such a sorry excuse for a carefully thought-out statement? Let me go over the main points which, I think, contain the original fundamental theoretical errors.

Trade unions are not just historically necessary; they are historically inevitable as an organisation of the industrial proletariat, and, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, embrace nearly the whole of it. This is basic, but Comrade Trotsky keeps forgetting it; he neither appreciates it nor makes it his point of departure, all this while dealing with "The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions", a subject of infinite compass.

It follows from what I have said that the trade unions have an extremely important part to play at every step of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But what is their part? I find that it is a most unusual one, as soon as I delve into this question, which is one of the most fundamental theoretically. On the one hand, the trade unions, which take in all industrial workers, are an organisation of the ruling, dominant, governing class, which has now set up a dictatorship and is exercising coercion through the state. But it is not a state organisation; nor is it one designed for coercion, but for education. It is an organisation designed to draw in and to train; it is, in fact, a school: a school of administration, a school of economic management, a school of communism. It is a very unusual type of school, because there are no teachers or pupils; this is an extremely unusual combination of what has necessarily come down to us from capitalism, and what comes from the ranks of the advanced revolutionary detachments, which you might call the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat. To talk about the role of the trade unions without taking these truths into account is to fall straight into a number of errors.

Within the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the trade unions stand, if I may say so, between the Party and the government. In the transition to socialism the dictatorship of the proletariat is inevitable, but it is not exercised by an organisation which takes in all industrial workers. Why not? The answer is given in the theses of the Second Congress of the Communist International on the role of political parties in general. I will not go into this here. What happens is that the Party, shall we say, absorbs the vanguard of the proletariat, and this vanguard exercises the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship cannot be exercised or the functions of government performed without a foundation such as the trade unions. These functions, however, have to be performed through the medium of special institutions which are also of a new type, namely, the Soviets. What are the practical conclusions to be drawn from this peculiar situation? They are, on the one hand, that the trade unions are a *link* between the vanguard and the masses, and by their daily work bring conviction to the masses, the masses of the class which alone is capable of taking



us from capitalism to communism. On the other hand, the trade unions are a "reservoir" of the state power. This is what the trade unions are in the period of transition from capitalism to communism. In general, this transition cannot be achieved without the leadership of that class which is the only class capitalism has trained for large-scale production and which alone is divorced from the interests of the petty proprietor. But the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be exercised through an organisation embracing the whole of that class, because in all capitalist countries (and not only over here, in one of the most backward) the proletariat is still so divided, so degraded, and so corrupted in parts (by imperialism in some countries) that an organisation taking in the whole proletariat cannot directly exercise proletarian dictatorship. It can be exercised only by a vanguard that has absorbed the revolutionary energy of the class. The whole is like an arrangement of cogwheels. Such is the basic mechanism of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and of the essentials of transitions from capitalism to communism. From this alone it is evident that there is something fundamentally wrong in principle when Comrade Trotsky points, in his first thesis, to "ideological confusion", and speaks of a crisis as existing specifically and particularly in the trade unions. If we are to speak of a crisis, we can do so only after analysing the political situation. It is Trotsky who is in "ideological confusion", because in this key question of the trade unions' role, from the standpoint of transition from capitalism to communism, he has lost sight of the fact that we have here a complex arrangement of cogwheels which cannot be a simple one; for the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be exercised by a mass proletarian organisation. It cannot work without a number of "transmission belts" running from the vanguard to the mass of the advanced class, and from the latter to the mass of the working people. In Russia, this mass is a peasant one. There is no such mass anywhere else, but even in the most advanced countries there is a non-proletarian, or a not entirely proletarian, mass. That is in itself enough to produce ideological confusion. But it's no use Trotsky's pinning it on others.

When I consider the role of the trade unions in produc-

tion, I find that Trotsky's basic mistake lies in his always dealing with it "in principle", as a matter of "general principle". All his theses are based on "general principle", an approach which is in itself fundamentally wrong, quite apart from the fact that the Ninth Party Congress said enough and more than enough about the trade unions' role in production, and quite apart from the fact that in his own theses Trotsky quotes the perfectly clear statements of Lozovsky and Tomskey, who were to be his "whipping boys" and an excuse for an exercise in polemics. It turns out that there is, after all, no clash of principle, and the choice of Tomskey and Lozovsky, who wrote what Trotsky himself quotes, was an unfortunate one indeed. However hard we may look, we shall not find here any serious divergence of principle. In general, Comrade Trotsky's great mistake, his mistake of principle, lies in the fact that by raising the question of "principle" at this time he is dragging back the Party and the Soviet power. We have, thank heaven, done with principles and have gone on to practical business. We chatted about principles—rather more than we should have—at the Smolny.<sup>181</sup> Today, three years later, we have decrees on all points of the production problem, and on many of its components; but such is the sad fate of our decrees: they are signed, and then we ourselves forget about them and fail to carry them out. Meanwhile, arguments about principles and differences of principle are invented. I shall later on quote a decree dealing with the trade unions' role in production, a decree all of us, including myself, I confess, have forgotten.

The actual differences, apart from those I have listed, really have nothing to do with general principles. I have had to enumerate my "differences" with Comrade Trotsky because, with such a broad theme as "The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions", he has, I am quite sure, made a number of mistakes bearing on the very essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But, this apart, one may well ask, why is it that we cannot work together, as we so badly need to do? It is because of our different *approach* to the mass, the different way of winning it over and *keeping in touch* with it. That is the whole point. And this makes the trade union a very peculiar institution, which is set up under capitalism, which inevitably exists in the transition

from capitalism to communism, and whose future is a question mark. The time when the trade unions are actually called into question is a long way off: it will be up to our grandchildren to discuss that. What matters now is how to approach the mass, to establish contact with it and win it over, and how to get the intricate transmission system working (how to run the dictatorship of the proletariat). Note that when I speak of the intricate transmission system I do not mean the machinery of the Soviets. What it may have in the way of intricacy of transmission comes under a special head. I have only been considering, in principle and in the abstract, class relations in capitalist society, which consists of a proletariat, a non-proletarian mass of working people, a petty bourgeoisie and a bourgeoisie. This alone yields an extremely complicated transmission system owing to what has been created by capitalism, quite apart from any red tape in the Soviet administrative machinery. And that is the main point to be considered in analysing the difficulties of the trade unions' "task". Let me say this again: the actual differences do not lie where Comrade Trotsky sees them but in the question of how to approach the mass, win it over, and keep in touch with it. I must say that had we made a detailed, even if small-scale, study of our own experience and practices, we should have managed to avoid the hundreds of quite unnecessary "differences" and errors of principle in which Comrade Trotsky's pamphlet abounds. Some of his theses, for instance, polemicise against "Soviet trade-unionism". As if we hadn't enough trouble already, a new bogey has been invented. Who do you think it is? Comrade Ryazanov, of all people. I have known him for twenty odd years. You have known him less than that, but equally as well by his work. You are very well aware that assessing slogans is not one of his virtues, which he undoubtedly has. Shall we then produce theses to show that "Soviet trade-unionism" is just something that Comrade Ryazanov happened to say with little relevance? Is that being serious? If it is, we shall end up with having "Soviet trade-unionism", "Soviet anti-peace-signing", and what not! A Soviet "ism" could be invented on every single point. (*Ryazanov*: "Soviet anti-Brestism".) Exactly, "Soviet anti-Brestism".

While betraying this lack of thoughtfulness, Comrade Trotsky falls into error himself. He seems to say that in a workers' state it is not the business of the trade unions to stand up for the material and spiritual interests of the working class. That is a mistake. Comrade Trotsky speaks of a "workers' state". May I say that this is an abstraction. It was natural for us to write about a workers' state in 1917; but it is now a patent error to say: "Since this is a workers' state without any bourgeoisie, against whom then is the working class to be protected, and for what purpose?" The whole point is that it is not quite a workers' state. That is where Comrade Trotsky makes one of his main mistakes. We have got down from general principles to practical discussion and decrees, and here we are being dragged back and prevented from tackling the business at hand. This will not do. For one thing, ours is not actually a workers' state but a workers' and peasants' state. And a lot depends on that. (*Bukharin*: "What kind of state? A workers' and peasants' state?") Comrade Bukharin back there may well shout "What kind of state? A workers' and peasants' state?" I shall not stop to answer him. Anyone who has a mind to should recall the recent Congress of Soviets, and that will be answer enough.

But that is not all. Our Party Programme—a document which the author of the *ABC of Communism* knows very well—shows that ours is a workers' state *with a bureaucratic twist to it*. We have had to mark it with this dismal, shall I say, tag. There you have the reality of the transition. Well, is it right to say that in a state that has taken this shape in practice the trade unions have nothing to protect, or that we can do without them in protecting the material and spiritual interests of the massively organised proletariat? No, this reasoning is theoretically quite wrong. It takes us into the sphere of abstraction or an ideal we shall achieve in 15 or 20 years' time, and I am not so sure that we shall have achieved it even by then. What we actually have before us is a reality of which we have a good deal of knowledge, provided, that is, we keep our heads, and do not let ourselves be carried away by intellectualist talk or abstract reasoning, or by what may appear to be "theory" but is in fact error and misapprehension of the peculiarities of transition. We now have a state under which it is the business of the massively

organised proletariat to protect itself, while we, for our part, must use these workers' organisations to protect the workers from their state, and to get them to protect our state. Both forms of protection are achieved through the peculiar interweaving of our state measures and our agreeing or "coalescing" with our trade unions.

I shall have more to say about this coalescing later on. But the word itself shows that it is a mistake to conjure up an enemy in the shape of "Soviet trade-unionism", for "coalescing" implies the existence of *distinct* things that *have yet to be coalesced*: "coalescing" implies the need to be able to use measures of the state power to protect the material and spiritual interests of the massively organised proletariat *from* that very same state power. When the coalescing has produced *coalescence* and *integration*, we shall meet in congress for a business-like discussion of actual experience, instead of "disagreements" on principle or theoretical reasoning in the abstract. There is an equally lame attempt to find differences of principle with Comrades Tomsky and Lozovsky, whom Comrade Trotsky treats as trade union "bureaucrats"—I shall later on say which side in this controversy tends to be bureaucratic. We all know that while Comrade Ryazanov may love a slogan, and must have one which is all but an expression of principle, it is not one of Comrade Tomsky's many vices. I think, therefore, that it would be going a bit too far to challenge Comrade Tomsky to a battle of principles on this score (as Comrade Trotsky has done). I am positively astonished at this. One would have thought that we had grown up since the days when we all sinned a great deal in the way of factional, theoretical and various other disagreements—although we naturally did some good as well. It is time we stopped inventing and blowing up differences of principle and got down to practical work. I never knew that Tomsky was eminently a theoretician or that he claimed to be one; it may be one of his failings, but that is something else again. Tomsky, who has been working very smoothly with the trade union movement, must in his position provide a reflection of this complex transition—whether he should do so consciously or unconsciously is quite another matter and I am not saying that he has always done it consciously—so that if something is

hurting the mass, and they do not know what it is, and he does not know what it is (*applause, laughter*) but raises a howl, I say that is not a failing but should be put down to his credit. I am quite sure that Tomsky has many partial theoretical mistakes. And if we all sat down to a table and started thoughtfully writing resolutions or theses, we should correct them all; we might not even bother to do that because production work is more interesting than the rectifying of minute theoretical disagreements.

I come now to "industrial democracy", shall I say, for Bukharin's benefit. We all know that everyone has his weak points, that even big men have little weak spots, and this also goes for Bukharin. He seems to be incapable of resisting any little word with a flourish to it. He seemed to derive an almost sensuous pleasure from writing the resolution on industrial democracy at the Central Committee Plenum on December 7. But the closer I look at this "industrial democracy", the more clearly I see that it is half-baked and theoretically false. It is nothing but a hodgepodge. With this as an example, let me say once again, at a Party meeting at least: "Comrade N. I. Bukharin, the Republic, theory and you yourself will benefit from less verbal extravagance." (*Applause.*) Industry is indispensable. Democracy is a category proper only to the political sphere. There can be no objection to the use of this word in speeches or articles. An article takes up and clearly expresses one relationship and no more. But it is quite strange to hear you trying to turn this into a thesis, and to see you wanting to coin it into a slogan, uniting the "ayes" and the "nays"; it is strange to hear you say, like Trotsky, that the Party will have "to choose between two trends". I shall deal separately with whether the Party must do any "choosing" and who is to blame for putting the Party in this position of having to "choose". Things being what they are, we say: "At any rate, see that you choose fewer slogans, like 'industrial democracy', which contain nothing but confusion and are theoretically wrong." Both Trotsky and Bukharin failed to think out this term theoretically and ended up in confusion. "Industrial democracy" suggests things well beyond the circle of ideas with which they were carried away. They wanted to lay greater emphasis and focus attention on

industry. It is one thing to emphasise something in an article or speech; it is quite another to frame it into a thesis and ask the Party to choose, and so I say: cast your vote against it, because it is confusion. Industry is indispensable, democracy is not. Industrial democracy breeds some utterly false ideas. The idea of one-man management was advocated only a little while ago. We must not make a mess of things and confuse people: how do you expect them to know when you want democracy, when one-man management, and when dictatorship. But on no account must we renounce dictatorship either—I hear Bukharin behind me growling: “Quite right.” (*Laughter. Applause.*)

But to go on. Since September we have been talking about switching from the principle of priority to that of equalisation, and we have said as much in the resolution of the all-Party conference, which was approved by the Central Committee. The question is not an easy one, because we find that we have to combine equalisation with priority, which are incompatible. But after all we do have some knowledge of Marxism and have learned how and when opposites can and must be combined; and what is most important is that in the three and a half years of our revolution we have actually combined opposites again and again.

The question obviously requires thoughtfulness and circumspection. After all, we did discuss these questions of principle at those deplorable plenary meetings of the Central Committee\*—which yielded the groups of seven and eight, and Comrade Bukharin’s celebrated “buffer group”<sup>183</sup>—and we did establish that there was no easy transition from the priority principle to that of equalisation. We shall have to put in a bit of effort to implement the decision of the September Conference. After all, these opposite terms can be combined either into a cacophony or a symphony. Priority implies preference for one industry out of a group of vital industries because of its greater urgency. What does such preference entail? How great can it be? This is a difficult question, and I must say that it will take more than zeal to

\* The reference is to the November and December plenary meetings of the Central Committee in 1920. For the text of their resolutions see *Pravda* No. 255 of November 13, and No. 281 of December 14, and also *Izvestia of the C.C., R.C.P.*<sup>182</sup> No. 26 of December 20.

solve it; it may even take more than a heroic effort on the part of a man who is possibly endowed with many excellent qualities and who will do wonders on the right job; this is a very peculiar matter and calls for the correct approach. And so if we are to raise this question of priority and equalisation we must first of all give it some careful thought, but that is just what we fail to find in Comrade Trotsky's work; the further he goes in revising his original theses, the more mistakes he makes. Here is what we find in his latest theses:

"The equalisation line should be pursued in the sphere of *consumption*, that is, the conditions of the working people's existence as individuals. In the sphere of *production*, the principle of priority will long remain decisive for us"... (thesis 41, p. 31 of Trotsky's pamphlet).

This is a real theoretical muddle. It is all wrong. Priority is preference, but it is nothing without preference in consumption. If all the preference I get is a couple of ounces of bread a day I am not likely to be very happy. The preference part of priority implies preference in consumption as well. Otherwise, priority is a pipe dream, a fleeting cloud, and we are, after all, materialists. The workers are also materialists; if you say shock work, they say, let's have the bread, and the clothes, and the beef. That is the view we now take, and have always taken, in discussing these questions time without number with reference to various concrete matters in the Council of Defence, when one would say: "I'm doing shock work", and would clamour for boots, and another: "I get the boots, otherwise your shock workers won't hold out, and all your priority will fizzle out."

We find, therefore, that in the theses the approach to equalisation and priority is basically wrong. What is more, it is a retreat from what has actually been achieved and tested in practice. We can't have that; it will lead to no good.

Then there is the question of "coalescing". The best thing to do about "coalescing" right now is to keep quiet. Speech is silver, but silence is golden. Why so? It is because we have got down to coalescing in practice; there is not a single large gubernia economic council, no major department of the Supreme Economic Council, the People's Commissariat for Communications, etc., where something is not being



coalesced *in practice*. But are the results all they should be? Ay, there's the rub. Look at the way coalescence has *actually* been carried out, and what it has produced. There are countless decrees introducing coalescence in the various institutions. But we have yet to make a business-like study of our own practical experience; we have yet to go into the actual results of all this; we have yet to discover what a certain type of coalescence has produced in a particular industry, what happened when member X of the gubernia trade union council held post Y in the gubernia economic council, how many months he was at it, etc. What we have not failed to do is to invent a disagreement on coalescence as a principle, and make a mistake in the process, but then we have always been quick at that sort of thing; but we were not up to the mark when it came to analysing and verifying our own experience. When we have congresses of Soviets with committees not only on the application of the better-farming law in the various agricultural areas but also on coalescence and its results in the Saratov Gubernia flour-milling industry, the Petrograd metal industry, the Donbas coal industry, etc., and when these committees, having mustered the facts, declare: "We have made a study of so and so", then I shall say: "Now we have got down to business, we have finally grown up." But could anything be more erroneous and deplorable than the fact that we are being presented with "theses" splitting hairs over the principle of coalescence, after we have been at it for three years? We have taken the path of coalescence, and I am sure it was the right thing to do, but we have not yet made an adequate study of the results of our experience. That is why keeping quiet is the only common sense tactics on the question of coalescence.

A study must be made of practical experience. I have signed decrees and resolutions containing instructions on practical coalescence, and no theory is half so important as practice. That is why when I hear: "Let's discuss 'coalescence'", I say: "Let's analyse what we have done." There is no doubt that we have made many mistakes. It may well be that a great part of our decrees need amending. I accept that, for I am not in the least enamoured of decrees. But in that case let us have some practical proposals as to what

actually has to be altered. That would be a business-like approach. That would not be a waste of time. That would not lead to bureaucratic projecteering. But I find that that is exactly what's wrong with Trotsky's "Practical Conclusions", Part VI of his pamphlet. He says that from one-third to one-half of the members of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and the Presidium of the Supreme Economic Council should serve on both bodies, and from one-half to two-thirds, on the collegiums, etc. Why so? No special reason, just "rule of thumb". It is true, of course, that rule of thumb is frequently used to lay down similar proportions in our decrees, but then why is it inevitable in decrees? I hold no brief for all decrees as such and have no intention of making them appear better than they actually are. Quite often rule of thumb is used in them to fix such purely arbitrary proportions as one-half or one-third of the total number of members, etc. When a decree says that, it means: try doing it this way, and later on we shall assess the results of your "try-out". We shall later sort out the results. After sorting them out, we shall move on. We are working on coalescence and we expect to improve it because we are becoming more efficient and practical-minded.

But I seem to have lapsed into "production propaganda". That can't be helped. It is a question that needs dealing with in any discussion of the role of the trade unions in production.

My next question will therefore be that of production propaganda. This again is a practical matter and we approach it accordingly. Government agencies have already been set up to conduct production propaganda. I can't tell whether they are good or bad; they have to be tested and there's no need for any "theses" on this subject at all.

If we take a general view of the part trade unions have to play in industry, we need not, in this question of democracy, go beyond the usual democratic practices. Nothing will come of such tricky phrases as "industrial democracy", for they are all wrong. That is the first point. The second is production propaganda. The agencies are there. Trotsky's theses deal with production propaganda. That is quite useless, because in this case theses are old hat. We do not know as yet whether the agencies are good or bad. But

we can tell after testing them in action. Let us do some studying and polling. Assuming, let us say, that a congress has 10 committees with 10 men on each, let us ask: "You have been dealing with production propaganda, haven't you? What are the results?" Having made a study of this, we should reward those who have done especially well, and discard what has proved unsuccessful. We do have some practical experience; it may not be much but it is there; yet we are being dragged away from it and back to these "theses on principles". This looks more like a "reactionary" movement than "trade-unionism".

There is then the third point, that of bonuses. Here is the role and task of the trade unions in production: distribution of bonuses *in kind*. A start on it has been made. Things have been set in motion. Five hundred thousand poods of grain had been allocated for the purpose, and one hundred and seventy thousand has been distributed. How well and how correctly, I cannot tell. The Council of People's Commissars was told that they were not making a good job of this distribution, which turned out to be an additional wage rather than a bonus. This was pointed out by officials of the trade unions and the People's Commissariat for Labour. We appointed a commission to look into the matter but that has not yet been done. One hundred and seventy thousand poods of grain has been given away, but this needs to be done in such a way as to reward those who display the heroism, the zeal, the talent, and the dedication of the thrifty manager, in a word, all the qualities that Trotsky extols. But the task now is not to extol this in theses but to provide the bread and the beef. Wouldn't it be better, for instance, to deprive one category of workers of their beef and give it as a bonus to workers designated as "shock" workers? We do not renounce that kind of priority. That is a priority we need. Let us take a closer look at our practices in the application of priority.

The fourth point is disciplinary courts. I hope Comrade Bukharin will not take offence if I say that without disciplinary courts the role of the trade unions in industry, "industrial democracy", is a mere trifle. But the fact is that there is nothing at all about this in your theses. "Great grief!" is therefore the only thing that can be said about

Trotsky's theses and Bukharin's attitude, from the standpoint of principle, theory and practice.

I am confirmed in this conclusion when I say to myself: yours is not a Marxist approach to the question. This quite apart from the fact that there are a number of theoretical mistakes in the theses. It is not a Marxist approach to the evaluation of the "role and tasks of the trade unions", because such a broad subject cannot be tackled without giving thought to the peculiar political aspects of the present situation. After all, Comrade Bukharin and I did say in the resolution of the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P. on trade unions that politics is the most concentrated expression of economics.

If we analysed the current political situation, we might say that we were going through a transition period within a transition period. The whole of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a transition period, but we now have, you might say, a heap of new transition periods: the demobilisation of the army, the end of the war, the possibility of having a much longer breathing space in peace than before, and a more solid transition from the war front to the labour front. This—and this alone—is causing a change in the attitude of the proletarian class to the peasant class. What kind of change is it? Now this calls for a close examination, but nothing of the sort follows from your theses. Until we have taken this close look, we must learn to wait. The people are overweary, considerable stocks that had to be used for certain priority industries have been so used; the proletariat's attitude to the peasantry is undergoing a change. The war weariness is terrible, and the needs have increased, but production has increased insufficiently or not at all. On the other hand, as I said in my report to the Eighth Congress of Soviets, our application of coercion was correct and successful whenever we had been able to back it up from the start with persuasion. I must say that Trotsky and Bukharin have entirely failed to take account of this very important consideration.

Have we laid a sufficiently broad and solid base of persuasion for all these new production tasks? No, indeed, we have barely started doing it. We have not yet made the masses a party to them. Now I ask you, can the masses tackle

these new assignments right away? No, they cannot, because while there is now no need for special propaganda on the question of, say, whether Wrangel the landowner should be overthrown or whether any sacrifices should be spared for the purpose, we have just started to work on this question of the role of the trade unions in production, and I mean the business aspect of the matter and not the question of "principle", the reasoning about "Soviet trade-unionism" and such-like trifles; we have just set up the agency for production propaganda, but we have as yet no experience. We have introduced the payment of bonuses in kind, but we lack the experience. We have set up the disciplinary courts, but we are not yet aware of the results. Still, from the political standpoint it is the preparedness of the masses that is crucial. Has the question been prepared, studied, weighed, and considered from this angle? No, far from it. And that is a basic, deep-going and dangerous political mistake, because if ever there was need to act according to the rule of measuring your cloth seven times before cutting it once, it is in this question. We find instead that the cutting has been started in earnest without a single measure having been taken. We are told that "the Party must choose between two trends", but the false slogan of "industrial democracy" was invented without a single measuring.

We must try to understand the meaning of this slogan, especially in the present political situation, when the masses are confronted with bureaucratic practices in visual form, and when we have the question itself on the agenda. Comrade Trotsky says in his theses that on the question of workers' democracy it remains for the congress to "enter it unanimously in the record". That is not correct. There is more to it than an entry in the record; an entry in the record fixes what has been fully weighed and measured, whereas the question of industrial democracy is far from having been fully weighed, tried and tested. Just think how the masses may interpret this slogan of "industrial democracy".

"We, the rank and file who work among the masses, say that there is need for new blood, that things must be corrected and the bureaucrats ousted, and here you are beating about the bush, talking about getting on with production and displaying democracy in achieving success in production;

we refuse to get on with production under such a bureaucratic set-up of central and other boards, we want a different one." You have not given the masses a chance to discuss things, to see the point, and to think it over; you have not allowed the Party to gain fresh experience but are already acting in haste, overdoing it, and producing formulas which are theoretically false. Just think how this mistake will be further amplified by unduly zealous functionaries! A political leader is responsible not only for the quality of his leadership but also for the acts of those he leads. He may now and again be unaware of what they are about, he may often wish they had not done something, but the responsibility still falls on him.

I now come to the November 9 and December 7 plenary meetings of the Central Committee, which gave expression to all these mistakes in action, rather than in logical categories, premises and theoretical reasoning. This threw the Central Committee into confusion; it is the first time this has happened in our Party's history, in time of revolution, and it is dangerous. The crux was that there was a division, there was the "buffer" group of Bukharin, Preobrazhensky and Serebryakov, which did the most harm and created the most confusion.

You will recall the story of Glavpolitput<sup>184</sup> and Tsektran. The resolution of the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P. in April 1920 said that Glavpolitput was being set up as a "temporary" institution, and that conditions should be brought back to normal "*as soon as possible*". In September you read, "Return to normal conditions".\* The plenary meeting was held in November (November 9), and Trotsky came up with his theses and ideas about trade-unionism. However fine some of his points about production propaganda may be, he should have been told that all this was neither here nor there, quite beside the mark, and a step backward;

\* See *Izvestia of the C.C., R.C.P.* No. 26, p. 2, the Resolution of the September Plenum of the C.C., Paragraph 3, which said: "The C.C. further believes that there has been a great improvement in the grave situation in the transport workers' unions, which produced Glavpolitput and Politvod,<sup>185</sup> as temporary levers for assisting and organising the work. Therefore, incorporation of these organisations in the union, as union agencies being adapted to and absorbed by the union apparatus, can and must now proceed."

it is something the C.C. should not be dealing with at present. Bukharin says: "It is very good." It may be very good, but that is no answer to the question. After a heated debate, a resolution is adopted by 10 to 4 saying in a polite and comradely way that Tsektran has itself "already got down to ... strengthening and developing methods of proletarian democracy within the union". It adds that Tsektran must "take an active part in the general work of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, being incorporated in it on an equal footing with other trade union bodies".

What is the gist of the Central Committee's decision? It is obviously this: "Comrades of Tsektran! You must do more than go through the motions of carrying out congress and C.C. decisions, you must actually do so to help all trade unions by your work, wipe out every trace of red tape, favouritism, arrogance, the we-are-better-than-you attitude, and boasts of being richer and getting more aid."

We then get down to brass tacks. A commission is set up, and the names of its members are published. Trotsky walks out, refuses to serve on the commission, and disrupts its work. What are his reasons? There is only one. Lutovinov is apt to play at opposition. That is true, and that also goes for Osinsky. Frankly speaking, it is not a pleasant game. But do you call that a reason? Osinsky was making an excellent job of the seed campaign. The thing to do was to work with him, in spite of his "opposition campaign", for this business of disrupting the work of a commission is bureaucratic, un-Soviet, un-socialist, incorrect and politically harmful. Such methods are doubly incorrect and politically harmful at a time when there is need to separate the wheat from the chaff within the "opposition". When Osinsky conducts an "opposition campaign", I tell him: "This is a harmful campaign", but it is a pleasure to see him conduct the seed campaign. I shall not deny that, like Ishchenko and Shlyapnikov, Lutovinov is making a mistake in his "opposition campaign", but that is no reason to disrupt the work of a commission.

What did the commission in fact signify? It signified transition to practical work from intellectualist talk about sterile disagreements. What the commission was due to discuss and deal with was production propaganda, bonuses,

and disciplinary courts. It was then that Comrade Bukharin, the head of the "buffer group", together with Preobrazhensky and Serebryakov, seeing the Central Committee dangerously divided, set out to create a buffer, one that I find difficult to describe in parliamentary terms. If I could draw cartoons as well as Comrade Bukharin does, I would depict him as a man pouring a bucket of kerosene on the flames, and give the following caption: "Buffer kerosene". Comrade Bukharin wanted to create something, and his intentions were no doubt most sincere and entirely in the "buffer" spirit. But the buffer failed to materialise; the upshot was that he failed to take account of the political situation and, what is more, made some theoretical mistakes.

Should all such disputes have been brought up for broad discussion? Was it worth going into these trifles? Was it worth wasting the few precious weeks before a Party congress? We could have used the time to analyse and study the question of bonuses, disciplinary courts and coalescence. Those are the questions we could have given a practical solution to in the C.C. commission. If Comrade Bukharin wished to create a buffer, instead of giving a display of barking up the wrong tree, he should have demanded and insisted that Comrade Trotsky remained on the commission. If he had said and done that, we should have been on the right track, with the commission looking into the practical aspects of such things as one-man management, democracy, appointees, etc.

But to go on. By December (the December 7 Plenary Meeting), we were already faced with this flare-up of the watermen, which intensified the conflict, and as a result there were now eight votes in the Central Committee to our seven. Comrade Bukharin, in an effort to bring about a "reconciliation" through the use of his "buffer", hastily wrote the "theoretical" part of the December plenum's resolution, but with the commission a shambles, nothing, of course, could come of it.

Where did Glavpolitput and Tsektran err? Certainly not in their use of coercion; that goes to their credit. Their mistake was that they failed to switch to normal trade union work at the right time and without conflict, as the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P. required; they failed to adapt them-



selves to the trade unions and help them by meeting them on an equal footing. Heroism, zeal, etc., are the positive side of military experience; red tape and arrogance are the negative side of the experience of the worst military types. Trotsky's theses, whatever his intentions, do not tend to play up the best, but the worst in military experience. It must be borne in mind that a political leader is responsible not only for his own policy but also for the acts of those he leads.

The last thing I want to tell you about—something I called myself a fool for yesterday—is that I had altogether overlooked Comrade Rudzutak's theses. His weak point is that he does not speak in ringing tones; he is not an impressive or eloquent speaker. He is liable to be overlooked. Unable to attend the meetings yesterday, I went through my material and found a printed leaflet issued for the Fifth All-Russia Trade Union Conference, which was held from November 2 to 6, 1920. It is called: *The Tasks of the Trade Unions in Production*. Let me read it to you, it is not long.

#### Fifth All-Russia Trade Union Conference

#### The tasks of the trade unions in production (THESES OF COMRADE RUDZUTAK'S REPORT)

1. Immediately after the October Revolution, the trade unions proved to be *almost the only* bodies which, while exercising workers' control, were able and bound to undertake the work of organising and managing production. In that early period of the Soviet power, no state apparatus for the management of the national economy had yet been set up, while sabotage on the part of factory owners and senior technicians brought the working class squarely up against the task of safeguarding industry and getting the whole of the country's economic apparatus back into normal running order.

2. In the subsequent period of the Supreme Economic Council's work, when a considerable part of it consisted in liquidating private enterprises and organising state management to run them, *the trade unions carried on this work jointly and side by side with the state economic management agencies.*

This parallel set-up was explained and justified by the weakness of the state agencies; historically it was vindicated by the establishment of full contact between the trade unions and the economic management agencies.

3. *The centre of gravity in the management of industry and the drafting of a production programme shifted to these agencies as a result of their administration, the gradual spread of their control over production and management and the co-ordination of the several*

parts. In view of this, the work of the trade unions in organising production was reduced to *participation in forming the collegiums* of chief administrations, central boards, and factory managements.

4. At the present time, we are once again squarely faced with the question of establishing the closest possible ties between the economic agencies of the Soviet Republic and the trade unions, for the best use must be made of every working individual, and the whole mass of producers must be induced to take a conscious part in production, for the state apparatus of economic management, gradually gaining in size and complexity, has been transformed into a huge bureaucratic machine which is out of all proportion to the scale of industry, and is inevitably impelling the trade unions to take direct part in organising production not only through its men in the economic agencies but also as an organised whole.

5. While the Supreme Economic Council's point of departure in drawing up an overall production programme is *the availability of the material elements of production* (raw materials, fuel, the state of machinery, etc.), the trade unions must look at it *from the standpoint of organising labour* for the tasks of production and its best use. Therefore, the overall production programme, in whole and in part, must be drawn up with the participation of the trade unions in order to combine the use of the material resources of production and manpower in the best possible way.

6. Only if the whole mass of those engaged in production *consciously take a hand* in establishing real labour discipline, fighting deserters from the labour front, etc., can these tasks be fulfilled. *Bureaucratic methods and orders* will not do; it must be brought home to each participant in production that his production tasks are appropriate and important; that each must take a hand not only in fulfilling his assignments, but also play an intelligent part in correcting any technical and organisational defects in the sphere of production.

The tasks of the trade unions in this sphere are tremendous. They must teach *their members in each shop* and in each factory to *react to and take account of all defects in the use of manpower arising from improper handling of technical means or unsatisfactory management*. *The sum total of the experience gained by separate enterprises and industry as a whole* must be used to combat red tape, bureaucratic practices and carelessness.

7. In order to lay special emphasis on the importance of these production tasks, they must be organisationally worked into current operations. As the *economic departments* of the trade unions, which are being set up in pursuance of the decision of the Third All-Russia Congress, extend their activity, they must gradually explain and define the nature of all trade union work. Thus, in the present social conditions, when all of production is geared to the satisfaction of the working people's needs, *wage rates and bonuses must be closely tied in with and must depend on the extent to which the production plan is fulfilled*. Bonuses in kind and partial payment of wages in kind must be gradually transformed into a *system of workers' supply* which depends on the level of labour productivity.

8. Trade union work on these lines would, on the one hand, put an end to the existence of *parallel bodies* (*political departments, etc.*) and, on the other, restore the close ties between the masses and the economic management agencies.

9. After the Third Congress, the trade unions largely failed to carry out their programme for participation in economic construction, owing, first, to the *military conditions*, and second, to their *organisational weakness* and isolation from the administrative and practical work of the economic bodies.

10. In view of this, the trade unions should set themselves the following immediate practical tasks: a) the most active participation in solving production and management problems; b) direct participation, with the respective economic agencies, in *setting up competent administrative bodies*; c) careful consideration of the various *types of management bodies*, and their influence on production; d) unflinching participation in working out and laying down economic *plans* and production programmes; e) *organisation of labour* in accordance with the economic priorities; f) development of an extensive organisation for production *agitation and propaganda*.

11. The economic departments of the *trade unions* and of their organisations must be actually transformed into powerful and expeditious levers for the trade unions' systematic participation in organising production.

12. In the matter of providing workers with steady material supplies, the trade unions must shift their *influence onto the distributive bodies of the Commissariat for Food*, both local and central, taking a practical and business-like part and exercising *control* in all the distributive bodies, and paying special attention to the activity of central and gubernia *workers' supply commissions*.

13. In view of the fact that the narrow departmental interests of some chief administrations, central boards, etc., have plunged the so-called "priority" into a state of utter confusion, the trade unions must everywhere uphold the real order of economic priorities and review the existing system so as to determine them in accordance with the actual importance of the various industries and the availability of material resources in the country.

14. Special attention must be given to the so-called model group of factories to help them set an example through the organisation of efficient management, labour discipline and trade union activities.

15. In labour organisation, apart from the introduction of a harmonious wage-rate system and the overhaul of output rates, the trade unions should take a firm hand in fighting the various *forms of labour desertion* (absenteeism, lateness, etc.). The disciplinary courts, which have not received due attention until now, must be turned into a real means of combating breaches of proletarian labour discipline.

16. The economic departments must be entrusted with the fulfilment of these tasks and also the drafting of a practical plan for production propaganda and a number of measures to improve the economic condition of the workers. It is necessary, therefore, to authorise the economic department of the All-Russia Central Council of

Trade Unions to call a special *All-Russia Conference of Economic Departments* in the near future to discuss the practical problems of economic construction in connection with the work of state economic agencies.

I hope you see now why I called myself names. There you have a platform, and it is very much better than the one Comrade Trotsky wrote after a great deal of thinking, and the one Comrade Bukharin wrote (the December 7 Plenum resolution) without any thinking at all. All of us members of the Central Committee who have been out of touch with the trade union movement for many years would profit from Comrade Rudzutak's experience, and this also goes for Comrade Trotsky and Comrade Bukharin. The trade unions have adopted this platform.

We all entirely forgot about the disciplinary courts, but "industrial democracy", without bonuses in kind or disciplinary courts, is nothing but empty talk.

I make a comparison between Rudzutak's theses and those submitted by Trotsky to the Central Committee. At the end of thesis 5, I read:

"...a reorganisation of the unions must be started right away, that is, a selection of functionaries must be above all made from precisely that angle...."

There you have an example of the real bureaucratic approach: Trotsky and Krestinsky selecting the trade union "functionaries"!

Let me say this once again: here you have an explanation of Tsektran's mistake. It was not wrong to use pressure; that goes to its credit. It made the mistake of failing to cope with the general tasks of all the trade unions, of failing to act itself and to help all the trade unions to employ the disciplinary comrades' courts more correctly, swiftly and successfully. When I read about the disciplinary courts in Comrade Rudzutak's theses it occurred to me that there might be a decree on this matter. And in fact there was. It is the *Regulations Governing Workers' Disciplinary Comrades' Courts*, issued on November 14, 1919 (*Collection of Statutes* No. 537).

The trade unions have the key role in these courts. I don't know how good these courts are, how well they function, and whether they always function. A study of our own practical

experience would be a great deal more useful than anything Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin have written.

Let me end by summing up everything there is on the question. I must say that it was a great mistake to put up these disagreements for broad Party discussion and the Party Congress. It was a political mistake. We should have had a business-like discussion in the commission, and only there, and would have in that case moved forward; as it is we are sliding back, and shall keep sliding back to abstract theoretical propositions for several weeks, instead of dealing with the problem in a business-like manner. Personally, I am sick and tired of it, and quite apart from my illness, it would give me great pleasure to get away from it all. I am prepared to seek refuge anywhere.

The net result is that there are a number of theoretical mistakes in Trotsky's and Bukharin's theses: they contain a number of things that are wrong in principle. Politically, the whole approach to the matter is utterly tactless. Comrade Trotsky's "theses" are politically harmful. The sum and substance of his policy is bureaucratic harassment of the trade unions. Our Party Congress will, I am sure, condemn and reject it. (*Prolonged, stormy applause.*)

Published in pamphlet form  
in 1921, Petrograd

*Collected Works*, Vol. 32,  
pp. 19-42

---

## The Party Crisis

The pre-Congress discussion is in full swing. Minor differences and disagreements have grown into big ones, which always happens when someone persists in a minor mistake and balks at its correction, or when those who are making a big mistake seize on the minor mistake of one or more persons.

That is how disagreements and splits always grow. That is how we "grew up" from minor disagreements to syndicalism, which means a complete break with communism and an inevitable split in the Party if it is not healthy and strong enough to purge itself of the malaise.

We must have the courage to face the bitter truth. The Party is sick. The Party is down with the fever. The whole point is whether the malaise has affected only the "feverish upper ranks", and perhaps only those in Moscow, or the whole organism. And if the latter is the case, is it capable of healing itself completely within the next few weeks, before the Party Congress and at the Party Congress, making a relapse impossible, or will the malaise linger and become dangerous?

What is it that needs to be done for a rapid and certain cure? *All* members of the Party must make a calm and painstaking *study* of 1) the essence of the disagreements and 2) the development of the Party struggle. A study must be made of both, because the essence of the disagreements is revealed, clarified and specified (and very often transformed

as well) in the *course of the struggle*, which, passing through its various stages, always shows, at every stage, a *different* line-up and number of combatants, *different* positions in the struggle, etc. A *study* must be made of both, and a demand made for the most exact, printed documents that can be thoroughly verified. Only a hopeless idiot will believe oral statements. If *no* documents are available, there must be an examination of witnesses on *both* or several sides and the grilling must take place in the presence of witnesses.

Let me outline the essence of the disagreements and the successive stages in the struggle, as I see them.

Stage one. The Fifth All-Russia Trade Union Conference, November 2-6. The battle is joined. Trotsky and Tomsy are the only Central Committee "combatants". Trotsky lets drop a "catchy phrase" about "shaking up" the trade unions. Tomsy argues very heatedly. The majority of the Central Committee members are on the fence. The serious mistake they (and I above all) made was that we "overlooked" Rudzutak's theses, *The Tasks of the Trade Unions in Production*, adopted by the Fifth Conference. That is the *most* important document in the *whole* of the controversy.

Stage two. The Central Committee Plenum of November 9. Trotsky submits his "draft theses", *The Trade Unions and Their Future Role*, advocating the "shake-up" policy, *camouflaged* or adorned with talk of a "severe crisis" gripping the trade unions, and their new tasks and methods. Tomsy, strongly supported by Lenin, considers that in view of Tsektran's irregularities and bureaucratic excesses it is the "shake-up" that is the crux of the whole controversy. In the course of it, Lenin makes a number of obviously exaggerated and therefore mistaken "attacks", which produces the need for a "buffer group", and this is made up of ten members of the Central Committee (the group includes Bukharin and Zinoviev, but neither Trotsky nor Lenin). It resolves "not to put the disagreements up for broad discussion", and, *cancelling Lenin's report* (to the trade unions), appoints Zinoviev as the rapporteur and instructs him to "present a business-like and non-controversial report".

Trotsky's theses are rejected. Lenin's theses are adopted. In its final form, the resolution is adopted by ten votes to

four (Trotsky, Andreyev, Krestinsky and Rykov). And this resolution advocates "sound forms of the militarisation of labour", condemns "the degeneration of centralism and militarised forms of work into bureaucratic practices, petty tyranny, red tape", etc. Tsektran is instructed to "take a more active part in the general work of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, being incorporated in it on an equal footing with other trade union bodies".

The Central Committee sets up a trade union commission and elects Comrade Trotsky to it. He refuses to work on the commission, magnifying by this step *alone* his original mistake, which subsequently leads to factionalism. Without that step, his mistake (in submitting incorrect theses) remained a very minor one, such as every member of the Central Committee, without exception, has had occasion to make.

Stage three. The conflict between the water transport workers and Tsektran in December. The Central Committee Plenary Meeting of December 7. It is no longer Trotsky and Lenin, but Trotsky and Zinoviev who are the chief "combatants". As chairman of the trade union commission, Zinoviev inquires into the December dispute between the water transport workers and Tsektran. The Central Committee Plenary Meeting of December 7. Zinoviev makes a practical proposal for an immediate change in the composition of Tsektran. This is opposed by a majority of the Central Committee. Rykov goes over to Zinoviev's side. Bukharin's resolution—the substantive part of which is three-quarters in favour of the water transport workers, while the preamble, rejecting the proposal to "reconstruct" the trade unions "from above" (Paragraph 3), approves of the celebrated "industrial democracy" (Paragraph 5)—is adopted. Our group of Central Committee members is in the minority, being opposed to Bukharin's resolution chiefly because we consider the "buffer" a paper one; for Trotsky's non-participation in the trade union commission's work actually implies a continuation of the struggle and its transfer outside the Central Committee. We propose that the Party Congress be convened on February 6, 1921. That is adopted. The postponement to March 6 was agreed to later, on the demand of the outlying areas.



Stage four. The Eighth Congress of Soviets. On December 25, Trotsky issues his "platform pamphlet" *The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions*. From the standpoint of formal democracy, Trotsky had an uncontested right to issue his platform, for on December 24 the Central Committee had permitted free discussion. From the standpoint of revolutionary interest, this was blowing up the mistake out of all proportion and *creating a faction* on a faulty platform. The pamphlet quotes from the Central Committee resolution of December 7 only that part which refers to "industrial democracy" but does *not* quote what was said against "reconstruction from above". The buffer created by Bukharin on December 7 with Trotsky's aid was wrecked by Trotsky on December 25. The pamphlet from beginning to end is shot through with the "shake-up" spirit. Apart from its intellectualist flourishes ("production atmosphere", "industrial democracy"), which are wrong in theory and in practice fall within the concept, ambit and tasks of production propaganda, it *fails* to indicate any "new" "tasks or methods" that were to gild or camouflage or justify the "shake-up".

Stage five. The discussion before thousands of responsible Party workers from all over Russia at the R.C.P. group of the Eighth Congress of Soviets on December 30. The controversy flares up to full blast. Zinoviev and Lenin on one side, Trotsky and Bukharin on the other. Bukharin wants to play the "buffer", but speaks only against Lenin and Zinoviev, and not a word against Trotsky. Bukharin reads out an excerpt from his theses (published on January 16), but *only* that part which says nothing about the rupture with communism and the switch to syndicalism. Shlyapnikov (on behalf of the Workers' Opposition<sup>186</sup>) reads out the syndicalist platform, which Trotsky had demolished beforehand (thesis 16 of his platform) and which (partly, perhaps, for that reason) no one is inclined to take seriously.

In my opinion, the climax of the whole discussion of December 30 was the reading of Comrade Rudzutak's theses. Indeed, Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin, far from being able to object to them, even invented the legend that the "best part" of the theses had been drawn up by *members of Tsektran*—Holtzmann, Andreyev and Lyubimov. And

that is why Trotsky humorously and amiably twitted Lenin on his unsuccessful "diplomacy", by which, he said, Lenin had wanted to "call off or disrupt" the discussion, and find a "lightning conductor", "accidentally catching hold of Tsektran instead of the lightning conductor".

The legend was exploded that very day, December 30, by Rudzutak, who pointed out that Lyubimov "did not exist" on the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, that in its presidium Holtzmann had voted against these theses, and that they had been drawn up by a commission consisting of Andreyev, Tsiperovich and himself.

But let us for a moment assume that Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin's legend is true. Nothing so completely defeats them as such an assumption. For what is the conclusion if the "Tsektranites" had inserted their "new" ideas into Rudzutak's resolution, if Rudzutak had accepted them, if all the trade unions had adopted this resolution (November 2-6!), and if Bukharin and Trotsky have nothing to say against it?

It is that all of Trotsky's disagreements are artificial, that *neither he nor the "Tsektranites" have any* "new tasks or methods", and that everything practical and substantive had been said, adopted and *decided upon* by the trade unions, *even before the question was raised in the Central Committee.*

If anyone ought to be taken thoroughly to task and "shaken up", it is not the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions but the Central Committee of the R.C.P., for having "overlooked" Rudzutak's theses, a mistake which allowed an altogether empty discussion to flare up. There is nothing to *cover up* the mistake of the Tsektranites (which is not an excessive one but is, in essence, a very common one, consisting in some exaggeration of bureaucracy). What is more, it needs to be rectified, and not covered up, toned down or justified. That's all there is to it.

I summed up the substance of Rudzutak's theses on December 30 in four points: 1) ordinary democracy (without any exaggerations, without denying the Central Committee's right of "appointment", etc., but also without any obstinate defence of the mistakes and excesses of certain "appointees", which need to be rectified); 2) production propaganda (this includes all that is practical in clumsy,

ridiculous, theoretically wrong "formulas" like "industrial democracy", "production atmosphere", etc.). We have established a *Soviet institution*, the All-Russia Production Propaganda Bureau. We must do everything to support it and not spoil production work by *producing ... bad theses*. That's all there is to it; 3) bonuses in kind and 4) disciplinary comrades' courts. Without Points 3 and 4, all talk about "the role and tasks in production", etc., is empty, highbrow chatter; and it is these two points that are omitted from Trotsky's "platform pamphlet". But they are in Rudzutak's theses.

While dealing with the December 30 discussion, I must correct another mistake of mine. I said: "Ours is not actually a workers' state but a workers' and peasants' state." Comrade Bukharin immediately exclaimed: "What kind of a state?" In reply I referred him to the Eighth Congress of Soviets, which had just closed. I went back to the report of that discussion and found that I was wrong and Comrade Bukharin was right. What I should have said is: "A workers' state is an abstraction. What we actually have is a workers' state, with this peculiarity, firstly, that it is not the working class but the peasant population that predominates in the country, and, secondly, that it is a workers' state with bureaucratic distortions." Anyone who reads the whole of my speech will see that this correction makes no difference to my reasoning or conclusions.

Stage six. The Petrograd organisation issues an "Appeal to the Party" against Trotsky's platform, and the Moscow Committee issues a counter-statement (*Pravda*, January 13).<sup>187</sup>

This is a transition from the struggle between factions, formed from above, to the intervention of lower organisations. It is a big step towards recovery. Curiously enough, the Moscow Committee noticed the "dangerous" side of the *Petrograd organisation's* issuing a platform, but refused to notice the *dangerous side* of Comrade Trotsky's forming a faction on December 25! Some wags have said this is "buffer" (one-eyed) blindness.

Stage seven. The trade union commission concludes its work and issues a platform (a pamphlet, entitled *Draft Decision of the Tenth Congress of the R.C.P. on the Role*

and *Tasks of the Trade Unions*,<sup>188</sup> dated January 14 and signed by nine members of the Central Committee—Zinoviev, Stalin, Tomskey, Rudzutak, Kalinin, Kamenev, Petrovsky, Artyom and Lenin, and also by Lozovsky, a member of the trade union commission; Comrades Shlyapnikov and Lutovinov seem to have “fled” to the Workers’ Opposition). It was published in *Pravda* on January 18, with the following additional signatures: Schmidt, Tsiperovich and Milyutin.

On January 16, *Pravda* carries the Bukharin platform (signed: “On behalf of a group of comrades, Bukharin, Larin, Preobrazhensky, Serebryakov, Sokolnikov, Yakovleva”) and the Sapronov platform (signed: “A group of comrades standing for democratic centralism”, Bubnov, Boguslavsky, Kamensky, Maximovsky, Osinsky, Rafail, Sapronov).<sup>189</sup> The enlarged meeting of the Moscow Committee on January 17 was addressed by spokesmen for these platforms, and also by the “Ignatovites”<sup>190</sup> (theses published in *Pravda* on January 19 and signed by Ignatov, Orekhov, Korzinov, Kuranova, Burovtsev, Maslov). \*

What we find here is, on the one hand, increased solidarity (for the platform of the nine Central Committee members is in complete accord with the decision of the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions); and, on the other, confusion and disintegration, with Bukharin and Co.’s theses being an all-time low in *ideological* disintegration. We have here one of those “turns” which in the old days Marxists used to call “not so much historical as hysterical”. Thesis 17 says: “At the present time, these nominations must be made *mandatory*” (that is, the trade unions’ nominations to the respective “chief administrations and central boards”).

This is a clean break with communism and a transition to syndicalism. It is, in essence, a repetition of Shlyapnikov’s “unionise the state” slogan, and means transferring the Supreme Economic Council apparatus piecemeal to the

---

\* Incidentally, the Party should demand that every “platform” be issued with the full signatures of all the comrades responsible for it. This demand is met by the “Ignatovites” and the “Sapronovites” but not by the “Trotskyites”, the “Bukharinites” and the “Shlyapnikovites”, who refer to anonymous comrades allegedly responsible for their platforms.

respective trade unions. To say, "I propose *mandatory* nominations", is exactly the same as saying, "I appoint".

Communism says: The Communist Party, the vanguard of the proletariat, leads the non-Party workers' masses, educating, preparing, teaching and training the masses ("school" of communism)—first the workers and then the peasants—to enable them eventually to concentrate in their hands the administration of the whole national economy.

Syndicalism hands over to the mass of non-Party workers, who are compartmentalised in the industries, the management of their industries ("the chief administrations and central boards"), thereby making the Party superfluous, and failing to carry on a sustained campaign either in training the masses or in *actually* concentrating in *their* hands the management of the whole national economy.

The Programme of the R.C.P. says: "The trade unions *should eventually arrive*" (which means that they are not yet there or even on the way) "at a *de facto* concentration in their hands" (in *their*, that is, the hands of the trade unions, that is, the hands of the fully organised *masses*; anyone will see how far we have still to go even to the very first approaches to this *de facto* concentration)... concentration of what? "of the whole administration of the whole national economy, as a single economic entity" (hence, not branches of industry, or even industry as a whole, but industry *plus* agriculture, etc. Are we anywhere near to actually concentrating the management of agriculture in the hands of the trade unions?). The R.C.P. Programme then speaks of the "ties" between the "central state administration" and the "broad masses of toilers", and of the "*participation* of the trade unions in running the economy".

Why have a Party, if industrial management is to be appointed ("mandatory nomination") by the trade unions nine-tenths of whose members are non-Party workers? Bukharin has talked himself into a logical, theoretical and practical implication of a split in the Party, or, rather, a breakaway of the syndicalists from the Party.

Trotsky, who had been "chief" in the struggle, has now been "outstripped" and entirely "eclipsed" by Bukharin, who has thrown the struggle into an altogether new balance

by talking himself into a mistake that is much more serious than all of Trotsky's put together.

How could Bukharin talk himself into a break with communism? We know how soft Comrade Bukharin is; it is one of the qualities which endears him to people, who cannot help liking him. We know that he has been ribbed for being as "soft as wax". It turns out that any "unprincipled" person, any "demagogue" can leave any mark he likes on this "soft wax". The sharp words in quotation marks were used by Comrade Kamenev, during the January 17 discussion, and he had a perfect right to do so. But, of course, neither Kamenev nor anyone else would dream of *attributing* or reducing it all to unprincipled *demagogy*.

On the contrary, there is an objective logic in factional struggles which inevitably leads even the best of men—if they persist in their mistaken attitude—into a state which differs little if at all from unprincipled demagogy. That is the lesson of the entire history of factional wars (for example, the alliance of the Vperyodists<sup>191</sup> and the Mensheviks against the Bolsheviks). That is why we must make a study not only of the nature of the disagreements in the abstract, but also of their concrete development and change at the various stages of the struggle. This development was summed up in the January 17 discussion.<sup>192</sup> Neither the "shake-up" nor the "new production tasks" can any longer be advocated (because all the efficient and sensible ideas went into Rudzutak's theses). The alternative then is to find what Lassalle called "the physical strength of mind" (and character) to admit the mistake, rectify it and turn over this page of the history of the R.C.P., or... to cling to the remaining allies, no matter who they are, and "ignore" the principles altogether. There remain only the adherents of "democracy" *ad nauseam*. And Bukharin is sliding down towards them and syndicalism.

While we are slowly absorbing what was sound in the "democratic" Workers' Opposition, Bukharin has to cling to what is *unsound*. On January 17, Comrade Bumazhny, a prominent Tsektranite, or Trotskyite, expressed his readiness to accept Bukharin's syndicalist proposals. The "Sapronovites" have gone so far as to insist in the same thesis (3) on a "profound crisis" and a "bureaucratic necrosis" of the trade

unions, while proposing, as being "absolutely" necessary, the "extension of the trade unions' *rights* in production..." probably because of their "bureaucratic necrosis"? Can this group be taken seriously? They had heard the talk about the *role* of the trade unions in production, and wishing to outshout the others, blurted out: "extension of rights" on the occasion of "bureaucratic necrosis". You need read no more than the first few lines of their "practical" proposals: "The presidium of the Supreme Economic Council shall be nominated by the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and confirmed by the All-Russia Central Executive Committee." And what is their *democratic* position in "principle"? Listen to this (thesis 2): "They [Zinoviev and Trotsky] in fact express two trends within the same group of *ex-militarisers of the economy*."

Taken seriously, this is Menshevism and Socialist-Revolutionarism at their worst. But Sapronov, Osinsky and Co. should not be taken seriously, when, before every Party congress ("every blessed time on this very same spot"), these, I believe, superlative workers have a sort of paroxysmal seizure and try to outshout the others (the "champion shouter" faction) and solemnly make a hash of things. The "Ignatovites" try to keep up with the "Sapronovites". It is, of course, quite permissible (specially before a congress) for various groups to form blocs (and also to go vote chasing). But this should be done within the framework of communism (and not syndicalism) and in such a way as to avoid being ridiculous. Who is the highest bidder? Promisers of more "rights" to non-Party people, unite on the occasion of the congress of the Russian Communist Party!...

Our platform up to now has been: Do not defend but rectify the bureaucratic excesses. The fight against bureaucracy is a long and arduous one. Excesses can and must be rectified at once. It is not those who point out harmful excesses and strive to rectify them but those who resist rectification that undermine the prestige of the military workers and appointees. Such were the excesses of certain Tsektranites who, however, will continue to be (and have been) valuable workers. There is no need to harass the trade unions by inventing disagreements with them, when they themselves have decided upon and accepted all that is new, business-like and

practical in the tasks of the trade unions in production. On this basis, let us vigorously work together for practical results.

We have now added to our platform the following: We must combat the ideological discord and the *unsound* elements of the opposition who talk themselves into repudiating all "militarisation of industry", and not only the "appointments method", which has been the prevailing one up to now, but all "appointments", that is, in the last analysis, repudiating the *Party's* leading role in relation to the non-Party masses. We must combat the syndicalist deviation, which will kill the Party unless it is entirely cured of it.

The Entente capitalists will surely try to take advantage of our Party's malaise to mount another invasion, and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, to hatch plots and rebellions. We need have no fear of this because we shall all unite as one man, without being afraid to admit the malaise, but recognising that it demands from all of us a greater discipline, tenacity and firmness at every post. By the time the Tenth Congress of the R.C.P. meets in March, and after the Congress, the Party will not be weaker, but stronger.

January 19, 1921

*Pravda* No. 13,  
January 21, 1921  
Signed: *N. Lenin*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 32,  
pp. 43-53



---

## The Second All-Russia Congress of Miners

January 25—February 2, 1921

### 1

**Report on the Role and Tasks  
of the Trade Unions  
Delivered on January 23 at a Meeting  
of the Communist Group of the Congress**

The morbid character of the question of the role and tasks of the trade unions is due to the fact that it took the form of a factional struggle much too soon. This vast, boundless question should not have been taken up in such haste, as it was done here, and I put the chief blame on Comrade Trotsky for all this fumbling haste and precipitation. All of us have had occasion to submit inadequately prepared theses to the Central Committee and this is bound to go on because all our work is being done in a rush. This is not a big mistake, for all of us have had to act in haste. Taken by itself, it is a common mistake and is unavoidable because of the extremely difficult objective conditions. All the more reason, therefore, to treat factional, controversial issues with the utmost caution; for in such matters even not very hot-headed persons—something, I'm afraid, I cannot say about my opponent—may all too easily fall into this error. To illustrate my point, and to proceed at once to the heart of the matter, let me read you the chief of Trotsky's theses.

In his pamphlet, towards the end of thesis 12, he writes:

"We observe the fact that as economic tasks move into the foreground, many trade unionists take an ever more aggressive and uncompromising stand against the prospect of 'coalescence' and the practical conclusions that follow from it. Among them we find Comrades Tomsy and Lozovsky.

"What is more, many trade-unionists, balking at the new tasks and methods, tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of corporative exclusiveness and hostility for the new men who are being drawn into the given branch of the economy, thereby actually fostering the survivals of craft-unionism among the organised workers."

I could quote many similar passages from Trotsky's pamphlet. I ask, by way of factional statement: Is it becoming for such an influential person, such a prominent leader, to attack his Party comrades in this way? I am sure that 99 per cent of the comrades, excepting those involved in the quarrel, will say that this should not be done.

I could well understand such a statement if Comrades Tomsy and Lozovsky were guilty, or could be suspected of being guilty, of, say, having flatly refused to sign the Brest Peace Treaty, or of having flatly opposed the war. The revolutionary interest is higher than formal democracy. But it is fundamentally wrong to approach the subject in such haste at the present moment. It won't do at all. This point says that many trade-unionists tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of hostility and exclusiveness. What does that mean? What sort of talk is this? Is it the right kind of language? Is it the right approach? I had earlier said that I might succeed in acting as a "buffer" and staying out of the discussion, because it is harmful to fight with Trotsky—it does the Republic, the Party, and all of us a lot of harm—but when this pamphlet came out, I felt I had to speak up.

Trotsky writes that "many trade-unionists tend to cultivate a spirit of hostility for the new men". How so? If that is true, those who are doing so should be named. Since this is not done, it is merely a shake-up, a bureaucratic approach to the business. Even if there is a spirit of hostility for the new men, one should not say a thing like that. Trotsky accuses Lozovsky and Tomsy of bureaucratic practices. I would say the reverse is true. It is no use reading any further because the approach has spoiled everything; he has poured a spoonful of tar into the honey, and no matter how much honey he may add now, the whole is already spoiled.

Whose fault is it that many trade-unionists tend to cultivate a spirit of hostility for the new men? Of course, a

bufferite or a Tsektranite will say it is the trade-unionists'.

The fact is that in this case idle fancy and invention have accumulated like the snowdrifts in the storm outside. But, comrades, we must sort things out and get at the substance. And it is that a spirit of hostility has been aroused among the masses by a number of tactless actions. My opponent asserts that certain people have been cultivating a spirit of hostility. This shows that the question is seen in the wrong light. We must sort things out. The All-Russia Conference was held in November, and that is where the "shake-up" catchword was launched. Trotsky was wrong in uttering it. Politically it is clear that such an approach will cause a split and bring down the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We must understand that trade unions are not government departments, like People's Commissariats, but comprise the whole organised proletariat; that they are a special type of institution and cannot be approached in this way. And when there arose this question of a wrong approach, latent with the danger of a split, I said: "Don't talk about any broad discussion for the time being; go to the commission and examine the matter carefully over there." But the comrades said: "No, we can't do that; it is a violation of democracy." Comrade Bukharin went so far as to talk about the "sacred slogan of workers' democracy". Those are his very words. When I read that I nearly crossed myself. (*Laughter.*) I insist that a mistake always has a modest beginning and then grows up. Disagreements always start from small things. A slight cut is commonplace, but if it festers, it may result in a fatal illness. And this thing here is a festering wound. In November, there was talk about a shake-up; by December, it had become a big mistake.

The December Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee was against us. The majority sided with Trotsky and carried Trotsky and Bukharin's resolution, which you must have read. But even the C.C. members who did not sympathise with us had to admit that the water transport workers had more right on their side than Tsektran. That is a fact. When I ask what Tsektran's fault was, the answer is not that they had brought pressure to bear—that goes to

their credit—but that they had allowed bureaucratic excesses.

But once you have realised that you had allowed excesses you ought to rectify them, instead of arguing against rectification. That is all there is to it. It will take decades to overcome the evils of bureaucracy. It is a very difficult struggle, and anyone who says we can rid ourselves of bureaucratic practices overnight by adopting anti-bureaucratic platforms is nothing but a quack with a bent for fine words. Bureaucratic excesses must be rectified right away. We must detect and rectify them without calling bad good, or black white. The workers and peasants realise that they have still to learn the art of government, but they are also very well aware that there are bureaucratic excesses, and it is a double fault to refuse to correct them. This must be done in good time, as the water transport workers have pointed out, and not only when your attention is called to it.

Even the best workers make mistakes. There are excellent workers in Tsektran, and we shall appoint them, and correct their bureaucratic excesses. Comrade Trotsky says that Comrades Tomskey and Lozovsky—trade-unionists both—are guilty of cultivating in their midst a spirit of hostility for the new men. But this is monstrous. Only someone in the lunatic fringe can say a thing like that.

This haste leads to arguments, platforms and accusations, and eventually creates the impression that everything is rotten.

You know when people fall out it only takes them a couple of days to start abusing each other's relatives down to the tenth generation. You ask: "What are you quarrelling over?" "Oh, his aunt was this, and his grandfather was that." "I don't mean now; how did the whole thing start?" It turns out that in the course of two days a heap of disagreements has piled up.

Tsektran has allowed excesses in a number of cases, and these were harmful and unnecessary bureaucratic excesses. People are liable to allow excesses everywhere. There are departments with a staff of 30,000 in Moscow alone. That is no joke. There's something to be corrected, there's a wall to be scaled. There must be no fear, no thought of causing

offence or dissension. To start a factional struggle and accuse Tomskey of cultivating among the masses a spirit of hostility for the Tsektranites is utterly to distort the facts, absolutely to spoil all the work, and entirely to damage all relations with the trade unions. But the trade unions embrace the whole proletariat. If this thing is persisted in and voted on by platforms, it will lead to the downfall of the Soviet power.

If the Party falls out with the trade unions, the fault lies with the Party, and this spells certain doom for the Soviet power. We have no other mainstay but the millions of proletarians, who may not be class conscious, are often ignorant, backward and illiterate, but who, being proletarians, follow their own Party. For twenty years they have regarded this Party as their own. Next comes a class which is not ours, which may side with us, if we are wise and if we pursue a correct policy within our own class. We have now reached the supreme moment of our revolution: we have roused the proletarian masses and the masses of poor peasants in the rural areas to give us their conscious support. No revolution has ever done this before. There is no class that can overthrow us: the majority of the proletarians and the rural poor are behind us. Nothing can ruin us but our own mistakes. This "but" is the whole point. If we cause a split, for which we are to blame, everything will collapse because the trade unions are not only an official institution, but also the source of all our power. They are the class which the economics of capitalism has converted into the economic amalgamator, and which through its industry brings together millions of scattered peasants. That is why one proletarian has more strength than 200 peasants.

That is just why Trotsky's whole approach is wrong. I could have analysed any one of his theses, but it would take me hours, and you would all be bored to death. Every thesis reveals the same thoroughly wrong approach: "Many trade-unionists tend to cultivate a spirit of hostility." There is a spirit of hostility for us among the trade union rank and file because of our mistakes, and the bureaucratic practices up on top, including myself, because it was I who appointed Glavpolitput. What is to be done? Are things to be set right? We must correct Tsektran's excesses, once

we realise that we are a solid workers' party, with a firm footing, and a head on its shoulders. We are not renouncing either the method of appointment, or the dictatorship. This will not be tolerated by workers with a twenty years' schooling in Russia. If we condone this mistake, we shall surely be brought down. It is a mistake, and that is the root of the matter.

Trotsky says Lozovsky and Tomskey are balking at the new tasks. To prove this will put a new face on the matter. What are the new tasks?

Here we are told: "production atmosphere", "industrial democracy" and "role in production". I said, at the very outset, in the December 30 discussion, that that was nothing but words, which the workers did not understand, and that it was all part of the task of production propaganda. We are not renouncing the dictatorship, or one-man management; these remain, I will support them, but I refuse to defend excesses and stupidity. "Production atmosphere" is a funny phrase that will make the workers laugh. Saying it more simply and clearly is all part of production propaganda. But a special institution has been set up for the purpose.

About enhancing the role of the trade unions in production, I replied on December 30 and in the press, and said that we have Comrade Rudzutak's resolution, which was adopted at the Conference on November 5. Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin said that Tsektran had drafted this resolution. Although this has been refuted, let me ask: if they had drafted it, who, in that case, is kicking? The trade unions adopted it and Tsektran drafted it. Well and good. There's no point, therefore, in quarrelling like children and raising factional disagreements. Has Comrade Trotsky brought up any new tasks? No, he hasn't. The fact is that his new points are all worse than the old ones. Comrade Trotsky is campaigning to get the Party to condemn those who are balking at new tasks, and Tomskey and Lozovsky have been named as the greatest sinners.

Rudzutak's resolution is couched in clearer and simpler language, and has nothing in it like "production atmosphere" or "industrial democracy". It says clearly that every trade union member must be aware of the vital necessity of

increasing productivity in the country. It is put in simple and intelligible language. All this is stated better than in Trotsky's theses, and more fully, because bonuses in kind and disciplinary courts have been added. Without the latter, all this talk of getting the transport system going and improving things is humbug. Let us set up commissions and disciplinary courts. In this matter Tsektran has allowed excesses. We propose calling a spade a spade: it is no use covering up excesses with new tasks; they must be corrected. We have no intention of renouncing coercion. No sober-minded worker would go so far as to say that we could now dispense with coercion, or that we could dissolve the trade unions, or let them have the whole of industry. I can imagine Comrade Shlyapnikov blurting out a thing like that.

In the whole of his speech there is one excellent passage on the experience of the Sormovo Works, where, he said, absenteeism was reduced by 30 per cent. This is said to be true. But I am a suspicious sort, I suggest that a commission be sent there to investigate and make a comparison of Nizhni-Novgorod and Petrograd. There is no need to have a meeting about this: it can all be done in commission. Trotsky says that there is an attempt to prevent coalescence, but that is nonsense. He says we must go forward. Indeed, if the engine is good; but if it isn't, we must put it into reverse. The Party will benefit from this, because we must study experience.

Production is at a standstill, but some people have been busy producing bad theses. This question requires study and experience. You are trade-unionists and miners who are doing their job. Now since you have taken up this question, you must inquire, demand figures, verify them over and over again—don't take any statements for granted—and when you have done that, let us know the result. If it is good, then go on; if it is bad, go back. This means work, not talk. All this should have been done at Party meetings.

At the Eighth Congress of Soviets, I said that we ought to have less politics. When I said that I thought we would have no more political mistakes, but here we are, three years after the Soviet revolution, talking about syndicalism. This is a shame. If I had been told six months ago that I would be writing about syndicalism, I would have said that

I preferred to write about the Donbas. Now we are being distracted, and the Party is being dragged back. A small mistake is growing into a big one. That is where Comrade Shlyapnikov comes in. Point 16 of Comrade Trotsky's theses gives a correct definition of Shlyapnikov's mistake.

In an effort to act the buffer, Bukharin clutched at Shlyapnikov, but it would have been better for him to clutch at a straw. He promises the unions mandatory nominations, which means they are to have the final say in appointments. But that is exactly what Shlyapnikov is saying. Marxists have been combating syndicalism all over the world. We have been fighting in the Party for over twenty years, and we have given the workers visual proof that the Party is a special kind of thing which needs forward-looking men prepared for sacrifice; that it does make mistakes, but corrects them; that it guides and selects men who know the way and the obstacles before us. It does not deceive the workers. It never makes promises that cannot be kept. And if you skip the trade unions you will make a hash of everything we have achieved over the past three years. Comrade Bukharin, with whom I discussed this mistake, said: "Comrade Lenin, you are picking on us."

I take mandatory nominations to mean that they will be made under the direction of the Party's Central Committee. But in that case, what are the rights we are giving them? There will then be no chance of having a bloc. The workers and the peasants are two distinct classes. Let us talk about vesting the rights in the trade unions when electricity has spread over the whole country—if we manage to achieve this in twenty years it will be incredibly quick work, for it cannot be done quickly. To talk about it before then will be deceiving the workers. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most stable thing in the world because it has won confidence by its deeds, and because the Party took great care to prevent diffusion.

What does that mean?

Does every worker know how to run the state? People working in the practical sphere know that this is not true, that millions of our organised workers are going through what we always said the trade unions were, namely, a school of communism and administration. When they have



attended this school for a number of years they will have learned to administer, but the going is slow. We have not even abolished illiteracy. We know that workers in touch with peasants are liable to fall for non-proletarian slogans. How many of the workers have been engaged in government? A few thousand throughout Russia and no more. If we say that it is not the Party but the trade unions that put up the candidates and administer, it may sound very democratic and might help us to catch a few votes, but not for long. It will be fatal for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Read the decision of the Second Congress of the Comintern<sup>193</sup>. Its resolutions and decisions have gone round the world. The recent Socialist Congress in France revealed that we have won a majority in a country where chauvinism is most virulent; we have split the Party and ejected the corrupt leaders, and we did this in opposition to the syndicalists.<sup>194</sup> And all the best workers and leaders there have adopted our theory. Even syndicalists—revolutionary syndicalists—are siding with us all over the world. I myself have met American syndicalists who, after a visit to this country, say: "Indeed, you cannot lead the proletariat without a Party." You all know that this is a fact. And it is quite improper for the proletariat to rush into the arms of syndicalism and talk about mandatory nominations to all-Russia producers' congresses". This is dangerous and jeopardizes the Party's guiding role. Only a very small percentage of the workers in the country are now organised. The majority of the peasants will follow the Party because its policy is correct, and because, during the Brest peace ordeal, it was capable of making temporary sacrifices and retreats, which was the right thing to do. Are we to throw all this away? Was it all a windfall? No, it was all won by the Party in decades of hard work. Everybody believes the word of the Bolsheviks, who have had twenty years of Party training.

To govern you need an army of steeled revolutionary Communists. We have it, and it is called the Party. All this syndicalist nonsense about mandatory nominations of producers must go into the wastepaper basket. To proceed on those lines would mean thrusting the Party aside and making the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia impossible.

This is the view I believe it to be my Party duty to put to you. It is, in my opinion, enunciated in the form of practical propositions in the platform called *Draft Decision of the Tenth Congress of the R.C.P.* and signed by Lenin, Zinoviev, Tomskey, Rudzutak, Kalinin, Kamenev, Lozovsky, Petrovsky, Sergeyev and Stalin. Lozovsky, who is not a member of the Central Committee, was included because he was on the trade union commission from which Shlyapnikov and Lutovinov, unfortunately, resigned. It is up to the workers to decide whether Shlyapnikov was right in resigning, and he will be censured, if he was wrong. I am convinced that all class-conscious workers will accept this platform and that the present disagreements in our Party will be confined to fever at the top. I am sure the workers will put them right, remain at their posts, maintain Party discipline and join in an efficient but careful drive to increase production and secure full victory for our cause. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Published in the *Bulleten Vtorogo vserossiiskogo syezda gornorabochikh* (Bulletin of the Second All-Russia Congress of Miners) No. 1, January 25, 1921

*Collected Works*, Vol. 32,  
pp. 54-63

**Speech Closing the Discussion  
Delivered at a Meeting of the Communist Group  
of the Congress  
January 24**

Comrades, I should like to begin by speaking about who is trying to intimidate whom, and about Comrade Shlyapnikov, who has tried hard to scare us. Everyone here said Lenin was trying to raise the bogey of syndicalism. This is ridiculous because the very idea of using syndicalism as a bogey is ridiculous. I think we ought to start with our programmes, by reading the Programme of the Communist Party to see what it says. Comrades Trotsky and Shlyapnikov referred to the same passage which happens to be its Paragraph 5. Let me read it to you in full:

“5. The organisational apparatus of socialised industry should rely chiefly on the trade unions, which must to an ever increasing degree divest themselves of the narrow craft-union spirit and become large industrial associations, embracing the majority, and eventually all of the workers in the given branch of industry.”

Comrade Shlyapnikov quoted this passage in his speech. But, if the figures were correct, those who were managing the organisations constituted 60 per cent, and these consisted of workers. Furthermore, when reference is made to the Programme, this should be done properly, bearing in mind that Party members know it thoroughly, and do not confine themselves to reading one extract, as Trotsky and Shlyapnikov have done. Comrades, there is much history to show that the workers cannot organise otherwise than

by industries. That is why the idea of industrial unionism has been adopted all over the world. That is for the time being, of course. There is talk about the need to cast off the narrow craft-union spirit. I ask you, has this been done to, say, a tenth? Of course, not, is the sincere answer. Why forget this?

Who is it who says to the unions: "You have not yet divested yourselves of the narrow craft-union spirit, and must get on with it?" It is the R.C.P. which does this in its Programme. Read it. To depart from this is to abandon the Programme for syndicalism. Despite the hints at Lenin's "intimidation", the Programme is still there. You depart from it by quoting the first part and forgetting the second. In which direction? Towards syndicalism. Let me read further:

"The trade unions being, on the strength of the laws of the Soviet Republic and established practice, participants in all the local and central organs of industrial management, should eventually arrive at a *de facto* concentration in their hands of the whole administration of the whole national economy, as a single economic entity."

Everyone makes references to this paragraph. What does it say? Something that is absolutely indisputable: "should eventually arrive." It does not say that they are arriving. It does not contain the exaggeration which, once made, reduces the whole to an absurdity. It says, "should eventually arrive". Arrive where? At a *de facto* concentration and administration. When are you due to arrive at this point? This calls for education, and it must be so organised as to teach everyone the art of administration. Now can you say, with a clear conscience, that the trade unions are able to fill any number of executive posts with suitable men at any time? After all, it is not six million, but sixty thousand or, say, a hundred thousand men that you need to fill all the executive posts. Can they nominate this number? No, they cannot—not yet—as anyone will say who is not chasing after formulas and theses and is not misled by the loudest voices. Years of educational work lie ahead for the Party, ranging from the abolition of illiteracy to the

whole round of Party work in the trade unions. An enormous amount of work must be done in the trade unions to achieve this properly. This is exactly what it says: "should eventually arrive at a *de facto* concentration in their hands of the whole administration of the whole national economy". It does not say branches of industry, as Trotsky does in his theses. One of his first theses quotes the Programme correctly, but another one says: organisation of industry. I am afraid that is no way to quote. When you are writing some theses and you want to quote the Programme, you must read it to the end. Anyone who takes the trouble to read this Paragraph 5 right through and give it ten minutes' thought will see that Shlyapnikov has departed from the Programme, and that Trotsky has leaped over it. Let's read Paragraph 5 to the end:

"The trade unions, ensuring in this way indissoluble ties between the central state administration, the national economy and the broad masses of working people, should draw the latter into direct economic management on the widest possible scale. At the same time, the participation of the trade unions in economic management and their activity in drawing the broad masses into this work are the principal means of combating the bureaucratisation of the economic apparatus of the Soviet power and making possible the establishment of truly popular control over the results of production."

You find that you must first achieve *de facto* concentration. But what are you ensuring now? First, there are the ties within the central state administration. This is a huge machine. You have not yet taught us to master it. And so, you must ensure ties between the central state administration—that's one; national economy—that's two; and the masses—that's three. Have we got those ties? Are the trade unions capable of administration? Anybody over thirty years of age with some little practical experience of Soviet organisation will laugh at this. Read the following:

"At the same time, the participation of the trade unions in economic management and their activity in drawing the broad masses into work are the prin-

cial means of combating the bureaucratisation of the economic apparatus of the Soviet power and making possible the establishment of truly popular control over the results of production."

First, there is need to create ties between the central state organisations. We have no intention of concealing this malaise, and our Programme says: ensure ties with the masses, and ensure the participation of the trade unions in economic management. There are no loud words in this. When you have done that in such a way as to reduce absenteeism by, say, 3 per cent—let alone 30—we shall say: you have done a fine job. Our present Programme says: "...the participation of the trade unions in economic management and their activity in drawing the broad masses into this work...." It does not contain a single promise or a single loud word; nor does it say anything about your doing the electing. It does not resort to demagogy, but says that there is an ignorant, backward mass, that there are trade unions, which are so strong that they are leading the whole of the peasantry, and which themselves follow the lead of the Party, with a twenty-year schooling in the fight against tsarism. No country has gone through what Russia has, and that is the secret of our strength. Why is this regarded as a miracle? Because in a peasant country, only the trade unions can provide the economic bonds to unite millions of scattered farms, if this mass of six million has faith in its Party, and continues to follow it as it had hitherto. That is the secret of our strength, and the way it works is a political question. How can a minority govern a huge peasant country, and why are we so composed? After our three years' experience, there is no external or internal force that can break us. Provided we do not make any extra-stupid mistakes leading to splits, we shall retain our positions; otherwise everything will go to the dogs. That is why, when Comrade Shlyapnikov says in his platform:

"The All-Russia Congress of Producers shall elect a body to administer the whole national economy,"

I say: read the whole of Paragraph 5 of our Programme, which I have read out to you, and you will see that there

is no attempt at intimidation either on Lenin's or anyone else's part.

Shlyapnikov concluded his speech by saying: "We must eliminate bureaucratic methods in government and the national economy." I say this is demagogy. We have had this question of bureaucratic practices on the agenda since last July. After the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P. last July, Preobrazhensky also asked: Are we not suffering from bureaucratic excesses? Watch out! In August, the Central Committee endorsed Zinoviev's letter: Combat the evils of bureaucracy. The Party Conference met in September, and endorsed it. So, after all, it was not Lenin who invented some new path, as Trotsky says, but the Party which said: "Watch out: there's a new malaise." Preobrazhensky raised this question in July; we had Zinoviev's letter in August; there was the Party Conference in September and we had a long report on bureaucratic practices at the Congress of Soviets in December. The malaise is there. In our 1919 Programme we wrote that bureaucratic practices existed. Whoever comes out and demands a stop to bureaucratic practices is a demagogue. Shlyapnikov was always like that, and still is—there is a bit of that about him. When you are called upon to "put a stop to bureaucratic practices", it is demagogy. It is nonsense. We shall be fighting the evils of bureaucracy for many years to come, and whoever thinks otherwise is playing demagogue and cheating, because overcoming the evils of bureaucracy requires hundreds of measures, wholesale literacy, culture and participation in the activity of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. Shlyapnikov has been People's Commissar for Labour and People's Commissar for Trade and Industry. Has *he* put a stop to bureaucratic practices? Kiselyov has been on the Central Board of the Textile Industry. Has *he* put a stop to the evils of bureaucracy?

Let me say this once again: We shall have grown up when all our congresses resolve themselves into sections and marshal the facts about coalescence among the millers and the Donbas miners. But writing a string of useless platforms shows up our poor economic leadership. I repeat that nothing can break us, neither external nor internal forces, if we do not lead things up to a split. I say that Tsektran is

more than a bludgeon, but exaggerating this has led up to a split. Anyone can be guilty of an excess of bureaucratic practices, and the Central Committee is aware of it, and is responsible for it. In this respect, Comrade Trotsky's mistake lies in that he drew up his theses in the wrong spirit. They are all couched in terms of a shake-up, and they have all led to a split in the union. It is not a matter of giving Trotsky bad marks—we are not schoolchildren and have no use for marks—but we must say that his theses are wrong in content and must therefore be rejected.

Published in the *Bulleten*  
*Vtorogo vserossiiskogo syezda*  
*gornorabochikh* (Bulletin of the  
Second All-Russia Congress of  
Miners) No. 2, January 26, 1921

*Collected Works*, Vol. 32,  
pp. 64-68



---

## Once Again on the Trade Unions, The Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin

The Party discussion and the factional struggle, which is of a type that occurs before a congress—before and in connection with the impending elections to the Tenth Congress of the R.C.P.—are waxing hot. The first factional pronouncement, namely, the one made by Comrade Trotsky on behalf of “a number of responsible workers” in his “platform pamphlet” (*The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions*, with a preface dated December 25, 1920), was followed by a sharp pronouncement (the reader will see from what follows that it was deservedly sharp) by the Petrograd organisation of the R.C.P. (“Appeal to the Party”, published in *Petrogradskaya Pravda*<sup>195</sup> on January 6, 1921, and in the Party’s Central Organ, the Moscow *Pravda*, on January 13, 1921). The Moscow Committee then came out against the Petrograd organisation (in the same issue of *Pravda*). Then appeared a verbatim report, published by the bureau of the R.C.P. group of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, of the discussion that took place on December 30, 1920, at a very large and important Party meeting, namely, that of the R.C.P. group at the Eighth Congress of Soviets. It is entitled *The Role of the Trade Unions in Production* (with a preface dated January 6, 1921). This, of course, is by no means all of the discussion material. Party meetings to discuss these issues are being held almost everywhere. On December 30, 1920, I spoke at a meeting in conditions in which, as I put it then, I “departed

from the rules of procedure", i.e., in conditions in which I could not take part in the discussion or hear the preceding and subsequent speakers. I shall now try to make amends and express myself in a more "orderly" fashion.

### The Danger of Factional Pronouncements to the Party

Is Comrade Trotsky's pamphlet *The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions* a factional pronouncement? Irrespective of its content, is there any danger to the Party in a pronouncement of this kind? Attempts to hush up this question are a particularly favourite exercise with the members of the Moscow Committee (with the exception of Comrade Trotsky, of course), who see the factionalism of the Petrograd comrades, and with Comrade Bukharin, who, however, felt obliged, on December 30, 1920, to make the following statement on behalf of the "buffer group":

"...when a train seems to be heading for a crash, a buffer is not a bad thing at all" (report of the December 30, 1920 discussion, p. 45).

So there is some danger of a crash. Can we conceive of intelligent members of the Party being indifferent to the question of how, where and when this danger arose?

Trotsky's pamphlet opens with the statement that "it is the fruit of collective work", that "a number of responsible workers, particularly trade-unionists (members of the Presidium of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, the Central Committee of the Metalworkers' Union, Tsektran and others)" took part in compiling it, and that it is a "platform pamphlet". At the end of thesis 4 we read that "the forthcoming Party Congress will have to choose [Trotsky's italics] between the two trends within the trade union movement".

If this is not the formation of a faction by a member of the Central Committee, if this does not mean "heading for a crash", then let Comrade Bukharin, or anyone of his fellow-thinkers, explain to the Party any other possible meaning of the words "factionalism", and the Party "seems to be heading for a crash". Who can be more purblind than

men wishing to play the "buffer" and *closing their eyes to such a "danger of a crash"?*

Just imagine: after the Central Committee had spent two plenary meetings (November 9 and December 7) in an unprecedentedly long, detailed and heated discussion of Comrade Trotsky's original draft theses and of the entire trade union policy that he advocates for the Party, one member of the Central Committee, *one out of nineteen*, forms a group outside the Central Committee and presents its "collective work" as a "platform", inviting the Party Congress "to choose between *two* trends"! This, incidentally, quite apart from the fact that Comrade Trotsky's announcement of two and only two trends on December 25, 1920, despite Bukharin's coming out as a "buffer" on November 9, is a glaring exposure of the Bukharin group's true role as abettors of the worst and most harmful sort of factionalism. But I ask any Party member: Don't you find this attack and insistence upon "choosing" between two trends in the trade union movement rather sudden? What is there for us to do but stare in astonishment at the fact that after three years of the proletarian dictatorship even one Party member can be found to "attack" the two trends issue *in this way?*

Nor is that all. Look at the factional attacks in which this pamphlet abounds. In the very first thesis we find a threatening "gesture" at "certain workers in the trade union movement" who are thrown "back to trade-unionism, pure and simple, which the Party repudiated in principle long ago" (evidently the Party is represented by only one member of the Central Committee's nineteen). Thesis 8 grandiloquently condemns "the craft conservatism prevalent among the top trade union functionaries" (note the truly bureaucratic concentration of attention on the "top"! ). Thesis 11 opens with the astonishingly tactful, conclusive and business-like (what is the most polite word for it?) "hint", that the "majority of the trade-unionists ... give only formal, that is, *verbal*, recognition" to the resolutions of the Party's Ninth Congress.

We find that we have some very authoritative judges before us who say the *majority* (!) of the trade-unionists give only *verbal* recognition to the Party's decisions.

Thesis 12 reads:

"...many trade-unionists take an ever more aggressive and uncompromising stand against the prospect of 'coalescence'.... Among them we find Comrades Tomsy and Lozovsky.

"What is more, many trade-unionists, balking at the new tasks and methods, tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of corporative exclusiveness and hostility for the new men who are being drawn into the given branch of the economy, thereby actually fostering the survivals of craft-unionism among the organised workers."

Let the reader go over these arguments carefully and ponder them. They simply abound in "gems". Firstly, the pronouncement must be assessed from the standpoint of factionalism! Imagine what Trotsky would have said, and how he would have said it, if Tomsy had published a platform accusing Trotsky and "many" military workers of cultivating the spirit of bureaucracy, fostering the survivals of savagery, etc. What is the "role" of Bukharin, Preobrazhensky, Serebryakov and the others who fail to see—positively fail to note, utterly fail to note—the aggressiveness and factionalism of all *this*, and refuse to see how much more factional it is than the pronouncement of the Petrograd comrades?

Secondly, take a closer look at the approach to the subject: many trade-unionists "tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit".... This is an out-and-out bureaucratic approach. The whole point, you see, is not the level of development and living conditions of the masses in their millions, but the "spirit" which Tomsy and Lozovsky tend to cultivate "in their midst".

Thirdly, Comrade Trotsky has unwittingly revealed the *essence* of the whole controversy which he and the Bukharin and Co. "buffer" have been evading and camouflaging with such care.

What is the point at issue? Is it the fact that many trade-unionists are balking at the new tasks and methods and tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of hostility for the new officials?

Or is it that the masses of organised workers are legitimately protesting and inevitably showing readiness to throw out the new officials who refuse to rectify the useless and harmful excesses of bureaucracy?

Is it that someone has refused to understand the "new tasks and methods"?

Or is it that someone is making a clumsy attempt to cover up his defence of certain useless and harmful excesses of bureaucracy with a lot of talk about new tasks and methods?

It is this *essence* of the dispute that the reader should bear in mind.

### Formal Democracy and the Revolutionary Interest

"Workers' democracy is free from fetishes", Comrade Trotsky writes in his theses, which are the "fruit of collective work". "Its sole consideration is the revolutionary interest" (thesis 23).

Comrade Trotsky's theses have landed him in a mess. That part of them which is correct is not new and, what is more, turns *against* him. That which is new is all wrong.

I have written out Comrade Trotsky's correct propositions. They turn against him not only on the point in thesis 23 (Glavpolitput) but on the others as well.

Under the rules of formal democracy, Trotsky *had a right* to come out with a factional platform even against the whole of the Central Committee. That is indisputable. What is also indisputable is that the Central Committee had endorsed this formal right by its decision on freedom of discussion adopted on December 24, 1920. Bukharin, the buffer, recognises this formal right for Trotsky, but not for the Petrograd organisation, probably because on December 30, 1920, he talked himself into "the sacred slogan of workers' democracy" (verbatim report, p. 45)....

Well, and what about the revolutionary interest?

Will any serious-minded person who is not blinded by the factional egotism of "Tsektran" or of the "buffer" faction, will anyone in his right mind say that *such* a pronouncement on the trade union issue by *such* a prominent leader as Trotsky does promote *the revolutionary interest*?

Can it be denied that, even if Trotsky's "new tasks and methods" were as sound as they are in fact unsound (of which later), his very approach would be damaging to himself, the Party, the trade union movement, the training of millions of trade union members and the Republic?

It looks as if the kind Bukharin and his group call themselves a "buffer" because they have firmly decided *not to think* about the obligations this title imposes upon them.

### **The Political Danger of Splits in the Trade Union Movement**

Everyone knows that big disagreements sometimes grow out of minute differences, which may at first appear to be altogether insignificant. A slight cut or scratch, of the kind everyone has had scores of in the course of his life, may become very dangerous and even fatal *if* it festers and *if* blood poisoning sets in. This may happen in any kind of conflict, even a purely personal one. This also happens in politics.

Any difference, even an insignificant one, may become politically dangerous if it has a chance to grow into a split, and I mean the kind of split that will shake and destroy the whole political edifice, or lead, to use Comrade Bukharin's simile, to a crash.

Clearly, in a country under the dictatorship of the proletariat, a split in the ranks of the proletariat, or between the proletarian party and the mass of the proletariat is not just dangerous; it is extremely dangerous, especially when the proletariat constitutes a small minority of the population. And splits in the trade union movement (which, as I tried hard to emphasise in my speech on December 30, 1920, is a movement of the almost completely organised proletariat) mean precisely splits in the mass of the proletariat.

That is why, when the whole thing started at the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions on November 2-6, 1920 (and that is exactly where it did start), and when right after the Conference—no, I am mistaken, *during* that conference—Comrade Tomskey appeared before the Political Bureau in high dudgeon and, fully supported by Comrade Rudzutak, the most even-tempered of men, began to relate that at the conference Comrade Trotsky had talked about "shaking up" the trade unions and that he, Tomskey, had opposed this—when that happened, I decided there and then that policy (i.e., the Party's trade union policy) lay at

the root of the controversy, and that Comrade Trotsky, with his "shake-up" policy against Comrade Tomsy, was entirely in the wrong. For, *even if the "shake-up" policy were partly justified* by the "new tasks and methods" (Trotsky's thesis 12), it cannot be tolerated at the present time, and in the present situation because it threatens a split.

It now seems to Comrade Trotsky that it is "an utter travesty" to ascribe the "shake-up-from-above" policy to him (L. Trotsky, "A Reply to the Petrograd Comrades", *Pravda* No. 9, January 15, 1921). But "shake-up" is a real "catchword", not only in the sense that after being uttered by Comrade Trotsky at the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions it has, you might say, "caught on" throughout the Party and the trade unions. Unfortunately, it remains true even today in the much more profound sense that it alone epitomises *the whole spirit, the whole trend* of the platform pamphlet entitled *The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions*. Comrade Trotsky's platform pamphlet is shot through with the spirit of the "shake-up-from-above" policy. Just recall the accusation made against Comrade Tomsy, or "many trade-unionists", that they "tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of hostility for the new men"!

But whereas the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions (November 2-6, 1920) only saw the makings of the atmosphere fraught with splits, the split within Tsektran became a fact in early December 1920.

This event is basic and essential to an understanding of the political essence of our controversies; and Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin are mistaken if they think hushing it up will help matters. A hush-up in this case does not produce a "buffer" effect but rouses passions; for the question has not only been placed on the agenda by developments, but has been emphasised by Comrade Trotsky in his platform pamphlet. It is this pamphlet that repeatedly, in the passages I have quoted, particularly in thesis 12, raises the question of whether the essence of the matter is that "many trade unionists tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of hostility for the new men", or that the "hostility" of the *masses* is legitimate in view of certain useless and harmful excesses of bureaucracy, for example, in Tsektran.

The issue was bluntly and properly stated by Comrade Zinoviev in his very first speech on December 30, 1920, when he said that it was "Comrade Trotsky's immoderate adherents" who had brought about a split. Perhaps that is why Comrade Bukharin abusively described Comrade Zinoviev's speech as "a lot of hot air"? But every Party member who reads the verbatim report of the December 30, 1920 discussion will see that that is not true. He will find that it is Comrade Zinoviev who quotes and operates with the facts, and that it is Trotsky and Bukharin who indulge most in intellectualist verbosity minus the facts.

When Comrade Zinoviev said, "Tsektran stands on feet of clay and has already split into three parts", Comrade Sosnovsky interrupted and said:

"That is something you have encouraged" (verbatim report, p. 15).

Now this is a serious charge. If it were proved, there would, of course, be no place on the Central Committee, in the R.C.P., or in the trade unions of our Republic for those who were guilty of *encouraging a split* even in one of the trade unions. Happily, this serious charge was advanced in a thoughtless manner by a comrade who, I regret to say, has now and again been "carried away" by thoughtless polemics before this. Comrade Sosnovsky has even managed to insert "a fly in the ointment" of his otherwise excellent articles, say, on production propaganda, and this has tended to negate all its pluses. Some people (like Comrade Bukharin) are so happily constituted that they are incapable of injecting venom into their attacks even when the fight is bitterest; others, less happily constituted, are liable to do so, and do this all too often. Comrade Sosnovsky would do well to watch his step in this respect, and perhaps even ask his friends to help out.

But, some will say, the charge is there, even if it has been made in a thoughtless, unfortunate and patently "factional" form. In a serious matter, the badly worded truth is preferable to the hush-up.

That the matter is serious is beyond doubt, for, let me say this again, the *crux* of the issue lies in this area to a greater extent than is generally suspected. Fortunately, we are in possession of sufficiently objective and conclusive facts to pro-



vide an answer *in substance* to Comrade Sosnovsky's point.

First of all, there is on the same page of the verbatim report Comrade Zinoviev's statement denying Comrade Sosnovsky's allegation and making precise references to conclusive facts. Comrade Zinoviev showed that Comrade Trotsky's accusation (made obviously, let me add, in an outburst of factional zeal) was quite a different one from Comrade Sosnovsky's; Comrade Trotsky's accusation was that Comrade Zinoviev's *speech at the September All-Russia Conference of the R.C.P.* had helped to bring about or had brought about the split. (This charge, let me say in parenthesis, is quite untenable, if only because Zinoviev's September speech was approved in substance by the Central Committee and the Party, and there has been no formal protest against it since.)

Comrade Zinoviev replied that at the Central Committee meeting Comrade Rudzutak had used the minutes to prove that "*long before* any of my [Zinoviev's] speeches and the All-Russia Conference the question [concerning certain unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy in Tsektran] had been examined in Siberia, on the Volga, in the North and in the South".

That is an absolutely precise and clear-cut statement of fact. It was made by Comrade Zinoviev in his first speech before thousands of the most responsible Party members, and his facts were *not* refuted either by Comrade Trotsky, who spoke *twice later*, or by Comrade Bukharin, who *also spoke later*.

Secondly, the December 7, 1920 resolution of the Central Committee's Plenary Meeting concerning the dispute between the Communists working in water transport and the Communist group at the Tsektran Conference, given in the same verbatim report, was an even more definite and official refutation of Comrade Sosnovsky's charges. The part of the resolution dealing with Tsektran says:

"In connection with the dispute between Tsektran and the water transport workers, the Central Committee resolves: 1) To set up a Water Transport Section within the amalgamated Tsektran; 2) To convene a congress of railwaymen and water transport workers in February to hold normal elections to a new Tsektran; 3) To authorise the old Tsektran to function until then; 4) To abolish Glavpolitvod and Glav-

politput immediately and to transfer all their funds and resources to the trade union on normal democratic lines."

This shows that the water transport workers, far from being censured, are deemed to be *right* in every essential. Yet *none* of the C.C. members who had signed the common platform of January 14, 1921 (except Kamenev) voted for the resolution. (The platform referred to is the *Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions. Draft Decision of the Tenth Congress of the R.C.P.*, submitted to the Central Committee by a group of members of the Central Committee and the trade union commission. Among those who signed it was Lozovsky, a member of the trade union commission but not of the Central Committee. The others were Tomskey, Kalinin, Rudzutak, Zinoviev, Stalin, Lenin, Kamenev, Petrovsky and Artyom Sergeyev.)

This resolution was carried *against* the C.C. members listed above, that is, against our group, for we would have voted against allowing the old Tsektran to continue temporarily. Because we were sure to win, Trotsky was forced to vote for Bukharin's resolution, as otherwise our resolution would have been carried. Comrade Rykov, who had been *for* Trotsky in November, took part in the trade union commission's examination of the dispute between Tsektran and the water transport workers in December, and saw that the latter were right.

To sum up: the December 7 majority in the Central Committee consisted of Comrades Trotsky, Bukharin, Preobrazhensky, Serebryakov and other C.C. members who are above suspicion of being biased *against* Tsektran. Yet the substance of their resolution did not censure the water transport workers but Tsektran, which they just stopped short of dissolving there and then. This proves Sosnovsky's charge to be quite groundless.

There is one other point to be dealt with, if we are to leave no room for ambiguity. What were these "certain unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy" to which I have repeatedly referred? Isn't *this* last charge unsupported or exaggerated?

Once again it was Comrade Zinoviev who, in his very first speech on December 30, 1920, provided the answer which was as precise as one could wish. He quoted from

Comrade Zoff's water transport circular of May 3, 1920: "Committee treadmill abolished."<sup>198</sup> Comrade Zinoviev was quite right in saying this was a fundamental error. It exemplified the unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy and the "appointments system". But he said there and then that some appointees were "not half as experienced or as tried" as Comrade Zoff. I have heard Comrade Zoff referred to in the Central Committee as a most valuable worker, and this is fully borne out by my own observations in the Council of Defence. It has not entered anyone's mind either to make scapegoats of such comrades or to undermine their authority (as Comrade Trotsky suggests, without the least justification, on page 25 of his report). Their authority is not being undermined by those who try to correct the "appointees'" mistakes, but by those who would defend them even when they are wrong.

We see, therefore, that the danger of splits within the trade union movement was not imaginary but real. And we find that the actual disagreements really boiled down to a demand that certain unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy, and the appointments system should not be justified or defended, but corrected. That is all there is to it.

### Disagreements on Principle

There being deep and basic disagreements on principle—we may well be asked—do they not serve as vindication for the sharpest and most factional pronouncements? Is it possible to vindicate such a thing as a split, provided there is need to drive home some entirely new idea?

I believe it is, provided of course the disagreements are truly very deep and there is no other way to rectify a wrong trend in the policy of the Party or of the working class.

But the whole point is that there are no such disagreements. Comrade Trotsky has tried to point them out, and failed. A tentative or conciliatory approach had been possible—and necessary—*before* the publication of his pamphlet (December 25) ("such an approach is ruled out even in the case of disagreements and vague new tasks"); but *after*

its publication we had to say: Comrade Trotsky is essentially wrong on all his new points.

This is most evident from a comparison of his theses with Rudzutak's which were adopted by the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions (November 2-6). I quoted the latter in my December 30 speech and in the January 21 issue of *Pravda*. They are fuller and more correct than Trotsky's, and wherever the latter differs from Rudzutak, he is wrong.

Take this famous "industrial democracy", which Comrade Bukharin hastened to insert in the Central Committee's resolution of December 7. It would, of course, be ridiculous to quibble about this ill-conceived brainchild ("tricky flourishes"), if it merely occurred in an article or speech. But, after all, it was Trotsky and Bukharin who put themselves into the ridiculous position by *insisting in their theses* on this very term, which is the one feature that distinguishes their "platforms" from Rudzutak's theses adopted by the trade unions.

The term is theoretically wrong. In the final analysis, every kind of democracy, as political superstructure in general (which must exist until classes have been abolished and a classless society established), serves production and is ultimately determined by the relations of production in a given society. It is, therefore, meaningless to single out "industrial democracy", for this leads to confusion, and the result is a dummy. That is the first point.

The second is that if you look at Bukharin's own explanation given in the resolution of the C.C. Plenary Meeting on December 7, which he drafted, you will find that he says: "Accordingly, the methods of workers democracy must be those of industrial democracy, which means...." Note the "which means"! The fact is that Bukharin opens his appeal to the masses with such an outlandish term that he must *give a gloss* on it. This, I think, is *undemocratic* from the democratic standpoint. You must write for the masses without using terms that require a glossary. This is bad from the "production" standpoint because time is wasted in explaining unnecessary terms. "Which means," he says, "that nomination and seconding of candidates, elections. etc., must proceed with an eye not only to their

political staunchness, but also business efficiency, administrative experience, leadership, and proved concern for the working people's material and spiritual interests."

The reasoning there is obviously artificial and incorrect. For one thing, democracy is more than "nomination and seconding of candidates, elections, etc." Then, again, not all elections should be held with an eye to political staunchness and business efficiency. Comrade Trotsky notwithstanding, an organisation of many millions must have a certain percentage of canvassers and bureaucrats (we shall not be able to make do without good bureaucrats for many years to come). But we do not speak of "canvassing" or "bureaucratic" democracy.

The third point is that it is wrong to consider only the elected, the organisers, the administrators, etc. After all, they constitute a minority of outstanding men. It is the mass, the rank and file that we must consider. Rudzutak has it in simpler, more intelligible and theoretically more correct terms (thesis 6):

"...it must be brought home to each participant in production that his production tasks are appropriate and important; that each must not only take a hand in fulfilling his assignments, but also play an intelligent part in correcting any technical and organisational defects in the sphere of production."

The fourth point is that "industrial democracy" is a term that lends itself to misinterpretation. It may be read as a repudiation of dictatorship and individual authority. It may be read as a suspension of ordinary democracy or a pretext for evading it. Both readings are harmful, and cannot be avoided without long special commentaries.

Rudzutak's plain statement of the same ideas is more correct and more handy. This is indirectly confirmed by Trotsky's parallel of "war democracy" which he draws with his own term in an article, "Industrial Democracy" in *Pravda* of January 11, and which fails to refute that his term is inaccurate and inconvenient (for he side-steps the whole issue and fails to compare his theses with Rudzutak's). Happily, as far as I can recall, we have never had any factional controversy over that kind of term.

Trotsky's "production atmosphere" is even wider of the mark, and Zinoviev had good reason to laugh at it. This

made Trotsky very angry, and he came out with this argument: "We once had a war atmosphere.... We must now have a production atmosphere and not only on the surface but deep down in the workers' mass. This must be as intense and practical an interest in production as was earlier displayed in the fronts...." Well, there you are: the message must be carried "deep down into the workers' mass" in the language of Rudzutak's theses, because "production atmosphere" will only earn you a smile or a shrug. Comrade Trotsky's "production atmosphere" has essentially the same meaning as production propaganda, but such expressions must be avoided when production propaganda is addressed to the workers at large. The term is an example of how *not* to carry it on among the masses.

### Politics and Economics. Dialectics and Eclecticism

It is strange that we should have to return to such elementary questions, but we are unfortunately forced to do so by Trotsky and Bukharin. They have both reproached me for "switching" the issue, or for taking a "political" approach, while theirs is an "economic" one. Bukharin even put that in his theses and tried to "rise above" either side, as if to say that he was combining the two.

This is a glaring theoretical error. I said again in my speech that politics is a concentrated expression of economics, because I had earlier heard my "political" approach rebuked in a manner which is inconsistent and inadmissible for a Marxist. Politics must take precedence over economics. To argue otherwise is to forget the ABC of Marxism.

Am I wrong in my political appraisal? If you think so, say it and prove it. But you forget the ABC of Marxism when you say (or imply) that the political approach is equivalent to the "economic", and that you can take "the one and the other".

What the political approach means, in other words, is that the wrong attitude to the trade unions will ruin the Soviet power and topple the dictatorship of the proletariat. (In a peasant country like Russia, the Soviet power would

surely go down in the event of a split between the trade unions and a Party in the wrong.) This proposition can (and must) be tested in substance, which means looking into the rights and wrongs of the approach and taking a decision. To say: I "appreciate" your political approach, "*but*" it is only a political one and we "*also* need an economic one", is tantamount to saying: I "appreciate" your point that in taking that particular step you are liable to break your neck, *but* you must also take into consideration that it is better to be clothed and well-fed than to go naked and hungry.

Bukharin's insistence on combining the political *and* the economic approach has landed him in theoretical *eclecticism*.

Trotsky and Bukharin make as though they are concerned for the growth of production whereas we have nothing but formal democracy in mind. This picture is wrong, because the *only* formulation of the issue (which the Marxist standpoint *allows*) is: without a correct political approach to the matter the given class will be unable to stay on top, *and, consequently*, will be incapable of solving *its production problem* either.

Let us take a concrete example. Zinoviev says: "By carrying things to a split within the trade unions, you are making a political mistake. I spoke and wrote about the growth of production back in January 1920, citing the construction of the public baths as an example." Trotsky replies: "What a thing to boast of: a pamphlet with the public baths as an example (p. 29), 'and not a single word' about the tasks of the trade unions" (p. 22).

This is wrong. The example of the public baths is worth, you will pardon the pun, a dozen "production atmospheres", with a handful of "industrial democracies" thrown in. It tells the masses, the whole bulk of them what the trade unions are to do, and does this in plain and intelligible terms, whereas all these "production atmospheres" and "democracies" are so much murk blurring the vision of the workers' masses, and *dimming* their understanding.

Comrade Trotsky also rebuked me for not "saying a word" (p. 66) about "the role that has to be played—and is being played—by the levers known as the trade union apparatus".

I beg to differ, Comrade Trotsky. By reading out Rudzutak's theses *in toto* and endorsing them, I made a statement on the question that was *fuller, plainer, clearer and more correct* than all your theses, your report or co-report, and speech in reply to the debate. I insist that bonuses in kind and disciplinary comrades' courts mean a great deal more to economic development, industrial management, and wider trade union participation in production than the absolutely abstract (and therefore empty) talk about "industrial democracy", "coalescence", etc.

Behind the effort to present the "production" standpoint (Trotsky) or to overcome a one-sided political approach and combine it with an economic approach (Bukharin) we find:

1) neglect of Marxism, as expressed in the theoretically incorrect, eclectic definition of the relation between politics and economics;

2) defence or camouflage of the political mistake expressed in the shake-up policy, which runs through the *whole* of Trotsky's platform pamphlet, and which, unless it is admitted and corrected, *leads* to the collapse of the dictatorship of the proletariat;

3) a step back in purely economic and production matters, and the question of how to increase production; it is, in fact, a step back from Rudzutak's *practical* theses, with their concrete, vital and urgent tasks (develop production propaganda; learn proper distribution of bonuses in kind and correct use of coercion through disciplinary comrades' courts), to the highbrow, abstract, "empty" and theoretically incorrect general *theses* which *ignore* all that is most practical and business-like.

That is where Zinoviev and myself, on the one hand, and Trotsky and Bukharin, on the other, actually stand on this question of politics and economics.

I could not help smiling, therefore, when I read Comrade Trotsky's objection in his speech of December 30: "In his summing-up at the Eighth Congress of Soviets of the debate on the situation, Comrade Lenin said we ought to have less politics and more economics, but when he got to the trade union question he laid emphasis on the political aspect of the matter" (p. 65). Comrade Trotsky thought these words were "very much to the point". Actually, how-



ever, they reveal a terrible confusion of ideas, a truly hopeless "ideological confusion". Of course, I have always said, and will continue to say, that we need more economics and less politics, but if we are to have this we must clearly be rid of political dangers *and political mistakes*. Comrade Trotsky's political mistakes, aggravated by Comrade Bukharin, *distract* our Party's attention from economic tasks and "production" work, and, *unfortunately, make us waste time* on correcting them and arguing it out with the syndicalist deviation (which leads to the collapse of the dictatorship of the proletariat), objecting to the incorrect approach to the trade union movement (which leads to the collapse of the Soviet power) and debating general "theses", instead of having a practical and business-like "economic" discussion as to whether it was the Saratov millers, the Donbas miners, the Petrograd metalworkers or some other group that had the best results in coalescing, distributing bonuses in kind, and organising comrades' courts, on the basis of Rudzutak's theses, adopted by the Fifth All-Russia Trade Union Conference on November 2-6.

Let us now consider what good there is in a "broad discussion". Once again we find political mistakes distracting attention from economic tasks. I was against this "broad" discussion, and I believed, and still do, that it was a mistake—a political mistake—on Comrade Trotsky's part to disrupt the work of the trade union commission, which ought to have held a business-like discussion. I believe Bukharin's buffer group made the political mistake of misunderstanding the tasks of the buffer (in which case they had once again substituted eclecticism for dialectics), for from the "buffer" standpoint they should have vigorously opposed any broad discussion and demanded that the matter should be taken up by the trade union commission. Here is what came of this.

On December 30, Bukharin went so far as to say that "we have proclaimed the new and sacred slogan of workers' democracy, which means that questions are no longer to be discussed in the board-room within the corporation or at small meetings but are to be placed before big meetings. I insist that by taking the trade union issue before such a large meeting as this one we are not taking a step back-

ward but forward" (p. 45). And this man has accused Zinoviev of spouting "hot air" and overdoing the democracy! I say that he himself has given us a lot of hot air and has shown some unexampled bungling; he has completely failed to understand that formal democracy must be subordinate to the revolutionary interest.

Trotsky is in the same boat. His charge is that "Lenin wants at all costs to disrupt or shelve the discussion of the matter in essence" (p. 65). He declares: "My reasons for refusing to serve on the commission were clearly stated in the Central Committee: until such time as I am permitted, on a par with all other comrades, to air these questions fully in the Party press, I do not expect any good to come of any cloistered examination of these matters, and, consequently, of work on the commission" (p. 69).

What is the result? Less than a month has passed since Trotsky started his "broad discussion" on December 25, and you will be hard put to find one responsible Party worker in a hundred who is not fed up with the discussion and has not realised its futility (to say no worse). For Trotsky has made the Party waste time on a discussion of words and bad theses, and has ridiculed as "cloistered" the *business-like* economic discussion in the commission, which was to have studied and verified practical experience and projected its lessons for *progress* in real "production" work, in place of the *regress* from vibrant activity to scholastic exercises in all sorts of "production atmospheres".

Take this famous "coalescence". My advice on December 30 was that we should keep mum on this point, because we had *not studied* our own practical experience, and without that any discussion was bound to degenerate into "hot air" and draw off the Party's forces *from* economic work. I said it was bureaucratic projecteering for Trotsky to propose in his theses that from one-third to one-half and from one-half to two-thirds of the economic councils should consist of trade-unionists.

For this I was upbraided by Bukharin who, I see from p. 49 of the report, made a point of proving to me at length and in great detail that "when people meet to discuss something, they should not act as deaf-mutes" (*sic*). Trotsky was also angry and exclaimed:

"Will every one of you please make a note that on this particular date Comrade Lenin described this as a bureaucratic evil. I take the liberty to predict that within a few months we shall have accepted for our guidance and consideration that the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and the Supreme Economic Council, the Central Committee of the Metalworkers' Union and the Metals Department, etc., are to have from one-third to one-half of their members in common" (p. 68).

When I read that I asked Comrade Milyutin (Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Economic Council) to let me have the available *printed* reports on coalescence. I said to myself: why not make a small start on the *study of our practical experience*; it's so dull engaging in "general Party talk" (Bukharin's expression, p. 47, which has every chance of becoming a catchword like "shake-up") to no useful purpose, without the facts, and inventing disagreements, definitions and "industrial democracies".

Comrade Milyutin sent me several books, including *The Report of the Supreme Economic Council to the Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets* (Moscow, 1920; preface dated December 19, 1920). On its p. 14 is a table showing workers' participation in administrative bodies. Here is the table (covering only part of the gubernia economic councils and factories):

Administrative body	Total mem- bers	Workers		Specialists		Office workers and others	
		Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent
Presidium of Supreme Economic Council and gubernia economic councils . .	187	107	57.2	22	11.8	58	31.0
Collegiums of chief administrations, departments, central boards and head offices . . . . .	140	72	51.4	31	22.2	37	26.4
Corporate and one-man managements of factories . . . . .	1,143	726	63.5	398	34.8	19	1.7
<i>Total . . . . .</i>	<i>1,470</i>	<i>905</i>	<i>61.6</i>	<i>451</i>	<i>30.7</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>7.7</i>

It will be seen that 61.6 per cent, that is, closer to two-thirds than to one-half, of the staff of administrative bodies

now consists of workers. And this *already proves* that what Trotsky wrote on this matter in his theses was an exercise in bureaucratic projecteering. To talk, argue and write platforms about "one-third to one-half" and "one-half to two-thirds" is the most useless sort of "general Party talk", which diverts time, attention and resources from *production* work. It is empty politicking. All this while, a great deal of good could have been done in the commission, where men of experience would have refused to write any theses without a study of the facts, say, by polling a dozen or so "common functionaries" (out of the thousand), by comparing their impressions and conclusions with objective statistical data, and by making an attempt to obtain practical guidance for the future: that being our experience, do we go straight on, or do we make some change in our course, methods and approach, and how; or do we call a halt, for the good of the cause, and check things over and over again, make a few changes here and there, and so on and so forth.

Comrades, a real "executive" (let me also have a go at "production propaganda") is well aware that even in the most advanced countries, the capitalists and their executives take years—sometimes ten and more—to study and test their own (and others') practical experience, making innumerable starts and corrections to tailor a system of management, select senior and junior executives, etc., fit for their particular business. That was the rule under capitalism, which throughout the civilised world based its business practices on *the experience and habits of centuries*. We who are breaking new ground must put in a long, persistent and patient effort to retrain men and change the old habits which have come down to us from capitalism, but this can only be done little by little. Trotsky's approach is quite wrong. In his December 30 speech he exclaimed: "Do or do not our workers, Party and trade union functionaries have any production training? Yes or no? I say: No" (p. 29). This is a ridiculous approach. It is like asking whether a division has enough felt boots: Yes or no?

It is safe to say that even ten years from now we shall have to admit that all our Party and trade union functionaries do not have enough production training, in much the same way as the workers of the Military Department, the

trade unions and the Party will not have had enough military experience. But we have made a *start* on production training by having about a thousand workers, and trade union members and delegates take part in management and run factories, head offices and other bodies higher up the scale. The basic principle underlying "production training"—which is the training of *our own selves*, of the old underground workers and professional journalists—is that we should start a painstaking and detailed study of our own practical experience, and teach others to do so, according to the rule: Look before you leap. The fundamental and absolute rule behind "production training" is systematic, circumspect, practical and business-like verification of what this one thousand have done, and even more efficient and careful correction of their work, taking a step forward only when there is ample proof of the usefulness of a given method, system of management, proportion, selection of men, etc. And it is this rule that Comrade Trotsky has broken by his theses and approach. All his theses, his entire platform pamphlet, are so wrong that they have diverted the Party's attention and resources from practical "production" work to a lot of empty talk.

### Dialectics and Eclecticism. "School" and "Apparatus"

Among Comrade Bukharin's many excellent traits are his theoretical ability and keen interest in getting at the theoretical roots of every question. That is a very valuable trait because you cannot have a proper understanding of any mistake, let alone a political one, unless you dig down to its theoretical roots among the basic premises of the one who makes it.

Responding to this urge, Comrade Bukharin tended to shift the controversy into the theoretical sphere, beginning from December 30, if not earlier.

In his speech on that day he said: "That neither the political nor the economic factor can be ignored is, I believe, absolutely incontrovertible—and that is the theoretical essence of what is here known as the 'buffer group' or its ideology" (p. 47).

The gist of his theoretical mistake in this case is substitution of eclecticism for the dialectical interplay of politics and economics (which we find in Marxism). His theoretical attitude is: "on the one hand, and on the other", "the one and the other". That is eclecticism. Dialectics requires an all-round consideration of relationships in their concrete development but not a patchwork of bits and pieces. I have shown this to be so on the example of politics and economics.

That of the "buffer" has gone to reinforce the point. You need a buffer, and it is useful when the Party train is heading for a crash. No question about that at all. Bukharin has built up his "buffer" problem eclectically, by collecting odd pieces from Zinoviev and Trotsky. As a "buffer", Bukharin should have decided for himself just where, when and how each individual or group had made their mistake, whether it was a theoretical mistake, one of political tact, factional pronouncement, or exaggeration, etc. He should have done that and gone *hammer and tongs at every* such mistake. But he has failed to understand his task of "buffer", and here is good proof of it.

The Communist group of Tsektran's Petrograd Bureau (the C.C. of the Railwaymen's and Water Transport Workers' Union), an organisation sympathising with Trotsky, has stated its opinion that, "on the main issue of the trade unions' role in production, Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin hold views which are variations of one and the same standpoint". It has issued Comrade Bukharin's report in Petrograd on January 3, 1921, in pamphlet form (N. Bukharin, *The Tasks of the Trade Unions*, Petrograd, 1921). It says:

"Comrade Trotsky's original formulation was that the trade union leadership should be removed and suitable comrades found to take their place, etc. He had earlier advocated a 'shake-up', but he has now abandoned the idea, and it is therefore quite absurd to use it as an argument against him" (p. 5).

I will let pass the numerous factual inaccuracies in this statement. (Trotsky used the term "shake-up" at the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions, November 2-6. He mentions "selection of leadership" in § 5 of his theses which he submitted to the Central Committee on November 8, and which, incidentally, some of his supporters have published as a leaflet. The whole of Trotsky's pamphlet,

*The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions*, December 25, reveals the same kind of mentality, the same spirit as I have pointed out before. When and how he "abandoned" this attitude remains a mystery.) I am now dealing with a different matter. When the "buffer" is an eclectic, he passes over some mistakes and brings up others; he says nothing of them in Moscow on December 30, 1920, when addressing thousands of R.C.P. functionaries from all over Russia; but he brings them up in Petrograd on January 3, 1921. When the "buffer" is a dialectician, he directs the full brunt of his attack at every mistake he sees on either side, or on all sides. And that is something Bukharin does not do. He does not even try to examine Trotsky's pamphlet in the light of the "shake-up" policy. *He simply says nothing about it.* No wonder his buffer performance has made everyone laugh.

To proceed. In that same Petrograd speech he says (p. 7):

"Comrade Trotsky's mistake is insufficient support for the school-of-communism idea."

During the December 30 discussion, Bukharin reasoned as follows:

"Comrade Zinoviev has said that the trade unions are a school of communism, and Trotsky has said that they are a technical and administrative apparatus for industrial management. I see no logical grounds for proof that either proposition is wrong; both, and a combination of both, are right" (p. 48).

Bukharin and his "group" or "faction" make the same point in their thesis 6: "On the one hand, they [the trade unions] are a school of communism... and on the other, they are—increasingly—a component part of the economic apparatus and of state administration in general" (*Pravda*, January 16).

That is where we find Comrade Bukharin's fundamental theoretical mistake, which is substitution of eclecticism (especially popular with the authors of diverse "fashionable" and reactionary philosophical systems) for Marxist dialectics.

When Comrade Bukharin speaks of "logical" grounds, his whole reasoning shows that he takes—unconsciously, perhaps—the standpoint of formal or scholastic logic, and not of dialectical or Marxist logic. Let me explain this by taking the simple example which Comrade Bukharin him-

self gives. In the December 30 discussion he said:

"Comrades, many of you may find that the current controversy suggests something like this: two men come in and invite each other to define the tumbler on the lectern. One says: 'It is a glass cylinder, and a curse on anyone who says different.' The other one says: 'A tumbler is a drinking vessel, and a curse on anyone who says different'" (p. 46).

The reader will see that Bukharin's example was meant to give me a popular explanation of the harm of one-track thinking. I accept it with gratitude, and in the one-good-turn-deserves-another spirit offer a popular explanation of the difference between dialectics and eclecticism.

A tumbler is assuredly both a glass cylinder and a drinking vessel. But there are more than these two properties, qualities or facets to it; there is an infinite number of them, an infinite number of "mediacies" and inter-relationships with the rest of the world. A tumbler is a heavy object which can be used as a missile; it can serve as a paper-weight, a receptacle for a captive butterfly, or a valuable object with an artistic engraving or design, and this has nothing at all to do with whether or not it can be used for drinking, is made of glass, is cylindrical or not quite, and so on and so forth.

Moreover, if I needed a tumbler just now for drinking, it would not in the least matter how cylindrical it was, and whether it was actually made of glass; what would matter though would be whether it had any holes in the bottom, or anything that would cut my lips when I drank, etc. But if I did not need a tumbler for drinking but for a purpose that could be served by any glass cylinder, a tumbler with a cracked bottom or without one at all would do just as well, etc.

Formal logic, which is as far as schools go (and should go, with suitable abridgements for the lower forms), deals with formal definitions, draws on what is most common, or glaring, and stops there. When two or more different definitions are taken and combined at random (a glass cylinder and a drinking vessel), the result is an eclectic definition which is indicative of different facets of the object, and nothing more.

Dialectical logic demands that we should go further.



Firstly, if we are to have a true knowledge of an object we must look at and examine all its facets, its connections and "mediacies". That is something we cannot ever hope to achieve completely, but the rule of comprehensiveness is a safeguard against mistakes and rigidity. Secondly, dialectical logic requires that an object should be taken in development, in change, in "self-movement" (as Hegel sometimes puts it). This is not immediately obvious in respect of such an object as a tumbler, but it, too, is in flux, and this holds especially true for its purpose, use and *connection* with the surrounding world. Thirdly, a full "definition" of an object must include the whole of human experience, both as a criterion of truth and a practical indicator of its connection with human wants. Fourthly, dialectical logic holds that "truth is always concrete, never abstract", as the late Plekhanov liked to say after Hegel. (Let me add in parenthesis for the benefit of young Party members that you *cannot* hope to become a *real*, intelligent Communist without making a study—and I mean *study* — of all of Plekhanov's philosophical writings, because nothing better has been written on Marxism anywhere in the world\*.)

I have not, of course, run through the whole notion of dialectical logic, but what I have said will do for the present. I think we can return from the tumbler to the trade unions and Trotsky's platform.

"A school, on the one hand, and an apparatus on the other", says Bukharin, and writes as much in his theses. Trotsky's mistake is "insufficient support for the school-of-communism idea"; Zinoviev errs by being lukewarm on the apparatus "factor".

Why is Bukharin's reasoning no more than inert and empty eclecticism? It is because he does not even try to make an independent analysis, from his own standpoint, either of the whole course of the current controversy (as

---

\* By the way, it would be a good thing, first, if the current edition of Plekhanov's works contained a special volume or volumes of all his philosophical articles, with detailed indexes, etc., to be included in a series of standard textbooks on communism; secondly, I think the workers' state must demand that professors of philosophy should have a knowledge of Plekhanov's exposition of Marxist philosophy and ability to impart it to their students. But all that is a digression from "propaganda" to "administration".

Marxism, *that is*, dialectical logic, unconditionally demands) or of the whole approach to the question, the whole presentation—the whole trend of the presentation, if you will—of the question at the present time and in these concrete circumstances. You do not see Bukharin doing that at all! His approach is one of pure abstraction: he makes no attempt at concrete study, and takes bits and pieces from Zinoviev and Trotsky. That is eclecticism.

Here is another example to clarify the picture. I know next to nothing about the insurgents and revolutionaries of South China (apart from the two or three articles by Sun Yat-sen, and a few books and newspaper articles I read many years ago). Since there are these uprisings, it is not too far-fetched to assume a controversy going on between Chinese No. 1, who says that the insurrection is the product of a most acute nation-wide class struggle, and Chinese No. 2, who says that insurrection is an art. That is all I need to know in order to write theses *à la* Bukharin: "On the one hand,... on the other hand." The one has failed to reckon with the art "factor", and the other, with the "acuteness factor", etc. Because no *concrete* study is made of *this particular* controversy, question, approach, etc., the result is a dead and empty eclecticism.

On the one hand, the trade unions are a school, and on the other, an apparatus; but they also happen to be an organisation of working people, an almost exclusive organisation of industrial workers, an organisation by industry, etc.\* Bukharin does not make any analysis for himself, nor does he produce a shred of evidence to prove why it is that we should consider the first two "facets" of the question or object, instead of the third, the fourth, the fifth, etc. That is why his group's theses are an eclectic soap bubble. His presentation of the "school-apparatus" relationship is fundamentally eclectic and wrong.

The only way to view this question in the right light is

---

\* Incidentally, here again Trotsky makes a mistake. He thinks that an industrial union is designed to control industry. That is wrong. When you say that a union is an industrial one you mean that it admits to membership workers in one industry, which is inevitable at the present level of technology and culture (in Russia and elsewhere).

to descend from empty abstractions to the concrete, that is, the present issue. Whether you take it in the form it assumed at the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions, or as it was presented and *slanted* by Trotsky himself in his platform pamphlet of December 25, you will find that his *whole* approach is quite wrong and that he has gone off at a tangent. He has failed to understand that the trade unions can and must be viewed as a school both when raising the question of "Soviet trade-unionism", and when speaking of production propaganda in general, and even when considering "coalescence" and trade union participation in industrial management, *as Trotsky does*. On this last point, as it is presented in Trotsky's platform pamphlet, the mistake lies in his failure to grasp that the trade unions are a *school of technical and administrative management of production*. In the context of the controversy, you cannot say: "a school, on the one hand, and something else on the other"; given Trotsky's approach, *the trade unions, whichever way you look at them, are a school*. They are a school of unity, solidarity, management and administration, where you learn how to protect your interests. Instead of making an effort to comprehend and correct Comrade Trotsky's fundamental mistake, Comrade Bukharin has produced a funny little amendment: "on the one hand, and on the other."

Let us go deeper into the question. Let us see what the present trade unions are, as an "apparatus" of industrial management. We have seen from the incomplete returns that about 900 workers—trade union members and delegates—are engaged in industrial management. If you multiply this number by 10 or even by 100—if it helps to clarify your fundamental mistake let us assume this incredible speed of "advance" in the immediate future—you still have an insignificant proportion of those directly engaged in *management*, as compared with the mass of six million trade union members. This makes it even clearer that it is quite wrong to look to the "leading stratum", and talk about the trade unions' role in production and industrial management, as Trotsky does, forgetting that 98.5 per cent (6 million minus 90,000 equals 5,910,000 or 98.5 per cent of the total) *are learning, and will have to continue to do*

*so for a long time to come. Don't say school and management, say s c h o o l of management.*

In his December 30 argument against Zinoviev, whom he accused, quite groundlessly and incorrectly, of denying the "appointments system", that is, the Central Committee's right and duty to make appointments, Comrade Trotsky inadvertently drew the following telltale comparison:

"Zinoviev tends to overdo the propaganda angle on every practical matter, forgetting that it is not only a source of material for agitation, but also a problem requiring an administrative solution" (p. 27).

Before I explain in detail the *potential* administrative approach to the issue, let me say that Comrade Trotsky's fundamental mistake is that he treats (rather, maltreats) *the questions* he himself had brought up in his platform pamphlet as *administrative* ones, whereas *they* could be and ought to be viewed *only from the propaganda angle*.

In effect, what are Trotsky's good points? One undoubtedly good and useful point is his *production propaganda*, but that is not in his theses, but in his *speeches*, specially when he forgets about his unfortunate polemics with the allegedly "conservative" wing of the trade-unionists. He would undoubtedly have done (and I believe he will do) a great deal of good in the trade union commission's practical business, as speaker and writer, and as a member of the All-Russia Production Propaganda Bureau. His platform theses were a mistake, for through them, like a scarlet thread, runs the administrative approach to the "crisis" and the "two trends" within the trade unions, the interpretation of the R.C.P. Programme, "Soviet trade-unionism", "production training" and "coalescence". I have listed all the main points of Trotsky's "platform" and they all happen to be topics which, considering the material at Trotsky's disposal, can be correctly approached at the present time only from the propaganda angle.

The state is a sphere of coercion. It would be madness to renounce coercion, especially in the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat, so that the administrative approach and "steerage" are indispensable. The Party is the leader, the vanguard of the proletariat, which rules directly. It is

not coercion but expulsion from the Party that is the specific means of influence and the means of purging and steeling the vanguard. The trade unions are a reservoir of the state power, a school of communism and a school of management. The specific and cardinal thing in this sphere is *not* administration but the "*ties*" "*between* the central state administration" (and, of course, the local as well), "the national economy and the *broad masses* of the working people" (see Party Programme, economic section, § 5, dealing with the trade unions).

The whole of Trotsky's platform pamphlet betrays an incorrect approach to the problem and a misunderstanding of this relationship.

Let us assume that Trotsky had taken a different approach to this famous question of "coalescence" in connection with the other topics of his platform, and that his pamphlet was entirely devoted to a detailed investigation of, say, 90 of the 900 cases of "coalescence" where trade union officials and members concurrently held elective trade union posts and Supreme Economic Council posts in industrial management. Let us say these 90 cases had been analysed together with the returns of a selective statistical survey, the reports of inspectors and instructors of Rabkrin and the People's Commissariats concerned: let us say they had been analysed in the light of the data supplied by the administrative bodies, the results of the work, the headway in production, etc. That would have been a correct administrative approach, and would have fully vindicated the "shake-up" line, which implies concentrating attention on removals, transfers, appointments and the immediate demands to be made on the "leading stratum". When Bukharin said in his January 3 speech, published by the Tsektran people in Petrograd, that Trotsky had at first wanted a "shake-up" but had now abandoned the idea, he made another one of his eclectic mistakes, which is ridiculous from the practical standpoint and theoretically inadmissible for a Marxist. He takes the question in the abstract, being unable (or unwilling) to get down to brass tacks. So long as we, the Party's Central Committee and the whole Party, continue to run things, that is, govern, we shall never—we cannot—dispense with the "shake-up", that is, removals, transfers, appointments,

dismissals, etc. But Trotsky's platform pamphlet deals with something else, and does not raise the "question of practical business" at all. It is not this but the "*trends* within the trade union movement" (Trotsky's thesis 4, end) that was being debated by Zinoviev and Trotsky, Bukharin and myself, and in fact the whole Party.

This is essentially a political question. Because of the substance of the case — this concrete, particular "case"—it is impossible to correct Trotsky's mistake by means of eclectic little amendments and addenda, as Bukharin has been trying to do, being moved undoubtedly by the most humane sentiments and intentions.

There is only one answer.

First, there must be a correct solution of the political question of the "trends within the trade union movement", the relationship between classes, between politics and economics, the specific role of the state, the Party, the trade unions, as "school" and apparatus, etc.

Second, once the correct political decision has been adopted, a diversified nation-wide production propaganda campaign must be carried through, or, rather, systematically carried forward with persistence and patience over a long term, under the sponsorship and direction of a state agency. It should be conducted in such a way as to cover the same ground over and over again.

Third, the "questions of practical business" must not be confused with trend issues which properly belong to the sphere of "general Party talk" and broad discussions; they must be dealt with as practical matters in the working commissions, with a hearing of witnesses and a study of memoranda, reports and statistics. And any necessary "shake-up" must be carried out only on that basis and in those circumstances: only under a decision of the competent Soviet or Party organ, or of both.

Trotsky and Bukharin have produced a hodgepodge of political mistakes in approach, breaks in the middle of the transmission belts, and unwarranted and futile attacks on "administrative steerage". It is now clear where the "theoretical" source of the mistake lies, since Bukharin has taken up that aspect of it with his example of the tumbler. His theoretical—in this case, gnosiological—mistake lies in his

substitution of eclecticism for dialectics. His eclectic approach has confused him and has landed him in syndicalism. Trotsky's mistake is one-track thinking, compulsiveness, exaggeration and obstinacy. His platform says that a tumbler is a drinking vessel, but this particular tumbler happens to have no bottom.

### Conclusion

It remains for me to go over a few more points which must be dealt with to prevent misunderstanding.

Thesis 6 of Trotsky's platform quotes § 5 of the economic section of the R.C.P. Programme, which deals with the trade unions. Two pages later, his thesis 8 says:

"Having lost the old basis of their existence, the class economic struggle, the trade unions"... (that is wrong, and is a hasty exaggeration: the trade unions no longer have to face the *class* economic struggle but the *non-class* "economic struggle", which means combating bureaucratic distortions of the Soviet apparatus, safeguarding the working people's material and spiritual interests in ways and means inaccessible to this apparatus, etc. This is a struggle they will unfortunately have to face for many more years to come). "The trade unions," says Trotsky, "have, for various reasons, not yet succeeded in mustering the necessary forces and working out the necessary methods enabling them to solve the new task, that of *organising production*" (Trotsky's italics, p. 9, thesis 8), "set before them by the proletarian revolution and formulated in our Programme."

That is yet another hasty exaggeration which is pregnant with grave error. The Programme does not contain any such formulation nor does it set the trade unions the task of "organising production". Let us go over the propositions in the Party's Programme as they unfold in the text:

(1) "The organisational apparatus" (but not the others) "of socialised industry should rely chiefly" (but not exclusively) "on the trade unions." (2) "They must to an ever increasing degree divest themselves of the narrow craft-union spirit" (how? under the leadership of the Party and through the proletariat's educational and other influence on the non-proletarian mass of working people) "and become

large industrial associations, embracing the majority, and eventually all of the workers in the given industry."

That is the first part of the section of the Party Programme dealing with the trade unions. You will have noted that it starts by laying down very "*strict conditions*" demanding a long sustained effort for what is to follow. And what follows is this:

"The trade unions being, on the strength of the laws of the Soviet Republic and established practice, participants" (note the cautious statement: participants only) "in all the local and central organs of industrial management, should eventually arrive at a *de facto* concentration in their hands of the whole administration of the whole national economy, as a single economic entity" (note this: should arrive at a *de facto* concentration of management not of branches of industry and not of industry as a whole, but of the whole national economy, and moreover, as an economic entity. In economic terms, this condition may be considered fulfilled only when the petty producers both in industry and agriculture account for less than one-half of the population and the national economy). "The trade unions ensuring in this way" (the way which helps to realise all the conditions listed earlier) "indissoluble ties between the central state administration, the national economy and the broad masses of working people, should draw the latter" (that is, the masses, the majority of the population) "into direct economic management on the widest possible scale. At the same time, the participation of the trade unions in economic management and their activity in drawing the broad masses into this work are the principal means of combating the bureaucratisation of the economic apparatus of the Soviet power and making possible the establishment of truly popular control over the results of production."

There again, in that last sentence, we find a very cautious phrase: "participation in economic management"; and another reference to the recruitment of the broad masses as the chief (but not the only) means of combating bureaucratic practices; finally, we find a highly cautious statement: "*making possible*" the establishment of "*popular*"—that is, workers' and peasants', and not just purely proletarian—"control".



It is obviously wrong to boil this down to the Party Programme "formulating" the trade unions' task as "organisation of production". And if you insist on this error, and write it into your platform theses, you will get nothing but an anti-communist, syndicalist deviation.

Incidentally, Comrade Trotsky says in his theses that "over the last period we have not made any headway towards the goal set forth in the Programme but have in fact retreated from it" (p. 7, thesis 6). That statement is unsupported, and, I think, wrong. It is no proof to say, as Trotsky did in the discussions, that the trade unions "themselves" admit this. That is not the last resort, as far as the Party is concerned, and, generally speaking, the proof lies only in a serious and objective study of a great number of facts. Moreover, even if such proof were forthcoming, there would remain this question: Why have we retreated? Is it because "many trade-unionists" are "balking at the new tasks and methods", as Trotsky believes, or because "we have not yet succeeded in mustering the necessary forces and working out the necessary methods" to cut short and correct certain unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy?

Which brings me to Bukharin's rebuke of December 30 (repeated by Trotsky yesterday, January 24, during our discussion in the Communist group of the Second Miners' Congress) that we have "dropped the line laid down by the Ninth Party Congress" (p. 46 of the report on the December 30 discussion). He alleged that at that Congress I had defended the militarisation of labour and had jeered at references to democracy, all of which I now "repudiate". In his reply to the debate on December 30, Comrade Trotsky added this barb: "Lenin takes account of the fact that... there is a grouping of opposition-minded comrades within the trade unions" (p. 65); that I view it from the "diplomatic angle" (p. 69), and that there is "manoeuvring inside the Party groups" (p. 70), etc. Putting such a complexion on the case is, of course, highly flattering for Trotsky, and worse than unflattering for me. But let us look at the facts.

In that same discussion on December 30, Trotsky and Krestinsky established the fact that "as long ago as July (1920), Comrade Preobrazhensky had proposed to the Cen-

tral Committee that we should switch to a new track in respect of the internal life of our workers' organisations" (p. 25). In August, Comrade Zinoviev drafted a letter, and the Central Committee approved a *C.C. letter* on combating red tape and extending democracy. In September, the question was brought up at a Party conference whose decisions were endorsed by the Central Committee. In December, the question of combating red tape was laid before the Eighth Congress of Soviets. Consequently, the whole Central Committee, the whole Party and the whole workers' and peasants' Republic had recognised that the question of the bureaucracy and ways of combating its evils was high on the agenda. Does any "repudiation" of the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P. follow from all this? Of course, not. The decisions on the militarisation of labour, etc., are incontestable, and there is no need for me at all to withdraw any of my jibes at the references to democracy by those who challenged these decisions. What does follow is that we shall be extending democracy in the workers' organisations, without turning it into a fetish; that we shall redouble our attention to the struggle against bureaucratic practices; and that we shall take special care to rectify any unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy, no matter who points them out.

One final remark on the minor question of priority and equalisation. I said during the December 30 discussion that Trotsky's formulation of thesis 41 on this point was theoretically wrong, because it implied priority in production and equalisation in consumption. I replied that priority implied preference and that that was nothing unless you also had it in consumption. Comrade Trotsky reproached me for "extraordinary forgetfulness" and "intimidation" (pp. 67 and 68), and I am surprised to find that he has not accused me also of manoeuvring, diplomatic moves, etc. He has made "concessions" to my equalitarian line, but I have attacked him.

Actually, however, anyone who takes an interest in Party affairs, can turn to indisputable Party documents: the November resolution of the C.C. Plenum, point 4, and Trotsky's platform pamphlet, thesis 41. However "forgetful" I may be, and however excellent Comrade Trotsky's memory, it is

still a fact that thesis 41 contains a theoretical error, which the C.C. resolution of November 9 does not. The resolution says: "While recognising the necessity of keeping to the principle of priority in carrying out the economic plan, the Central Committee, in complete solidarity with the decisions of the last All-Russia Conference (September), deems it necessary to effect a gradual but steady transition to equality in the status of various groups of workers and their respective trade unions, all the while building up the organisation on the scale of the union as a whole." That is clearly aimed against Tsektran, and it is quite impossible to put any other construction on the exact meaning of the resolution. Priority is here to stay. Preference is still to be given to enterprises, trade unions, trusts and departments on the priority list (in regard to fulfilment of the economic plan), but at the same time, the "equalitarian line"—which was supported not by "Comrade Lenin alone", but was approved by the *Party Conference and the Central Committee, that is, the entire Party*—makes this clear-cut demand: get on with the gradual but steady *t r a n s i t i o n* to equalisation. That Tsektran failed to carry out this C.C. resolution (November) is evident from the Central Committee's December resolution (on Trotsky and Bukharin's motion), which contains another reminder of the "principles of ordinary democracy". The theoretical error in thesis 41 is that it says: equalisation in consumption, priority in production. That is an economic absurdity because it implies a gap between production and consumption. I did not say—and could never have said—anything of the sort. If you don't need a factory, close it down. Close down all the factories that are not absolutely essential, and give preference to those that are. Give preference to, say, transport. Most certainly. But the preference must not be overdone, as it was in Tsektran's case, which was why the *Party* (and not just Lenin) issued this directive: *get on with the gradual but steady transition* to equality. And Trotsky has no one but himself to blame for having come out—after the November Plenary Meeting, which gave a clear-cut and theoretically correct solution—with a factional pamphlet on "the two trends" and proposed a formulation in his thesis 41 which is wrong in economic terms.

---

Today, January 25, it is exactly one month since Comrade Trotsky's factional statement. It is now patent that this pronouncement, inappropriate in form and wrong in essence, has diverted the Party from its practical economic and production effort into rectifying political and theoretical mistakes. But, it's an ill wind, as the old saying goes.

Rumour has it that some terrible things have been said about the disagreements on the Central Committee. Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries undoubtedly shelter (and have sheltered) behind the opposition, and it is they who are spreading the rumours, incredibly malicious formulations, and inventions of all sorts to malign the Party, put vile interpretations on its decisions, aggravate conflicts and ruin its work. That is a political trick used by the bourgeoisie, including the petty-bourgeois democrats, the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, who, for very obvious reasons, hate—and cannot help hating—the Bolsheviks' guts. Every intelligent member of the Party is familiar with this political trick, and knows its worth.

Because of the disagreements on the Central Committee, it had to appeal to the Party, and the discussions that followed clearly revealed the essence and scope of these disagreements. That killed the rumours and the slander. The Party learns its lessons and is tempered in the struggle against factionalism, a new malaise (it is new in the sense that after the October Revolution we had forgotten all about it). Actually, it is an old malaise, with relapses apparently bound to occur over the next few years, but with an easier cure now well in sight.

The Party is learning not to blow up its disagreements. Let me quote at this point Comrade Trotsky's correct remark about Comrade Tomsy: "I have always said—even when the polemic against Comrade Tomsy was at its bitterest—that it is quite clear to me that only men with his experience and authority ought to be our trade union leaders. I told this to the Party group of the Fifth Conference of the Trade Unions, and repeated it at the Zimin Theatre a few days ago. Ideological struggle within the Party does not mean mutual ostracism but mutual influence" (p. 34 of the report on the December 30 discussion). The Party will naturally apply this correct approach to Comrade Trotsky himself.

During the discussion it was Comrade Shlyapnikov and his group, the so-called Workers' Opposition, who showed the most pronounced syndicalist trend. This being an obvious deviation from communism and the Party, we shall have to reckon with it, talk it over, and make a special propaganda effort to explain the error of these views and the danger of making such mistakes. Comrade Bukharin, who actually coined the syndicalist phrase "mandatory nominations" (by trade unions to management bodies) tries to vindicate himself in today's issue of *Pravda*, but I am afraid his line of defence is highly ineffective and quite wrong. He wants us to know, you see, that he deals with the role of the Party in his other points. I should think so! If it were otherwise it would have been more than just a *mistake*, requiring correction and allowing some slight rectification: it would have been withdrawal from the Party. When you say "mandatory nominations" but neglect to add, there and then, that they are *not* mandatory for the Party, you have a syndicalist deviation, and that is *incompatible* with communism and the Party Programme. If you add: "mandatory but *not* for the Party" you are giving the non-Party workers a false sense of having some increase in their rights, whereas in fact there will be no change at all. The longer Comrade Bukharin persists in his deviation from communism—a deviation that is wrong theoretically and deceptive politically—the more deplorable will be the fruits of his obstinacy. You cannot maintain an untenable proposition. The Party does not object to the extension of the rights of the non-Party workers in general, but a little reflection will show what can and what cannot be done in this respect.

In the discussion by the Communist group of the Second All-Russia Miners' Congress, Shlyapnikov's platform was defeated despite the backing it got from Comrade Kiselyov, who commands special prestige in that union: our platform won 137 votes, Shlyapnikov's, 62, and Trotsky's, 8. The syndicalist malaise must and will be cured.

In this one month, Petrograd, Moscow and a number of provincial towns have shown that the Party responded to the discussion and has rejected Comrade Trotsky's wrong line by an overwhelming majority. While there may have been some vacillation "at the top" and "in the provinces",

in the committees and in the offices, the rank-and-file membership—the mass of Party workers—came out solidly against this wrong line.

Comrade Kamenev informed me of Comrade Trotsky's announcement, during the discussion in the Zamoskvorechye District of Moscow on January 23, that he was withdrawing his platform and joining up with the Bukharin group on a new platform. Unfortunately, I heard nothing of this from Comrade Trotsky either on January 23 or 24, when he spoke against me in the Communist group of the Miners' Congress. I don't know whether this is due to another change in Comrade Trotsky's platform and intentions, or to some other reason. In any case, his January 23 announcement shows that the Party, without so much as mustering all its forces, and with only Petrograd, Moscow, and a minority of the provincial towns going on record, has corrected Comrade Trotsky's mistake promptly and with determination.

The Party's enemies had rejoiced too soon. They have not been able—and will never be able—to take advantage of some of the inevitable disagreements within the Party to inflict harm on it and on the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia.

January 25, 1921

Published January 25 and 26,  
1921 in pamphlet form by Press  
Department of the Moscow Soviet  
of the Workers', Peasants' and  
Red Army Deputies  
Signed: *N. Lenin*

*Collected Works*, Vol. 32,  
pp. 70-107

---

## **Preliminary Draft Resolution of the Tenth Congress of the R.C.P. on the Syndicalist and Anarchist Deviation in Our Party<sup>187</sup>**

1. A syndicalist and anarchist deviation has been definitely revealed in our Party in the past few months. It calls for the most resolute measures of ideological struggle and also for purging the Party and restoring its health.

2. The said deviation is due partly to the influx into the Party of former Mensheviks, and also of workers and peasants who have not yet fully assimilated the communist world outlook. Mainly, however, this deviation is due to the influence exercised upon the proletariat and on the Russian Communist Party by the petty-bourgeois element, which is exceptionally strong in our country, and which inevitably engenders vacillation towards anarchism, particularly at a time when the condition of the masses has greatly deteriorated as a consequence of the crop failure and the devastating effects of war, and when the demobilisation of the army numbering millions sets loose hundreds and hundreds of thousands of peasants and workers unable immediately to find regular means of livelihood.

3. The most theoretically complete and clearly defined expression of this deviation (or: one of the most complete, etc., expressions of this deviation) is the theses and other literary productions of the so-called Workers' Opposition group. Sufficiently illustrative of this is, for example, the following thesis propounded by this group: "The organisation of the management of the national economy is the function of an All-Russia Congress of Producers organised

in industrial unions which shall elect a central body to run the whole of the national economy of the Republic."

The ideas at the bottom of this and numerous similar statements are radically wrong in theory, and represent a complete break with Marxism and communism, with the practical experience of all semi-proletarian revolutions and of the present proletarian revolution.

First, the concept "producer" combines proletarians with semi-proletarians and small commodity producers, thus radically departing from the fundamental concept of the class struggle and from the fundamental demand that a precise distinction be drawn between classes.

Secondly, the bidding for or flirtation with the non-party masses, which is expressed in the above-quoted thesis, is an equally radical departure from Marxism.

Marxism teaches—and this tenet has not only been formally endorsed by the whole of the Communist International in the decisions of the Second (1920) Congress of the Comintern on the role of the political party of the proletariat, but has also been confirmed in practice by our revolution—that only the political party of the working class, i.e., the Communist Party, is capable of uniting, training and organising a vanguard of the proletariat and of the whole mass of the working people that alone will be capable of withstanding the inevitable petty-bourgeois vacillations of this mass and the inevitable traditions and relapses of narrow craft unionism or craft prejudices among the proletariat, and of guiding all the united activities of the whole of the proletariat, i.e., of leading it politically, and through it, the whole mass of the working people. Without this the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible.

The wrong understanding of the role of the Communist Party in its relation to the non-party proletariat, and in the relation of the first and second factors to the whole mass of working people, is a radical theoretical departure from communism and a deviation towards syndicalism and anarchism, and this deviation permeates all the views of the Workers' Opposition group.

4. The Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party declares that it also regards as radically wrong all attempts on the part of the said group and of other persons to defend



their fallacious views by referring to § 5 of the economic section of the Programme of the Russian Communist Party, which deals with the role of the trade unions. This paragraph says that "the trade unions should eventually arrive at a *de facto* concentration in their hands of the whole administration of the whole national economy, as a single economic entity" and that they will "ensure in this way indissoluble ties between the central state administration, the national economy and the broad masses of working people", "drawing" these masses "into direct economic management".

This paragraph in the Programme of the Russian Communist Party also says that a prerequisite for the state at which the trade unions "should eventually arrive" is the process whereby they increasingly "divest themselves of the narrow craft-union spirit" and embrace the majority "and eventually all" of the working people.

Lastly, this paragraph in the Programme of the Russian Communist Party emphasises that "on the strength of the laws of the R.S.F.S.R., and established practice, the trade unions participate in all the local and central organs of industrial management".

Instead of studying the practical experience of participation in administration, and instead of developing this experience further, strictly in conformity with successes achieved and mistakes rectified, the syndicalists and anarchists advance as an immediate slogan "congresses or a congress of producers" "to elect" the organs of economic management. Thus, the leading, educational and organising role of the Party in relation to the trade unions of the proletariat, and of the latter to the semi-petty bourgeois and even wholly petty-bourgeois masses of working people, is completely evaded and eliminated, and instead of continuing and correcting the practical work of building new forms of economy already begun by the Soviet state, we get petty-bourgeois-anarchist disruption of this work, which can only lead to the triumph of the bourgeois counter-revolution.

5. In addition to the theoretical fallacies and a radically wrong attitude towards the practical experience of economic organisation already begun by the Soviet government, the Congress of the Russian Communist Party discerns in the views of this and similar groups and persons a gross political

mistake and a direct political danger to the very existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In a country like Russia, the overwhelming preponderance of the petty-bourgeois element and the devastation, impoverishment, epidemics, crop failures, extreme want and hardship inevitably resulting from the war, engender particularly sharp vacillations in the temper of the petty-bourgeois and semi-proletarian masses. First they incline towards a strengthening of the alliance between these masses and the proletariat, and then towards bourgeois restoration. The experience of all revolutions in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries shows most clearly and convincingly that the only possible result of these vacillations—if the unity, strength and influence of the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat is weakened in the slightest degree—will be the restoration of the power and property of the capitalists and landowners.

Hence, the views of the Workers' Opposition and of like-minded elements are not only wrong in theory, but are an expression of petty-bourgeois and anarchist wavering in practice, and actually weaken the consistency of the leading line of the Communist Party and help the class enemies of the proletarian revolution.

6. In view of all this, the Congress of the R.C.P., emphatically rejecting the said ideas, as being expressive of a syndicalist and anarchist deviation, deems it necessary:

First, to wage an unswerving and systematic struggle against these ideas;

Secondly, to recognise the propaganda of these ideas as being incompatible with membership of the R.C.P.

Instructing the C.C. of the Party strictly to enforce these decisions, the Congress at the same time points out that special publications, symposiums, etc., can and should provide space for a most comprehensive exchange of opinion between Party members on all the questions herein indicated.

---

## Message of Greetings to the First International Congress of Revolutionary Trade and Industrial Unions<sup>198</sup>

July 18

Comrade Rykov,

Please be so kind as to convey to the delegates of the International Congress of Trade Unions the following:

I thank them from the bottom of my heart for the invitation to the congress sent through you. I deeply regret that I am unable to accept it because of ill-health, for on doctor's orders I have had to leave Moscow for a month's holiday.

Please convey to the delegates my greetings and heartfelt wishes for the success of the congress. It is hard to find words to express the full importance of the International Congress of Trade Unions. The winning of trade-unionists to the ideas of communism is making irresistible headway everywhere, in all countries, throughout the world. The process is sporadic, overcoming a thousand obstacles, but it is making irresistible progress. The International Congress of Trade Unions will quicken this movement. Communism will triumph in the trade unions. No power on earth can avert the collapse of capitalism and the victory of the working class over the bourgeoisie.

Warm greetings and confidence in the inevitable victory of communism.

N. Lenin

Written July 18, 1921

Published in 1921 in the book  
*Pervyi Mezhdunarodny kongress  
revolyutsionnykh professionalnykh  
i proizvodstvennykh soyzov.  
Verbatim Report.*  
Press Bureau of the Congress  
(Publishers), Moscow

*Collected Works, Vol. 32,  
p. 501*

---

## **Draft Theses on the Role and Functions of the Trade Unions Under the New Economic Policy**

### **1. The New Economic Policy and the Trade Unions**

The New Economic Policy introduces a number of important changes in the position of the proletariat and, consequently, in that of the trade unions. These changes are due to the fact that in their entire policy of transition from capitalism to socialism the Communist Party and the Soviet government are now adopting special methods to implement this transition and in many respects are operating differently from the way they operated before: they are capturing a number of positions by a "new flanking movement", so to speak; they are drawing back in order to make better preparations for a new offensive against capitalism. In particular, a free market and capitalism, both subject to state control, are now being permitted and are developing; on the other hand, the state enterprises are being put on what is called a profit basis, i.e., they are being reorganised largely on commercial and capitalist lines.

### **2. State Capitalism in the Proletarian State and the Trade Unions**

The proletarian state may, without changing its own nature, permit freedom to trade and the development of capitalism only within certain bounds, and only on the con-

dition that the state regulates (supervises, controls, determines the forms and methods of, etc.) private trade and private capitalism. The success of such regulation will depend not only on the state authorities, but also, and to a larger extent, on the degree of maturity of the proletariat and of the masses of the working people generally, on their cultural level, etc. But even if this regulation is completely successful, the antagonism of class interests between labour and capital will certainly remain. Consequently, one of the main tasks that will henceforth confront the trade unions is to protect in every way the class interests of the proletariat in its struggle against capital. This task should be openly put in the forefront, and the machinery of the trade unions must be reorganised, modified or supplemented accordingly; strike funds, and so on should be formed, or rather, built up.

### **3. The State Enterprises That Are Being Put on a Profit Basis and the Trade Unions**

The conversion of state enterprises to the so-called profit basis is inevitably and inseparably connected with the New Economic Policy; in the near future this is bound to become the predominant, if not the sole, form of state enterprise. Actually, this means that with the free market now permitted and developing, the state enterprises, will to a large extent be put on a commercial, capitalist basis. This circumstance, in view of the urgent need to increase the productivity of labour and make every state enterprise pay its way and show a profit, and in view of the inevitable rise of narrow departmental interests and excessive departmental zeal, is bound to create a certain conflict of interests between the masses of workers and the directors and managers of the state enterprises, or the government departments in charge of them. Therefore, it is undoubtedly the duty of the trade unions, in regard to the state enterprises as well, to protect the class interests of the proletariat and the working masses against their employers.

**4. The Essential Difference Between the Class Struggle of the Proletariat in a State Which Recognises Private Ownership of the Land, Factories, etc., and Where Political Power Is in the Hands of the Capitalist Class, and the Class Struggle of the Proletariat in a State Which Does Not Recognise Private Ownership of the Land and the Majority of the Large Enterprises and Where Political Power Is in the Hands of the Proletariat**

As long as classes exist, the class struggle is inevitable. In the period of transition from capitalism to socialism the existence of classes is inevitable; and the Programme of the Russian Communist Party definitely states that we are taking only the first steps in the transition from capitalism to socialism. Hence, the Communist Party, the Soviet government and the trade unions must frankly admit the existence of a class struggle and its inevitability until the electrification of industry and agriculture is completed—at least in the main—and until small production and the supremacy of the market are thereby cut off at the roots. It follows from this that at the present moment we can under no circumstances abandon the idea of the strike struggle, we cannot, as a matter of principle, conceive the possibility of a law that makes compulsory state mediation take the place of strikes.

On the other hand, it is obvious that under capitalism the ultimate object of the strike struggle is to break up the state machine and to overthrow the given class state power. Under the transitional type of proletarian state such as ours, however, the ultimate object of the strike struggle can only be to fortify the proletarian state and the state power of the proletarian class by combating the bureaucratic distortions, mistakes and flaws in this state, and by curbing the class appetites of the capitalists who try to evade its control, etc. Hence, the Communist Party, the Soviet government and the trade unions must never forget and must never conceal from the workers and the mass of the

working people that the strike struggle in a state where the proletariat holds political power can be explained and justified only by the bureaucratic distortions of the proletarian state and by all sorts of survivals of the old capitalist system in the government offices on the one hand, and by the political immaturity and cultural backwardness of the mass of the working people on the other. When the law courts and all other organs of the state are built on a class basis, by the working people themselves, with the bourgeoisie excluded from the electorate, the normal method of settling conflicts between labour and capital, between employed and employers, will more and often find expression in the working people turning directly to the state authorities.

### **5. Reversion to Voluntary Trade Union Membership**

The compulsory wholesale signing up of all workers for membership in the trade unions is no longer consistent with the present degree of socialisation achieved in industry or with the level of development of the masses. Compulsory membership has moreover introduced a certain degree of bureaucratic distortion into the trade unions themselves. It is absolutely essential to revert for a fairly considerable length of time to the practice of voluntary membership in the trade unions. Under no circumstances must trade union members be required to subscribe to any specific political views; in this respect, as well as in respect of religion, the trade unions must be non-partisan. All that must be required of trade union members in the proletarian state is that they should understand comradely discipline and the necessity of uniting the workers' forces for the purpose of protecting the interests of the working people and that they should keep faith with the working people's government, i.e., the Soviet government. The proletarian state must encourage the workers to organise in trade unions both for legal and material reasons; but the trade unions can have no rights without duties.

## 6. The Trade Unions and the Management of Industry

Following its seizure of political power, the principal and fundamental interest of the proletariat lies in securing an increase in output, an enormous increase in the productive forces of society. This task, which is clearly formulated in the Programme of the Russian Communist Party, is particularly urgent in our country today owing to post-war ruin, famine and economic dislocation. Hence, the speediest and most enduring success in restoring large-scale industry is a condition without which no success can be achieved in the general cause of emancipating labour from the yoke of capital and securing the victory of socialism. To achieve this success in Russia, in the conditions at present obtaining in that country, it is absolutely essential that all authority in the factories be concentrated in the hands of the management. The factory management, usually built up on the principle of one-man responsibility, must have authority independently to fix and pay out wages, and also distribute rations, working clothes, and all other supplies; it must enjoy the utmost freedom to manoeuvre, exercise strict control of the actual successes achieved in increasing production, in making the factory pay its way and show a profit, and carefully select the most talented and capable administrative personnel, etc.

Under these circumstances, all direct interference by the trade unions in the management of factories must be regarded as positively harmful and impermissible.

It would be absolutely wrong, however, to interpret this indisputable axiom to mean that the trade unions must play no part in the socialist organisation of industry and in the management of state industry. Their participation in this is necessary in the following strictly defined forms.

## 7. The Role and Functions of the Trade Unions in the Business and Administrative Organisations of the Proletarian State

The proletariat is the class foundation of the state making the transition from capitalism to socialism. In a



country where the small peasantry is overwhelmingly predominant the proletariat can successfully fulfil this function only if it very skilfully, cautiously and gradually establishes an alliance with the vast majority of the peasantry. The trade unions must collaborate closely and constantly with the government, all the political and economic activities of which are guided by the class-conscious vanguard of the working class—the Communist Party. Being a school of communism in general, the trade unions must, in particular, be a school for training the whole mass of workers, and eventually all working people, in the art of managing socialist industry (and gradually also agriculture).

Proceeding from these principles, the trade unions' part in the activities connected with the business and administrative organisations of the proletarian state should take the following main forms:

- (1) The trade unions should help to staff all the business and administrative bodies connected with economics by nominating their candidates for them and casting a consultative vote; the trade unions take part in these bodies, too, not directly, but through the members of the higher state bodies, the members of business boards, members of the factory managements (where collegiate management is practised), managers, their assistants, etc., nominated by them and endorsed by the Communist Party and the Soviet government.

- (2) One of the most important functions of the trade unions is to promote and train factory managers from among the workers and the masses of the working people generally. At the present time we have scores of such factory managers who are quite satisfactory, and hundreds who are more or less satisfactory, but very soon, however, we must have hundreds of the former and thousands of the latter. The trade unions must much more carefully and persistently than hitherto keep a systematic register of all workers and peasants capable of holding posts of this kind, and thoroughly, efficiently and from every aspect verify the progress they make in learning the art of management.

- (3) No less important is the participation of the trade unions in all the planning bodies of the proletarian state.

In addition to participating in all cultural and educational activities and in production propaganda, the trade unions must also, on an increasing scale, enlist the working class and the masses of the working people generally for all branches of the work of building up the state economy; they must make them familiar with all aspects of economic life and with all details of industrial operations—from the procurement of raw materials to the marketing of the product; give them a more and more concrete understanding of the single state plan of socialist economy and the worker's and peasant's practical interest in its implementation.

(4) The drawing up of wage rates and scales of supplies, etc., is one of the essential functions of the trade unions in the building of socialism and in their participation in the management of industry. In particular, disciplinary courts should steadily improve labour discipline and proper ways of promoting it and achieving increased productivity; but they must not interfere with the functions of the People's Courts in general or with the functions of factory managements.

This list of the major functions of the trade unions in the work of building up socialist economy, should, of course, be drawn up in greater detail by the competent trade union and government bodies. The most important thing is that the trade unions should consciously and resolutely avoid direct, inexpert, incompetent and irresponsible interference in administrative matters, which has caused no little harm, and should start persistent, practical activities calculated to extend over a long period of years and designed to give the workers and all the working people generally *practical training* in the art of *managing* the economy of the whole country.

## 8. Contact With the Masses— the Fundamental Condition for All Trade Union Activity

Contact with the masses, i.e., with the overwhelming majority of the workers (and eventually of all the working people), is the most important and most fundamental con-

dition for the success of all trade union activity. In all the trade union organisations and their machinery, from bottom up, there should be instituted, and tested in practice over a period of many years, a system of responsible comrades—who must not all be Communists—who should live right among the workers, study their lives in every detail, and be able unerringly, on any question, and at any time, to judge the mood, the real needs, aspirations, and thoughts of the masses. They must be able without a shadow of false idealisation to define the degree of their class-consciousness and the extent to which they are influenced by various prejudices and survivals of the past; and they must be able to win the boundless confidence of the masses by comradely attitude and concern for their needs. One of the greatest and most serious dangers that confront the numerically small Communist Party, which, as the vanguard of the working class, is guiding a vast country in the process of transition to socialism (for the time being without the direct support of the more advanced countries), is isolation from the masses, the danger that the vanguard may run too far ahead and fail to “straighten out the line”, fail to maintain firm contact with the whole army of labour, i.e., with the overwhelming majority of workers and peasants. Just as the very best factory, with the very best motors and first-class machines, will be forced to remain idle if the transmission belts from the motors to the machines are damaged, so our work of socialist construction must meet with inevitable disaster if the trade unions—the transmission belts from the Communist Party to the masses—are badly fitted or function badly. It is not sufficient to explain, to reiterate and corroborate this truth; it must be backed up organisationally by the whole structure of the trade unions and by their everyday activities.

#### 9. The Contradictions in the Status of the Trade Unions Under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

From all the foregoing it is evident that there are a number of contradictions in the various functions of the trade unions. On the one hand, their principal method of

operation is that of persuasion and education; on the other hand, as participants in the exercise of state power they cannot refuse to share in coercion. On the one hand, their main function is to protect the interests of the masses of the working people in the most direct and immediate sense of the term; on the other hand, as participants in the exercise of state power and builders of the economy as a whole they cannot refuse to resort to pressure. On the one hand, they must operate in military fashion, for the dictatorship of the proletariat is the fiercest, most dogged and most desperate class war; on the other hand, specifically military methods of operation are least of all applicable to the trade unions. On the one hand, they must be able to adapt themselves to the masses, to their level; on the other hand, they must never pander to the prejudices and backwardness of the masses, but steadily raise them to a higher and higher level, etc., etc.

These contradictions are no accident, and they will persist for several decades. For one thing, these contradictions are inherent in every school. And the trade unions are a school of communism. We cannot count, until the lapse of several decades, on the majority of the workers achieving the highest level of development and discarding all traces and memories of the "school" for adults. Secondly, as long as survivals of capitalism and small production remain, contradictions between them and the young shoots of socialism are inevitable throughout the social system.

Two practical conclusions must be drawn from this. First, for the successful conduct of trade union activities it is not enough to understand their functions correctly, it is not enough to organise them properly. In addition, special tact is required, ability to approach the masses in a special way in each individual case for the purpose of raising these masses to a higher cultural, economic and political stage with the minimum of friction.

Second, the afore-mentioned contradictions will inevitably give rise to disputes, disagreements, friction, etc. A higher body is required with sufficient authority to settle these at once. This higher body is the Communist Party and the international federation of the Communist Parties of all countries—the Communist International.

## 10. The Trade Unions and the Specialists

The main principles of this question are set forth in the Programme of the Russian Communist Party; but these will remain paper principles unless constant attention is paid to the facts which indicate the degree to which they are put into practice. Recent facts of this kind are: first, cases of the murder of engineers by workers in socialised mines not only in the Urals, but also in the Donets Basin; second, the suicide of V. V. Oldenborger,\* chief engineer of the Moscow Waterworks.

The Communist Party and the Soviet government as a whole bear a far greater share of the blame for cases of this kind than the trade unions. It is not a question now of establishing the degree of political guilt, but of drawing certain political conclusions. Unless our leading bodies, i.e., the Communist Party, the Soviet government and the trade unions, guard as the apple of their eye every specialist who does his work conscientiously and knows and loves it—even though the ideas of communism are totally alien to him—it will be useless to expect any serious progress in socialist construction. We may not be able to achieve it soon, but we must at all costs achieve a situation in which specialists—as a separate social stratum, which will persist until we have reached the highest stage of development of communist society—can enjoy better conditions of life under socialism than they enjoyed under capitalism insofar as concerns their material and legal status, comradely collaboration with the workers and peasants, and in the intellectual plane, i.e., finding satisfaction in their work, realising that it is socially useful and independent of the sordid interests of the capitalist class. Nobody will regard a government department as being tolerably well organised if it does not take systematic measures to provide for all the needs of the specialists, to reward the best of them, to safeguard and protect their interests, etc., and does not secure practical results in this.

---

\* Here is what *Pravda* reported about this on January 3, 1922: ((quote full text of report from "Chronicle" on page 4)).

The trade unions must conduct all the activities of the type indicated (or systematically collaborate in the activities of all the government departments concerned) not from the point of view of the interests of the given department, but from the point of view of the interests of labour and of the economy as a whole. With regard to the specialists, on the trade unions devolves the very arduous duty of daily exercising influence on the broad masses of the working people in order to create proper relations between them and the specialists. Only such activities can produce really important practical results.

### **11. The Trade Unions and Petty-Bourgeois Influence on the Working Class**

Trade unions are really effective only when they unite very broad strata of the non-Party workers. This must give rise—particularly in a country in which the peasantry greatly predominates—to relative stability, specifically among the trade unions, of those political influences that serve as the superstructure over the remnants of capitalism and over small production. These influences are petty-bourgeois, i.e., Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik (the Russian variety of the parties of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals)<sup>198</sup> on the one hand, and anarchist on the other. Only among these trends has any considerable number of people remained who defend capitalism ideologically and not from selfish class motives, and continue to believe in the non-class nature of the “democracy”, “equality”, and “liberty” in general that they preach.

It is to this socio-economic cause and not to the role of individual groups, still less of individual persons, that we must attribute the survivals (sometimes even the revival) in our country of such petty-bourgeois ideas among the trade unions. The Communist Party, the Soviet bodies that conduct cultural and educational activities and all Communist members of trade unions must therefore devote far more attention to the ideological struggle against petty-bourgeois influences, trends and deviations among the trade unions, especially because the New Economic Policy is bound to

lead to a certain strengthening of capitalism. It is urgently necessary to counteract this by intensifying the struggle against petty-bourgeois influences upon the working class.

Written December 30, 1921-  
January 4, 1922  
Published with some amendments  
in *Pravda* No. 12, January 17,  
1922

*Collected Works*, Vol. 42,  
pp. 375-85

---

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Narodniks—adherents of a petty-bourgeois trend in the Russian revolutionary movement which arose in the sixties and seventies of the last century. They advocated the abolition of the autocracy and the transfer of the landed estates to the peasants. At the same time, they denied that Russia would necessarily develop along capitalist lines, and therefore considered the peasants, and not the proletariat as the main revolutionary force and the village commune as the embryo of socialism. In their efforts to rouse the peasants to fight the autocracy, the Narodniks went to the villages, "among the people", but met with no support. Narodnik socialism was utopian because it failed to take into account the actual development of society. Narodism went through several stages, evolving from revolutionary democratism to liberalism. In the eighties and nineties, the Narodniks adopted the line of reconciliation with tsarism, expressed the kulaks' interests and fought against Marxism. p. 28

<sup>2</sup> A reference to the abolition of serfdom in Russia in 1861. p. 35

<sup>3</sup> *A Protest by Russian Social-Democrats* was written in August 1899 by Lenin, then in exile in Siberia. It was spearheaded against "Credo"—an Economist manifesto drawn by Y. D. Kuskova.

*Economism*—an opportunist trend in Russian Social-Democracy at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, a variety of international opportunism.

The Economists confined the tasks of the working class to economic struggle for higher wages, better working conditions, etc., asserting that political struggle was a matter for the liberal bourgeoisie. They denied the leading role of the working-class party, claiming that the party should only observe the spontaneous movement and register developments. Exalting the spontaneous working-class movement, the Economists minimised the importance of revolutionary theory and political consciousness



and declared that socialist ideology could arise from a spontaneous movement. They denied the necessity for developing socialist consciousness in the working-class movement and thereby prepared the way for bourgeois ideology. The Economists defended the principle of independent amateurish groups in the Social-Democratic movement and opposed the creation of a centralised working-class party. Economism threatened to deflect the working class from the revolutionary class struggle and turn it into a political appendage of the bourgeoisie. p. 54

- <sup>4</sup> *Chartism*—a mass revolutionary movement of the English workers caused by their difficult economic situation and deprivation of political rights. The movement started in the late thirties with large-scale meetings and demonstrations and continued spasmodically till the early fifties of the last century. p. 54

- <sup>5</sup> Lenin refers to the *International Working Men's Association*—the First International—the first international mass organisation of the proletariat, founded on September 28, 1864, at an international workers' conference in London convened by British and French workers. Karl Marx was the organiser and the leader of the First International, the author of its Inaugural Address, Rules and other programme and tactical documents.

The central directing body of the First International was the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, of which Marx was a life member. Marx worked to overcome the petty-bourgeois influences and sectarian tendencies then prevailing in the working-class movement (trade-unionism in Britain, Proudhonism and anarchism in the Romance countries, Lassalleism in Germany), rallying advanced workers of Europe and America to the principles of scientific socialism. The First International directed the economic and political struggle of the workers in the various countries and strengthened solidarity between them. It played a tremendous role in disseminating Marxism and introducing socialism into the working-class movement.

After the defeat of the Paris Commune (1871), the working class was faced with the task of organising mass national parties based on the principles advanced by the First International. "...As I view European conditions," Marx wrote in 1873, "it is quite useful to let the formal organisation of the International recede into the background for the time being" (Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p. 286). In 1876, at a conference held in Philadelphia, the First International was officially liquidated. p. 54

- <sup>6</sup> *Bernsteinism*—an anti-Marxist trend in international Social-Democracy. It came into being at the end of the nineteenth century in Germany and was named after the German Social-Democrat Eduard Bernstein, who attempted to revise Marx's revolutionary teaching in the spirit of bourgeois liberalism. p. 55

- <sup>7</sup> *Lassalleans*—supporters and followers of the German petty-bourgeois socialist Ferdinand Lassalle; members of the General Asso-

ciation of German Workers founded in 1863 at the congress of workers' associations in Leipzig. Lassalle was the first Chairman of the Association. In their practical activities, Lassalle and his followers adjusted themselves to the hegemony of Prussia and supported the Great-Power policy of Bismarck: "Objectively," Engels wrote to Marx on January 27, 1865, "this was a base action and a betrayal of the whole working-class movement to the Prussians." p. 56

- <sup>8</sup> The strike at the Yaroslavl Big Manufactory took place in April-May 1895. Over 4,000 workers downed tools because the new rates introduced by the administration cut down their wages. The strike was ruthlessly suppressed by troops summoned to Yaroslavl. As a result, one worker was killed, 14 wounded and 11 brought to trial. p. 64

- <sup>9</sup> Lenin quotes von Puttkamer, Prussian Minister of the Interior. p. 64

- <sup>10</sup> *Rabocheye Dyelo* (Workers' Cause)—organ of the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, published in Geneva from April 1899 to February 1902. The *Rabocheye Dyelo* editorial office was the Economists' centre abroad. *Rabocheye Dyelo* supported Bernstein's slogan of "freedom to criticise" Marxism, advocated the opportunist ideas of subordinating the political struggle of the proletariat to the economic struggle, exalted spontaneity in the working-class movement and denied the leading role of the Party. p. 68

- <sup>11</sup> *Iskra* (The Spark)—the first all-Russia illegal Marxist newspaper founded by Lenin in 1900. It played a decisive role in forming the revolutionary Marxist party of the working class of Russia. The first issue of Lenin's *Iskra*, dated December 1900, came out in Leipzig; subsequent issues were published in Munich, from July 1902 in London, and from the spring of 1903 in Geneva. On Lenin's initiative and with his direct participation, the *Iskra* editors drew up the draft programme of the party (published in *Iskra* No. 21) and prepared the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., which laid the foundation for the revolutionary Marxist party in Russia.

Shortly after the Second Party Congress (1903), the Mensheviks, with Plekhanov's support, got control of *Iskra*. Beginning with issue No. 52, *Iskra* ceased to be an organ of revolutionary Marxism and began to be called the "new" *Iskra* in distinction to Lenin's "old" *Iskra*. p. 68

- <sup>12</sup> *Zarya* (Dawn)—a Marxist scientific and political journal published in Stuttgart by the *Iskra* editorial board in 1901-1902. p. 68

- <sup>13</sup> Lenin refers here to the mass strike of St. Petersburg textile workers in May-June 1896. It was caused by the refusal of the factory owners to pay the workers full wages for the non-working days in celebration of the coronation of Nicholas II. The strike began

at the Russian Cotton-Spinning (Kalinkin) Manufactory and spread rapidly to all the cotton-spinning and weaving factories of the city and then to the big machine-building works and other enterprises. It was the first time that the St. Petersburg proletariat rose to a large-scale struggle against the exploiters. Over 30,000 workers went on strike, led by the St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working-Class. The League issued leaflets which called upon the workers to stand up for their rights solidly and staunchly. The League published and circulated the workers' main demands ("What Do the Workers of St. Petersburg Cotton-Spinning Mills Demand?"): reduction of the working day to  $10\frac{1}{2}$  hours, higher rates, timely payment of wages, etc. The St. Petersburg strikes contributed to the spread of the strike movement all over Russia and forced the tsarist government to revise factory legislation and promulgate the law of June 2 (14), 1897, reducing the working day at factories to  $11\frac{1}{2}$  hours.

p. 69

- <sup>14</sup> *The Emancipation of Labour group*—the first Russian group; was founded by Plekhanov in 1883 in Geneva and existed till the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903). It worked hard to disseminate Marxism in Russia: made translations into Russian, published abroad and began to distribute secretly in Russia the works of the founders of Marxism, among them *Manifesto of the Communist Party* by Marx and Engels, *Wage-Labour and Capital* by Marx, and *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* by Engels.

In their works, the members of the group and G. V. Plekhanov in particular criticised the Narodnik theories and expounded the fundamentals of scientific socialism.

At the same time, the group made a number of serious mistakes: they had erroneous ideas about the role of the liberal bourgeoisie in the revolution, underestimated the revolutionary role of the peasantry and the significance of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasants for victory over tsarism.

The Emancipation of Labour group did not yet associate its activity with the mass working-class movement. "The Emancipation of Labour group only laid the theoretical foundations for the Social-Democratic movement and took the first step towards the working-class movement" (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 278).

p. 71

- <sup>15</sup> This pamphlet was written in 1894 in Vilna by A. Kremer and edited by Y. Martov; at first it was circulated in manuscript and hectographed form, and at the close of 1897 was printed in Geneva with a preface and an afterword by P. Axelrod. The pamphlet summed up the experience of Social-Democratic work in Vilna and greatly influenced the Russian Social-Democrats inasmuch as it contained appeals to pass from the methods of narrow study-circle propaganda to mass agitation among workers on issues

concerning their everyday needs and demands. However, the pamphlet exaggerated the role and significance of purely economic struggle to the detriment of political agitation based on general democratic demands. p. 71

- 16 The St. Petersburg *League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class* was formed by Lenin in the autumn of 1895 and united all Marxist workers' circles in the city. For the first time in Russia it combined socialism with the working-class movement and went over from propaganda of Marxism among a narrow circle of advanced workers to political agitation among the broad working-class masses. The League headed the working-class movement and combined the workers' struggle for economic demands with political struggle against tsarism. According to Lenin, it was the first real embryo of a revolutionary party relying on the working-class movement and directing the class struggle of the proletariat. Under the influence of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle, similar leagues were formed in other towns of Russia. p. 71
- 17 The editorial article "To the Russian Workers", written by Lenin for the newspaper *Rabocheye Dyelo* has not yet been found.  
*Russkaya Starina* (The Russian Antiquary)—a monthly journal of history published in St. Petersburg from 1870 to 1918. p. 71
- 18 *S.-Peterburgskiy Rabochiy Listok* (St. Petersburg Workers' Bulletin)—organ of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class. Two issues appeared, in February and September 1897. p. 72
- 19 *Rabochaya Gazeta* (Workers' Gazette)—illegal organ of the Kiev Social-Democrats. Two issues came out, in August and December 1897. p. 72
- 20 The reference is to the Manifesto of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party issued in 1898 on the instructions of the First Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. It put forward as the main task of the Russian Social-Democracy the struggle for political freedom and the overthrow of the autocracy and tied in the political struggle with the general tasks of the working-class movement. p. 72
- 21 The reference is to the meetings of "veterans"—founders of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class, V. I. Lenin, A. A. Vaneyev, G. M. Krzhizhakovskiy, Y. O. Martov and others—and new representatives of the League of Struggle. They were held in St. Petersburg between February 14 and 17 (February 26 and March 1), 1897, when the "veterans" were released from prison before being sent to exile in Siberia. The meetings revealed serious differences on organization and tactics. p. 73
- 22 *Listok "Rabotnika"* (The Workingman's Paper) was published irregularly from 1896 to 1898 in Geneva by the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad. p. 74

- <sup>23</sup> *Decembrists*—Russian revolutionaries from the nobility who, on December 14, 1825, organised a revolt against the tsarist autocracy. p. 74
- <sup>24</sup> An allusion to the tsarist gendarmes, who wore blue uniforms. p. 75
- <sup>25</sup> V.V.—pseudonym of V. P. Vorontsov, one of the ideologists of liberal Narodism in the eighties and nineties of the last century. Lenin's words "the V.Vs of Russian Social-Democracy" are an allusion to the Economists. p. 76
- <sup>26</sup> *Die Neue Zeit*—a theoretical magazine of the German Social-Democratic Party published in Stuttgart between 1883 and 1923. Up to October 1917 it was edited by Karl Kautsky and then by Heinrich Cunow. Some works by Marx and Engels were first published in it. Engels constantly gave advice to the editors and often criticised their deviations from Marxism. From the mid-nineties onwards, the magazine regularly published articles by revisionists, including a series of articles by E. Bernstein, "Problems of Socialism", which opened the revisionists' campaign against the Marxists. During the First World War, the magazine adopted a Centrist Kautskyan position and actually supported the social-chauvinists. p. 78
- <sup>27</sup> *The Vienna Congress of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party*, held from November 2 to 6, 1901, adopted a new party programme in lieu of the old (1888) Hainfeld programme. A draft of the new programme, drawn up by a special commission (V. Adler, and others) on instructions from the Brünn Congress of 1890, contained serious concessions to Bernsteinism, which gave rise to a number of critical remarks; Karl Kautsky, in particular, in his article "Die Revision des Programms der Sozialdemokratie in Österreich", published in *Die Neue Zeit* No. 3 for 1901-1902, advocated preserving the theoretical part of the Hainfeld programme because it expressed more fully and correctly the Social-Democratic understanding of the general historical process and the tasks of the working class. p. 78
- <sup>28</sup> *The Hirsch-Duncker unions*—reformist trade unions established in Germany in 1868 by Hirsch and Duncker, activists of the bourgeois progressist party. Advocating "harmony" of interests between labour and capital, the organisers of the Hirsch-Duncker unions considered that capitalists could be admitted to the unions alongside workers and denied the expediency of a strike struggle. They asserted that the workers could get rid of the yoke of capital within the framework of capitalist society through bourgeois state legislation and trade unions; they saw the main tasks of the trade unions in mediation between workers and employers and in raising money. Opposition to strikes turned these trade unions into organisations of strikebreakers, and their activity was reduced mainly to that of mutual benefit societies and educational bodies. Although the Hirsch-Duncker unions existed up

to May 1933, they were never of any real importance in the German working-class movement despite the efforts of the bourgeoisie and the support of government bodies. In 1933, the opportunist leaders of the Hirsch-Duncker unions joined the fascist "labour front". p. 81

- <sup>29</sup> The reference is to the legal workers' organisations set up in 1901-1903 on the initiative of the chief of the Moscow secret police department Zubatov, with a view to diverting workers from the political struggle against autocracy. The leaders of Zubatov organisations endeavoured to restrict the working-class movement to narrow economic demands and to convince the workers that the government was ready to satisfy these demands. Zubatov organisations were set up in Moscow, Minsk, Odessa, Vilna, Kiev and other cities.

The revolutionary Social-Democrats exposed the Zubatov organisations as reactionary and used legal workers' organisations to draw ever broader sections of the working class into the struggle against the autocracy. Later Lenin wrote, "And now the Zubatov movement is outgrowing its bounds. Initiated by the police in the interests of the police, in the interests of supporting the autocracy and demoralising the political consciousness of the workers, this movement is turning against the autocracy and is becoming an outbreak of the proletarian class struggle" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 90).

The mighty revolutionary upsurge in 1903 forced the tsarist government to dissolve the Zubatov organisations. p. 82

- <sup>30</sup> *The Self-Emancipation of the Workers' group*—a small group of Economists formed in St. Petersburg in the autumn of 1898. It existed only a few months and published a manifesto setting forth its tasks (dated March 1899 and printed in the journal *Nakanune* in July 1899), a set of rules and several leaflets addressed to the workers. p. 82

- <sup>31</sup> *Separate Supplement to "Rabochaya Mysl"*—a pamphlet issued by the editorial board of the newspaper *Rabochaya Mysl* in September 1899. p. 83

- <sup>32</sup> *Nakanune* (On the Eve)—"a social and revolutionary review", a monthly journal of Narodnik tendencies. It was published in Russian from January 1899 to February 1902 in London. Thirty-seven issues appeared. The journal advocated general democratic views and was a rallying-point for representatives of diverse petty-bourgeois parties and trends. *Nakanune* was hostile to Marxism in general and to Russian Social-Democracy in particular. p. 83

- <sup>33</sup> *The Anti-Socialist Law* was introduced in Germany in 1878 by the Bismarck Government and was aimed against the working-class and socialist movement. All Social-Democratic organisations, mass workers' organisations and workers' press were banned, socialist literature was confiscated, Social-Democrats were persecuted, arrested and exiled. Under popular pressure and the

growing working-class movement, the Anti-Socialist Law was repealed in 1890. p. 88

- <sup>34</sup> A reference to the newspaper *Sozialdemokrat*, central organ of the German Social-Democratic Party at the time of the Anti-Socialist Law (1878-90). p. 88

- <sup>35</sup> A reference to the satirical poem "Anthem of the Super-Modern Russian Socialist" published in *Zarya* No. 1 for April 1901 over the signature of Nartsis Tuporylov. It ridiculed the Economists and their adaptation to the spontaneous movement. The author was Y. O. Martov. p. 90

- <sup>36</sup> *Rural superintendent*—an administrative post instituted by the tsarist government in 1899 to strengthen the landowners' power over the peasants. Appointed from among the local landed nobility, rural superintendents received not only extensive administrative, but also judicial powers over the peasants; they even had the right to arrest peasants and subject them to corporal punishment. p. 97

- <sup>37</sup> *The General Jewish Workers' Union of Lithuania, Poland and Russia (Bund)* was founded in 1897 at the Inaugural Congress of Jewish Social-Democratic groups in Vilna and embraced mainly semi-proletarian elements from among the Jewish artisans in the western regions of Russia. At the First Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1898), the Bund joined the R.S.D.L.P. "as an autonomous organisation independent only in matters specifically concerning the Jewish proletariat" (KPSS v rezolutsiyakh i resheniyakh syezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK [The C.P.S.U. in the Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and C.C. Plenary Meetings], Part I, 1954, p. 14).

The Bund upheld nationalism and separatism in the Russian working-class movement, and adopted an opportunist stand on the main problems of the Social-Democratic movement. In April 1901, the Fourth Bund Congress rejected the relations between the Bund and the R.S.D.L.P. established by the First R.S.D.L.P. Congress and took a resolution to substitute federation for autonomy. The congress resolution "On Means of Political Struggle" stated that "the best means of drawing the broad masses into the movement is economic struggle".

At the Second R.S.D.L.P. Congress, the Bund withdrew from the Party after the Congress had rejected its demand for recognition as the sole representative of the Jewish proletariat. In 1906, following the decision of the Fourth (Unity) Congress, the Bund rejoined the R.S.D.L.P.

In the R.S.D.L.P. the Bundists always supported the opportunist wing of the Party (Economists, Mensheviks and liquidators) and opposed the Bolsheviks and Bolshevism. p. 98

- <sup>38</sup> *Svoboda* (Freedom)—a journal published in Switzerland in 1901-1902 by the "revolutionary socialist" *Svoboda* group. The *Svoboda* group advocated terrorism and Economism and joined the St. Pe-

tersburg Economists in opposition to *Iskra* and the St. Petersburg Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. p. 109

- <sup>39</sup> Marx and Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (Marx and Engels, *Selected Works* in two volumes, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, p. 65). p. 114

- <sup>40</sup> *Zemstvos*—local self-government bodies with exceedingly limited powers introduced in the central gubernias of Russia in 1864. The *Zemstvo* members included intellectuals and liberal landowners who opposed the autocracy. Despite this, however, they feared further development of the revolution. The *Zemstvo* officials welcomed the tsar's manifesto of October 17, 1905, as the beginning of a certain "constitutional era", though in reality it was only a manoeuvre to divert the people from the revolutionary struggle by false promises. p. 116

- <sup>41</sup> *Iskra* No. 7 (August 1901) carried in its section "Workers' Movement and Letters from the Factories" a letter from a Petersburg weaver which testified to the vast influence of Lenin's *Iskra* on the advanced workers.

"I showed *Iskra* to many fellow-workers and the copy was read till it was in tatters; but we treasure it.... *Iskra* writes about our cause, about the all-Russia cause which cannot be evaluated in kopeks or measured in hours of work; when you read the paper, you understand why the gendarmes and police are afraid of us workers and of the intellectuals whom we follow. It is a fact that they do not simply make the bosses tremble for their wallet, but inspire fear in the tsar, the employers and the others.... It will not take much now to set the working folk aflame. All that is needed is a spark to kindle the fire that is already smouldering among the people. How true are the words 'the spark will kindle a flame!' ... In the past, every strike was an event, but today everyone sees that strikes alone are not enough, that we must now strive for liberty, win it with might and main. Today everyone, old and young, is eager to read, but the trouble is that there are no books. Last Sunday, I got eleven people together and read them 'Where to Begin', and we discussed it till late in the evening. How truly it expresses everything, how it gets to the very heart of things. And we want to write to your *Iskra* asking you to teach us not only how to begin, but how to live and how to die." p. 119

- <sup>42</sup> *Guesdists*—a revolutionary Marxist trend in the French socialist movement at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, headed by Jules Guesde and Paul Lafargue. In 1882, after the split in the Workers' Party of France at the St. Etienne Congress, the Guesdists formed an independent party retaining its old name. The Guesdists remained loyal to the 1880 Havre programme of the party, the theoretical part of which was written by Karl Marx; they stood for an independent revolutionary policy of the proletariat. They enjoyed great prestige in the industrial centres of France and rallied the advanced elements of the working class.



In 1901, the supporters of the revolutionary class struggle headed by Jules Guesde united in a Socialist Party of France and also began to be called Guesdists after their leader. In 1905, they merged with the reformist French Socialist Party. During the imperialist war of 1914-18, the leaders of this party (Guesde, Sembat and others) betrayed the cause of the working class and went over to social-chauvinists. p. 123

- <sup>43</sup> *Rossiia* (Russia)—a moderate liberal daily published in St. Petersburg from 1899 to 1902. p. 124

- <sup>44</sup> *Struve-ism*—a liberal-bourgeois trend distorting Marxism. It got its name from the chief representative of legal Marxism in Russia, P. B. Struve. Legal Marxism appeared as a social and political trend among the Russian liberal-bourgeois intellectuals in the nineties of the last century. Headed by Struve, legal Marxists attempted to use Marxism in the interests of the bourgeoisie. Lenin pointed out that Struve-ism took from Marxism everything that was acceptable to the liberal bourgeoisie and cast aside the living soul of Marxism—its revolutionary essence, the teaching on the inevitable doom of capitalism, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Struve exalted the capitalist way of life and issued a call "to learn from capitalism". p. 129

- <sup>45</sup> *Afanasy Ivanovich* and *Pulkheria Ivanovna*—a patriarchal family of petty-provincial landowners depicted by the Russian writer N. V. Gogol in his short story *Old-Time Landowners*. p. 129

- <sup>46</sup> A reference to an incident that took place in Hamburg in 1900. A group of 122 bricklayers founded a Free Bricklayers' Union and did piece-work during a strike despite the prohibition of the central association. The Hamburg section of the bricklayers' union complained to the local Party organisations about the strikebreaking activities of the Social-Democratic members of the group. The local organisations submitted the question for consideration by the C.C. of the German Social-Democratic Party. The court of arbitration appointed by the C.C. branded the conduct of the Social-Democratic members of the Free Bricklayers' Union but turned down the suggestion that they should be expelled from the Party. p. 142

- <sup>47</sup> *Brentanoism*—a "liberal-bourgeois theory recognising the non-revolutionary 'class' struggle of the proletariat" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 229), advocating the possibility of solving the labour problem within the framework of capitalism through factory legislation and the organisation of workers in trade unions. The trend got its name from Lujo Brentano, one of the chief representatives of the Katheder-Socialist school in bourgeois political economy. p. 146

- <sup>48</sup> *Rassvet* (Dawn)—a daily legal liberal newspaper published in St. Petersburg in 1905. p. 147

<sup>49</sup> *Proletary*—an illegal Bolshevik weekly, Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P., founded by decision of the Third Party Congress. On April 27 (May 10), 1905, the Plenary Meeting of the Party Central Committee appointed Lenin editor-in-chief of the newspaper, which was published in Geneva from May 14 (27) to November 12 (25), 1905. Twenty-six issues appeared. p. 147

<sup>50</sup> *The Jena Congress of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party* was held from September 17 to 23, 1905. Its resolution on mass political strike stressed that the use of mass strikes on a broad scale is one of the most effective means of struggle of the proletariat. . 149

<sup>51</sup> *The Dresden Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party* was held from September 13 to 20, 1903. It concentrated its attention on Party tactics and the struggle against revisionism. A resolution adopted at the congress by an overwhelming majority (288 against 11) stated: "The Party Congress condemns most resolutely the revisionist strivings to change our old tested and triumphant tactics based on the class struggle and to replace the winning of political power (by overthrowing our enemies) by the policy of making concessions to the existing order." The adoption of such a resolution had a certain positive significance. However, the congress did not display sufficient consistency in its struggle against revisionism; the revisionists were not expelled from the German Social-Democratic Party, and after the congress they continued to spread their opportunist views.

When discussing the tactics of the socialist parties, the Amsterdam Congress of the Second International (August 1904) also adopted a decision condemning revisionism, but it did not resolutely conclude as to the necessity of breaking with the revisionists. p. 149

<sup>52</sup> *The Cologne Congress of German trade unions* took place in May 1905. The reformist and opportunist trade union leaders at the congress pursued an anti-socialist trade-unionist policy, claiming that trade unions should confine their activities to economic struggle with capital on the basis of the everyday vital interests of the working class and should not wage a political struggle. On the question of mass political strikes, they succeeded in getting a resolution adopted which said that the congress condemned the propaganda of mass political strikes and recommended that the workers should energetically oppose attempts of this kind. The opportunist leaders of the congress also moved that the May Day celebration should be postponed until the evening under the pretext of giving all the workers the opportunity to take part in it. This was an attempt to deprive the May Day celebration of its militant international character. The majority of the congress rejected this proposal.

*Proletary* No. 5 for June 26 (13), 1905, carried an article "Fifth Congress of Trade Unions in Germany", which sharply criticised the opportunist decisions adopted by the congress. p. 150

- <sup>53</sup> *Mensheviks*—an opportunist trend in Russian Social-Democracy.

During the election of the central bodies at the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. in 1903, the revolutionary Social-Democrats headed by Lenin got the majority (in Russian—*bolshinstvo*, hence Bolsheviks) and the opportunists were in the minority (in Russian—*menshinstvo*, hence Mensheviks).

During the 1905-1907 revolution, the Mensheviks opposed the hegemony of the working class in the revolution and the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, and demanded a compromise with the liberal bourgeoisie, who, they thought, should be given the lead in the revolution. During the years of reaction that followed the defeat of the 1905-1907 revolution, the bulk of the Mensheviks became liquidators; they demanded that the illegal revolutionary party of the working class should be liquidated. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917, the Mensheviks entered the bourgeois Provisional Government, supported its imperialist policy and fought against the socialist revolution then in preparation.

After the October Socialist Revolution, the Mensheviks became an openly counter-revolutionary party which organised and participated in plots and uprisings aimed at overthrowing Soviet power.

p. 152

- <sup>54</sup> A reference to the tsar's manifesto—a law instituting the State Duma and its election regulations—published on August 6 (19), 1905. The Duma was named after A. G. Bulygin, Minister for the Interior, whom the tsar charged with drawing up the draft law on the Duma. According to the Bulygin draft, the majority of the population were disfranchised and the Duma was to have only advisory powers. The Bulygin Duma was never convened, for it was swept away by the rising revolutionary tide.

p. 157

- <sup>55</sup> *The Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905* ended in defeat for the tsarist autocracy. On August 23 (September 5), 1905, Russia and Japan signed a peace treaty at Portsmouth (U.S.A.) which stipulated that the tsarist government should cede to Japan the rights to the bases at Port Arthur and Dalny, the South-Manchurian Railway and the south of Sakhalin. Japanese influence was recognised as dominating in Korea. Moreover, Russia undertook to grant Japan fishing concessions near the Russian coast in the Japan, Okhotsk and Behring seas. By signing the Portsmouth peace treaty, tsarism intended to free its hands to fight the revolution that was growing in the country.

p. 157

- <sup>56</sup> *Vorwärts*—a daily newspaper, central organ of the German Social-Democratic Party, published in Berlin from 1891 to 1933. In its columns, Engels waged a struggle against all manifestations of opportunism. In the late nineties, after Engels' death, the *Vorwärts* editorial board fell into the hands of the Party's Right wing and the paper systematically published articles by opportunists.

p. 160

- <sup>57</sup> *Le Temps*—a daily conservative newspaper published in Paris from 1861 to 1942.

p. 160

- <sup>58</sup> *Le Matin*—a daily newspaper of the French bourgeoisie, published in Paris from 1884 to 1944. p. 160
- <sup>59</sup> M. Borisov's article "On the Trade Union Movement and the Tasks of Social-Democracy" was published in *Proletary* with an editorial note by Lenin and then reprinted in the Bolshevik newspaper *Novaya Zhizn* No. 7, November 8, 1905, published in St. Petersburg. The article spoke of the workers' striving for unity in trade unions and their attempts at organising them. Therefore the Social-Democratic Party, the advanced and organised detachment of the working class, whose slogans were to be taken up by millions of proletarians, faced the following tasks: to assist actively in organising trade unions, direct their work, carry out Social-Democratic agitation among their members, educate the workers to understand the class struggle and the socialist tasks of the proletariat. p. 162
- <sup>60</sup> *Moskovskiy Vedomosti* (Moscow Recorder)—one of the oldest Russian newspapers, published by the Moscow University from 1756. From 1863 to 1887, the editor and publisher of the newspaper was M. N. Katkov, an extreme reactionary and chauvinist. During that period, the newspaper became a monarchist and nationalist organ expressing the views of the most reactionary groups of the landowners and the clergy. From 1905 onwards, the newspaper became one of the chief organs of the Black Hundreds and was published up to the Great October Socialist Revolution. p. 162
- <sup>61</sup> *Osvobozhdeniye* group—members of the liberal bourgeoisie formed around the fortnightly journal *Osvobozhdeniye* (Emancipation), published abroad from June 18 (July 1), 1902 to October 5 (18), 1905. Edited by P. B. Struve, it consistently expressed the ideas of moderate monarchist liberalism. In 1903, the *Osvobozhdeniye League* developed around the journal; it took definite shape in January 1904 and existed until October 1905. The *Osvobozhdeniye League* made up the core of the Constitutional-Democratic (Cadet) Party founded in October 1905. p. 164
- <sup>62</sup> *The All-Russia Railwaymen's Union* was formed at the First All-Russia Railwaymen's Congress held in Moscow on April 20-21 (May 3-4), 1905. The congress moved a number of political and economic demands, viz.: granting of political freedoms, convocation of a Constituent Assembly, better working conditions on railways, etc. With the growth of the 1905-1907 revolution, Bolshevik influence in the Railwaymen's Union was strengthened. The Second All-Russia Railwaymen's Congress held in Moscow, July 22-24 (August 4-6), 1905, resolved to start immediately agitation for an all-Russia political railwaymen's strike. The All-Russia Railwaymen's (so-called delegates') Congress took place in St. Petersburg in September-October 1905. Under pressure from the revolutionary masses it presented the government with a number of demands: an eight-hour working day, electivity of railway administration from top to bottom, immediate release of those arrested for taking part in the strike, repeal of martial

law and reinforced security measures, granting of political freedoms, amnesty, national self-determination, immediate convocation of a Constituent Assembly elected on the basis of universal, equal, direct suffrage by secret ballot. Lenin underscored the leading role of railwaymen and their union in the October general political strike. The strike began on October 7 (20), 1905, on the Moscow-Kazan Railway and rapidly grew into an all-Russia political strike which dealt a heavy blow to the autocracy. The All-Russia Conference of representatives of 29 railways supported the decision of the Bolshevik Moscow City Conference to hold a general political strike, and on December 6 (19), 1905, it adopted the resolution to join the strike and to declare immediately an all-Russia railway strike. p. 164

<sup>63</sup> At the session of the Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies on November 13 (26), 1905, Lenin spoke on measures to fight the lock-out by which the capitalists responded to the eight-hour working day introduced by workers themselves and moved a resolution on this point. On the basis of it, the Executive Committee of the Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies adopted on November 14 (27) a decision on the measures to fight the lock-out. p. 167

<sup>64</sup> The Party Programme adopted in 1903 at the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. consisted of two parts: the maximum programme and the minimum programme. The former was aimed at the victory of the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat to build socialist society. The latter included the Party's immediate demands: overthrow of the autocracy, establishment of a democratic republic, introduction of an eight-hour working day, elimination of all survivals of serfdom in the countryside. p. 171

<sup>65</sup> *Calends*—the name of the first day of the month in the ancient Roman calendar. The Greeks did not have this name. To defer till the Greek calends means to put off for ever. p. 173

<sup>66</sup> This refers to the All-Russia political strike in October 1905. p. 173

<sup>67</sup> *Nasha Zhizn* (Our Life)—a daily paper of liberal trend. It appeared in St. Petersburg intermittently from November 1904 to June 1906. p. 174

<sup>68</sup> *Radical-Democrats*—members of a petty-bourgeois organisation formed in November 1905. Their position was intermediate between those of the Cadets and the Mensheviks. The Radical-Democrats demanded a democratic republic, even though they were willing to settle for a constitutional monarchy, provided the government was accountable to parliament. Their organisation disintegrated early in 1906. p. 174

<sup>69</sup> *Socialist-Revolutionaries* (S.-R.s)—a petty-bourgeois party in Russia, formed at the end of 1901 and beginning of 1902 from the amalgamation of various Narodnik groups and circles. The Social-

ist-Revolutionaries did not see the class distinctions between the proletariat and the small proprietor. They glossed over the class differentiation and contradictions within the peasantry and rejected the proletariat's leading role in the revolution. The tactics of individual terrorism, which the Socialist-Revolutionaries advocated as the basic method of struggle against the autocracy, did much harm to the revolutionary movement and made it difficult to organise the masses for revolutionary struggle.

The agrarian programme of the Socialist-Revolutionaries envisaged the abolition of private landownership and transfer of the land to the village communes on the basis of the "labour principle", "equalised" tenure, and the development of co-operatives. There was nothing socialist in this programme, which the Socialist-Revolutionaries described as a programme for "socialisation of land". At the same time, Lenin pointed out that the demand for equalised land tenure, while not socialist, was historically progressive and revolutionary-democratic, being directed against reactionary landlordism.

The Bolshevik Party exposed the Socialist-Revolutionaries' attempts to pose as socialists; it waged a persistent struggle against the Socialist-Revolutionaries for influence over the peasantry, and revealed the harmful effect which their tactics of individual terrorism had on the working-class movement. However, under certain conditions the Bolsheviks concluded temporary agreements with the Socialist-Revolutionaries in the struggle against tsarism.

The class heterogeneousness of the peasantry accounted for the political and ideological instability of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the organisational confusion among them, for their constant wavering between the liberal bourgeoisie and the proletariat. During the Stolypin reaction (1907-10), the Socialist-Revolutionary Party disintegrated ideologically and organisationally. The First World War saw most Socialist-Revolutionaries adopt social-chauvinist views.

After the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, together with the Mensheviks and Cadets, formed the mainstay of the counter-revolutionary bourgeois-landowner Provisional Government, which included leaders of their party, Kerensky, Avksentyev and Chernov. The Socialist-Revolutionary Party refused to support the peasants' demand for abolition of the landed estates, and advocated its maintenance. The Socialist-Revolutionary ministers of the Provisional Government sent punitive expeditions against the peasants who had seized landed estates.

During the foreign military intervention and the Civil War, the Socialist-Revolutionaries carried on counter-revolutionary subversive activities, vigorously supported the interventionists and whiteguards, took part in counter-revolutionary plots, and organised terrorist acts against Soviet statesmen and Communist Party leaders. After the Civil War, they continued their activities against the Soviet state.

- <sup>70</sup> Lenin here refers to the heroic struggle of the Lodz proletariat in December 1906-March 1907 against the lock-out declared by the Union of Lodz Manufacturers with the aim of depriving the workers of the gains achieved during the revolution. A riot at one of the factories was used as a pretext for the lock-out. The manufacturers threatened to fire every fifth worker in answer to the workers' refusal to give away the "disturbers". After the workers had resolutely rejected the demands of the manufacturers and gone on strike, the Manufacturers' Union closed at first the seven biggest Lodz factories and then all the remaining factories and shops. Following the Lodz manufacturers, the textile mill owners in Warsaw and Vilna, also declared a lock-out.

Thirty thousand workers took part in the struggle, which lasted three months. Workers in Warsaw, St. Petersburg, Moscow and other towns came to the aid of their Lodz comrades. They opened a subscription list for the benefit of the lock-out victims; trade union papers published accounts of the collections, appeals for support of the strikers and other material.

However, the resistance of the Lodz workers, was broken by hunger and repressions. p. 178

- <sup>71</sup> See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, pp. 390-94. p. 179

- <sup>72</sup> The Odessa publishing house Osvobozhdeniye Truda put out in 1907 a collection of articles on the labour question which included the unsigned article "On the Question of the Labour Congress", supporting the idea of a labour congress. p. 179

- <sup>73</sup> The reference is to the resolution "To the Question on the Limits of the Agitational Work in Favour of the Labour Congress" adopted by the Second Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. ("First All-Russia"), held in Tammerfors on November 3-7 (16-20), 1906. p. 179

- <sup>74</sup> *Proletary* (Proletarian)—an illegal Bolshevik newspaper which appeared from August 21 (September 3), 1906, to November 28 (December 11), 1909, and was edited by Lenin. Altogether 50 issues appeared.

*Proletary* was actually the Central Organ of the Bolsheviks. The main editorial work was done by Lenin. Most of the issues carried several of his articles. Altogether over 100 articles and items by Lenin on vital issues of the revolutionary struggle of the working class were published in *Proletary*. p. 179

- <sup>75</sup> *The Duma*—a representative body which the tsarist government was compelled to convene as a result of the revolutionary events of 1905. Formally the Duma was a legislative body, but actually it had no real power.

Elections to the Duma were neither direct, equal, nor universal. The electoral rights of the working classes and of the non-Russian nationalities inhabiting Russia were greatly curtailed, and a considerable number of the workers and peasants had no vote at all. Under the electoral law of December 11 (24), 1905, the vote of a landowner was equivalent to 3 urban bourgeoisie votes, 15 peasant votes, and 45 workers' votes.

The First Duma (April-July) 1906 and the Second Duma (February-June 1907) were dissolved by the tsarist government.

After the coup d'état of June 3, 1907, the government promulgated a new electoral law, which still further curtailed the rights of the workers, peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie and ensured complete domination by the Black-Hundred bloc of landowners and big capitalists in the Third (1907-12) and Fourth (1912-17) Dumas. p. 181

- <sup>76</sup> *Octobrists*—members of the Octobrist Party (or Union of October Seventeenth) formed in Russia after the promulgation of the tsar's Manifesto of October 17 (30), 1905. It was a counter-revolutionary party representing and defending the interests of the big bourgeoisie and the landowners. The Octobrists fully supported the home and foreign policy of the tsarist government. p. 181

- <sup>77</sup> *Cadets*—members of the Constitutional-Democratic Party, the principal party of the Russian liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie. The Cadet Party was founded in October 1905, its membership including representatives of the bourgeoisie, Zemstvo officials from among the landowners, and bourgeois intellectuals. The Cadets called themselves the "party of people's freedom" to mislead the working masses. In reality they never demanded anything beyond a constitutional monarchy. They considered as their main task the fight against the revolutionary movement, and they strove to share power with the tsar and the feudal landowners. During the First World War, the Cadets actively supported the tsarist government's foreign policy of conquest. At the time of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917, they tried to save the monarchy. They played the key role, in the bourgeois Provisional Government, and pursued a counter-revolutionary policy opposed to the interests of the people. Following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Cadets became rabid enemies of Soviet power and participated in all armed counter-revolutionary actions and campaigns of the interventionists. Living in emigration after the defeat of the interventionists and whiteguards, they continued their anti-Soviet counter-revolutionary activity. p. 181

- <sup>78</sup> *The Cadet Electoral Law of December 11 (24), 1905*—a law on the elections to the First Duma promulgated by the tsarist government at the height of the Moscow armed uprising.

Unlike the "consultative" Bulygin Duma, the one envisaged by the new law was a "legislative" Duma. To the earlier established agricultural (landowners), urban (bourgeoisie) and peasant curias, it added a workers' curia and somewhat extended the composition of the urban electorate, without increasing, however, the total number of electors from the urban curia. Suffrage was not universal, not equal, or direct. The electoral law of December 11 (24), 1905, ensured an overwhelming predominance of landowners and capitalists in the Duma. p. 181

- <sup>79</sup> On June 3 (16), 1907, the tsar's manifesto was issued, by which the Second Duma was dissolved and the electoral law altered.



The new law increased considerably the representation of landowners and commercial and industrial bourgeoisie in the Duma, and reduced several times the already meagre representation of workers and peasants. This was a flagrant violation of the Manifesto of October 17, 1905, and the Fundamental Law of 1906, under which no laws could be promulgated by the government without the approval of the Duma. The Third Duma, elected on the basis of this law, assembled on November 1 (14), 1907, and was a Duma of Black Hundred and Octobrist deputies.

The coup d'état of June 3 ushered in the period of Stolypin reaction. p. 182

- <sup>80</sup> *Non-party Progressists*—a political grouping of the liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie of Russia, which during the election to the Dumas and in the Dumas themselves, sought to unite various elements of the bourgeois and landowner parties and groups under the flag of "non-partisanship".

In November 1912, the Progressists formed a separate political party with the following programme: a moderate constitution with limited franchise, petty reforms, a responsible ministry, i.e., a government answerable to the Duma, and suppression of the revolutionary movement. Lenin pointed out that in composition and ideology the Progressists were a "cross between the Octobrists and the Cadets". p. 182

- <sup>81</sup> *The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart*—the Seventh Congress of the Second International—was held from August 18 to 24 (New Style), 1907.

Eight hundred and eighty six delegates from socialist parties and trade unions were present at the congress. The Russian delegation consisted of 37 Social-Democrats, 21 Socialist-Revolutionaries and 7 members of trade unions. The questions considered by the congress included the relations between the political parties and the trade unions. Despite Right-wing opposition, a resolution was adopted on this issue, reaffirming the principle of partisanship of the trade unions. p. 183

- <sup>82</sup> *The Stockholm Congress*—the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., held in Stockholm from April 10 to 25 (April 23-May 8), 1906. p. 183

- <sup>83</sup> *Die Gleichheit* (Equality)—a Social-Democratic fortnightly journal, organ of the German working women's movement; later it became the organ of international women's movement; it was published in Stuttgart from 1890 to 1925 and edited by Clara Zetkin from 1892 to 1917. p. 183

- <sup>84</sup> *The Preface to the Pamphlet by Voinov (A. V. Lunacharsky) on the Attitude of the Party Towards the Trade Unions* was written by Lenin in November 1907. In his letter to A. V. Lunacharsky written between November 2 and 11 (15-24), 1907, after he had received the last part of the manuscript of this pamphlet, Lenin wrote that "there are many unguarded statements, the kind of things which various S.-R.s, Mensheviks, syndicalists, etc., will

*pick on.* We discussed collectively whether we should touch it up or give an explanation in the preface. We decided on the latter course....” Further Lenin gave advice as to how improve the pamphlet with the aim of directing it against both opportunism and syndicalism which produces “no end of confusion (particularly dangerous confusion in the case of Russia)” (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 34, pp. 370-71). Lunacharsky’s pamphlet was never published. p. 185

<sup>85</sup> *Znamya Truda* (Banner of Labour)—the central organ of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, published in Paris from July 1907 to April 1914. p. 185

<sup>86</sup> This refers to the *Mannheim Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party* held in September 23-29, 1906. The chief item on the agenda was the question of mass political strikes, which the German Social-Democrats at their Jena Congress in 1905, under the direct influence of the revolutionary movement in Russia, recognised as the most important method of political struggle. The congress adopted a resolution making the declaration by the party of a mass political strike dependent on the consent of the General Commission of Trade Unions, whose opportunist leaders categorically opposed a mass political strike, considering it as anarchistic, and adopted a resolution in that spirit at a trade union congress in Cologne in 1905. The Mannheim Congress did not openly condemn the opportunist position of the trade union leaders, but recommended all party members to join trade union organisations, and trade union members to join the S.-D. Party “in order to infuse the spirit of Social-Democracy into the trade union movement”. p. 186

<sup>87</sup> *Narcissus*—in Greek mythology a handsome young man who fell in love with his own reflection, figuratively, a conceited man. p. 187

<sup>88</sup> *Nozdrev*—one of the characters in Gogol’s *Dead Souls*. p. 188

<sup>89</sup> *The Paris Commune of 1871*—the first-ever dictatorship of the proletariat, which existed from March 18 to May 28, 1871. p. 191

<sup>90</sup> The resolution of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P. on the trade unions was published in *Proletary* No. 21, February 13 (26), 1908.

Party members were instructed to set up Party groups within trade union organisations and to work in them under the guidance of the local Party centres. Where police persecution made it impossible to organise trade unions or to restore those that had been broken up, the C.C. proposed that trade union nuclei and trade unions should be organised illegally. As regards such legal organisations as mutual benefit societies, and temperance societies, the resolution of the C.C. instructed the local Party organisations to form within them “well-knit groups of Social-Democrats to carry out Party work among the broadest possible masses of the proletariat”. To thwart any attempt by the Mensheviks to interpret this part of the resolution in an opportunistic spirit the reso-

lution pointed out the need to make it clear that "the organised activity of the proletariat cannot be limited to such societies alone" and that the legal existence of trade unions "should not belittle the militant tasks of proletarian trade unions" (*Proletary*, No. 21, February 13 (26), 1908, p. 4).

<sup>91</sup> *Nash Vek* (Our Century)—a newspaper, popular edition of the Left-Cadet organ *Tovarishch*, published in St. Petersburg in 1905-1908. p. 193

<sup>92</sup> The Bolshevik draft resolution on the trade unions published in *Proletary*, No. 17, October 20, 1907, says: "Strenuous work must be performed by Social-Democrats in trade union movement as dictated by the present situation, it must be conducted in the spirit of the London and Stuttgart resolutions, i.e., by no means in the spirit of recognising the principle of neutrality or non-partisanship of the trade unions. On the contrary, it must be carried out with a view to establishing possibly the closest and firmest relations with the Social-Democratic Party. The partisanship of the trade unions must be achieved by S.-D. propaganda and organisational work within the unions and declaration of this partisanship is advisable only when a considerable majority of trade union members firmly adhere to Social-Democratic views."

In the resolution of the C.C., R.S.D.L.P. on trade unions the last phrase ("The partisanship of the trade unions...") was replaced by the following: "The Social-Democratic partisanship of the trade unions must be achieved exclusively by S.-D. propaganda and organisational work within the unions and must not infringe the unity of the proletariat's economic struggle" (*Proletary*, No. 21, February 13 (26), 1908). Explaining the resolution on trade unions in a letter to local organisations on Social-Democratic work within the trade unions, published in *Proletary*, No. 23, February 27 (March 14), 1908, the C.C. outlined and recommended a number of measures to strengthen the ties between the Party and trade union organisations. Among them were the following: 1) to hold meetings of Social-Democrats working on trade union boards for preliminary discussion of the most urgent Party as well as trade union problems; 2) to discuss at Party meetings the most urgent problems of trade union work, etc. p. 193

<sup>93</sup> *Vperyod* (Forward)—a Bolshevik mass workers' newspaper directed by Lenin; published illegally in Vyborg by the editorial board of *Proletary* from September 1906 to January 1908. Twenty issues appeared. p. 194

<sup>94</sup> The book *A Reconsideration of the Agrarian Programme and Its Substantiation* by D. Firsov (D. Rosenblum) and M. Jacoby (M. Hendelman) was issued by the Era Publishers (Moscow, 1908). The book was confiscated. The analysis of it in *Proletary* promised by Lenin did not appear. p. 198

<sup>95</sup> *Sovremennyy Mir* (Contemporary World)—a monthly literary, scientific and political magazine, published in St. Petersburg from October 1906 to 1918. p. 199

- <sup>96</sup> *Justice*—a weekly published in London from January 1884 to the beginning of 1925; organ of the Social-Democratic Federation and from 1911, organ of the British Socialist Party. From February 1925 to December 1933, the paper appeared under the name *Social-Democrat*. p. 201
- <sup>97</sup> *The Labour Leader*—a monthly journal, organ of the Independent Labour Party, published since 1801. Since 1946 it has appeared under the name *Socialist Leader*. p. 202
- <sup>98</sup> The *Independent Labour Party*—a reformist organisation founded by the leaders of the "new trade unions" in 1893 during the intensification of the strike movement and the mounting drive for independence of the British working class from the bourgeois parties. The membership of the I.L.P. consisted of the "new trade-unionists" and members of the old trade unions, as well as intellectuals and petty bourgeois holding Fabian views. The leader of the Party was Keir Hardie. The programme of the party included the struggle for collective ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, introduction of an eight-hour working day, prohibition of child labour, social insurance and unemployment relief.
- From the day it was founded, the I.L.P. took a bourgeois-reformist stand, devoting its chief attention to parliamentary forms of struggle and parliamentary deals with the Liberal Party. In the words of Lenin, the Independent Labour Party was "actually an opportunist party that has always been dependent on the bourgeoisie", it was "'independent' only of socialism, but very dependent on liberalism" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 494 and Vol. 18, p. 360). p. 202
- <sup>99</sup> *Reynolds' News* (*Reynolds' Weekly Newspaper*)—English newspaper of radical trend published in London from 1850 to 1924. In the early 1850s it supported the Chartists. Since 1924 it has appeared under the name *Reynolds' Illustrated*. p. 202
- <sup>100</sup> *The Times*—a daily newspaper founded in 1785 in London; one of the biggest Conservative newspapers of the British bourgeoisie. p. 202
- <sup>101</sup> *The Fabians*—members of the Fabian Society, an English reformist organisation founded in 1884 and named after the Roman General Quintus Fabius Maximus (3rd century B.C.) dubbed the Cunctator (Procrastinator) for his temporising tactics and evasion of decisive battles in the war with Hannibal. The membership of the Fabian Society consisted chiefly of bourgeois intellectuals—scientists, writers and politicians (the Webbs, Ramsay MacDonald, Bernard Shaw, and others). They denied the need for the proletariat's class struggle and a socialist revolution, and maintained that the transition from capitalism to socialism could be brought about only by minor and gradual reforms. In 1900 the Fabian Society joined the Labour Party. "Fabian socialism" is one of the sources of Labour Party ideology. p. 202

- <sup>102</sup> *The New Age*—a democratic survey of politics, religion and literature. Published in London from 1894 to 1938. p. 202
- <sup>103</sup> This article was written by Lenin in connection with a workers' meeting held in Berlin on September 7 (20), 1908, to protest against the growing menace of war. The article was intended for issue No. 36 of the newspaper *Proletary*, but was not published. p. 204
- <sup>104</sup> *The Labour Party* was founded in 1900 as a result of the amalgamation of trade unions, socialist organisations and groups with the aim of putting workers' representatives in Parliament (Labour Representation Committee). In 1906, the Committee was renamed the Labour Party. Members of trade unions automatically become members of the Party if they pay party dues. The Labour Party originally took shape as a workers' party, but was later joined by a considerable number of petty-bourgeois elements. In its ideology and tactics it is an opportunist organisation. Ever since its foundation, the leaders of the party have been pursuing a policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. During the First World War (1914-18) Labour Party leaders advocated social-chauvinist views.  
The Labour Party has several times been in office and has always pursued a policy suiting British imperialism. p. 208
- <sup>105</sup> *The Social-Democratic Federation*—founded in 1884. Besides reformists (Hyndman and others) its membership included a group of revolutionary Social-Democrats holding Marxist views (Harry Quelch, Tom Mann, Edward Aveling, Eleanor Marx, and others). They formed the Left wing of the British socialist movement. Engels criticised the leadership of the Social-Democratic Federation for dogmatism and sectarianism, isolation from the mass working-class movement of England and disregard for its peculiarities. In 1907, the Social-Democratic Federation was named the Social-Democratic Party. In 1911 it joined with Left elements of the Independent Labour Party to form the British Socialist Party. (See Note 114.) p. 208
- <sup>106</sup> *Le Peuple*—a daily newspaper, central organ of the Belgian Workers' Party; published since 1885 in Brussels; now the organ of the Belgian Socialist Party. p. 210
- <sup>107</sup> See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p. 395. p. 211
- <sup>108</sup> *The Italian Socialist Party* was founded in 1892. Ever since its foundation there was a sharp ideological struggle within it between the opportunist and revolutionary wings, which differed on party policy and tactics. Under pressure from the Left, the most outspoken reformists (Bonomi, Bissolati, and others), who supported war and advocated collaboration with the government and the bourgeoisie, were expelled from the party at its congress in Reggio Emilia in 1912. After the outbreak of the war, and before Italy's entry into it, the Party took an anti-war stand. With Italy's entry into the war on the side of the Entente (1915) there

appeared three definite trends in the Italian Socialist Party: 1) the Right wing, who helped the bourgeoisie to pursue the war; 2) the Centrists, who rallied the majority of party members under the slogan "neither participate in the war, nor sabotage it"; and 3) the Left wing, who took a more resolute stand against the war but were unable to organise a consistent opposition to it. The Lefts did not realise the need to turn the imperialist war into civil war and to break away resolutely from the reformists who collaborated with the bourgeoisie. The Italian socialists held a joint conference with the Swiss socialists at Lugano (1914) and took an active part in the international socialist conferences at Zimmerwald (1915) and Kienthal (1916).

At the end of 1916, the Italian Socialist Party took a social-pacifist stand. p. 221

- <sup>109</sup> The reference is to the miners' strike in the spring of 1912, which involved about a million miners. Lenin gives more details of this strike in his article "The British Labour Movement in 1912" (see present edition, pp. 227-28). The same article deals with the Minimum Wages Act mentioned below. p. 223

- <sup>110</sup> This refers to the foundation of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union by Joseph Arch, an agricultural worker, in 1872. By the end of 1872 its membership had reached about 100,000, and the Union had managed to secure wage rises for agricultural workers. However as a result of the agricultural depression in the 1870s, the Union lost its influence; it broke up in 1894. p. 224

- <sup>111</sup> The *American Federation of Labor* (A.F.L.)—a trade union association, formed in 1881. The A.F.L., based on the shop principle, united mainly the "labour aristocracy".

The reformist leadership of the A.F.L. rejects the principles of socialism and class struggle, advocates "class collaboration" and defends the capitalist order. The A.F.L. leadership pursues a policy of splitting the international working-class movement and actively supports the aggressive foreign policy of American imperialism. In 1955, the A.F.L. merged with another trade union association, the Congress of Industrial Organisations. The new body is named the American Federation of Labor—Congress of Industrial Organisations (A.F.L.—C.I.O.). p. 225

- <sup>112</sup> The railway strike in Britain (August 1911) involved almost 200,000 workers. The strike brought railway communications in the country to a standstill and seriously hindered industrial activity. The government sent troops against the strikers. Armed clashes took place in Liverpool, Llanelly and other towns. Several workers were killed and many wounded. This repression aroused a storm of indignation throughout the country. The owners of the railway companies, frightened by the scope of the movement, were compelled to make some concessions, in particular, the Railway Workers' Union received formal recognition. p. 227

<sup>113</sup> Lenin quotes from the workers' song which Georg Herwegh, a German poet, wrote in 1863 for the General Association of German Workers. p. 227

<sup>114</sup> *The British Socialist Party* was founded in 1911 in Manchester, as a result of the amalgamation of the Social-Democratic Party with other socialist groups. The B.S.P. carried on propaganda in the spirit of Marxist ideas; was "not opportunist and was really independent of the Liberals" (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 273). Owing to its small membership and poor contact with the masses, however, it was somewhat sectarian.

During the First World War (1914-18) a sharp struggle developed in the party between the internationalist trend (William Gallacher, Albert Inkpin, John Maclean, Theodore Rothstein and others) and the social-chauvinist trend headed by Henry Mayers Hyndman. There were wavering elements within the internationalist trend who took a Centrist stand on a number of issues. In February 1916, a group of the party's active members founded the newspaper *The Call*, which played an important role in uniting the internationalists. The annual conference of the B.S.P. held at Salford in April 1916 condemned the social-chauvinist stand taken by Hyndman and his adherents, and they left the party.

The British Socialist Party hailed the Great October Socialist Revolution and its members played a great part in the British working people's movement in defence of Soviet Russia against foreign intervention. In 1919, the majority of the local party organisations (98 against 4) declared in favour of joining the Communist International. With the Communist Unity Group, the B.S.P. played a leading role in forming the Communist Party of Great Britain. At the First Unity Congress, held in 1920, the overwhelming majority of the B.S.P. local organisations joined the Communist Party. p. 228

<sup>115</sup> The reference is to the fuss created by the liquidators (see Note 126) and Trotsky for agitational purposes over a "petition" drawn up by the St. Petersburg liquidators in December 1910. The "petition", which demanded freedom to organise unions, to hold meetings and to strike, was to be sent to the Third Duma in the name of the workers. The "petition campaign" was not supported by the workers. p. 230

<sup>116</sup> The general strike in Belgium took place from April 14 to 24, 1913. The Belgian workers came out demanding the amendment of the Constitution, demanding universal and equal suffrage. Between 400,000 and 500,000 out of a total of more than one million workers participated in the strike. p. 234

<sup>117</sup> *Kievskaya Mysl* (Kiev Thought)—a daily newspaper of bourgeois-democratic trend, published in Kiev from 1906 to 1918. p. 235

<sup>118</sup> *Luch* (The Ray)—a legal daily newspaper published by the Menshevik liquidators in St. Petersburg from September 16 (29), 1912 to July 5 (18), 1913. p. 235

<sup>119</sup> This refers to the shooting down of unarmed workers in the Lena gold-fields, Siberia, on April 4 (17), 1912. p. 244

<sup>120</sup> *Black Hundreds*—monarchist gangs organised by the tsarist police to fight the revolutionary movement. They assassinated revolutionaries, assaulted progressive intellectuals and organised pogroms against the Jews. p. 244

<sup>121</sup> This refers to the Slavophil demonstrations organised by reactionary nationalist elements in St. Petersburg on March 17, 18 and 24 (March 30, 31 and April 6), 1913, on the occasion of the Serbo-Bulgarian victories over the Turks during the first Balkan war. The reactionaries tried to use the national liberation struggle of the Balkan peoples to further the Great-Power policy of Russian tsarism in the Near East. p. 246

<sup>122</sup> On *January 9, 1905*, by order of the tsar, troops fired on a peaceful demonstration of St. Petersburg workers marching to the Winter Palace (residence of the tsar) to present a petition to the tsar. This massacre of unarmed workers started a wave of mass political strikes and demonstrations all over Russia under the slogan "Down with the autocracy!"

The events of January 9 marked the beginning of the 1905-1907 revolution. p. 250

<sup>123</sup> The reference is to a one-day strike in St. Petersburg on April 4, 1913, which marked the first anniversary of the shooting of workers in the Lena gold-fields in 1912. More than 85,000 people participated in the strike. p. 250

<sup>124</sup> This refers to the struggle of the Irish liberal bourgeoisie for political self-government within the framework of the British Empire. The Home Rule bill was repeatedly introduced in Parliament but was killed. The bill was introduced for the third time in 1912, at the height of the workers' and national liberation movement in Ireland, and it was sanctioned by the King in 1914. p. 254

<sup>125</sup> The reference is to the *Irish Independent*, a daily newspaper, published since 1891, the chief organ of the Irish nationalists. p. 255

<sup>126</sup> *Liquidationism*—an opportunist trend that spread among the Menshevik Social-Democrats after the defeat of the 1905-1907 revolution.

The liquidators demanded the dissolution of the illegal revolutionary working-class party. They urged the workers to abandon the revolutionary struggle against tsarism, intending to form a legal opportunist organisation which would engage only in the legal activity permitted by the tsarist government. The policy of the liquidators was not supported by the workers. The liquidators were expelled from the Party in January 1912 at the Prague Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. p. 259

<sup>127</sup> *Pravda* (The Truth)—a legal Bolshevik daily, published in St. Petersburg. Founded by Lenin in April 1912.



*Pravda* was a mass working-class newspaper published with money collected by the workers themselves. An extensive system of worker correspondents and worker writers formed round the paper. In a single year it published over 11,000 items by worker correspondents. *Pravda* had an average daily circulation of 40,000 rising in some months to 60,000.

Lenin directed the newspaper while living abroad. He wrote for it almost every day, gave instructions and advice to its editors and gathered the Party's best literary forces around it.

*Pravda* was subjected to constant police persecutions. In two years and three months *Pravda* was closed eight times, but reappeared under other names. The paper was closed down on July 8 (21), 1914, on the eve of the First World War, and did not resume publication until after the February revolution. From March 5 (18), 1917, it came out as the Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P. On April 5 (18), on his return from abroad, Lenin joined the editorial board of *Pravda* and became its Editor-in-Chief. On July 5 (18), 1917, the paper's offices were wrecked by the officer cadets and Cossacks. Between July and October 1917 *Pravda* was persecuted by the Provisional Government and repeatedly changed its name, appearing as *Listok Pravdy*, *Proletary*, *Rabochy*, *Rabochy Put*. On October 27 (November 9) the paper resumed its old name of *Pravda*. p. 261

- <sup>128</sup> *The Six*—six Bolshevik deputies of the Social-Democratic group in the Fourth Duma. *The Seven*—seven Menshevik liquidator deputies of the Social-Democratic group in the Fourth Duma. p. 262

- <sup>129</sup> Lenin calls the Socialist-Revolutionaries Narodniks. p. 263

- <sup>130</sup> *Stoikaya Mysl* (Staunch Thought)—one of the names of the Socialist-Revolutionary newspaper *Trudovoi Golos* (Labour Voice) published in St. Petersburg in 1914. p. 264

- <sup>131</sup> *Nash Put* (Our Path)—a legal workers' newspaper published in Moscow in 1913. Lenin took an active part in its publication. p. 265

- <sup>132</sup> *Metallist* (Metalworker)—a weekly magazine, organ of the Metalworkers' Union published in St. Petersburg in 1914. p. 265

- <sup>133</sup> The reference is to the *Meeting of the C.C. of the R.S.D.L.P. and Party functionaries*, called the February meeting for conspiratorial reasons; it was held in Cracow from December 26, 1912 to January 1, 1913 (January 8-14, 1913).

The meeting adopted decisions on major issues of the working-class movement: the Party's tasks in connection with the new rise of the revolutionary and strike movement; the formation of an illegal organisation; the activity of the Social-Democratic group in the Duma; the insurance campaign; the Party press; the national Social-Democratic organisations; the struggle against the liquidators; and the unity of the proletariat's party. p. 269

- <sup>134</sup> Elections to the Insurance Board were held on March 2 (15), 1914. In connection with these elections, a sharp struggle developed between the Bolsheviks, on the one hand, and the liquidators and Left Narodniks (the S.-Rs), on the other. The Bolsheviks launched a campaign to win over legal workers' organisations and associations, using the insurance campaign to strengthen its influence among the masses. On the occasion of the elections to the Insurance Board, the journal *Voprosy Strakhovaniya*, the newspaper *Proletarskaya Pravda* and later *Put Pravdy* carried the Bolsheviks' instructions to the workers' representatives in the insurance agencies and the Insurance Board. The liquidators published their platform in the newspaper *Novaya Rabochaya Gazeta*, demanding that workers' representatives should form a group independent of the party.

On March 2 (15), 47 delegates attended the meeting to elect workers' representatives to the Insurance Board. The candidates on the list published by the *Put Pravdy* were elected by a majority vote. The liquidators were completely defeated; 75 per cent of the electors supported the Bolsheviks and rejected the platform of the bloc of the liquidators and the Socialist-Revolutionaries. The liquidators suffered a similar defeat during the elections to the All-Russia Insurance Agency; 82 per cent of the 57 delegates were Pravdists.

p. 269

- <sup>135</sup> *Put Pravdy* (The Path of Truth)—one of the names of *Pravda*.  
p. 273

- <sup>136</sup> *The Socialist Party of America* was formed in July 1901. One of its organisers was Eugene Debs, a popular leader of the American labour movement. The party had a mixed social composition, being made up of American workers, immigrant workers, small farmers and petty bourgeois. The Centrist and Right opportunist leadership of the party (Victor L. Berger, Morris Hillquit and others) denied the need for a dictatorship of the proletariat, rejected revolutionary methods of struggle and reduced the activities of the party mainly to participation in election campaigns. During the First World War three trends appeared in the S.P.A.—the social-chauvinists, who supported the government's imperialist policy; the Centrists, who paid only lip-service to the struggle against the imperialist war; and the revolutionary minority, who took an internationalist stand and opposed the war.

The Left wing of the Socialist Party headed by Charles Ruthenberg, William Foster, William Heywood and others and backed by the proletarian members, campaigned against the party's opportunist leadership for independent political action by the proletariat, and for the creation of industrial trade unions based on the principle of the class struggle. In 1919 a split occurred in the Socialist Party. The breakaway Left wing took the lead in forming the Communist Party of the U.S.A., of which it was the core.

p. 275

- <sup>137</sup> See Note 111.

p. 275

- <sup>138</sup> Lenin refers to the tsarist bureaucracy's attitude towards the democratic Zemstvo personnel—doctors, technicians, statisticians, teachers, agriculturists, etc., called the "third element" in a speech made in 1900 by the Samara Deputy Governor-General Kondoidi. The expression was subsequently used in literature to designate the democratic intelligentsia. p. 277
- <sup>139</sup> *Sozialistische Monatshefte*—a monthly journal, the principal organ of the German opportunists, and one of the organs of international revisionism, published in Berlin from 1897 to 1933. During the First World War (1914-18), it took a social-chauvinist stand. p. 278
- <sup>140</sup> Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, 1965, p. 140 p. 283
- <sup>141</sup> See K. Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Moscow, 1966, p. 150. p. 283
- <sup>142</sup> See Engels' letter to Marx of February 5, 1851 (Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 27, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1967, S. 178-81). p. 284
- <sup>143</sup> See Engels' letters to Marx of December 17, 1857, and October 7, 1858 (Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 29, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, S. 230-31, 357-58). p. 284
- <sup>144</sup> See Engels' letter to Marx of April 8, 1863, and Marx's letters to Engels of April 9, 1863, and April 2, 1866 (Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 30, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1967, S. 337-39, 340-43; Bd. 31, S. 197-99). p. 284
- <sup>145</sup> See Engels' letters to Marx of November 19, 1869 and August 11, 1881 (Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 32; Bd. 35, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1967, S. 395-400; S. 19-20). p. 284
- <sup>146</sup> *The Chkheidze faction*—the Menshevik group in the Fourth Duma, led by N. S. Chkheidze. During the First World War, the Menshevik Duma group took a Centrist position, but practically supported the policy of the Russian social-chauvinists. p. 292
- <sup>147</sup> *Nashe Dyelo* (Our Cause)—a Menshevik monthly, chief organ of the Russian liquidators and social-chauvinists. Published in Petrograd in 1915 in place of *Nasha Zarya* (Our Dawn), which was closed down in October 1914.  
*Golos Truda* (Voice of Labour)—a legal Menshevik paper published in Samara in 1916, after the closure of *Nash Golos* (Our Voice). Three issues appeared. p. 292
- <sup>148</sup> *O.C.ists*—Mensheviks united round their leading centre, the Organising Committee (O.C.), formed at the August 1912 conference of liquidators. In the First World War, the O.C. followed a social-chauvinist policy, justified tsarist Russia's part in the war and carried on jingoist propaganda. It functioned up to the election of the Central Committee of the Menshevik Party in August 1917. p. 292
- <sup>149</sup> See Note 122. p. 296

- 150 *The All-Russia Trade Union Conference* (the third) was held in Petrograd from June 21 to 28 (July 4-11), 1917. It was the first legal conference of Russia's trade unions. It was attended by 241 delegates with the right to vote representing 1,400,000 trade union members, 73 of them being Bolsheviks from big industrial centres. Among the items on the agenda were the tasks of the trade union movement and the formation of trade unions.

A bitter ideological struggle developed at the conference between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, S.-R.s, Bundists and others on all the major issues of the agenda.

The Mensheviks preached trade union "neutrality", glossed over the need for a resolute class struggle against the bourgeoisie and supported the S.R.-Menshevik Soviets' conciliatory policy. The Bolshevik resolution on the role of the proletarian party in the trade union movement pointed out that trade union "neutrality" was harmful and that the struggle of the working class could be successful only if the party and trade union organisations acted in unison. The resolution on the tasks of the trade unions said that they could perform their functions successfully only if they fought relentlessly against the imperialist war, "civil peace" with the bourgeoisie and the participation of socialists in bourgeois governments.

Under the influence of the Bolshevik delegates, the conference adopted a resolution demanding the immediate promulgation of a decree on the eight-hour working day, the ban of overtime, etc.

It elected a provisional Central Council of Trade Unions and approved the rules for the next congress. p. 304

- 151 On August 23 (September 5), 1917, in view of the elections to the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the workers' section of the Soviet raised the question of revising the system of elections to the Soviet under which one delegate was elected for every 1,000 workers, while soldiers elected one delegate from each unit, command or company. As a result, the soldiers had a considerably greater number of deputies in the Soviet than the workers. By a majority of votes the workers' section adopted a Bolshevik resolution saying that the system of elections to the Soviet should be revised and based on the principle of proportionate representation, that is, one delegate from every thousand voters. The soldiers' section, however, which met on August 25 (September 7), voted down the proposal. The S.-R.s succeeded in putting through their own resolution, which left the electoral system unchanged. p. 309

- 152 *The Novaya Zhizn* people—Menshevik internationalists grouped round the newspaper *Novaya Zhizn*.

*Novaya Zhizn* (New Life)—a daily published in Petrograd from April 18 (May 1), 1917 to July 1918 by a group of Menshevik internationalists and the writers who contributed to the magazine *Letopis* (Chronicle). The newspaper was hostile to the October Socialist Revolution and Soviet power. p. 310

- <sup>153</sup> *Tit Titych*—a rich tyrannical merchant in A. N. Ostrovsky's comedy *Shouldering Another's Troubles*. p. 313
- <sup>154</sup> During the Franco-Prussian War the French Army was routed at Sedan in September 1870, and more than 100,000 French soldiers together with their Emperor Napoleon III, were taken prisoners. p. 313
- <sup>155</sup> *Izvestia Petrogradskogo Soveta Rabochikh i Soldatskikh Deputatov* (Bulletin of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies)—a daily newspaper published from February 28 (March 13), 1917. Up to October 1917, it was controlled by the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries and fought against the Bolshevik Party. After the October Socialist Revolution, it became the official organ of the Soviet government and has since been published under the name of *Izvestia Sovetov Deputatov Trudyashchikhsya* (Bulletin of the Soviets of Working People's Deputies). p. 316
- <sup>156</sup> This refers to the discussion on the role of the trade unions at the First All-Russia Congress of Trade Unions held in Petrograd from January 7 to 14 (20-27), 1918. The discussion of the items on the agenda (the report of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, reports on the current situation and the tasks of the trade unions, the regulation of industry and workers' control) proceeded in an atmosphere of bitter struggle between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks and Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, who upheld the principle of "independence" of the trade union movement from political parties and the proletarian state. p. 317
- <sup>157</sup> *The Poor Peasants' Committees* were set up under the June 11, 1918 decree of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, "On the Organisation and Supply of the Rural Poor". They were to take stock of food reserves on peasant farms, to reveal surplus food on kulak farms, and to help the Soviet food supply bodies in requisitioning such surpluses and providing food for the poor at the expense of the kulaks. They were also to distribute farm implements, manufactured goods, etc. Their activity, however, embraced all aspects of work in the countryside. They became the strongholds and organs of the proletarian dictatorship in the villages. Their establishment marked a further development of the socialist revolution in the countryside. At the end of 1918, after they had fulfilled their tasks, the committees were merged with volost and village Soviets. p. 321
- <sup>158</sup> *The Second All-Russia Trade Union Congress* was held in Moscow from January 16 to 25, 1919. It was attended by 648 delegates with the right to vote, 449 of whom were Communists or their sympathisers. The other delegates were Mensheviks, Left Socialist-Revolutionaries or members of other petty-bourgeois parties.

The agenda included a report on the work of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, the tasks of the trade unions and a number of matters concerning organisation.

Lenin spoke on the central item on the agenda—the tasks of the trade unions—at the third plenary session, which met in the

evening of January 20. During the debate, the Mensheviks and their supporters from other petty-bourgeois parties tried to push through a resolution declaring the trade unions' "independence" of the Soviet state. By a majority of 430 the congress adopted a resolution moved by the Communist group pointing out that attempts to set the proletariat against the Soviet state on the plea of the "unity" and "independence" of the trade union movement had led "the groups supporting this slogan to open struggle against Soviet government and divorced them from the working class". The resolution also rejected the anarcho-syndicalist demands that the trade unions be entrusted with state functions. The congress established the production principle of trade union organisation (until then, workers and other employees of one and the same enterprise were members of different trade unions). It emphasised the need for the trade unions to take in those proletarians and semi-proletarians who had not yet been organised and enlist them for socialist construction. p. 323

<sup>159</sup> The quotation is taken from Chapter VI of *The Holy Family or Critique of Critical Critique* by Marx and Engels (Moscow, 1956, p. 110). p. 324

<sup>160</sup> *Commoners*—the Russian intellectuals from among the petty townfolk, the clergy, the merchant classes and the peasantry, as distinct from those coming from the nobility. p. 327

<sup>161</sup> *The Third, Communist, International*—an international revolutionary organisation of the proletariat uniting Communist Parties of various countries. It existed from 1919 to 1943.

The establishment of the Communist International became a historic necessity after the split in the working-class movement resulting from the betrayal of socialism by the opportunist leaders of the Second International at the beginning of the First World War and the collapse of the Second International. The Communist International restored and strengthened the ties between the working people of all countries, helped to expose opportunism in the international working-class movement, promoted the consolidation of the young Communist Parties and the elaboration of the strategy and tactics of the international communist movement.

In May 1943, the Executive Committee of the Comintern adopted a decision to dissolve the Communist International because its organisational form, which corresponded to the past historical stage, had outlived itself. p. 328

<sup>162</sup> See Note 110. p. 335

<sup>163</sup> *The Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany*—a Centrist party founded at the Inaugural Congress in Gotha in April 1917. The Independents preached unity with social-chauvinists and renounced the class struggle. The Kautskyite Labour Commonwealth group in the Reichstag formed the core of the party. At its congress in Halle in October 1920 the party split. A large section of it united with the Communist Party of Germany in December

1920. The Right wing formed a separate party, adopting the old name—the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany. It existed until 1922. p. 343

- <sup>164</sup> In its declaration of March 2 (15), 1917, the Provisional Government announced its intention to convene a Constituent Assembly. On June 14 (27), it decided to hold elections to the Constituent Assembly on September 17 (30). In August it postponed the elections until November 12 (25).

Elections to the Constituent Assembly took place on the appointed date, November 12 (25), after the October Socialist Revolution. Deputies were elected according to the lists that had been drawn up before the revolution, and did not reflect the new relation of forces in the country. As a result, the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks secured a majority of seats in the Assembly.

The Constituent Assembly met on January 5 (18), 1918. As its counter-revolutionary majority rejected the "Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People" submitted by the Soviet Government and refused to approve the Decrees on Land and Peace adopted by the Soviet government, it was dissolved by decree of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, which expressed the will of the broad masses of Russia's workers, soldiers and peasants. p. 344

- <sup>165</sup> *The Entente*—a bloc of imperialist powers (Britain, France and Russia) which took final shape in 1907 and was opposed to the imperialists of the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy). It derived its name from the 1904 Anglo-French agreement, the Entente Cordiale. During the First World War of 1914-18 the Entente was joined by the United States, Japan, Italy and other countries. After the October Socialist Revolution, the chief members of the bloc, Britain, France, the U.S.A. and Japan, inspired, organised and participated in the armed intervention against Soviet Russia. p. 346

- <sup>166</sup> *The Communist International*—the periodical organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, published from 1919 to 1943 in Russian, English, French, German, Spanish and Chinese. p. 355

- <sup>167</sup> *Folkets Dagblad Politiken* (People's Political Daily)—organ of the Swedish Left Social-Democrats, who founded the Left Social-Democratic Party of Sweden in 1917. The newspaper was published in Stockholm from April 1916. In 1921, the Left Social-Democratic Party joined the Communist International and assumed the name of the Communist Party of Sweden, and the newspaper became its organ. After the Communist Party of Sweden split in October 1929, the newspaper was taken over by the Right wing. It ceased publication in May 1945. p. 356

- <sup>168</sup> *The Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.)*—a workers' trade union organisation in the U.S.A. founded in 1905 and uniting mainly unskilled and low-paid workers of various trades. In

conditions of the mass strike movement in the U.S.A., which developed under the influence of the Russian revolution of 1905-07, the I.W.W. organised a number of successful mass strikes and waged a struggle against the policy of class collaboration pursued by the reformist leaders of the American Federation of Labor and the Right-wing socialists. During the First World War, the I.W.W. led a number of mass anti-war actions by the American working class. Some I.W.W. leaders, among them William Heywood, welcomed the October Socialist Revolution and joined the Communist Party of the U.S.A. At the same time, anarcho-sindicalist features showed up in I.W.W. activities: it did not recognise the proletariat's political struggle, denied the party's leading role and the necessity of the proletarian dictatorship, and refused to carry on work among the membership of the American Federation of Labor. In 1920 the organisation's anarcho-sindicalist leaders took advantage of the imprisonment of many revolutionaries and, against the will of the trade union masses, rejected an appeal by the Comintern's Executive Committee to join the Communist International. As a result of the leaders' opportunist policy, the I.W.W. degenerated into a sectarian organisation which soon lost all influence on the working-class movement.

p. 357

- <sup>169</sup> Lenin has in mind the anarchist group of "Lefts" which broke away from the Communist Party of Germany and formed the so-called Communist Workers' Party of Germany in April 1920. They advocated petty-bourgeois, anarcho-sindicalist views. The party's members, Otto Rühle and A. Merges, delegated to the Second Congress of the Communist International, got no encouragement from the Comintern and walked out. Subsequently this party became an insignificant sectarian group, enjoying no support from the workers.

p. 362

- <sup>170</sup> In October 1918, part of the Swiss Social-Democratic Left wing united to form the Communist Party of Switzerland. It was not a big party at the time, being represented by two delegates at the Second Congress of the Comintern.

In December 1920, the Left wing of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party broke away from it and raised the question of forming a strong section of the Communist International in Switzerland. At a congress held in Zurich in March 1921 and attended by 28 delegates from the Communist Party and 145 delegates representing the former Left wing of the Social-Democratic Party, the two groups officially united to form a single Communist Party of Switzerland.

p. 362

- <sup>171</sup> *The Workers' Socialist Federation*—a small organisation formed in May 1918 on the basis of the Society for the Protection of Women's Suffrage and consisting mainly of women. In January 1921, it united with the Communist Party of Great Britain. p. 362

- <sup>172</sup> *Shop Stewards' Committees*—elective labour organisations in various industries in Britain, which were particularly wide-



spread during the First World War. In the conditions of the upsurge of the labour movement and the increased dissatisfaction with the trade union leaders' reformist policy, shop stewards led the workers' actions against the imperialist war and for better living conditions. They were united in district and city committees and in the National Committee.

After the October Revolution, during the foreign armed intervention against the Soviet Republic, the Shop Stewards' Committees actively supported Soviet Russia. Many leaders of the Shop Stewards' Committees (William Gallacher, Harry Pollitt, Arthur McManus and others) joined the Communist Party of Great Britain.

p. 362

- <sup>173</sup> *The Amsterdam "International" of yellow trade unions* (the International Federation of Trade Unions) was established by reformist trade union leaders of a number of countries at a conference held in Amsterdam on July 26-August 2, 1919. It included trade union organisations of 14 countries: Britain, France, Germany, the U.S.A., Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Luxemburg, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland and Spain. The reactionary trade union leaders of Britain and France dominated the Amsterdam International of trade unions, whose entire activities were connected with the policies of the opportunist parties of the Second International. The Amsterdam International came out in favour of the proletariat's collaboration with the bourgeoisie and rejected revolutionary forms of the proletariat's struggle. The leaders of the Amsterdam International pursued a policy of splitting the working-class movement, expelled Left-wing trade unions from the organisation, and rejected all proposals by the Red International of Labour Unions for joint action against capital, the threat of war, reaction and fascism, and to establish world-wide trade union unity.

During the Second World War the Amsterdam International ceased its activity.

p. 363

- <sup>174</sup> *The Red International of Trade Unions (the Profintern)*—an international organisation of revolutionary trade unions. It was organised in 1921 and existed till the end of 1937. It united trade union organisations which had not entered the reformist Amsterdam International of trade unions, i.e., the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, the Unitary General Confederation of Labour of France, the national revolutionary trade union centres of Australia, Belgium, Holland, Indonesia, Ireland, Canada, China, Colombia, Korea, Lithuania, Mongolia, Iran, Peru, Uruguay, Czechoslovakia, Chile and Estonia, as well as opposition groups and trends within the reformist trade unions in a number of capitalist countries. The Profintern fought for unity in the trade union movement on the basis of revolutionary struggle in defence of the demands of the working class, against capital and fascism, against the threat of imperialist war, and for establishing closer relations with the working class of Soviet Russia.

p. 364

- <sup>175</sup> This document formed the basis of the resolution on the tasks of the trade union movement which was passed by the R.C.P.(B.) group of the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions on November 8, 1920, and published in *Pravda* on November 13. More than 200 delegates supported the resolution, with 12 delegates abstaining.

At the conference, which took place in Moscow from November 2 to 6 (officially it opened on November 3), the Party raised the question of reorganising the work of the trade unions in keeping with the tasks of peaceful socialist construction, extending democracy and abandoning military methods of command and administration. Trotsky came out against the proposed reorganisation. At a sitting of the Communist group on November 3, he spoke "fine words", as Lenin put it, about "shaking up" the trade unions, "tightening the screws" and immediate "governmentalisation of trade unions". Trotsky's speech, which sparked off a discussion in the Party, was duly rebuffed by the Communist delegates. Disagreement with Trotsky over trade unions concerned the "different approach to the mass, the different way of winning it over and keeping in touch with it" (see present volume, p. 373). Had Trotsky had his way, the trade unions would have been ruined and the dictatorship of the proletariat undermined. The Central Committee of the Party could therefore not leave the matter at that. At a plenary meeting of the Central Committee on November 8, Lenin read his theses, in which he opposed Trotsky's views. Trotsky's theses won 7 votes, and Lenin's 8 votes.

Lenin's theses formed the basis of his draft resolution on "The Tasks of the Trade Unions, and the Methods of Their Accomplishment", which was passed by 10 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.  
p. 365

- <sup>176</sup> *The Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)* was held in Moscow from March 29 to April 5, 1920. It defined the immediate economic tasks of socialist construction and emphasised the need for the trade unions to take an active part in it. This found expression in the resolutions "The Immediate Tasks of Economic Construction" and "On the Questions of the Trade Unions and Their Organisation".  
p. 365

- <sup>177</sup> *Tsektran*—the Central Committee of the Joint Trade Union of Rail and Water Transport Workers, established in September, 1920. Having done much to restore the transport system, the Tsektran subsequently degenerated into a bureaucratic body that had lost touch with the rank and file of the union. The red tape, administration by mere injunction, the method of filling posts by appointment and the departure from democratic methods of work cultivated by the Trotskyites who had seized the leadership of the union tended to set the transport workers against the Party and split their ranks. The C.C., R.C.P.(B.) plenary meetings of November 8 and December 7, 1920 decided to incorporate the Tsektran in the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions on an equal footing with the other trade unions, recommending that the union

leaders should change their methods of work in the direction of extending democracy within the union.

The First All-Russia Congress of Transport Workers, convened in March 1921 by decision of the Party Central Committee, expelled the Trotskyites from the Tsektran leadership and outlined measures to improve the work of the union. p. 365

- <sup>178</sup> *Bednota* (The Poor)—a daily for peasants published in Moscow from 1918 to 1931. p. 368

- <sup>179</sup> A system of labour organisation founded by Taylor, an American engineer, and consisting in the maximum utilisation of the working day and rational use of the instruments and means of production. p. 369

- <sup>180</sup> Lenin's speech at a joint meeting of Communist delegates to the Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, Communist members of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and the Communist Members of the Moscow City Council of Trade Unions held in the Bolshoi Theatre on December 30, 1920, was his first speech to Party activists in connection with the discussion on the role and tasks of the trade unions in socialist construction (see Note 176). Lenin sharply criticised Trotsky's views, exposed the factional character of the opposition's activities, which were undermining the Party's unity, and put forward and developed a number of important propositions of principle on the role of the trade unions under the dictatorship of the proletariat and their tasks in socialist construction. p. 370

- <sup>181</sup> *Smolny*—the former Smolny Institute in Petrograd, the seat of the Soviet Government until it moved to Moscow in March 1918. p. 373

- <sup>182</sup> *Izvestia of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)*—an information organ dealing with Party problems. It was published from May 28, 1919, by decision of the Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) p. 378

- <sup>183</sup> The "buffer group" or "buffer faction"—one of the anti-Party groups which were formed during the trade union discussion in 1920-21. It was headed by N. I. Bukharin. It tried to reconcile Leninism and Trotskyism, acting as a buffer between the two platforms; hence its name. In fact, it defended the Trotskyites in their struggle against Lenin and the Party policy, and soon united openly with them.

Lenin characterised its platform as a deviation to syndicalism leading to the rejection of the Party's guiding role, and called it an "all-time low in ideological disintegration". p. 378

- <sup>184</sup> *Glavpolitput*—the Chief Political Administration of the People's Commissariat for Communications—was formed in February 1919 as a provisional political organ under the direct leadership of the Party's Central Committee. In January 1920 it was reorganised into the Chief Political Administration of the P.C.C. Its aim was

to take extraordinary measures to save the railways from utter ruin. It was abolished by decision of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) plenary meeting of December 7, 1920. p. 385

- <sup>185</sup> *Politvod (Glavpolitvod)*—the Chief Political Administration of Water Transport of the People's Commissariat for Communications—was set up in April 1920 as a branch of Glavpolitput to exercise political control over technical and administrative personnel, to direct political education among the workers for the rapid rehabilitation of water transport, and to stimulate higher productivity and improve labour discipline. It was dissolved in December 1920. p. 385

- <sup>186</sup> *The Workers' Opposition*—an anti-Party anarcho-syndicalist factional group which was formed during the trade union discussion in 1920-21. Its views were the expression of an anarcho-syndicalist deviation in the Party. It proposed that the national economy should be run by an All-Russia Congress of Producers. It demanded that all economic management bodies be elected by the relevant trade unions, whose candidates could not be rejected by Party or government bodies. The workers' opposition set the trade unions against the Soviet state and the Communist Party, regarding trade unions and not the Party as the highest form of working-class organisation. p. 396

- <sup>187</sup> *The Appeal to the Party* was adopted at a meeting of representatives of Petrograd district Party organisations on January 3, 1921. On January 6, it was approved by a city meeting in the People's House attended by over 4,000 Party members and candidates. No more than 20 votes were cast against it. When it was discussed in the district Party organisations, it had the support of 95-98 per cent of the membership.

In this Appeal, the Petrograd Bolsheviks set forth their views on the role and tasks of the trade unions, supported Lenin and condemned Trotsky's platform. They called the other Party organisations to follow Lenin and stressed the danger of Trotsky's platform, for its implementation would have practically abolished the trade unions and undermined the dictatorship of the proletariat. The "Appeal to the Party" was published in *Pravda* No. 7 on January 13.

The Moscow Party Committee, which at that time took a "buffer" stand, made a counter-statement in reply to the Petrograd organisation's Appeal. In a resolution published in the same issue of *Pravda*, the Moscow Committee said that it found it "absolutely impossible" to accept the Petrograd Bolsheviks' proposals. It said the Petrograd Party organisation's stand showed its "extremely dangerous" tendency to become a special centre for preparing the Party congress. It did not condemn Trotsky's establishment of a faction, thereby giving support to his anti-Party struggle. p. 398

- <sup>188</sup> *Draft Decision of the Tenth Congress of the R.C.P. on the Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions* was Lenin's "Platform of 10" tabled

before the Central Committee by a group of members of the C.C. and of the Central Committee's Trade Union Commission in opposition to the platforms of the anti-Party groups. It defined the role of the trade unions in the light of the new tasks connected with the end of the Civil War and transition to peaceful socialist construction. Their role was to be a school of administration, a school of economic management, a school of communism. They were chiefly to take part in government, train personnel for government bodies and economic management and help tighten labour discipline. They were to base their work on education, persuasion and democratic practices. The "Platform of 10", which had been supported by a majority of local Party organisations during the trade union discussion, served as a basis for the Tenth Congress's resolution on the role and tasks of the trade unions. p. 399

- <sup>189</sup> *The Democratic Centrism group*—an opportunist faction that first came out against Lenin's line in Party and Soviet organisations at the Eighth Party Congress in 1919. They denied the Party's leading role in the Soviets and trade unions, rejected one-man management and the personal responsibility of managers in industry, opposed Lenin's principles in organisational matters and demanded freedom for factions and groups. They were against the unity of the C.C.'s political and organisational leadership and wanted the Organisation Bureau of the Central Committee to be deprived of any say in political leadership.

They failed to find any support among the rank and file of the Party.

During the trade union discussion in 1920-21, the group published its platform, which they defended at the pre-congress meetings. But it won only a handful of votes. At the Tenth Party Congress they withdrew it and allowed their members to vote freely.

In 1923 the group broke up and its leaders joined the Trotskyites. p. 399

- <sup>190</sup> *Ignatovites*, or "a group of activists of Moscow city districts"—an anti-Party anarcho-syndicalist group headed by Y. N. Ignatov, which existed during the trade union discussion of 1920-21. It had no influence among the city's rank-and-file Party members and workers. The Ignatovites shared the anarcho-syndicalist views of the Workers' Opposition; they demanded the hand-over of the management of the economy to a body elected by the All-Russia Trade Union Congress; they set the trade unions in opposition to the Soviet state, denied the Party's leading role in socialist construction, opposed democratic centralism, demanded freedom of discussions and wanted the Party membership to consist of workers only. At the Tenth Congress, Ignatov was the official speaker of the Workers' Opposition on problems of Party organisation. After the congress, the group of Ignatovites broke up. p. 399

- <sup>191</sup> The reference is to the merger of the anti-Party *Vperyod* group with the Menshevik liquidators and Trotskyites. They united

after the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. in 1912 to fight its decisions. p. 401

- <sup>192</sup> The reference is to the trade union discussion at an enlarged session of the Moscow Party Committee attended also by delegates from Party organisations of Moscow city districts and uyezds on January 17, 1921.

The session debated all the draft theses put forward by various groups during the discussion. In the preliminary voting, Lenin's theses got 76 votes; Trotsky's 27; Bukharin's 5; Shlyapnikov's 4; Sapronov's 11; Ignatov's 25; Nogin's none, and Ryazanov's none. In the revote on the two main platforms, 84 votes were cast for Lenin's theses, and 27 for Trotsky's.

On the following day, January 18, the Moscow Party Committee adopted an appeal "To All Party Organisations" urging all Party members to give unanimous support to Lenin's platform. p. 401

- <sup>193</sup> The reference is to the resolution of the Second Congress of the Communist International, "On the Role of the Communist Party in the Proletarian Revolution". p. 412

- <sup>194</sup> The reference is to the Eighteenth Congress of the French Socialist Party held in Tours from December 25 to 30, 1920. The main question on the agenda was the party's affiliation to the Communist International.

After a bitter struggle between supporters of affiliation and its opponents, 70 per cent of the delegates voted for affiliation.

The majority set up the Communist Party of France, which was finally constituted in May 1921. The minority, whose aim was to split the workers' movement, walked out of the congress, forming their own reformist party, which retained the old name of the French Socialist Party. p. 412

- <sup>195</sup> *Petrogradskaya Pravda* (Petrograd Truth)—a daily published from April 2, 1918, as the organ of the Central and Petrograd Party Committees. Since January 1924, it has appeared as *Leningradskaya Pravda*. p. 420

- <sup>196</sup> V. I. Zoff's circular of May 3, 1920, was published in the *Bulleten Mariinskogo Oblastnogo Upravleniya Vodnogo Transporta* (Bulletin of the Mariinsky Regional Water Transport Administration) No. 5, 1920. It ran: "A great change is about to occur in the life of water transport: primitive methods, committee treadmill, haphazard work and anarchy are on the way out. Water transport is becoming a State enterprise, headed by political commissars with appropriate powers. Committees, trade unions and elected delegates will no longer have the power to interfere in technical and administrative matters."

The circular was an example of administration by injunction and bureaucratic practices, which the Tsektran's Trotskyite leadership was introducing, and was evidence of their misunderstanding of the trade unions' role in rehabilitating transport. The trade unions were equated with outdated army committees,

called "committee treadmill", and barred by order from taking part in improving water transport operations. p. 430

- <sup>197</sup> *The Tenth Party Congress* was held in Moscow from March 8 to 16, 1921. One of the main items on its agenda was the question of the trade unions' role in economic development. The congress summed up the discussion on the trade unions. It condemned the views of the Trotskyites, the Workers' Opposition, the Democratic Centralism group and other opportunist trends and approved by an overwhelming majority Lenin's platform, which defined the role and tasks of the trade unions as a school of communism and suggested measures to develop trade union democracy. p. 458

- <sup>198</sup> *The First International Congress of Revolutionary Trade and Industrial Unions* took place in Moscow from July 3 to 19, 1921. It was attended by 380 delegates from 41 countries of Europe, America and Asia. p. 462

- <sup>199</sup> *The "Two-and-a-Half" International* (officially called the International Union of the Socialist Parties)—an international organisation of the Centrist socialist parties and groups which had left the Second International under pressure from the revolutionary masses. It was formed at a conference in Vienna in February 1921. Professing opposition to the Second International, the leaders of the Two-and-a-Half International actually pursued the same opportunist and splitting policy on the most important questions of the proletarian movement and tried to make the new organisation a counterbalance to the growing influence of the Communists among the workers.

In May 1923, the Second International and the Two-and-a-Half International united to form the so-called Labour and Socialist International. p. 473

## NAME INDEX

### A

**ADLER, Victor** (1852-1918)—one of the organisers and leaders of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party; subsequently a reformist leader of the Second International. Advocated "class peace" and opposed working-class revolutionary action—210

**AKIMOV (MAKHNOVETS), Vladimir Petrovich** (1872-1921)—Russian Social-Democrat, well-known representative of "Economism", an extreme opportunist—155

**ANDREYEV, Andrei Andreyevich** (1895-1971)—prominent leader of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, Secretary of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions (1920-22)—395, 396

**ARCH, Joseph** (1826-1919)—leader of the English labour movement. Founder of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union (1872), fought for the improvement of the conditions of agricultural labourers; Liberal Party MP (1885, 1892, 1895-1900)—224

**ARTYOM (SERGEYEV, Fyodor Andreyevich)** (1883-1921)—prominent figure of the

Communist Party and the Soviet state, Party member since 1901. Chairman of the All-Russia Miners' Union Central Committee, member of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee—399, 413, 429

**AVRAMOV, Stefan**—Bulgarian Social-Democrat. Delegate of the Bulgarian Social-Democratic Party ("Tessnyaki") to the Session of the International Socialist Bureau (1908); withdrew from Party work soon after the session—209, 211

**AXELROD, Pavel Borisovich** (1850-1928)—Russian Social-Democrat, a Menshevik leader—83, 84, 122, 143, 179, 180

### B

**BABUSHKIN, Ivan Vasilyevich** (1873-1906)—Russian Social-Democrat, Bolshevik. Helped organise *Iskra* (The Spark), was one of its first agents and active correspondents. Was repeatedly arrested, exiled and imprisoned.

Active participant of the 1905-07 Revolution. Was seized while transporting arms



- and executed without trial—357
- BAZAINE, François Achille** (1811-1888)—French Marshal, monarchist. During the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71) was commander of the Rhine Army. In October 1870 capitulated in Metz—202
- BEBEL, August** (1840-1913)—an outstanding leader of the German Social-Democratic Party and the international working-class movement—135, 150, 151, 188, 189, 190, 200
- BEER, Heinrich**—Austrian Social-Democrat, opportunist—186
- BELL, Richard** (1859-1930)—leader of the Railway Servants' Union in England, pursued a conciliatory and treacherous policy towards the working class—201, 202
- BELTOV**—see *Plekhanov*
- BERNSTEIN, Eduard** (1850-1932)—leader of the extreme opportunist wing of German Social-Democracy and the Second International, theoretician of revisionism and reformism—55, 88, 100, 102
- BISSOLATI, Leonida** (1857-1920)—one of the founders of the Italian Socialist Party and leader of its extreme Right reformist wing. Was expelled from the Italian Socialist Party in 1912 and became one of the founders of the so-called "Socialist Reformist Party". A social-chauvinist during the First World War, advocated Italy's entry into the war on the side of the Entente—291
- BLANC, Louis** (1811-1882)—French petty-bourgeois socialist, historian; denied that class contradictions were irreconcilable under capitalism; opposed proletarian revolution. During the French revolution in February 1848 entered the provisional government. His conciliatory tactics helped the bourgeoisie divert the workers from the revolutionary struggle—345
- BOGUSLAVSKY, M.S.** (1886-1937)—member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1917; worked in the Chief Political Department of the People's Commissariat for Communications in 1920; was chairman of the Printers' Union. Joined the anti-Party "Democratic Centralism" group in 1920-21; later sided with the Trotskyite opposition. Was expelled from the Party by decision of the Fifteenth Party Congress in 1927—399
- BRENTANO, Lujo** (1844-1931)—German bourgeois economist; advocate of so-called "state socialism". Using Marxist phrases as a cover, Brentano and his followers sought to subordinate the working-class movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie—146, 147
- BRIAND, Aristide** (1862-1932)—French statesman and diplomat; was repeatedly Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, brutally suppressed the railwaymen's strike in 1910 and imposed martial law on the railways—312
- BRINGMANN, August** (1861-1920)—German trade union leader, reformist, proponent of craft union tendencies in the working-class movement; brought about a merger of

- two separate carpenters' trade unions (1891); for many years was a member of the General Commission of Trade Unions
- BROUCKERE, Louis de** (1870-1951)—leader and theoretician of the Belgian Workers' Party, headed its Left wing before the First World War. At the Stuttgart Congress of the Second International spoke on the relationship between socialist parties and the trade unions—183
- BUBNOV, Andrei Sergeyevich** (1883-1940)—leading figure of the Party and the Soviet state; member of the Bolshevik Party from 1903. After the October Socialist Revolution held responsible Party, government and military posts. Was connected with the opportunist "Democratic Centralism" group (1920-21); supported the Trotskyite opposition in 1923, later opposed Trotskyism—399
- BUKHARIN, Nikolai Ivanovich** (1888-1938)—Russian Social-Democrat. Member of the Bolshevik Party from 1906. Following the October Socialist Revolution held a number of responsible posts. Repeatedly opposed the Party's Leninist policy; headed the anti-Party group of "Left Communists" in 1918; during the trade union discussion initially took up a "buffer" stand and afterwards joined the anti-Leninist Trotsky group; led the Right-wing opposition in the Party as of 1928; was expelled from the Party for his anti-Party activity in 1937—375, 377, 378, 382, 383, 385, 386, 387, 391, 392, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 406, 409, 411, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 427, 429, 431, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 448, 449, 452, 454, 456, 457
- BULKIN, Fyodor Afanasyevich** (b. 1888)—Russian Social-Democrat, Menshevik; a liquidator after the defeat of the 1905-07 Revolution; a defencist during the First World War; worked on War Industries Committees in Novgorod, Samara and Petersburg. Following the October Socialist Revolution left the Mensheviks and joined the R.C.P.(B.) in 1920. In 1922 was expelled from the Party for his participation in the anti-Party "Workers' Opposition" group; joined again the Party in 1927; worked on economic bodies—291
- BULYGIN, Alexander Grigoryevich** (1851-1919)—tsarist statesman; Minister of the Interior from January 1905; directed the drafting of a bill to convene a consultative State Duma with a view to weakening the rising revolutionary movement. The Duma was not convened; it was swept away by the Revolution—164
- BUMAZHNY, Yefim Osipovich** (b. 1894)—Party member from 1917. After the October Socialist Revolution—member of the Collegium of the People's Commissariat for Labour, member of the Urals Regional Labour Bureau of the C.C. R.C.P.(B.); worked in the A.C.C.T.U. during 1920-21. Sided with Trotsky during the trade union discussion—401
- BURNETT, James**—Secretary of the Scottish Circuit Coun-

- cil of the Social-Democratic Federation of Britain—201  
*BURNS, John Elliot* (1858-1943)—English political leader; in the 1880s a trade union leader; was elected to Parliament in 1892; opposed working-class interests and advocated collaboration with the capitalists; was Minister for Local Self-government (1905-14) and later Trade Minister (1914)—212  
*BUROVTSEV, M.V.* (1889-1954)—Party member from 1905. An active participant in Ignatov's group that shared the views of the anti-Party "Workers' Opposition" group during the trade union discussion (1920-21). Joined the Trotskyite opposition in 1923-24; was expelled from the Party in 1937—399

## C

- CALWER, Richard* (1868-1927)—well-known German economist, adherent of the reformist and revisionist trend in the German Social-Democratic Party—150  
*CARSON, Edward Henry* (1854-1935)—English political leader, Tory, Lord, sworn opponent of self-government for Ireland. To combat the Irish national liberation movement, Carson organised in Ulster (Northern Ireland) (1921) gangs of armed thugs (supporters of the Ulster Union)—256  
*CHERNOV, Victor Mikhailovich* (1876-1952)—leader and theoretician of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party—186  
*CHKHEIDZE, Nikolai Semyonovich* (1864-1926)—one of the Menshevik leaders; member

of the Provisional Committee of the State Duma during the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution; chairman of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, chairman of the Central Executive Committee (first convocation); actively supported the Provisional Government; after the October Socialist Revolution headed the counter-revolutionary Menshevik government of Georgia; subsequently a white émigré—291, 292

*CHKHENKELI, Akaky Ivanovich* (1874-1959)—Menshevik, after the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution chairman of the bourgeois Provisional Government in Transcaucasia; Foreign Minister in the Menshevik government of Georgia in 1918-21, subsequently a white émigré—285

## D

- DAN (GURVICH), Fyodor Ilyich* (1871-1947)—a Menshevik leader—250  
*DAVID, Eduard* (1863-1930)—one of the Right-wing leaders of the German Social-Democrats, revisionist—285  
*DE LEON, Daniel* (1852-1914)—leader of the American labour movement; from the 1890s, leader and ideologist of the Socialist Labour Party, publicist; one of the founders of the Industrial Workers of the World (1905)—355  
*DENIKIN, Anton Ivanovich* (1872-1947)—tsarist general; commander-in-chief of the whiteguard armed forces in the south of Russia during

the foreign military intervention and the Civil War (1918-20). After his troops were routed by the Red Army in March 1920, he fled abroad—350

**DÜHRING, Eugen** (1833-1921)—German philosopher-eclectic and economist, petty-bourgeois ideologist—278

**DÜNCKER, Franz** (1822-1888)—German bourgeois political figure and publisher. Together with Hirsch he founded several reformist trade unions ("Hirsch-Duncker trade unions")—81, 146

## E

**E.P. (PIMENOVA, E.K.)** (1885-1935)—Russian journalist and writer of Menshevik convictions—201, 203

**EBERT, Friedrich** (1871-1925)—one of the leaders of the Right wing of German Social-Democracy. Social-chauvinist during the imperialist world war; at the beginning of the November 1918 Revolution in Germany he held the post of Reichschancellor and headed the so-called Council of People's Representatives, which was actually a camouflage for the rule of the bourgeoisie; President of Germany from February 1919. Under his leadership the coalition government representing the Social-Democratic and bourgeois parties ruthlessly suppressed the revolutionary actions of the German proletariat—325, 326

**EL (LUZIN, I.I.)** (died c. 1914)—Russian Social-Democrat, Menshevik; supported the opportunist idea of convening a "labour congress"—179

**ENGELS, Friedrich** (1820-1895)—55, 62, 70, 86, 93, 112, 153, 211, 212, 283, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 293, 355, 885

## F

**FIRSOV, D. (ROSENBLUM, D.S.)** (b. 1875)—Socialist-Revolutionary, one of the authors of the book *Revision of the Agrarian Programme and Its Substantiation*, put out by Era Publishers in 1908—198

**FISCHER, Richard** (1855-1926)—German Social-Democrat, journalist; was Secretary of the Social-Democratic Party (1890-93); Reichstag deputy (1893-1926)—150, 206

**FOURIER, Francois Marie Charles** (1772-1837)—great French utopian socialist—54

## G

**GERSHUNI, Grigory Andreyevich** (1870-1908)—one of the founders and leaders of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, organiser and leader of its combat group. At the Tammerfors Congress of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party (1907) called for a bloc with the Cadets—196

**GLASIER, John Bruce** (1859-1920)—English socialist, one of the founders of the Labour Party; a metalworker. Attended the International Socialist Bureau as a delegate of the Independent Workers' Party—209

**GOLTZ, Rüdiger** (1865-1930)—German general. At the head of the German expeditionary force supported by white Finnish detachments, he crushed

the workers' revolution in Finland in 1918. Was commander-in-chief of the German occupation forces in the Baltic states in 1919. With the assistance of U.S. and British imperialists he organised an anti-Soviet army of German units and whiteguards. Subsequently an organiser of fascist gangs in Germany—345

**GOMPERS, Samuel** (1850-1924)—leading figure in the American trade union movement. One of the founders of the American Federation of Labor (AFL); was its permanent president from 1895. Conducted a policy of class collaboration with the capitalists, opposed the revolutionary struggle of the working class; was a social-chauvinist during the First World War—225, 344, 354, 357, 358

**GUESDE, Jules Basile** (1845-1922)—one of the organisers and leaders of the socialist movement in France and the Second International—209

**GUILBEAUX, Henri** (1885-1938)—French socialist, journalist. Centrist during the world imperialist war; published the pacifist magazine *Demain* (Tomorrow); was for the restoration of internationalist contacts. Attended the Kienthal Conference (1916); from the 1920s lived in Germany; was a correspondent of *L'Humanité*; became a Trotskyite—341, 342

**GUSEV, Sergei Ivanovich** (1874-1933)—Russian Social-Democrat, Bolshevik. Secretary of the Bureau Majority Committees and the Petersburg Party Committee (1904-05), subse-

quently one of the leaders of the Odessa Bolshevik organisation—152

**GVOZDYOV, Kuzma Antonovich** (b. 1883)—Menshevik-liquidator, social-chauvinist during the First World War, chairman of the workers' group of the Central War Industries Committee. Following the February bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1917, member of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet, Deputy Minister and later Minister for Labour in the bourgeois Provisional Government—291, 293, 310

## H

**HAASE, Hugo** (1863-1919)—leader of the German Social-Democracy, and opportunist. During the November 1918 Revolution in Germany was member of the so-called Council of People's Representatives, whose policy aimed at suppressing the revolutionary movement—345, 346

**HALES, John** (b. 1839)—leader of the English trade union movement, chairman of the Knitwear Workers' Union. From the beginning of 1872 he headed the reformist wing of the British Federal Council of the International and, drawing ever closer to the English liberal bourgeoisie, waged a struggle against the General Council of the International and against its leaders—Marx and Engels; was expelled by the General Council from the International in May 1873—286

**HASSELMAN, Wilhelm** (b. 1844)—German Social-Demo-

- crat, subsequently an anarchist; prominent leader of the Lassallean General German Workers' Union. While the Anti-Socialist Law was in force, he openly sided with the anarchists. Together with Most he was expelled from the Social-Democratic Party in 1880-88, 135
- HAYES, Max* (b. 1866)—prominent figure in the working-class movement in the U.S.A.; one of the leaders of the Socialist Labor Party of the U.S.A. (1900); for many years held various posts in trade union and socialist organizations—225
- HEGEL, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich* (1770-1831)—prominent German philosopher, objective idealist, who elaborated a comprehensive system of idealist dialectics; ideologist of the German bourgeoisie—444
- HENDERSON, Arthur* (1863-1935)—one of the leaders of the Labour Party and English trade union movement. Chairman of the Labour Parliamentary group in 1908-10 and 1914-17. A social-chauvinist during the First World War, he was a member of the Asquith coalition government and later of Lloyd George's War Cabinet; was member of several British governments—292, 354, 357, 358
- HIRSCH, Max* (1832-1905)—German economist and publicist, member of the Progressist Party, Reichstag deputy. Together with Franz Duncker he founded several reformist trade unions (the "Hirsch-Duncker trade unions") in 1868. In his writings he preached "harmony" between labour and capital. Opposed revolutionary proletarian tactics and defended reformism—76, 81, 146
- HÖCHBERG, Karl* (1853-1885)—German Right-wing Social-Democrat, journalist; when the Anti-Socialist Law was promulgated he published an article written jointly with Schramm and Bernstein, entitled "Retrospective Review of the Socialist Movement in Germany", which condemned the party's revolutionary tactics. The authors called for an alliance with the bourgeoisie and submission to it of the interests of the proletariat. These opportunist views met with a sharp protest from Marx and Engels—88, 278
- HOLTZMANN, A. Z.* (1894-1933)—participated in the revolutionary movement since 1910; member of the Bolshevik Party from April 1917. After the October Socialist Revolution, he occupied leading posts in trade union and economic bodies. Member of the Central Committee of the Metalworkers' Union (1917-20), member of the Presidium of the A.C.C.T.U. (1920-21). During the trade union discussion sided with Trotsky—396, 397
- HOLYOAK, George Jacob* (1817-1906)—English publicist, reformist. In the 1830s-40s sided with the Chartists and Owenites, subsequently leader of the co-operative movement—284
- HORNER (Pannekoek, Anton)* (1873-1960)—Dutch Social-Democrat, an internationalist during the First World War; in 1918-21, was member of

the Communist Party of the Netherlands; took part in the work of the Communist International; adopted an ultra-left sectarian stand—349

**HYNDMAN, Henry Mayers** (1842-1921)—English socialist, reformist. Founder of the Democratic Federation (1881) reorganised into Social-Democratic Federation in 1884. Member of the International Socialist Bureau (1900-10); leader of the British Socialist Party from which he withdrew in 1916 when the Salford Party Conference condemned his social-chauvinist attitude towards the imperialist war—209, 241, 292, 293

## I

**IGNATOV, Y.N.** (1890-1933)—joined the Bolshevik Party in 1912. Was a member of the Executive Committee and the Presidium of the Moscow Soviet in 1917, and member of the Moscow Party Committee after the October Socialist Revolution. During the trade union discussion (1920-21) he formed an anti-Party anarcho-syndicalist group (the "Ingatovites") which shared the views of the "Workers' Opposition". Following the the Tenth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) he broke away from the opposition and held responsible posts—399

**IORDANSKY, Nikolai Ivanovich** (1876-1928)—Social-Democrat; a Menshevik after the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903). Permanently contributed to the Menshevik newspaper *Iskra* (1904). Following the 1905-07

Revolution was close to the Party-Mensheviks-Plekhanovites. Joined the R.C.P.(B.) in 1921. Worked in the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs; was ambassador in Italy—201

**ISHCHENKO, A.G.** (b. 1895)—Party member from 1917. Chairman of the Central Committee of the Water Transport Workers' Union (1919-21 and 1924-27); vigorous supporter of the Trotskyite opposition; was expelled from the Party for his counter-revolutionary activity in 1935—386

**IVANOVSKY, P. (SHNEERSON, I.A.)** (1878-1942)—Russian Social-Democrat. Supported the opportunist idea of convening a "labour congress"—179

**IVANSHIN, Vladimir Pavlovich (V.I.)** (1869-1904)—Social-Democrat, a leader of "Economism". An editor of the *Rabocheye Dyelo* (Worker's Cause) (Organ of the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad), was also closely linked with the newspaper *Rabochaya Mysl* (Workers' Thought), published by the Petersburg "Economists". In his articles he set up the immediate economic interests of the workers in opposition to the political aims of the Social-Democrats—74, 75, 83, 84

## J

**JACOBY, M. (GENDELMAN, M.Y.)**—Socialist-Revolutionary, one of the authors of the *Revision of the Agrarian Programme and Its Substantiation*, published in 1908 by Era Publishers—198

**JAURÈS, Jean** (1859-1914)—a prominent leader of the French and international socialist movement, historian. Founder of the French Socialist Party. Defended democratic freedoms and peace and fought imperialist oppression and wars of conquest. His fight for peace and against the threat of war earned him the hatred of the imperialist bourgeoisie and led to his assassination by a hireling of the reactionaries on the eve of the world imperialist war—205

**JOUHAUX, Léon** (1879-1954)—reformist leader of the French and international trade union movement; one of the Right-wing leaders of the Amsterdam International of the Trade Unions. Social-chauvinist during the First World War—354, 357, 358

## K

**KALININ, Mikhail Ivanovich** (1875-1946)—outstanding leader of the Communist Party and the Soviet state. Member of the Party from 1898. Chairman of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee from March 1919; chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. from December 1922; chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. from 1938; member of the Central Committee from 1919; member of the Politbureau of the C.C., Communist Party of the Soviet Union since 1926—399, 413, 429

**KAMENEV, Lev Borisovich** (**ROSENFELD, L. B.**) (1883-1936)—member of the

R.S.D.L.P. since 1901. After the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903) joined the Bolsheviks. Held key posts after the October Socialist Revolution. Repeatedly vacillated and attacked the Party's Leninist policy. By decision of the Fifteenth Party Congress (1927) was expelled from the Party for his active support of the Trotskyite opposition; was reinstated twice and then again expelled for his anti-Party activity—399, 401, 413, 429, 457

**KAMENSKY, A. Z.** (1885-1938)—member of the Party since 1917. After the October Socialist Revolution worked on Party, government and trade union bodies. During the trade union discussion joined the anti-Party "Democratic Centralism" group. Belonged to the Trotskyite opposition in 1925-26—399

**KAREYEV, Nikolai Ivanovich** (1850-1931)—Russian liberal historian and publicist; an adherent of the subjectivist school in sociology, idealist-eclectic—89

**KATKOV, Mikhail Nikiforovich** (1818-1887)—Russian reactionary publicist—119

**KAUTSKY, Karl** (1854-1938)—one of the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party and the Second International. Marxist at the beginning of his political career, later betrayed Marxism and became an ideologist of Centrism (Kautskyism), one of the opportunist trends in the working-class movement—78, 183, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 194, 209, 210, 211, 285, 286, 288, 289, 293, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 355, 362



**KERENSKY, Alexander Fyodorovich** (1881-1970)—Socialist-Revolutionary; out-and-out social-chauvinist during the world imperialist war. Following the February bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1917 was Premier of the bourgeois Provisional Government and supreme commander-in-chief. After the October Socialist Revolution, fought against Soviet power; fled abroad in 1918—311

**KISELYOV, Alexei Semyonovich** (1879-1938)—member of the Party from 1898. Following the October Socialist Revolution worked on government, economic and trade union bodies. Was elected chairman of the Centrotexil in 1918 and later became member of the Presidium of the Supreme Economic Council; was chairman of the Miners' Union in 1920; member of the anti-Party anarcho-syndicalist group of the "Workers' Opposition" in 1921. Secretary of the All-Russia C.E.C. (1924-38)—418, 456

**KNIGHT, Robert**—prominent leader of the English trade union movement. Secretary of the Boiler-Makers' Union and the Amalgamated Boiler-Makers' and Shipbuilders' Union (1871-99); MP (1875-82, 1896-1900). Knight advocated vigorously the amalgamation of the English trade unions; was one of the founders of the General Federation of Trade Unions of Great Britain (1899)—112

**KOLCHAK, Alexander Vasilyevich** (1873-1920) — tsarist admiral, monarchist, one of the main leaders of the Rus-

sian counter-revolution (1918-19), creature of the Entente. After the October Socialist Revolution, with the help of the U.S. imperialists and the Entente, proclaimed himself supreme ruler of Russia and headed the military bourgeois-landowner dictatorship in the Urals, Siberia and the Far East. Under the blows of the Red Army and the rising revolutionary partisan movement, Kolchak's forces were routed—345

**KORNILOV, Lavr Georgiyevich** (1870-1918)—tsarist general, monarchist. Supreme commander-in-chief of the Russian army (July-August 1917). Headed the counter-revolutionary mutiny in August. After the putsch was crushed he was arrested and sent to gaol from which he escaped to the Don to become one of the organisers and later commander of the whiteguard Volunteer Army—310, 311

**KORZINOV, G.I.** (1886-1926)—member of the Party from 1904. After the October Socialist Revolution worked on Party, Soviet and economic bodies. During the trade union discussion (1920-21) he belonged to Ignatov's anarcho-syndicalist group which shared the anti-Party views of the "Workers' Opposition"—399

**KRESTINSKY, Nikolai Nikolayevich** (1883-1938)—Soviet statesman, Bolshevik. Minister for Finance of the R.S.F.S.R. (1918-21); Secretary of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) from December 1919 to March 1921; supporter of Trotsky-Bukharin platform during the trade union discussion in

- 1921; subsequently a diplomat—391, 395, 452
- KRICHEVSKY, Boris Naumovich** (1866-1919)—Russian Social-Democrat, publicist, one of the leaders of "Economism"—85, 86, 89, 103, 113, 127
- KURANOVA, Y.Y.** (b. 1891)—member of the R.C.P.(B.), member of the Moscow Gubernia Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies (1920-21); supported Ignatov's anti-Party anarcho-syndicalist group during the trade union discussion (1920-21)—399
- KUSKOVA, Yekaterina Dmitriyevna** (1869-1958)—Russian bourgeois public figure and publicist, prominent representative of "Economism". A document written by her in a Bernsteinian spirit called "Credo" vividly expressed the opportunist essence of "Economism". After the October Socialist Revolution, Kuskova fought Soviet power. Was deported in 1922, and continued anti-Soviet activity among white émigrés abroad—190
- KÜTLER, Nikolai Nikolayevich** (1859-1924)—tsarist statesman, prominent leader of the Cadet Party, deputy of the Second and Third State Dumas, one of the authors of the Cadets' draft agrarian programme. After the October Socialist Revolution, worked in the People's Commissariat for Finance and the U.S.S.R. State Bank—191
- L
- LABRIOLA, Arturo** (1873-1959)—Italian political figure, lawyer and economist; one of the leaders of the syndicalist movement in Italy—222
- LARIN, Y. (LURYE, Mikhail Alexandrovich)** (1882-1932)—Social-Democrat, Menshevik; upheld the opportunist idea of convening a "labour congress". Following the defeat of the 1905-07 Revolution—liquidator. After the February bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1917 headed the Menshevik-internationalist group. Member of the Bolshevik Party from August 1917. After the October Socialist Revolution worked on Soviet and economic bodies. During the trade union discussion (1920-21) supporter of Bukharin's group and later Trotsky's group—179, 180, 399
- LARKIN, James** (1878-1947)—leader of the Irish working-class and trade union movement. In 1909 was one of the founders of the Irish Transport and Unskilled Workers' Union. Led the dockers' strike in 1911 and the Dublin general strike in 1913. From 1914 to 1923 was in the U.S.A. where he was subjected to repression for his participation in the working-class movement. After his return to Ireland, he organised the Left Irish Workers' Union, which was for some time affiliated to the Prointern. As of 1924, was a member of the British Communist Party. Subsequently broke with the communist movement and entered into collaboration with the Labourites and Irish bourgeois nationalists—255, 256, 257

- LARKIN, Michael** (1834-1867)—prominent leader of the national liberation movement in Ireland; belonged to the Fenians who prepared an armed uprising against the English domination. Was arrested while trying to release two imprisoned Fenian leaders, and was executed in Manchester—256
- LASSALLE, Ferdinand** (1825-1864)—German petty-bourgeois socialist, who brought in the German working-class movement one of the varieties of opportunism—Lassalleism; founder of the General German Workers' Union (1863). The setting up of this Union was an event of positive significance for the working-class movement. Lassalle, president of the Union, however, led it along opportunist lines. He supported the policy of Germany's unification "from above" under the hegemony of reactionary Prussia—54, 56, 80, 401
- LAW, Andrew Bonar** (1858-1923)—English politician, one of the Tory leaders; was against the Home Rule Bill (self-government) for Ireland—256
- LEGIEN, Karl** (1861-1920)—German Right-wing Social-Democrat, a German trade union leader, revisionist. Chairman of the General Commission of German Trade Unions since 1890. From 1903 Secretary, and from 1913 chairman of the International Secretariat of the Trade Unions. Between 1893 and 1920 (intermittently) Reichstag Deputy of the German Social-Democratic Party. An extreme social-chauvinist during the First World War. Member of the National Assembly of the Weimar Republic (1919-20). Supported bourgeois policy, fought against the proletarian revolutionary movement—205, 275-78, 285, 292, 344, 349, 354, 357, 358
- LENIN, Vladimir Ilyich** (1870-1924)—78, 84, 119, 126, 143, 144, 210, 394, 395, 396, 399, 411, 413, 414, 415, 418, 429, 433, 435, 437, 452, 454
- LENSCH, Paul** (1873-1926)—German Social-Democrat, chauvinist; at the demand of rank-and-file members of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, was expelled from its ranks in 1922—288
- LEROUX, Gaston** (b. 1868)—correspondent of the French bourgeois newspaper *Le Matin* (Morning) in Petersburg at the time of the 1905-07 Revolution in Russia—160
- LIEBKNECHT, Wilhelm** (1826-1900)—prominent leader of the German and international working-class movement, one of the founders and leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party. From 1875 to the end of his life, Liebknecht was a member of the Executive of the German Social-Democratic Party and responsible editor of its Central Organ *Vorwärts*—87, 88, 112, 135, 188
- LIEBKNECHT, Karl** (1871-1919)—an outstanding leader of the German and international working-class movement. An active fighter against opportunism and militarism. At the outset of the First World War, was resolutely against supporting one's "own" government in the predatory war, and was the only

one in the entire Reichstag to vote against war credits (December 2, 1914). One of the organisers and leaders of the revolutionary "Spartacus League". During the November Revolution in Germany, together with Rosa Luxemburg he headed the revolutionary vanguard of the German workers; was one of the founders of the Communist Party of Germany and leader of the workers' uprising in Berlin in January 1919. After the uprising was crushed, he was brutally murdered by counter-revolutionaries—150, 347

**LLOYD GEORGE, David** (1863-1945)—British statesman and diplomat, leader of the Liberal Party; Finance Minister (1908-15); Prime Minister (1916-32)—202, 223, 291, 292, 293

**LONDONDERRY, Charles Stewart** (1852-1915)—English politician, Tory, Marquis; in the House of Lords led those who opposed the Home Rule Bill (self-government) for Ireland—256

**LOZOVSKY (DRIDZO), Solomon Abramovich** (1878-1952)—Russian Social-Democrat, Bolshevik; chairman of the Moscow City Council of Trade Unions (1920); General Secretary of the Profintern (1921-37)—373, 376, 399, 404, 405, 407, 409, 413, 423, 429

**LUDENDORFF, Erich** (1865-1937)—German general, war ideologist of German imperialism. In 1919-23 headed the counter-revolutionary forces that attempted to restore the monarchy in Germany—345

**LUNACHARSKY (VOINOV), Anatoly Vasilyevich** (1875-

1933)—professional revolutionary, prominent Soviet statesman. Following the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903)—Bolshevik. After the October Socialist Revolution he was People's Commissar for Education (up to 1929). From 1930—Academician; publicist, playwright, author of a number of works on art and literature—183, 185, 187, 188, 189, 191, 192, 197, 199

**LUTOVINOV, Yuri Khrisanovich** (1887-1924)—member of the R.S.D.L.P. from 1904. Following the October Socialist Revolution, worked on trade union and Soviet bodies. During the trade union discussion (1920-21), one of the leaders of the anti-Party "Workers' Opposition" group—386, 399, 413

**LUXEMBURG, Rosa** (1871-1919)—outstanding leader of the international working-class movement, one of the leaders of the Left wing of the Second International. Was among the founders and leaders of the Social-Democratic Party of Poland.

From the outbreak of the First World War was an internationalist and one of the organisers of the "Spartacus League". During the November 1918 Revolution in Germany, was one of the leaders of the revolutionary vanguard of the German workers and one of the founders of the Communist Party of Germany. In January 1919 was arrested and brutally murdered by counter-revolutionaries—280, 347

**LYUBIMOV**—396

## M

- MADDISON, Fred** (1856-1937)—English socialist, type-setter; member of Parliament (1897-1900 and 1906-10)—205
- MANN, Tom** (1856-1941)—prominent leader of the English labour movement. In 1885 he joined the Social-Democratic Federation. At the end of the 1880s, took an active part in the new trades union movement, organiser of a number of strikes. In 1893 Tom Mann helped to found the Independent Workers' Party, and belonged to its Left wing. In the 1900s was in Australia, where he played a leading role in the working-class movement; member of the Communist Party of Great Britain from the day of its foundation (1920)—286
- MARKOV, Nikolai Yevgenyevich** (Markov the second) (b. 1876)—big landowner, reactionary tsarist politician. Deputy of the Third and Fourth State Dumas; leader of the extreme Right-wingers in the Duma—248
- MARTOV, L.** (**TSEDERBAUM, Yuli Osipovich, Yegorov, A.**) (1873-1923)—Russian Social-Democrat, a Menshevik leader. In 1900 took part in founding and publishing *Iskra*, and was a member of its editorial board. Delegated to the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903) by the *Iskra*, he headed the opportunist minority of the congress and then became one of the leaders of the Menshevik central bodies and editor of Menshevik publications. A Centrist during First World War. After the October Socialist Revolution he opposed Soviet power. Emigrated to Germany in 1920—143, 144, 145
- MARTYNOV, A. (PIKER, Alexander Samoilovich)** (1865-1935)—Russian Social-Democrat, one of the leaders of "Economism". In 1900 became member of the editorial board of the "Economists" journal *Rabocheye Dyelo* (*Workers' Cause*), opposed the Leninist *Iskra*. After the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903)—Menshevik. Joined the Communist Party after the October Socialist Revolution—86, 92, 95, 96, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108, 110, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 121, 122, 127
- MARX, Karl** (1818-1883)—55, 70, 78, 86, 112, 189, 199, 200, 278, 282-83, 285-86, 287, 292, 293, 355
- MASLOV, I.N.** (1891-1938)—Party member since 1917. During the trade union discussion (1920-21) joined the platform advanced by Ignatov, who shared the views of the anti-Party "Workers' Opposition" group—399
- MAXIMOVSKY, Vladimir Nikolayevich** (1887-1941)—Party member from 1903. Following the October Socialist Revolution, worked on Party and government bodies; in 1920-21 a leader of the anti-Party "Democratic Centralism" group—399
- MEHRING, Franz** (1846-1919)—outstanding leader of the working-class movement in Germany, one of the leaders and theoreticians of the Left-wing of German Social-Democracy, and one of the founders of the Communist Party of Germany—88

**MERRHEIM, Alphonse** (1881-1925)—French trade union leader, syndicalist. From 1905 one of the leaders of the Metalworkers' Federation and the General Confederation of Labour of France; held social-chauvinist and reformist views—354

**MESHCHERSKY, Vladimir Petrovich** (1839-1914)—Russian reactionary, publicist. In his publications, which were lavishly subsidised by the tsarist government, opposed government concessions not only to the workers, but to the liberal bourgeoisie as well—119

**MIKHAILOV, Nikolai Nikolayevich** (1870-1905)—agent provocateur at whose denunciation Lenin and other leaders of the Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class were arrested in 1895—75

**MIKHAILOVSKY, Nikolai Konstantinovich** (1842-1904)—Russian publicist, literary critic, philosopher-positivist, one of the representatives of the subjectivist school in philosophy, a prominent representative of liberal Narodism, and an enemy of Marxism—89

**MILYUKOV, Pavel Nikolayevich** (1859-1943)—prominent ideologist of the Russian imperialist bourgeoisie, historian and publicist. One of the founders of the Constitutional-Democratic Party (October 1905). Deputy to the Third and Fourth State Dumas. In 1917 Foreign Minister in the first bourgeois Provisional Government. After the October Socialist Revolution, one of the organisers of foreign mi-

litary intervention against Soviet Russia and an active leader of white émigrés—268

**MILYUTIN, Vladimir Pavlovich** (1884-1938)—took part in the Social-Democratic movement from 1903; at first a Menshevik; from 1910 a member of the Bolshevik Party. After the October Socialist Revolution held responsible posts on Soviet and economic bodies; was elected member of the Party's C.C. and the Central Control Commission—399, 438

**MIROV, V. (IKOV, V.K.)**—Russian Social-Democrat, Menshevik, supported the opportunist idea of convening a "labour congress"—179

**MOST, Johann Joseph** (1846-1906)—German Social-Democrat, anarchist. Advocated the anarchist idea of "propaganda by action", believed the proletarian revolution could be carried out immediately. Called on the workers to resort to individual terrorism; which he regarded as the most effective means of revolutionary struggle—88, 135

**MURPHY, William Martin** (1844-1921)—big Irish capitalist and nationalist. Publisher of the Irish nationalist newspaper *Irish Independent*—255, 256, 257

# N

**NICHOLAS II (ROMANOV)** (1868-1918)—the last Russian emperor; reigned from 1894 to the February bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1917—309

**NIKITIN, A.M. (b. 1876)**—Russian Social-Democrat and

Menshevik. In 1917 was a member of the bourgeois Provisional Government—310

*NOGIN, Victor Pavlovich* (1878-1924) — member of the R.S.D.L.P. from 1898, professional revolutionary, Bolshevik. After the October Socialist Revolution member of the Council of People's Commissars in the capacity of People's Commissar for Trade and Industry. In November 1917 he supported the idea of setting up a coalition government with the participation of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries; withdrew from the C.C. and the Government on account of his disagreements with the Party's policy. Subsequently he admitted his mistakes and held responsible posts on Soviet and economic bodies—319

*NOLAN, James* (d. 1913)—Irish worker, member of the Irish Transport and Unskilled Workers' Union—256

*NOSKE, Gustav* (1868-1946)—an opportunist leader of the German Social-Democratic Party. As War Minister in 1919-20 he suppressed the Berlin workers and organised the assassination of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg—189

## O

*OREKHOV, A. M.* (b. 1887)—Party member from 1907. Was in the Red Army from 1918 to 1920. During the trade union discussion (1920-21) joined Ignatov's group, the members of which shared the "Workers' Opposition" anti-

Party views. Later held responsible posts—399

*OSINSKY, N. (OBOLENSKY, Valerian Valerianovich)* (1887-1938)—member of the Bolshevik Party since 1907; held responsible posts on Soviet and Party bodies after the October Socialist Revolution; "Left Communist" in 1918; active member of the anti-Party "Democratic Centralism" group (1920-21); joined the Trotsky opposition in 1923; later worked on economic bodies—386, 399, 402

*OWEN, Robert* (1771-1858)—great English utopian socialist—54

*OZEROV, Ivan Khristoforovich* (1869-1942)—bourgeois economist, professor of the Moscow and Petersburg universities. In 1901-02 actively supported Zubatov's "police socialism"—128, 129, 133

## P

*PARNELL, Charles* (1846-1891)—prominent leader of the Irish national movement, Liberal; was elected in 1875 to the British Parliament, where he was among the organisers of parliamentary obstruction to the passing of reactionary measures by the English Government; headed the supporters of Home Rule for Ireland; helped to form the Land League, a mass peasant organisation (1879); later afraid of the growing Irish peasant movement, he entered into secret blocs and compromised with the English bourgeoisie—257

*PARTRIDGE, W. P.*—prominent figure in the labour movement in Ireland, chairman

of the Dublin section of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers, the leader of the Irish Transport and Unskilled Workers' Union from 1913; was active in the Dublin insurrection of 1916 for the independence of Ireland. After the insurrection was crushed, he was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment; was released on account of ill-health before his term expired and died soon after—257

**PESHEKHONOV, Alexei Vasilyevich** (1867-1933)—bourgeois public figure and publicist, one of the leaders of the petty-bourgeois party of Popular Socialists (P.S.s) since 1906; Minister for Food in the bourgeois Provisional Government in 1917; fought against Soviet power after the October Socialist Revolution; white émigré from 1922—342

**PETROVSKY, Grigory Ivanovich** (1878-1958)—a veteran of the revolutionary working-class movement, Party member from 1897, Bolshevik, prominent statesman and Party leader—399, 413, 429

**PLEKHANOV, Georgi Valentinovich** (**BELTOV, G.V.**) (1856-1918)—outstanding leader of the Russian and international working-class movement, first propagandist of Marxism in Russia, irreconcilable fighter for materialist world outlook; founded the Emancipation of Labour group, the first Russian Marxist organisation, in Geneva (1883). In the early 1900s Plekhanov, together with Lenin, edited the newspaper *Iskra* (The Spark) and the magazine *Zarya* (Dawn); took

part in drafting the Party programme and in preparing for the Second R.S.D.L.P. Congress.

After the Second Congress (1903) Plekhanov assumed a conciliatory attitude towards opportunism and then joined the Mensheviks. He had serious differences with the Bolsheviks over basic tactical questions during the first Russian Revolution of 1905-07; in the years of reaction (1907-10) he came out against the Machist revision of Marxism and against liquidationism and headed the group of Party Mensheviks; adopted social-chauvinist position during the First World War (1914-18). After the February bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1917 Plekhanov returned to Russia; adopted a negative attitude towards the October Socialist Revolution—84, 113, 151, 183, 186, 187, 188, 190, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 203, 280, 285, 292, 444

**POTRESOV, Alexander Nikolayevich** (**STAROVER**) (1869-1934)—one of the Menshevik leaders; joined the Marxists in 1890s; contributed to *Iskra* and *Zarya*; supported the *Iskra* minority group at the Second R.S.D.L.P. Congress (1903); social-chauvinist during the First World War; emigrated after the October Socialist Revolution—250, 285, 291, 293

**PREOBRAZHENSKY, Evgeny Alexeyevich** (1886-1937)—member of the R.S.D.L.P. from 1903; carried on Party and political work in the army after the October Socialist Revolution; "Left Communist"



- in 1918; supported Trotsky during the trade union discussion (1920-21); in 1923 was active in the opposition group headed by Trotsky, for which he was expelled from the Party in 1927; was reinstated in 1929; but later expelled again for his anti-Party activities—385, 386, 399, 418, 429, 452
- PROKOPOVICH, Sergei Nikolayevich** (1871-1955)—bourgeois economist, publicist, prominent representative of "Economism", one of the first champions of Bernsteinism in Russia; member of the C.C. of the Constitutional-Democratic Party in 1906; member of the bourgeois Provisional Government after the February revolution of 1917; was banished from Russia for his anti-Soviet activities in 1922—80, 146, 190, 310
- PROUDHON, Pierre Joseph** (1809-1865)—French publicist, economist and sociologist, petty-bourgeois ideologist, one of the founders of anarchism—54, 79
- PURISHKEVICH, Vladimir Mitrofanovich** (1870-1920)—big landowner, rabid reactionary, monarchist; deputy to the Second, Third and Fourth Dumas. In 1905-07 he founded Black-Hundred organisations to fight the revolutionary movement; actively fought Soviet power after the October Socialist Revolution—248, 256
- R
- R.M.**—author of "Our Reality", an article in the *Separate Supplement* to "Rabochaya Mysl" (Workers' Thought) (September 1899), which expounded the opportunist views of the "Economists"—87, 102
- RADUS-ZENKOVICH, Victor Alexeyevich** (1877-1967)—Party member from 1898; professional revolutionary; headed the social insurance and labour protection department in 1918-21, later was R.S.F.S.R. Deputy People's Commissar for Labour—319
- RAFAIL (FARBMAN, R.B.)** (b. 1893)—Party member since 1910; was engaged in Party and Soviet work after the October Socialist Revolution; belonged to the "Democratic Centralism" group in 1920-21; was expelled from the Party for his anti-Party activities in 1927—399
- RENAUDEL, Pierre** (1871-1935)—one of the reformist leaders of the French Socialist Party—292, 293
- RODICHEV, Fyodor Izmailovich** (b. 1856)—one of the leaders of the Constitutional-Democratic Party, member of its C.C.—174, 191
- ROMANOVVS**—the ruling dynasty in Russia from 1610 to 1917—244, 250
- ROUSSEL, Angela**—French socialist, member of the Permanent Administrative Commission of the French Socialist Party from 1907 to 1912; she subsequently gave up political activity—209, 211
- RUBANOVICH, Ilya Adolfovich** (1860-1920)—one of the leaders of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party—209, 210, 211
- RUDZUTAK, Yan Ernestovich** (1887-1938)—prominent leader of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, Party

member from 1905; held leading posts on trade union and Party bodies after the October Socialist Revolution—388, 391, 394, 397, 398, 399, 401, 409, 413, 425, 428, 429, 431, 432, 435, 436

**RYAZANOV, David Borisovich** (1870-1938)—Russian Social-Democrat, Menshevik, joined the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) at the Sixth Party Congress (1917); held leading trade union posts after the October Socialist Revolution; adopted anti-Party position during the trade union discussion (1920-21) and was removed from trade union work; expelled from the C.P.S.U.(B.) in February 1931 for supporting Menshevik counter-revolutionary activity—374, 376

**RYKOV, Alexei Ivanovich** (1881-1938)—Party member from 1899; held responsible posts after the October Socialist Revolution; repeatedly opposed the Leninist Party policy; was one of the leaders of the Right opportunist deviation in the C.P.S.U.(B.) in 1928; was expelled from the Party in 1937 for his anti-Party activities—395, 429, 462

## S

**SAPRONOV, Timofei Vladimirovich** (1887-1939)—member of the Bolshevik Party from 1912; held responsible posts on Party, Soviet and trade union bodies after the October Socialist Revolution; repeatedly opposed Party policy; headed the anti-Party "Democratic Centralism" group during the trade union discussion (1920-21); was ac-

tive in the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc; was expelled from the Party in 1927 for his anti-Party activities—399, 402

**SCHEIDEMANN, Philipp** (1865-1939)—one of the leaders of the extreme Right opportunist wing of German Social-Democracy; during the November 1918 Revolution in Germany entered the so-called Council of People's Representatives, whose activity was in line with the interests of the bourgeoisie; in February-June 1919 he headed the coalition government of the Weimar Republic and was one of the organisers of the ruthless suppression of the German working-class movement in 1918-21. Later withdrew from active political activity—292, 293, 325, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348

**SCHMIDT, Vasily Vladimirovich** (1886-1940)—member of the Bolshevik Party from 1905; after the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution, Secretary of the Petrograd Trade Union Council; in 1918-28, Secretary of the A.C.C.T.U.; subsequently People's Commissar for Labour—334, 339

**SCHRAMM, Karl August**—German economist, Social-Democrat; with Höchberg and Bernstein he published the article "Retrospective Review of the Socialist Movement in Germany". Condemning the party's revolutionary tactics, the authors called for an alliance with the bourgeoisie and submission to it of the interests of the proletariat. Marx and Engels opposed their opportunist views—88

- SCHULZE-DELITZSCH, Hermann* (1808-1883)—German vulgar economist and public figure; deputy to the Reichstag in 1867-83; preached harmony of class interests of the capitalists and workers; from 1849 waged a campaign among the German workers and craftsmen for setting up co-operative societies and loan and savings banks for workers, seeing in this a means of establishing social peace within the framework of capitalist society—80
- SCHWEITZER, Johann Baptiste* (1833-1875)—German public figure and writer, follower of Ferdinand Lassalle; he pursued the opportunist Lassallean tactics of collaboration with the Prussian Government in the hope that it would introduce general franchise, give state subsidies for producers' co-operatives, etc.; supported the Junker-Prussian way of unifying Germany "from above". Marx and Engels sharply criticised Schweitzer's "royal-Prussian governmental socialism". In the General German Workers' Union, Schweitzer pursued a policy of personal dictatorship, which caused dissatisfaction among its members; in 1871 he was forced to leave the post of president of the Union, after which he retired from political activity—88
- SEDOV, L. (KOLTSOV, D.)* (1863-1920)—Russian Social-Democrat; an active Menshevik after the Second R.S.D.L.P. Congress (1903), he contributed to several Menshevik publications; liquidator—following the defeat of 1905-07 Revolution—250
- SEREBRYAKOV, Leonid Petrovich* (1888-1937)—Party member from 1905; after the October Socialist Revolution, member of the Moscow Regional Party Committee, Secretary of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) and Secretary of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee; supported Trotsky during the trade union discussion (1920-21); from 1923 an active member of the Trotskyite opposition; was expelled from the Party in 1927, reinstated in 1930 and expelled again for his anti-Party activities in 1936—385, 387, 399, 423, 429
- SERGEYEV, F.A.*—see *Artyom*
- SHCHEGLO, V.A. (KHEISINA, L.V.)* (b. 1878)—Russian Social-Democrat; in 1906 supported the opportunist idea of a "labour congress"—179
- SHINGARYOV, Andrei Ivanovich* (1869-1918)—one of the leaders of the Constitutional-Democratic Party. Following the February revolution of 1917, member of the Provisional Government, Minister of Agriculture; Finance Minister—313
- SHLYAPNIKOV, Alexander Gavrilovich* (1885-1937)—member of the Bolshevik Party from 1901; after the October Socialist Revolution entered the Council of People's Commissars as People's Commissar for Labour; subsequently worked on trade union and economic bodies. In 1920-22, he organised and led the anti-Party Workers' Opposition group; during the Party purge in 1933, he was expelled from the Party—386, 396, 399, 410, 411, 413, 414, 416, 417, 418, 456

**SINGER, Paul** (1844-1911)—one of the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party, prominent in the Marxist wing of the Second International. A member of the International Socialist Bureau from 1900—189

**SKOBELEV, Matvei Ivanovich** (1885-1939)—Russian Social-Democrat, Menshevik; Deputy Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet and Deputy Chairman of the Central Executive Committee (first convocation), after the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution; Minister for Labour in the bourgeois Provisional Government between May and August 1917. After the October Socialist Revolution he broke with the Mensheviks and worked on economic bodies—291

**SMILLIE, Robert** (1857-1940)—leader of the British labour movement, chairman of the Scottish Miners' Union in 1894-1918 and 1921-40; chairman of the National Miners' Union (1912-21); organised a big miners' strike in 1912; pacifist during the First World War—223, 258

**SOKOLNIKOV (BRILLIANT), Grigory Yakovlevich** (1888-1939)—member of the Bolshevik Party from 1905; after the October Socialist Revolution, engaged in administrative and Party work; active participant in the Trotskyite opposition; in 1936 was expelled from the Party for his anti-Party activities—399

**SORGE, Friedrich Adolph** (1828-1906)—German socialist, prominent leader of the international working-class and socialist movement; friend and

associate of K. Marx and F. Engels—211, 286

**SOSNOVSKY, Lev Semyonovich** (1886-1937)—member of the Bolshevik Party from 1904, editor of the newspaper *Bednota* (The Poor) from 1918-24 (intermittently). During the trade union discussion (1920-21), supported Trotsky. Was expelled from the Party in 1927 by the Fifteenth C.P.S.U.(B.) Congress for his activity as a member of the Trotskyite opposition—427, 428

**STALIN, Josef Vissarionovich** (1879-1953)—Party member from 1898, Bolshevik; after the October Socialist Revolution People's Commissar for Nationalities; in 1919-20, People's Commissar for State Control, later headed the People's Commissariat for the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. From 1922 to 1952, General Secretary of the Party Central Committee, later Secretary of the C.C., C.P.S.U. From 1941 to 1953, chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, subsequently of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers—399, 413, 429

**STAMPFER, Friedrich** (1874-1957)—one of the leaders of the Right wing of German Social-Democracy, publicist. An extreme social-chauvinist during the First World War. In 1916-33 editor-in-chief of *Vorwärts* (central organ of the Social-Democratic Party), member of the Party's Executive—346

**STOLYPIN, Pyotr Arkadyevich** (1862-1911)—tsarist statesman; chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of the Interior from 1906 to 1911.

Stolypin gave his name to a whole period of brutal political reaction (1907-10)—251, 262

**STRUVE, Pyotr Berngardovich** (1870-1944)—Russian bourgeois economist and publicist, noted champion of legal Marxism (1890s); he came out with "amendments" and "criticism" of Marx's economic and philosophical teaching and strove to adapt Marxism and the working-class movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie; after the October Socialist Revolution enemy of the Soviet power; emigrated from Russia—80, 81, 102, 129, 151, 189, 190, 296, 310

**SUN YAT-SEN** (1866-1925)—outstanding Chinese revolutionary democrat and statesman—445

## T

**TOMSKY, Mikhail Pavlovich** (1880-1936)—member of the Bolshevik Party from 1904; Chairman of the Moscow Trade Union Council after the October Socialist Revolution; Chairman of the Presidium of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions from 1919; repeatedly opposed the Leninist Party policy, and was one of the leaders of the Right-wing opportunist deviation in the C.P.S.U.(B.) in 1928-29—319, 373, 376, 394, 404, 405, 407, 408, 409, 413, 423, 425, 429, 455

**TROTSKY (BRONSTEIN), Lev Davidovich** (1879-1940)—R.S.D.L.P. member since 1897, a Menshevik; following the defeat of the 1905-07 Revolution, under the screen of "non-factionalism", he

actually adopted a liquidator stand; organised the anti-Party August bloc in 1912; adopted a Centrist position during the imperialist world war (1914-18). On his return from emigration after the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution, he was admitted to the Party. However, Trotsky did not change over to the Bolshevik position and fought overtly and covertly against Leninism and the Party policy.

After the October Socialist Revolution, he held a number of responsible posts; waged a fierce factional struggle against the Party's general line and Lenin's programme of building socialism in the U.S.S.R.; headed the opposition in the trade union discussion in 1920-21; was expelled from the Party in 1927 and banished from the U.S.S.R. in 1929 for his anti-Soviet activities; was deprived of Soviet citizenship in 1932. While abroad, Trotsky continued his struggle against the Soviet state and the Communist Party—278, 280, 370-79, 380-84, 386, 387, 388, 391-92, 394-404, 401-02, 404-11, 414, 416, 418, 419, 420-24, 426-42, 443-50, 452-57

**TSERETELI, Irakly Georgiyevich** (1882-1959)—Menshevik leader; liquidator following the defeat of the 1905-07 Revolution; a Centrist during the First World War. After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution, member of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet and of the Central Executive Committee of Soviets (first convocation). In May 1917,

he entered the bourgeois Provisional Government, was one of the instigators of pogroms and persecutions of the Bolsheviks; after the October Socialist Revolution was one of the leaders of the counter-revolutionary Menshevik government in Georgia; emigrated after the victory of Soviet power in Georgia—310

*TSIPEROVICH, G.V.* (1871-1932)—Russian economist and man of letters, took part in the revolutionary movement from 1888; worked on the trade union bodies and wrote for various magazines after the October Socialist Revolution; adhered to Lenin's platform during the trade union discussion (1920-21)—397, 399

*TURATI, Filippo* (1857-1932)—reformist leader of the Italian working-class movement; one of the organisers of the Italian Socialist Party (1892); pursued a policy of class collaboration between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; opposed the revolutionary movement of the Italian working people; a Centrist during the First World War—362

## V

*V.I.*—see *Ivanshin, V.P.*

*V.V. (VORONTSOV, Vasily Pavlovich)* (1847-1918)—Russian economist and publicist, one of the ideologists of the liberal Narodism of the 1880s-90s—76, 77, 83, 86, 89

*VAILLANT, Edouard Marie* (1840-1915)—French socialist, follower of Blanqui, one of the leaders of the Second International's Left wing,

member of the Executive Committee of the Paris Commune and the General Council of the First International. Was one of the founders of the Socialist Party of France (1901). After its merger with Jaurès' reformist French Socialist Party in 1905, Vaillant took up an opportunist stand on major issues; was social-chauvinist during First World War (1914-18)—209

*VAN KOL, Heinrich* (1851-1925)—one of the founders and leaders of the Dutch Social-Democratic Workers' Party (1894). Shortly after its foundation he became a reformist and an opportunist. At the Amsterdam (1904) and the Stuttgart (1907) congresses of the Second International defended an opportunist resolution on the colonial question which justified the enslavement of the colonial peoples on the pretext that imperialism had a "civilising mission" in the colonies—184, 188, 189

*VANEYEV, Anatoly Alexandrovich* (1872-1899)—Russian Social-Democrat, took an active part in founding the Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class in 1895; a propagandist in the workers' Social-Democratic study-circles, he took charge of technical matters in preparing the publication of the newspaper *Rabocheye Dyelo* (The Workers' Cause). Was arrested together with V.I. Lenin in connection with the case of the League of Struggle and exiled to Eastern Siberia in 1897. At the end of August and beginning of Sep-

- tember 1899, Vaneyev, together with sixteen other Social-Democrats, signed the "Protest of the Russian Social-Democrats" written by Lenin against the "Credo" of the "Economists"—71, 73
- VASILYEV, N.V. (b. 1855)—gendarmier colonel, supporter of Zubatov's "police socialism"—128
- VOINOV—see *Lunacharsky, A.V.*
- VOLLMAR, *Georg Heinrich* (1850-1922)—one of the leaders of the opportunist wing of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, journalist; ideologist of reformism and revisionism; opposed the intensification of the class struggle, extolled the advantages of "state socialism", called upon the Social-Democrats to unite with the Liberals and promoted the interests of the small landed proprietors when elaborating the agrarian programme—200
- VORONOV, *Boris (LEBEDEV, B.N.)* (1883-1919)—Socialist-Revolutionary, economist and publicist—264

## W

- WEBB, *Beatrice* (1858-1943)—and WEBB, *Sidney* (1859-1947)—well-known English public figures, reformists. Authors of books on the history and theory of the English labour movement. Their book *Industrial Democracy* (1897) was translated into Russian and published in 1900-01; the first volume was translated by V.I. Lenin, and the second edited by him. Ideologists of the petty bourgeoisie and labour aristocracy, the Webbs expounded the view that it was possible to achieve a peaceful solution of the worker's problem within the framework of capitalist society. During the First World War they held social-chauvinist views. Sidney Webb was one of the founders of the reformist Fabian Society and a member of the Labour Government (1924, 1929-31)—100, 288
- WEITLING, *Wilhelm* (1808-1871)—prominent leader of the German working-class movement at its inception; one of the theoreticians of utopian equalitarian communism—79
- WILHELM II (*Hohenzollern*) (1859-1944)—German Emperor and King of Prussia (1888-1918)—204, 206
- WITTE, *Sergei Yulyevich* (1849-1915)—Russian statesman (late 19th-early 20th century), supporter of the autocracy, tried to preserve the monarchy by making promises and granting minor concessions to the liberal bourgeoisie and by resorting to brutal reprisals against the people; was one of those who organised the suppression of the 1905-07 Revolution. As Railway Minister (February-August 1892), Finance Minister (1892-1903), chairman of the Council of Ministers (October 1905-April 1906), his measures in the sphere of finance, customs policy, railway construction, factory legislation and the encouragement of foreign investments, helped to promote capitalism in Russia and made her more dependent on imperialist powers—124, 164

**WOLTMANN, Ludwig** (1871-1907)—German reactionary sociologist and anthropologist, considered the economic struggle to be the main goal of the working-class movement—86

**WORMS, Alphonse Ernestovich** (1868-1937)—lawyer, professor of Moscow University; liberal. Delivered lectures at meetings of Zubatov's "Society for Mutual Aid of Workers Engaged in Mechanical Production" (1901-02). Left Moscow University with a group of other liberal professors in protest against repressions by the Minister for Education in 1911—128

**WRANGEL, Pyotr Nikolayevich** (1878-1928)—tsarist general, monarchist. Following the October Socialist Revolution, one of the leaders of counter-revolution in the south of Russia. After the rout of his troops by the Red Army in the Crimea in November 1920, he fled abroad—384

## Y

**YAKOVLEVA, Varvara Nikolayevna** (1885-1944)—member of the Bolshevik Party from 1904; after the October Socialist Revolution, worked on Party and government bodies; during the trade union discussion in 1920-21, joined the "buffer" group, which subsequently united with Trotsky; carried on organizational work in the Trotskyite centre in 1924-26; later broke with the opposition—399

**YEGOROV, A.**—see *Martov, Y.O.*

**YEZHOV, V. (TSEDER-BAUM, S.O.)** (1879-1939)—Russian Social-Democrat, Menshevik; liquidator following the defeat of the 1905-07 Revolution—268

**YUDENICH, Nikolai Nikolayevich** (1862-1933)—tsarist general; after the October Socialist Revolution, member of the counter-revolutionary "North-West government", and commander-in-chief of the whiteguard North-Western army; supported by the Entente, he made two unsuccessful attempts to capture Petrograd in 1919; was routed in November 1919 by the Red Army and withdrew to Estonia; then he left for England—350

## Z

**ZETKIN, Clara** (1857-1933)—outstanding leader of the German and international working-class movement and one of the founders of the German Communist Party — 183, 187

**ZINOVIEV (RADOMYSLSKY), Grigory Yevseyevich** (1883-1936)—Party member from 1901.

After the October Socialist Revolution, held a number of key posts. Repeatedly opposed the Party's Leninist policy; was one of the organisers of the "New Opposition" (1925) and one of the leaders of the anti-Party Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc (1926). Was expelled from the Party for his factional activity in November 1927, reinstated twice and expelled again for his anti-Party activity—394, 395, 396, 399, 402, 413, 418, 427-30, 432, 434, 435, 437,



441, 442, 444, 445, 447, 449,  
453  
*ZOFF, Vyacheslav Ivanovich*  
(1889-1940)—Soviet military  
figure and statesman; Party  
member from 1913, partici-  
pated in the Civil War. Mem-  
ber of the Collegium (1920),  
later head of the Chief Water

Transport Political Board—  
430

*ZUBATOV, Sergei Vasilye-  
vich* (1864-1917)—gendarm-  
ie colonel, inspirer and orga-  
niser of "police socialism"  
(Zubatovshchina, see Note 29)  
—80, 82, 128, 129, 133,  
357-58

## REQUEST TO READERS

*Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.*

*Please send all your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, U.S.S.R.*