STALIN

THE COLLECTED WORKS
VOLUME 4



an iskra classic

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

THE COLLECTED WORKS OF JOSEF STALIN



This softcover edition published by *Iskra Books* © 2025

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Original Russian Edition published by the decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik) 1946
Original English Edition published by Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow 1953

First published in Russian.

All rights reserved.
The moral rights of the author and the preparer have been asserted.

Iskra Books
US | England | Ireland
iskrabooks.org

Iskra Books is a nonprofit, independent, scholarly publisher—publishing original works of revolutionary theory, history, education, and art, as well as edited collections, new translations, and critical republications of older works.

ISBN-13: 979-8-2957-7649-6 (*Softcover*)
ISBN-13: 979-8-2957-7652-6 (*Hardcover*)

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

Prepared by Iskra Books
Cover Art, Book Design, and Typesetting by Ben Stahnke
Prepared by Roísín Dubh

THE COLLECTED WORKS OF JOSEF STALIN

VOLUME FOUR

iskra books
US | England | Ireland



Pictured above: Josef Stalin in the revolutionary period of 1917-1920. During these formative years of Soviet power, Stalin played a pivotal role as a member of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and People's Commissar for Nationalities. His tireless work alongside Lenin was crucial in coordinating efforts to defend the nascent Soviet Republic against counter-revolutionary forces and foreign intervention. This period marked Stalin's rise as a key strategist and organizer, committed to securing the victory of socialism amidst the turbulence of revolution and civil war.

CONTENTS

Publisher's Note **xvii**
Original Preface **xviii**

1917

Speech Delivered at the Congress of the Finnish Social-Democratic Labour Party, Helsingfors, November 14, 1917 **1**

Reply to Ukrainian Comrades in the Rear and at the Front **5**

The Ukrainian Rada. Speech Delivered in the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, December 14, 1917 **13**

What is the ukrainian rada? **16**

The Independence of Finland. Speech Delivered in the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, December 22, 1917 **19**

"Turkish Armenia" **21**

1918

Speech At The Meeting Of The Central Committee Of The R.S.D.L.P.(B.) On The Question Of Peace With The Germans, January 11, 1918 (Summary Record In The Minutes) **23**

The Kiev Bourgeois Rada **24**

Speeches Delivered At The Third All-Russian Congress Of Soviets Of Workers', Soldiers', And Peasants' Deputies, January 10-18, 1918 **25**

1. Report On The National Question, January 15 (Newspaper report) **25**

2. Draft Resolution on the Federal Institutions Of The Russian Republic **27**

3. Reply to the Discussion on the Report on the National Question, January 15 (Newspaper Report) **27**

Telephone Message to the Petrograd Committee, R.S.D.L.P.(B.), February 21, 1918 **32**

Telegram to the People's Secretariat, Ukrainian Soviet Republic, February 21, 1918 **33**

Note Sent by Direct Wire to the People's Secretariat, Ukrainian Soviet Republic, February 24, 1918 **35**

The Ukrainian Knot **38**

A Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic **41**

Transcaucasian Counter-Revolutionaries Under a Socialist Mask **42**

Organization of a Russian Federal Republic: *Pravda* Interview **54**

Bourgeois-Democratic Federations **54**

How The Russian Federation Now in Process of Formation Differs from them **55**

Structural Principles of the Russian Federation **56**

Composition of the Russian Federal Republic **56**

Rights of Federating Regions; Rights of National Minorities **57**

Structure of the Central Authority **57**

The Executive Organ of Power **58**

Transitional Function of Federalism **58**

Shaping the Political Structure of the Russian Federation. Federalism In Russia—a Transitional Step to Socialist Unitarism **59**

One Immediate Task **60**

General Provisions of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic **64**

Telegram to the Fifth Congress of Soviets of the Turkestan Region, April 22, 1918 **66**

The Peace Negotiations with the Ukraine: Izvestia Interview **67**

- Conclusion of an Armistice **67**
- Subsequent Negotiations **67**
- Effect of the Coup D'état In The Ukraine **68**
- Causes of the Coup D'état **68**

Speeches Delivered at a Conference on the Convening of a Constituent Congress of Soviets of the Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic, May 10-16, 1918 **70**

- 1. Speech at the Opening of the Conference, May 10 **70**
- 2. Speech at the Closing of the Conference, May 16 **74**

Another Lie **76**

The Situation in the Caucasus **77**

- I. Transcaucasia **77**
- II. The North Caucasus **79**

Concerning The Situation in the Caucasus **82**

The Don and the North Caucasus (Machinations And The Facts) **84**

Telegram to V. I. Lenin, June 7, 1918 **93**

Letter to V. I. Lenin, July 7, 1918 **95**

Letter to V. I. Lenin, July 10, 1918 **97**

Letter to V. I. Lenin, August 4, 1918 **98**

Letter to V. I. Lenin, August 31, 1918 **102**

Telegram to Sverdlov, Chairman of the Allrussian

Central Executive Committee, August 31, 1918 **103**

Telegram to the Council of People's Commissars, September 6, 1918 **104**

Telegram to Voroshilov, Commander of the Front, Tsaritsyn, September 19, 1918 **105**

The Southern Front: Izvestia Interview **106**

The Logic of Facts (In Reference to the "Theses" of the Central Committee of the Mensheviks) **108**

I. The October Revolution **108**

II. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat **110**

III. Petty-Bourgeois Muddle **112**

IV. What Next? **114**

Speech Delivered at a Plenary Meeting of the Moscow Soviet of Workers', Soldiers' And Peasants' Deputies on the Situation on the Southern Front, October 29, 1918 (Newspaper Report) **117**

The South of Russia: *Pravda* Interview **119**

Importance of the Southern Front **119**

Tsaritsyn the Main Target **119**

Wherein Lies the Strength of our Army? **120**

The October Revolution (October 24 and 25, 1917, in Petrograd) **123**

The October Revolution and the National Question **126**

I. The February Revolution and the National Question **126**

II. The October Revolution and the National Question **128**

III. The Worldwide Significance of the October Revolution **132**

Partition Wall **135**

Don't Forget the East **137**

The Ukraine is Liberating Itself **140**

Light from the East **143**

Things are Moving **148**

1919

Letter to V. I. Lenin from the Eastern Front, January 5, 1919 **152**

Report to V. I. Lenin **154**

Speech Delivered at a Joint Meeting of Party and Soviet Organizations in Vyatka, January 19, 1919 (Record in the Minutes) **159**

Report to Comrade Lenin by the Commissionof the Party Central Committee and the Council of Defence on the Reasons for the Fall of Perm in December 1918 **161**

- General Picture Of The Disaster **161**
- The Third Army and the Reserves **166**
- Conclusions **169**
- Control System of the Army And Instructions of the Centre **170**
- Conclusions **172**
- Insecurity of the Rear and Work of the Party and Soviet Institutions **173**
- Conclusions **175**
- Supply and Evacuation Agencies **177**
- Conclusions **178**
- Total Losses of Matériel and Men **179**
- Measures Taken to Strengthen the Front **180**

The Government's Policy on the National Question **183**

To The Soviets and the Party Organizations of Turkestan **187**

Two Camps **189**

Our Tasks in the East **193**

Two Years **196**

Imperialism's Reserves **200**

Excerpt from a Speech on the Military Question Delivered at the Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), March 21, 1919 **204**

The Re-Organization of State Control: Report Delivered At A Meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, April 9, 1919 (Newspaper Report) **206**

The Shooting of the Twenty-Six Baku Comrades by Agents of British Imperialism **207**

Telegram to the Inspector-Extraordinary of State Control, Shchigry, May 7, 1919 **211**

Note to V. I. Lenin from Petrograd by Direct Wire, May 25, 1919 **213**

Telegram to V. I. Lenin, June 16, 1919 **215**

Note to V. I. Lenin from Petrograd by Direct Wire, June 18, 1919 **216**

The Petrograd Front: *Pravda* Interview **218**

1. The Approaches to Petrograd **218**

2. The Enemy's Forces **218**

3. The Enemy's Calculations **219**

4. The Situation at the Front **220**

5. The Navy **221**

6. Summing Up **222**

Letter to V. I. Lenin about the Situation on the Western Front, August 11, 1919 **223**

Letter to V. I. Lenin from the Southern Front, October 15, 1919 **226**

Telegram to V. I. Lenin, October 25, 1919 **229**

Speech at the Opening of the Second All-Russian Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East, November 22, 1919 **230**

Greetings to Petrograd from the Southern Front **232**

The Military Situation in the South **233**

i. Abortive Plans of the Entente **233**

ii. Causes of the Defeat of the Counter-Revolution **234**

iii. Present Situation on the Southern Front **238**

1920

Order of the Day to the Ukrainian Labour Army, March 7, 1920 **241**

Speeches at the Fourth Conference of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of the Ukraine, March 17-23, 1920 **243**

1. Speech at the Opening of the Conference, March 17 **243**

2. Report on Economic Policy, March 19 **244**

3. Reply to the Discussion on the Report on Economic Policy, March 20 **249**

4. Speech at the Closing of the Conference, March 23 **250**

Lenin as the Organizer and Leader of the Russian Communist Party **253**

i. Lenin as the Organizer of the Russian Communist Party **254**

ii. Lenin as the Leader of the Russian Communist Party **257**

Speech Delivered At A Meeting Called By The Moscow Committee, R.C.P.(B.) on the Occasion of V. I. Lenin's Fiftieth Birthday, April 23, 1920 **261**

The Entente's New Campaign against Russia **264**

I. The General Situation **264**

II. Rear. Striking Area **267**

III. Prospects **269**

The Situation on the South-Western Front: Ukrainian Rosta Interview **271**

The Break-Through **271**

Results of the Break-Through **272**

Fate of the Polish Third Army **272**

Situation at the Front **273**

Conclusions **274**

The Crimean Front **274**

Telegram to V. I. Lenin, June 25, 1920 **276**

The Situation on the Polish Front: *Pravda* Interview **277**

1. May-June **277**

2. The Zhitomir Break-Through **277**

3. Results of the Break-Through **278**

4. The Danger from the South **279**

5. Remember Wrangel **280**

How the Red Army is Greeted: Statement to Krasnoarmeyets **282**

To All Party Organizations: Draft Letter of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) **284**

Creation of Fighting Reserves of the Republic **286**

1. Memorandum to the Political Bureau, C.C., R.C.P.(B.), August 25, 1920 **286**

2. Statement to the Political Bureau, C.C., R.C.P.(B.), August 30, 1920 **287**

The Policy of the Soviet Government on the National Question in Russia **290**

Speech at the Openingof the First All-russian Conference of Responsible Personnel of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, October 15, 1920 **300**

Author's Preface: to a Collection of Articles on the National Question, Published in 1920 **304**

The Political Situation of the Republic: Report Delivered at a Regional Conference of Communist Organizations of the Don and the Caucasus, Held in Vladikavkaz, October 27, 1920 **308**

Three Years of Proletarian Dictatorship: Report Delivered at a Celebration Meeting of the Baku Soviet, November 6, 1920 **314**

The First Period **315**

The Second Period **316**

The Third Period **318**

Prospects **319**

Congress of the Peoples of Daghestan, November 13, 1920 **323**

1. Declaration on Soviet Autonomy for Daghestan **323**

2. Concluding Remarks **326**

Congress of the Peoples of the Terek Region, November 17, 1920 **327**

1. Report on Soviet Autonomy for the Terek Region **327**

2. Concluding Remarks **330**

The Situation in the Caucasus: *Pravda* Interview **334**

Long Live Soviet Armenia! **338**

Appendix

Biographical Chronicle (October 1917-1920) **340**



PUBLISHER'S NOTE

With the war in Gaza raging, the capitalist media and ruling class have once again stoked the flames of Islamophobia. This has led to numerous assaults and even deaths, fueled by the hatred harbored in the hearts of some. Alarmingly, even individuals claiming to be socialists have echoed anti-Muslim rhetoric. Yet, during the civil war in Russia, Stalin wrote extensively about the importance of socialism's respect for, and protection of, diverse religious practice.

This fourth volume of the *Works* contains Stalin's writings from the period directly following the October Revolution in 1917 to 1920, when the war still raged. It concludes with a profound piece highlighting Stalin's commitment to the religious autonomy of the people of Daghestan. In his speech at the Congress of the Peoples of Daghestan, Stalin noted that:

> The Soviet Government considers that the Sharia, as common law, is as fully authorized as that of any other of the peoples inhabiting Russia. If the Daghestan people desire to preserve their laws and customs, they should be preserved.

Socialists of all stripes should take heed of Stalin's words and commit themselves to respecting the customs and religions of all working peoples. While the ruling class sows division and fails to uphold tolerant principles, we must rise above, protecting Muslim workers from such attacks and embodying the respectful balance Stalin advocated in his speech.

—Róisín Dubh, Iskra Books
December 22, 2024



ORIGINAL PREFACE

The Fourth Volume of J. V. Stalin's *Works* contains his writings and speeches belonging to the period immediately following the October Revolution, from November 1917 to December 1920.

The works of this period deal with the consolidation of the socialist state system, the policy of the Soviet Government on the national question, the creation and strengthening of the Red Army, and military strategy and tactics in the period of foreign armed intervention and civil war.

Questions of Soviet state structure and of Soviet policy on the national question are dealt with in J. V. Stalin's speeches at the Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets, in the interview "Organization of a Russian Federal Republic," in the "General Provisions of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic," and in "The October Revolution and the National Question," "The Policy of the Soviet Government on the National Question in Russia," and other works.

A number of the writings ("The Ukrainian Knot," "The Don and the North Caucasus," "Light From the East" and other articles) discuss the struggle of the peoples of the Ukraine, the Caucasus and the Baltic Region against foreign invasion and for the establishment of Soviet power.

Analyses of the situation on the civil war fronts are contained in the "Report to Comrade Lenin by the Commission of the Party Central Committee and the Council of Defence on the Reasons for the Fall of Perm in December 1918," in the draft letter of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) entitled "To All Party Organizations," in the articles "The Military Situation in the South" and "The Entente's New Campaign Against Russia," in surveys of the military situation on the Tsaritsyn, Petrograd and South-Western fronts, and in a number of letters and telegrams to V. I. Lenin.

The struggle and victory of the Soviet people in the civil war are summed up in "The Political Situation of the Republic" and "Three Years of Proletarian Dictatorship."

Included in this volume are the article "Lenin as the Organizer and Leader of the Russian Communist Party" and the speech at the meeting called by the Moscow Committee of the R.C.P.(B.) on the occasion of Lenin's fiftieth birthday, which paint a portrait of the great leader.

Published in this volume for the first time are: the letter to V. I. Lenin from Tsaritsyn (July 1918), the letter on the situation on the Western Front (August 1919), the memorandum and statement to the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) on the creation of fighting reserves of the Republic (August 1920), and other documents.

Numerous telegrams, letters, records of conversations over the direct wire, orders of the day and other documents relating to military operations, and congratulatory messages to individual military formations, men and commanders of the Red Army have not been included in the volume.

Dates until the adoption of the New Style calendar (up to February 14, 1918) are given in Old Style.

[Original] Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute
of the C.C., C.P.S.U.(B.)

1917

November



SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE CONGRESS OF THE FINNISH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY, HELSINGFORS

November 14, 1917

Comrades, I have been delegated to greet you on behalf of the workers' revolution in Russia, which is shaking the capitalist system to its foundations. I have come to you to greet your Congress on behalf of the Workers' and Peasants' Government of Russia, the Council of People's Commissars, which was born in the fire of this revolution.

But I have not only come to bring you greetings. I should like first of all to bring you the joyful news of the victories of the Russian revolution, of the disorganization of its enemies, and to tell you that in the atmosphere of the expiring imperialist war the chances of the revolution are improving day by day.

The bondage of landlordism has been broken, for power in the countryside has passed into the hands of the peasants. The power of the generals has been broken, for power in the army is now concentrated in the hands of the soldiers. A curb has been put on the capitalists, for workers' control is rapidly being established over the factories, mills and banks. The whole country, town and countryside, rear and front, is studded with revolutionary committees of workers, soldiers and peasants, which are taking the reins of government into their own hands.

They tried to scare us with the bogey of Kerensky and the counter-revolutionary generals. But Kerensky has been driven out, and the generals are besieged by the soldiers and Cossacks, who also support the demands of the workers and peasants.

They tried to scare us with the bogey of famine, and prophesied that the Soviet regime would perish in the grip of a disrupted food supply. But we had only to curb the profiteers, we had only to appeal to the

peasants, and grain began to flow to the towns in hundreds of thousands of poods.

They tried to scare us with the bogey of a breakdown of the machinery of state, sabotage by officials, and so on. And we knew ourselves that the new, socialist government would not be able simply to take over the old, bourgeois state machine and make it its own. But we had only to set about renovating the old machine, purging it of anti-social elements, and the sabotage began to melt away.

They tried to scare us with the bogey of war "surprises," the possibility of the imperialist cliques creating complications in connection with our proposal for a democratic peace. And, indeed, there was a danger, a mortal danger. But that danger arose after the capture of Ösel,[1] when the Kerensky Government was preparing to flee to Moscow and surrender Petrograd, and when the British and German imperialists were making a deal for peace at the expense of Russia. On the basis of such a peace the imperialists could indeed have wrecked the cause of the Russian and, perhaps, of the international revolution. But the October Revolution came in time. It took the cause of peace into its own hands, it struck the most dangerous weapon from the hands of international imperialism and thus saved the revolution from mortal peril. The old wolves of imperialism were left with one of two alternatives: either to bow to the revolutionary movement that is flaring up in all countries, by accepting peace, or to carry on the struggle by continuing the war. But to continue the war in its fourth year, when the whole world is suffocating in its grip, when the "imminent" winter campaign is arousing a storm of indignation among the soldiers of all countries, and when the filthy secret treaties have already been published—to continue the war under such circumstances means to doom oneself to obvious failure. This time the old wolves of imperialism have miscalculated. And that is why the bogey of imperialist "surprises" does not scare us.

Lastly, they tried to scare us with the bogey of the disintegration of Russia, of its splitting up into numerous independent states and hinted thereby that the right of nations to self-determination proclaimed by the Council of People's Commissars was a "fatal mistake." But I must de-

1 On September 29, 1917, the Germans began landing forces on Ösel, Dagö and other Baltic islands at the entrance to the Gulf of Riga.

clare most categorically that we would not be democrats (I say nothing of socialism!) if we did not recognize the right of the peoples of Russia to free self-determination. I declare that we would be betraying socialism if we did not do everything to restore-fraternal confidence between the workers of Finland and Russia. But everyone knows that the restoration of this confidence is inconceivable unless the right of the Finnish people to free self-determination is firmly recognized. And it is not merely the verbal, even if official, recognition of this right that is important here. What is important is that this verbal recognition will be confirmed by the act of the Council of People's Commissars, that it will be put into effect without hesitation. For the time for words has passed. The time has come when the old slogan "Workers of all countries, unite!" must be put into effect.

Complete freedom for the Finnish people, and for the other peoples of Russia, to arrange their own life! A voluntary and honest alliance of the Finnish people with the Russian people! No tutelage, no supervision from above, over the Finnish people! These are the guiding principles of the policy of the Council of People's Commissars.

Only as the result of such a policy can mutual confidence among the peoples of Russia be created. Only on the basis of such confidence can the peoples of Russia be united in one army. Only by thus uniting the peoples can the gains of the October Revolution be consolidated and the cause of the international socialist revolution advanced.

That is why we smile when we are told that Russia will inevitably fall to pieces if the idea of the right of nations to self-determination is put into practice.

These are the difficulties with which our enemies have tried and are still trying to scare us, but which we are overcoming as the revolution grows.

Comrades! Information has reached us that your country is experiencing approximately the same crisis of power as Russia experienced on the eve of the October Revolution. Information has reached us that attempts are being made to frighten you too with the bogey of famine, sabotage, and so on. Permit me to tell you on the basis of the practical experience of the revolutionary movement in Russia that these dangers,

even if real, are by no means insuperable! These dangers can be overcome if you act resolutely and without faltering. In the midst of war and economic disruption, in the midst of the revolutionary movement which is flaring up in the West and of the increasing victories of the workers' revolution in Russia, there are no dangers or difficulties that could withstand your onslaught. In such a situation only one power, socialist power, can maintain itself and conquer. In such a situation only one kind of tactics can be effective, the tactics of Danton—audacity, audacity and again audacity!

And if you should need our help, you will have it—we shall extend you a fraternal hand.

Of this you may rest assured.

Pravda, No. 191,
November 16, 1917

REPLY TO UKRAINIAN COMRADES IN THE REAR AND AT THE FRONT

Since our relations with the Ukrainian Rada[1] became strained I have been receiving numerous resolutions and letters from Ukrainian comrades on the subject of the conflict with the Rada. I consider it impossible and superfluous to answer each resolution and each letter separately, since the same things are repeated in almost all of them. I have therefore decided to single out the questions most frequently to be found in them and to reply with a clarity that will leave no room for doubt. These questions are generally known:

1) How did the conflict arise?

2) Over what issues did the conflict arise?

3) What measures are needed for a peaceful settlement of the conflict?

4) Can it really be that the fraternal peoples will

shed each other's blood?

That is followed by a general assurance that the conflict between the two kindred peoples will be settled peacefully, without fratricidal bloodshed.

First of all, it should be observed that the Ukrainian comrades are labouring under a certain confusion of ideas. They sometimes represent the conflict with the Rada as a conflict between the Ukrainian and Russian peoples. But that is not true. There is no conflict and there can be

1 The Ukrainian Central Rada was set up in Kiev in April 1917 by a bloc of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties and groups. After the victory of the October Socialist Revolution the Rada refused to recognize the Soviet Government and took the path of open struggle against Soviet power, supporting Kaledin and other whiteguard generals in the Don region. In April 1918 the German occupation forces deposed the Rada and set up a hetmanate under Skoropadsky.

no conflict between the Ukrainian and Russian peoples. The Ukrainian and Russian peoples, like the other peoples of Russia, consist of workers and peasants, of soldiers and sailors. Together, they all fought against tsarism and Kerenskyism, against the landlords and capitalists, against war and imperialism. Together, they all shed their blood for land and peace, for liberty and socialism. In the struggle against the landlords and capitalists they are all brothers and comrades. In the struggle for their vital interests there is no conflict and there can be no conflict between them. The enemies of the working people find it advantageous, of course, to represent the conflict with the Rada as a conflict between the Russian and Ukrainian peoples, because that makes it easier for them to incite the workers and peasants of the kindred peoples against one another, to the glee of the oppressors of the peoples. But is it so difficult for the enlightened workers and peasants to understand that what is advantageous to the oppressors of the peoples is harmful for the peoples themselves?

It was not between the peoples of Russia and the Ukraine that the conflict arose, but between the Council of People's Commissars and the General Secretariat of the Rada.

Over what questions did the conflict arise?

It is said that the conflict arose over the question of centralism or self-determination, that the Council of People's Commissars does not allow the Ukrainian people to take power into their own hands and to decide their destiny freely. Is this true? No, it is not. The Council of People's Commissars is, in fact, striving to have all power in the Ukraine belong to the Ukrainian people, that is, to the Ukrainian workers and soldiers, peasants and sailors. Soviet power, that is, the power of the workers and peasants, the soldiers and sailors, without landlords or capitalists, is precisely that people's power for which the Council of People's Commissars is fighting. The General Secretariat does not want such a power, because it does not desire to get rid of the landlords and capitalists. That, and not centralism, is the crux of the matter.

The Council of People's Commissars stands, and has stood from the very first, for free self-determination. It would not even object if the Ukrainian people were to secede and form an independent state. It has declared this officially on several occasions. But when self-determination of the people is identified with the autocratic rule of Kaledin, when the

General Secretariat of the Rada attempts to represent the counterrevolutionary revolts of Cossack generals as a manifestation of the self-determination of the people, the Council of People's Commissars cannot refrain from observing that the General Secretariat is making a pretence of self-determination, and is using this pretence to conceal its alliance with Kaledin and Rodzyanko. We stand for the self-determination of peoples, but we are opposed to self-determination being used as a camouflage for the surreptitious establishment of the autocratic rule of Kaledin, who only yesterday was campaigning for the strangulation of Finland.

It is said that the conflict arose over the question of the Ukrainian Republic, that the Council of People's Commissars does not recognize the Ukrainian Republic. Is this true? No, it is not. The Council of People's Commissars officially recognized the Ukrainian Republic in the "Ultimatum" and in the "Reply" to the Petrograd Ukrainian Staff.[2] It is prepared to recognize a republic in any of the national regions of Russia should the working population of the given region desire it. It is prepared to recognize a federal structure for our country, should the working population of the regions of Russia desire it. But when a people's republic is identified with the military dictatorship of Kaledin, when the General Secretariat of the Rada endeavours to represent the monarchists Kaledin and Rodzyanko as pillars of the republic, the Council of People's Commissars cannot refrain from pointing out that the General Secretariat is making a pretence of a republic, and is using this pretence

2 The "Ultimatum" of the Council of People's Commissars, or "Manifesto to the Ukrainian People and Ultimatum to the Ukrainian Rada," which was drafted by V. I. Lenin, stated: "...we, the Council of People's Commissars, recognize the people's Ukrainian Republic and its right completely to secede from Russia or to make a treaty with the Russian Republic concerning federal or other similar relations between them.

"Everything that concerns the national rights and national independence of the Ukrainian people is recognized by us, the Council of People's Commissars, forthwith and without reservation or qualification" (see V. I . Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 26, pp. 323-25).

The "Reply" of the Council of People's Commissars to the Petrograd Ukrainian Staff (its full name was: Ukrainian Staff of the Rada of the Petrograd Military Area), which was negotiating with the Council of People's Commissars on behalf of the Central Rada, stated: "As to the Rada's stipulations, there has been no dispute or conflict concerning any of them that involve questions of principle (right to self-determination), since the Council of People's Commissars recognizes and practises these principles in their entirety" (see *Izvestia*, No. 245, December 7, 1917).

to conceal its complete dependence on monarchist plutocrats. We stand for a Ukrainian Republic, but we are opposed to the republic being used as a camouflage for sworn enemies of the people, the monarchists Kaledin and Rodzyanko, who only yesterday were campaigning for the restoration of the old regime and the death penalty for the soldiers.

No, the questions of centralism and self-determination have no bearing on the conflict with the Rada. It was not over these questions that the dispute arose. Centralism and self-determination have been dragged in by the General Secretariat artificially, as a strategical ruse designed to conceal from the Ukrainian masses the real reasons for the conflict.

It was not over the question of centralism or self-determination that the conflict arose, but over the three following concrete questions:

First question. The conflict started with the orders issued to the front by member of the General Secretariat Petlura, orders which threatened to result in the complete disorganization of the front. Disregarding General Headquarters and the interests of the front, disregarding the peace negotiations and the cause of peace generally, Petlura began to issue orders for the return of all Ukrainian army and navy units to the Ukraine. It will be easily realized that if the Ukrainian units had obeyed Petlura's orders the front would have disintegrated instantaneously: the Ukrainian units in the North would have moved southward, the non-Ukrainian units in the South would have moved northward, the other nationalities would also have "hit the home trail," the railways would have been occupied exclusively with the transport of soldiers and equipment, food would have ceased to arrive at the front because there would have been no means of transporting it—and of the front nothing but a memory would have remained. This would have altogether wrecked the chances of an armistice and peace. No one denies that in ordinary times the place of the Ukrainian soldier is primarily at home, in the Ukraine. No one denies that "nationalization" of the army is an acceptable and desirable thing. This has been officially stated several times by the Council of People's Commissars. But in time of war, when peace has not yet been arranged, and the front is not constructed on national lines, and when, owing to the weakness of our transport system, immediate "nationalization" of the army would be fraught with the danger of the soldiers

leaving their positions and of the front disintegrating, thus wrecking the chances of a peace and armistice—it need not be said that, in these conditions, there could be no question of the national units leaving their positions immediately. I do not know whether Petlura was aware that by his senseless orders he was breaking up the front and wrecking the cause of peace. But the Ukrainian soldiers and sailors realized it at once, because all of them, with rare exceptions, refused to obey Petlura and decided to remain at their posts until peace was concluded. The Ukrainian soldiers have thereby saved the cause of peace, and Petlura's ill-considered orders have for the time being lost their extreme gravity.

Second question. The conflict started by Petlura's orders was aggravated by the policy of the General Secretariat of the Rada when it began to disarm the-Ukrainian- Soviets of Deputies. In Kiev, armed detachments of the General Secretariat fell upon the Soviet troops at night and disarmed them. Similar attempts were made in Odessa and Kharkov, but there they failed because they encountered resistance. But we have reliable information to the effect that the General Secretariat is massing forces against Odessa and Kharkov with the object of disarming the Soviet troops. We have reliable information to the effect that in a number of other, smaller, towns the Soviet troops have already been disarmed and "sent home." The General Secretariat of the Rada has thus made it its object to carry out Kornilov's and Kaledin's, Alexeyev's and Rodzyanko's programme of disarming the Soviets. But the Soviets are the bulwark and hope of the revolution. Whoever disarms the Soviets disarms the revolution, wrecks the cause of peace and liberty, betrays the cause of the workers and peasants. It was the Soviets that saved Russia from the yoke of Kornilovism. It was the Soviets that saved Russia from the shame of Kerenskyism. It was the Soviets that won land and an armistice for the peoples of Russia. The Soviets, and the Soviets alone, are capable of leading the people's revolution to complete victory. Therefore, whoever raises his hand against the Soviets helps the landlords and capitalists to strangle the workers and peasants of all Russia, helps the Kaledins and Alexeyevs to strengthen their "iron" rule over the soldiers and Cossacks.

Let no one try to tell us that the General Secretariat contains Socialists, and that they therefore cannot betray the cause of the people.

Kerensky calls himself a Socialist, nevertheless he sent troops against revolutionary Petrograd. Gotz calls himself a Socialist, nevertheless he raised the military cadets and officers against the Petrograd soldiers and sailors. Savinkov and Avksentyev call themselves Socialists, nevertheless they introduced the death penalty for the soldiers at the front. Socialists should be judged not by their words, but by their deeds. The General Secretariat is disrupting and disarming the Ukrainian Soviets, thereby helping Kaledin to establish his bloody regime on the Don and in the coal basin—and that is a fact that no socialist flag can conceal. That is why the Council of People's Commissars affirms that the General Secretariat's policy is a counter-revolutionary policy. That is why the Council of People's Commissars hopes that the Ukrainian workers and soldiers, who in Russia were in the van of the fight for revolutionary Soviet power, will be able to call their General Secretariat to order, or elect another in its place in the interest of peace among nations.

It is said that there must be an "exchange" of military units between the Ukraine and Russia, demarcation and the like. The Council of People's Commissars fully recognizes the necessity for demarcation. But demarcation must be effected in fraternal, friendly fashion, by agreement, and not forcibly, not on the "principle" of "grab what you can," "disarm whomsoever you can," as the General Secretariat is now doing, seizing food supplies, appropriating freights, and condemning the army to starve and freeze.

Third question. The conflict reached a climax when the General Secretariat categorically refused to permit the passage of the revolutionary troops of the Soviets proceeding against Kaledin. Armed detachments of the General Secretariat hold up trains carrying revolutionary troops, dismantle tracks, threaten to open fire, and declare that they cannot permit the transit of "alien" troops through their territory. It is Russian soldiers, who only yesterday were fighting shoulder to shoulder with the Ukrainians against the hangmen-generals who were trying to crush the Ukraine, that now, it appears, are "aliens"! And this at a time when this same General Secretariat freely permits the transit to Rostov through its territory of Kaledin's Cossack units and counter-revolutionary officers who are flocking to Kaledin from all parts!

Kornilovites and Kaledinites are putting Rostov Red Guards to the

sword, yet the General Secretariat of the Rada is preventing the sending of aid to our Rostov comrades! Kaledin's officers are shooting our comrades in the mines, yet the General Secretariat is preventing us from extending assistance to our comrades the miners! Is it any wonder that Kaledin, who yesterday was smashed, is today advancing further and further northward, seizing the Donets Basin and threatening Tsaritsyn? Is it not obvious that the General Secretariat is in alliance with Kaledin and Rodzyanko? Is it not obvious that the General Secretariat prefers an alliance with the Kornilovites to an alliance with the Council of People's Commissars?

It is said that there must be agreement between the Council of People's Commissars and the General Secretariat of the Rada. But is it difficult to understand that agreement with the present General Secretariat would be agreement with Kaledin and Rodzyanko? Is it difficult to understand that the Council of People's Commissars cannot agree to commit suicide? We did not begin the revolution against the landlords and capitalists in order to end it with an alliance with hangmen like Kaledin. The workers and soldiers did not shed their blood in order to surrender to the mercy of the Alexeyevs and Rodzyankos.

One thing or the other:

Either the Rada breaks with Kaledin, extends a hand to the Soviets and allows free passage to the revolutionary troops proceeding against the counter-revolutionary hotbed on the Don—and then the workers and soldiers of the Ukraine and Russia will cement their revolutionary alliance with a new surge of fraternization;

Or the Rada refuses to break with Kaledin and allow passage to the revolutionary troops—and then the General Secretariat of the Rada will achieve what the enemies of the people tried in vain to achieve, namely, fratricidal bloodshed of the peoples.

It depends upon the enlightenment and revolutionary consciousness of the Ukrainian workers and soldiers to call their General Secretariat to order or to elect another in its place in the interest of a peaceful settlement of the dangerous conflict.

It depends upon the staunchness and determination of the Ukrainian workers and soldiers to compel the General Secretariat to de-

clare definitely which alliance it now favours: an alliance with Kaledin and Rodzyanko against the revolution, or an alliance with the Council of People's Commissars against the counter-revolution of the Cadets and generals.

It is upon the people of the Ukraine that a peaceful settlement of the conflict depends.

People's Commissar
J. Stalin
December 12, 1917
Pravda, No. 213,
December 13, 1917



THE UKRAINIAN RADA

December 14, 1917

Speech Delivered in the All-Russian Central Executive Committee

It may seem strange that the Council of People's Commissars, which has always resolutely upheld the principle of self-determination, should have entered into a conflict with the Rada, which also takes its stand on the principle of self-determination. To understand the origin of the conflict, it is necessary to examine the political complexion of the Rada.

The Rada starts out from the principle of a division of power between the bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the proletariat and peasantry, on the other. The Soviets reject such a division, and want the whole power to belong to the people, without the bourgeoisie. This is why the Rada sets up in opposition to the slogan, "All power to the Soviets" (i.e., the people) its own slogan, "All power to the urban and rural local government bodies" (i.e., the people and the bourgeoisie).

It is said that the conflict arose over the question of self-determination. But that is not true. The Rada proposes the establishment of a federal system in Russia. The Council of People's Commissars, however, goes farther than the Rada and recognizes the right to secession. Consequently, the divergence between the Council of People's Commissars and the Rada is not over that question. Absolutely incorrect likewise is the Rada's assertion that centralism is the point of difference. Regional centres formed on the model of the Council of People's Commissars (Siberia, Byelorussia, Turkestan) applied to the Council of People's Commissars for directives. The Council of People's Commissars replied: you yourselves are the authority in your localities, and you yourselves therefore must draw up the directives. That, then, is not the point at issue.

Actually, the divergence between the Council of People's Commissars and the Rada arose over the following three points.

First question: concentration of the Ukrainian units on the Southern Front. Unquestionably, national armies are the best fitted to protect their own territories. But at present our front is not built on national lines. In view of the dislocation of transport, reconstruction of the front on national lines would result in its complete disruption. This would wreck the chances of peace. The Ukrainian soldiers proved to have more sense and honesty than the General Secretariat, for the majority of the Ukrainian units refused to obey the Rada's orders.

Second question: disarmament of the Soviet troops in the Ukraine. By upholding the interests of the Ukrainian landlords and bourgeoisie and disarming the Soviet troops, the Ukrainian Rada is striking a blow at the revolution. Substantially, the actions of the Rada in this respect in no way differ from the actions of Kornilov and Kaledin. Needless to say, the Council of People's Commissars will oppose this counter-revolutionary policy of the Rada might and main.

Lastly, the third question: refusal to permit the passage of Soviet troops proceeding against Kaledin, around whom all the counter-revolutionary forces of Russia have rallied. The Rada justified its refusal to permit the passage of the Soviet troops on the grounds of its "neutrality" vis-à-vis the "self-determining" Kaledin. But the Rada substitutes the autocratic rule of Kaledin for the self-determination of the labouring Cossacks. By obstructing the passage of the Soviet troops, the Rada is assisting Kaledin's advance northward. At the same time the Rada freely permits the transit of Kaledin Cossack units to the Don. At a time when our comrades are being shot down in Rostov and the Donets Basin, the Rada is preventing us from sending them aid. Needless to say, this treacherous conduct of the Rada cannot be tolerated.

The Council of People's Commissars cannot give up the fight against Kaledin. Kaledin's counter-revolutionary nest must be destroyed. That is inevitable. If the Rada obstructs our advance against Kaledin and tries to act as a shield for him, the blows aimed at Kaledin will fall upon the Rada. The Council of People's Commissars will not hesitate to wage a determined fight against the Rada, because it is well aware that the Rada is in secret alliance with Kaledin. The Council of People's Commissars

has intercepted a ciphered telegram which makes it clear that the Rada is in direct contact with the French Mission, with the aim of delaying peace until the spring, and, through the French Mission, with Kaledin. This alliance is directed against peace and the revolution. This alliance must and will be smashed.

We are reproached for conducting a resolute policy against the Rada. But it is precisely this resolute policy that has opened the eyes of the Ukrainian workers and peasants by revealing the bourgeois nature of the Rada. This is evident, for example, from the telegram reporting the formation in the Ukraine of a new Ukrainian revolutionary power[1] which recognizes the Soviet Government and is acting against the bourgeois Rada. (Applause.)

Izvestia, No. 254,
December 17, 1917

1 The telegram stated that a Central Executive Committee of Soviets, elected on December 13, 1917, by an All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and part of the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, had assumed plenary power in the Ukraine (see *Izvestia*, No. 252, December 15, 1917).



WHAT IS THE UKRAINIAN RADA?

The reader will find below a ciphered telegram intercepted by the Soviet Government which exposes the real nature of the Rada and the real designs of the Military Missions of "our Allies" in the matter of peace. It will be seen from the telegram that something in the nature of an alliance has already been arranged between the French Mission and the Rada, and that "officials of the French Mission are working in direct contact with the Rada." It will be seen from the telegram, further, that the purpose of this alliance is to "maintain the semblance of a Russian front until February or March and delay the definite conclusion of an armistice until the spring." It will be seen from the telegram, lastly, that the French Mission has entered into "an agreement with the Cossack Assembly" (i.e., the Kaledin "government") with the object of "supplying coal and food to the Rumanian and South-Western fronts" (which according to plan are to be taken over by the Rada—*J. St.*).

In short, there exists, it appears, an alliance of the Rada, Kaledin and the French Military Mission with the purpose of torpedoing peace, of "delaying" it "until the spring." Furthermore the French Military Mission is not acting independently, but on "the urgent instructions of the French Government."

We have no desire to dwell here on the conduct of the Military Missions of "our Allies." Their role has been sufficiently elucidated: in August they helped Kornilov, in November they helped the Rada and Kaledin, in December they are supplying the rebels with armoured cars. And all this for the sake of "a war to a finish." We do not doubt that the coercive undertaking of the "Allies" will be thwarted by the struggle of the peoples of Russia for a democratic peace. The missions are behaving as if they were in Central Africa. But the "Allies" will soon have cause to learn that Russia is not Central Africa... What chiefly interests us here is the ugly role assumed by the Rada.

Now we know why the Rada is concentrating the Ukrainian units on the Rumanian-South-Western Front: "nationalization" of the army is a camouflage with which it is trying to conceal its compact with the French Mission to delay an armistice until the spring.

Now we know why the Rada is not permitting the passage of Soviet troops proceeding against Kaledin: "neutrality" vis-à-vis Kaledin is a camouflage with which it is trying to conceal its alliance with Kaledin against the Soviets.

Now we know why the Rada protests against the "interference" of the Council of People's Commissars in Ukrainian internal affairs: talk of non-interference is only a camouflage with which it is trying to conceal the actual interference of the French Government in the affairs of the Ukraine and of all Russia, with the aim of liquidating the gains-of the revolution.

Ukrainian comrades frequently ask me. What is the Rada?

I reply:

The Rada, or rather its General Secretariat, is a government of traitors to socialism who call themselves Socialists in order to deceive the masses—just like the Government of Kerensky and Savinkov, who also called themselves Socialists.

The Rada, or rather its General Secretariat, is a bourgeois government which, in alliance with Kaledin, is fighting the Soviets. Formerly, the Kerensky Government, in alliance with Kornilov, disarmed the Soviets of Russia. Now the Rada Government, in alliance with Kaledin, is disarming the Soviets of the Ukraine.

The Rada, or rather its General Secretariat, is a bourgeois government which, in alliance with the British and French capitalists, is fighting to prevent peace. Formerly, the Kerensky Government delayed peace and condemned millions of soldiers to serve as cannon fodder. Now the Rada Government is endeavouring to prevent peace by "delaying an armistice until the spring."

For this, the Kerensky Government was overthrown by the joint efforts of the workers and soldiers of Russia.

We do not doubt that the Rada Government will likewise be over-

thrown by the efforts of the workers and soldiers of the Ukraine.

Only a new Rada, a Rada of the Soviets of the workers, soldiers and peasants of the Ukraine, can protect the interests of the Ukrainian people from the Kaledins and Kornilovs, the landlords and capitalists.

People's Commissar
J. Stalin
Pravda, No. 215,
December 15, 1917



THE INDEPENDENCE OF FINLAND

Speech Delivered in the All-Russian Central Executive Committee December 22, 1917 (Newspaper Report)

The other day, representatives of Finland applied to us with a demand for immediate recognition of Finland's complete independence and endorsement of its secession from Russia. The Council of People's Commissars resolved to give its consent and to issue a decree, which has already been published in the newspapers, proclaiming Finland's complete independence.

Here is the text of the decision of the Council of People's Commissars:

"In response to the application of the Finnish Government for recognition of the independence of the Finnish Republic, the Council of People's Commissars, in full conformity with the principle of the right of nations to self-determination, resolves to recommend to the Central Executive Committee: a) to recognize the state independence of the Finnish Republic, and b) to set up, in agreement with the Finnish Government, a special commission (composed of representatives of both sides) to elaborate the practical measures necessitated by the secession of Finland from Russia."

Naturally, the Council of People's Commissars could not act otherwise, for if a nation, through its representatives, demands recognition of its independence, a proletarian government, acting on the principle of granting the peoples the right to self-determination, must give its consent.

The bourgeois press asserts that we have brought about the complete disintegration of the country, that we have lost a whole number of countries, including Finland. But, comrades, we could not lose Finland, because actually it was never our property. If we forcibly retained Fin-

land, that would not mean that we had acquired it.

We know perfectly well how Wilhelm forcibly and arbitrarily "acquires" entire states and what sort of a basis this creates for mutual relations between the peoples and their oppressors.

The principles of Social-Democracy, its slogans and aspirations, consist in creating the long-awaited atmosphere of mutual confidence among nations, and only on such a basis is the slogan, "Workers of all countries, unite!" realizable. All this is old and well known.

If we closely examine the circumstances in which Finland obtained independence, we shall see that the Council of People's Commissars, actually and against its own wishes, granted freedom not to the people, not to the representatives of the Finnish proletariat, but to the Finnish bourgeoisie, which, owing to a strange conjuncture of circumstances, seized power and received independence from the hands of the Russian Socialists. The Finnish workers and Social-Democrats find themselves in the position of having to receive freedom not from the Socialists of Russia directly, but through the Finnish bourgeoisie. Regarding this as a tragedy for the Finnish proletariat, we cannot help remarking that it was only because of their irresolution and unaccountable cowardice that the Finnish Social-Democrats did not take vigorous measures to assume power themselves and wrest their independence from the hands of the Finnish bourgeoisie.

The Council of People's Commissars may be abused, may be criticized, but no one can assert that it does not carry out its promises; for there is no force on earth that can compel the Council of People's Commissars to break its promises. This we have demonstrated by the absolute impartiality with which we accepted the demand of the Finnish bourgeoisie that Finland be granted independence, and by proceeding at once to issue a decree proclaiming the independence of Finland.

May the independence of Finland help the emancipation of the Finnish workers and peasants and create a firm basis for friendship between our peoples.

Pravda, No. 222,
December 23, 1917



"TURKISH ARMENIA"

So-called "Turkish Armenia" is the only country, I believe, that Russia occupied "by right of war." This is that "bit of paradise" which for many years has been (and still is) the object of the voracious diplomatic appetites of the West and of the bloody administrative exercises of the East. Pogroms and massacres of Armenians, on the one hand, and the hypocritical "intercession" of the diplomats of all countries as a screen for fresh massacres, on the other, and a blood-soaked, deceived and enslaved Armenia as a result—who is not familiar with these "commonplace" pictures of the diplomatic "handiwork" of the "civilized" Powers?

The sons of Armenia—heroic defenders of their country, but by no means far-sighted politicians, who have allowed themselves time and again to be deceived by the sharks of imperialist diplomacy—cannot fail to see now that the old path of diplomatic scheming is not the path to the liberation of Armenia. It is becoming clear that the path of liberation for the oppressed peoples lies through the workers' revolution that was started in Russia in October. It is now clear to all that the fate of the peoples of Russia, and particularly of the Armenian people, is closely bound up with the fate of the October Revolution. The October Revolution has broken the chains of national oppression. It has torn up the tsarist secret treaties, which tied the peoples hand and foot. It, and it alone, can complete the emancipation of the peoples of Russia.

Acting on these considerations, the Council of People's Commissars has decided to issue a special decree on the free self-determination of "Turkish Armenia." This is particularly necessary today, when the German and Turkish authorities, true to their imperialist nature, make no secret of their desire forcibly to retain the occupied regions under their sway. Let the peoples of Russia know that the striving for conquest is alien to the Russian revolution and its government. Let everyone know

that the Council of People's Commissars counters the imperialist policy of national oppression by the policy of complete liberation of the oppressed peoples.

People's Commissar
J. Stalin
Pravda, No. 227,
December 31, 1917

SPEECH AT THE MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.) ON THE QUESTION OF PEACE WITH THE GERMANS

January 11, 1918

Summary Record in the Minutes

Comrade Stalin considers that if we accept the slogan of a revolutionary war we shall be playing into the hands of imperialism. Trotsky's position cannot be called a position at all. There is no revolutionary movement in the West, there is no evidence of a revolutionary movement. It exists only in potential, and in our practical activities we cannot rely merely on potentials. If the Germans begin to advance, it will strengthen the hand of counter-revolution here at home. Germany can advance, because she has her own Kornilov troops—her "Guards." In October, we talked of a sacred war against imperialism because we were told that the mere word "peace" would be enough to start a revolution in the West. But that has not proved correct. Our socialist reforms are stirring up the West, but we need time to carry them out. If we accept Trotsky's policy we shall create the worst possible conditions for a revolutionary movement in the West. Comrade Stalin therefore recommends the adoption of Comrade Lenin's proposal for the conclusion of peace with the Germans.

First published in
Minutes of the Central Committee,
R.S.D.L.P.,
August 1917-February 1918,
Moscow and Leningrad, 1929



THE KIEV BOURGEOIS RADA

The bourgeois newspapers are assiduously spreading rumours that "negotiations have started between the Rada and the Council of People's Commissars." Circles closely connected with the counter-revolutionaries are zealously spreading these rumours and stressing their "special" importance. Things have gone so far that many of our comrades are disposed to believe the tale about negotiations with the Kiev Rada, and many have already written to me inquiring whether it is authentic.

I publicly declare:

1) The Council of People's Commissars is not conducting and has no intention of conducting any negotiations with the Kiev Rada.

2) The Kiev Rada has definitely linked itself with Kaledin and is conducting treasonable negotiations with the Austro-German imperialists behind the back of the peoples of Russia—and such a Rada the Council of People's Commissars can only implacably fight until the Ukrainian Soviets are completely victorious.

3) Peace and tranquility can come to the Ukraine only as a result of the complete liquidation of the Kiev bourgeois Rada, as a result of its replacement by another, a socialist Rada of Soviets, the nucleus of which has already been formed in Kharkov.

People's Commissar
J. Stalin
Pravda, No. 9,
January 13, 1918

SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE THIRD ALL-RUSSIAN CONGRESS OF SOVIETS OF WORKERS', SOLDIERS' AND PEASANTS' DEPUTIES

January 10-18, 1918[1]

1. REPORT ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

January 15 Newspaper Report

One of the questions that was particularly agitating Russia just now, the speaker said, was the national question. Its importance was enhanced by the fact that the Great Russians did not constitute an absolute majority of the population of Russia and were surrounded by a ring of other, "non-sovereign" peoples, the inhabitants of the border regions.

The tsarist government realized the importance of the national question and tried to handle the affairs of the nationalities with a rod of iron. It carried out a policy of forcible Russification of the border peoples, and its method of action was the banning of native languages, pogroms and other forms of persecution.

Kerensky's coalition government abolished these national disabilities, but, because of its class character, it was incapable of a full solution

1 The Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies met in Petrograd from January 10 to 18, 1918, and was attended by 1,046 delegates. A report on the activities of the Council of People's Commissars was made by V. I. Lenin, and a report on the activities of the C.E.C. of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies by Y. M. Sverdlov. J. V. Stalin made a report on the national question. The congress passed a resolution approving the policy of the C.E.C. and the Council of People's Commissars and endorsed the "Declaration of the Rights of the Toiling and Exploited Peoples," which was drafted by V. I. Lenin with the participation of J. V. Stalin, the decrees of the Council of People's Commissars recognizing the independence of Finland and Armenia, and a resolution moved by J. V. Stalin on the federal institutions of the Russian Republic.

of the national question. The government of the early period of the revolution not only did not adopt the course of completely emancipating the nations, but in many instances it did not hesitate to resort to repressive measures to crush the national movement, as was the case with the Ukraine and Finland.

The Soviet Government alone publicly proclaimed the right of all nations to self-determination, including complete secession from Russia. The new government proved to be more radical in this respect than even the national groups within some of the nations.

Nevertheless, a series of conflicts arose between the Council of People's Commissars and the border regions. They arose, however, not over issues of a national character, but over the question of power. The speaker cited a number of examples of how the bourgeois nationalist governments, hastily formed in the border regions and composed of representatives of the upper sections of the propertied classes, endeavoured, under the guise of settling their national problems, to carry on a definite struggle against the Soviet and other revolutionary organizations. All these conflicts between the border regions and the central Soviet Government were rooted in the question of power. And if the bourgeois elements of this or that region sought to lend a national colouring to these conflicts, it was only because it was advantageous to them to do so, since it was convenient for them to conceal behind a national cloak the fight against the power of the labouring masses within their region.

As an illustration, the speaker dwelt in detail on the Rada, convincingly showing how the principle of selfdetermination was being exploited by the bourgeois chauvinist elements in the Ukraine in their imperialist class interests.

All this pointed to the necessity of interpreting the principle of self-determination as the right to self-determination not of the bourgeoisie, but of the labouring masses of the given nation. The principle of self-determination should be a means in the struggle for socialism and should be subordinated to the principles of socialism.

On the question of a federal structure of the Russian Republic, the speaker said that the supreme organ of the Soviet Federation must be the Congress of Soviets. In the intervals between congresses its functions

should be vested in the Central Executive Committee.

2. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS OF THE RUSSIAN REPUBLIC

1) The Russian Socialist Soviet Republic is constituted on the basis of a voluntary union of the peoples of Russia, as a Federation of the Soviet Republics of these peoples.

2) The supreme organ of power in the Federation is the All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, convened not less frequently than once every three months.

3) The All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies elects an All-Russian Central Executive Committee. In the intervals between congresses the All-Russian Central Executive Committee is the supreme organ.

4) The Government of the Federation, the Council of People's Commissars, is elected and replaceable in whole or in part by the All-Russian Congress of Soviets or the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

5) The way in which the Soviet Republics of regions distinguished by a specific manner of life and national composition will participate in the federal government, as well as the demarcation of the spheres of activity of the federal and regional institutions of the Russian Republic, will be determined, immediately upon the formation of the regional Soviet Republics, by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Central Executive Committees of these republics.

3. REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

January 15 Newspaper Report

Comrade Stalin wound up the discussion of the proposed resolution on the federal institutions of the Russian Republic.

He pointed out that the resolution was not intended as a law, but

only outlined the general principles of the future Constitution of the Russian Federative Republic.

So long as the struggle between the two political trends—nationalist counter-revolution, on the one hand, and Soviet power, on the other—had not ended, there could be no question of a clear-cut Constitution that distinctly and precisely defined every detail of the state structure of the Soviet Republics.

The resolution set forth only the general principles of the Constitution. They would be submitted to the Central Executive Committee for detailed elaboration, and presented for final endorsement to the next Congress of Soviets.

Replying to the reproach that the Soviet Government was displaying excessive severity in its fight against the bourgeois Rada, Comrade Stalin pointed out that it was a fight against bourgeois counter-revolution clothed in a national-democratic garb.

Comrade Stalin stressed that the democratic flag employed by various political leaders of the Rada (such as Vinnichenko) was by no means a guarantee of a really democratic policy.

We judge the Rada not by its words, but by its deeds.

In what way did the "Socialists" of the Rada display their socialism?

They professed in their Universal[2] to be in favour of the transfer of all the land to the people, but, actually, in their published explanation, they restricted the transfer by proclaiming part of the landlords' land inviolable and not transferable to the people.

They professed their loyalty to the Soviets, but, actually, they waged a desperate struggle against them, disarming Soviet troops, arresting Soviet officials and making the continued existence of the Soviets absolutely impossible.

They professed their fidelity to the revolution, but, actually, they had proved themselves to be bitter enemies of the revolution.

They professed neutrality in the struggle with the Don, but, actually, they were rendering direct and active assistance to General Kaledin,

2 The reference is to the Third Universal (Manifesto) of the Ukrainian Central Rada, adopted on November 7, 1917.

helping him to shoot down Soviet troops and preventing the passage of grain to the North.

All these were generally known facts, and that the Rada was essentially bourgeois and anti-revolutionary in character was beyond all doubt.

That being so, what fight of the Soviets against democracy was Martov referring to here?

The speakers of the Right, especially Martov, evidently praised and defended the Rada because they saw in its policy a reflection of their own. In the Rada, which represented that coalition of all classes so dear to Messrs. the compromisers, they saw the prototype of the Constituent Assembly. No doubt, on hearing the speeches of the representatives of the Right, the Rada would just as assiduously praise them. It was not for nothing that the proverb said: Birds of a feather flock together. (*Laughter and applause.*)

The speaker then dwelt on the question of self-determination of the Caucasus, and cited exact data showing that the Caucasian Commissariat[3] was pursuing a manifestly aggressive policy against the Caucasian Soviet organizations and the army Soviet, and at the same time was maintaining contact with the hero of the counter-revolutionary movement in the Caucasus, General Przhevalsky.

From all this it followed that it was necessary to continue the so-called civil war, which was actually a struggle between the trend which was striving to establish coalition, compromising governments in the border regions, and the other trend which was striving to establish socialist power, the power of the Soviets of the labouring masses of the workers', soldiers' and peasants' deputies.

That was the nature and historical import of the bitter conflicts which were arising between the Council of People's Commissars and the bourgeois-nationalist coalition governments in the border regions. The assertion of these governments that they were fighting to uphold national independence was nothing but a hypocritical cover for the cam-

3 The Caucasian, or Transcaucasian, Commissariat was set up in Tiflis in November 1917 by the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries, Dashnaks and Mussavatists. It existed until May 26, 1918.

paign they were waging against the working people. (*Stormy applause.*)

Replying to Martov's reproach that the Soviet Government was guilty of a contradiction in demanding proletarian power in the Russian border regions and contenting itself with a referendum in Courland, Lithuania, Poland, etc., as advocated by Trotsky in BrestLitovsk, Comrade Stalin remarked that it would be utterly absurd to demand Soviet power in the Western regions when they had not yet even Soviets, had not yet had a socialist revolution.

"If we acted on Martov's prescription," the speaker said, "we should have to invent Soviets where they do not yet exist, and what is more, where the road to them has not yet even been paved. To talk of self-determination through Soviets under such conditions is the height of absurdity."

In conclusion, the speaker dwelt again on the fundamental difference between the Right and Left wings of the democracy. Whereas the Left wing was striving to establish the dictatorship of the lower classes, the power of the majority over the minority, the Right wing recommended turning back to an already past stage, the stage of bourgeois parliamentarism. The experience of parliamentarism in France and America convincingly showed that the ostensibly democratic governments resulting from universal suffrage were actually coalitions with finance capital which were very remote from, and hostile to, genuine democracy. In France, that land of bourgeois democracy, the members of parliament were elected by the whole people, but the ministers were supplied by the Bank of Lyons. In America the suffrage was universal, but it was representatives of the billionaire Rockefeller who were in power.

"Is not that a fact?" the speaker asked. "Yes, we have indeed buried bourgeois parliamentarism, and it is in vain that the Martovs are trying to drag us back to the martovsky[4] period of the revolution. (*Laughter and applause.*) We, the representatives of the workers, want the people not only to vote, but to govern as well. It is not those who vote and elect that rule, but those who govern." (*Stormy applause*.)

4 The Russian adjective ***martovsky*** is the adjectival form of both "March" and "Martov."—*Tr.*

Pravda, Nos. 12 and 13,
January 17 and 18, 1918



TELEPHONE MESSAGE TO THE PETROGRAD COMMITTEE, R.S.D.L.P.(B.)

We advise the Executive Commission of the Petrograd Committee and all district committees of the Bolshevik Party to rouse all the workers without a moment's delay and, in accordance with the decision to be adopted this evening by the Petrograd Soviet, to muster tens of thousands of workers and to set to work all the bourgeoisie without exception, under the control of the workers, for digging trenches outside Petrograd. Now, when the revolution is in danger, this is the only way in which it can be saved. The line of trenches will be indicated by the military. Get your weapons ready and, the chief thing, organize and mobilize to a man.

Lenin
Stalin
February 21, 1918
Published for the first time

TELEGRAM TO THE PEOPLE'S SECRETARIAT, UKRAINIAN SOVIET REPUBLIC[1]

Five days ago, General Hoffmann announced that the term of the armistice had expired,[2] and two days later he started hostilities. The Council of People's Commissars intimated its willingness to resume peace negotiations, but no reply has yet been received. The German Government is evidently in no hurry to reply, its idea being to pillage the country to the limit and only then to open peace negotiations. The Germans have captured Dvinsk, Rovno, Minsk, Volmar and Gapsal and are advancing on Petrograd and Kiev. Obviously, the object of the campaign is not only conquest, but, chiefly, the suppression of the revolution and its gains.

The Council of People's Commissars has decided to organize resistance from Petrograd and to mobilize the entire working population, and the bourgeoisie as well, and if the latter should refuse to dig trenches, to take them by force and compel them to do so under the control of the workers.

It is the general opinion of the comrades that you, in Kiev, should without a moment's delay organize similar resistance from Kiev westward, muster every able-bodied person, set up artillery, dig trenches,

1 The People's Secretariat of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic— the first Soviet Government of the Ukrainian Republic—was elected by the Ukrainian Central Executive Committee of Soviets from among its members in December 1917. In April 1918, in connection with the German occupation of the Ukraine, the People's Secretariat was re-organized, and its chief task became to direct the popular insurrectionary struggle against the German occupationists and the Haydamak detachments.

2 The armistice between Russia and the Quadruple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey) was signed in Brest-Litovsk on December 2, 1917, for a term of 28 days. Owing to the protracted character of the peace negotiations, the armistice was prolonged. On February 18, 1918, the Germans violated the armistice and launched an offensive along the whole front.

force the bourgeoisie to do trench-digging under the control of the workers, proclaim a state of siege and act with the utmost severity. The general objective is to hold Petrograd and Kiev and check the German bands at all costs.

The situation is more serious than you might think. We have not the slightest doubt that the German bandits want to promenade from Petrograd to Kiev and to start peace talks in these capitals, and in them alone. I believe you have not yet annulled the treaty concluded by the old Rada with the Germans.[310] If so, we think you should be in no hurry to do so.

Once again: do not lose a single moment, set to work without wasting words, and demonstrate to all that the Soviet regime is capable of defending itself.

All our hope is in the workers, for the so-called army now being demobilized has proved capable only of panic and flight.

I await an immediate reply.

On behalf of the Council of People's Commissars
J. Stalin
Petrograd,
February 21, 1918
First published in
Documents on the Defeat of the German
Invaders in the Ukraine, 1918,
Gospolitizdat, 1942

3 [10] The reference is to a treaty concluded after secret negotiations by representatives of the Ukrainian Central Rada and the Quadruple Alliance in Brest-Litovsk on January 27, 1918.



NOTE SENT BY DIRECT WIRE TO THE PEOPLE'S SECRETARIAT, UKRAINIAN SOVIET REPUBLIC

From People's Commissar Stalin, on behalf of the Council of People's Commissars.

The day before yesterday, February 22, we received the German Government's peace terms. They are very severe, one might say ferocious, and the Germans insist on their acceptance within forty-eight hours. Meanwhile, German detachments are advancing on Revel and Pskov, threatening Petrograd, and our troops definitely fail to offer resistance. I do not know whether these terms are known to you. We broadcast them by radio. Here are the major points.

"Clause four. Russia shall immediately conclude peace with the Ukrainian People's Republic. Russian troops and Red Guards shall be immediately withdrawn from the Ukraine and Finland." "Russian warships in the Black Sea, etc., shall be immediately withdrawn to Russian ports and remain there until the conclusion of general peace, or be disarmed." "Commercial navigation in the Black Sea and other seas shall be resumed, as was envisaged in the armistice agreement. Mine-sweeping operations shall be begun immediately."

"Clause three. Russian troops and Red Guards shall be immediately withdrawn from Livonia and Estland, which shall be occupied by German police until the state of affairs in the country guarantees public security and order in these parts. All inhabitants arrested for political reasons shall be immediately set at liberty."

"Clause five. Russia shall do all in her power to ensure immediately the systematic restitution to Turkey of her eastern Anatolian provinces, and shall recognize the abolition of the Turkish capitulations."

Then follow clauses concerning a trade agreement, patterned on the

former Rada's treaty with AustriaHungary, with which you are familiar.

In general, it must be said that the terms are incredibly ferocious. We believe that the clause on the Ukraine implies not the restoration of the Vinnichenko Government, which in itself is of no value to the Germans, but the exertion of very definite pressure on us with a view to compelling you and us to accept the treaty of the former Rada with Austria-Hungary, since what the Germans want is not Vinnichenko, but the exchange of manufactures for grain and ores.

We assess the present state of affairs arising out of the Germans' advance and the flight of our troops as follows: after having overthrown our own imperialists, we have, owing to the slowness of the revolutionary movement in the West, the instability of our troops, and the unparalleled voracity of the German imperialists, temporarily fallen into the clutches of foreign imperialism, against which we must now muster our forces for waging a patriotic war with the hope of an unleashing of the revolutionary forces in the West, which in our opinion is inevitable. In order to muster our forces we need a certain minimum respite, and this even a ferocious peace could provide. We must under no circumstances cherish illusions. We must have the courage to face the facts and admit that we have temporarily fallen into the clutches of German imperialism. It was by these considerations that the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Soviets was guided when it decided today at three in the morning to conclude peace on these ferocious terms and instructed the Council of People's Commissars to send a delegation to Brest, which was done today. The C.E.C. decided that only in this way could the Soviet regime be preserved. Meanwhile we must prepare, and thoroughly prepare, for waging a sacred war against German imperialism.

We are all of the opinion that your People's Secretariat should send its own delegation to Brest and there declare that if Vinnichenko's adventure is not supported by the Austrians and Germans, the People's Secretariat will not object to the basic provisions of the treaty concluded by the former Kiev Rada. Such a step on your part would, firstly, stress the ideological and political brotherhood of the Soviets of the South and the North, and, secondly, preserve the Soviet regime in the Ukraine, which is an immense asset to the international revolution as a whole. We should like you to understand us and agree with us concerning these

cardinal issues of the unhappy peace.

I await an immediate reply on two points: will you send delegates today to Petrograd or, more simply, straight to Brest for joint negotiations with the Germans?—that is the first question. Secondly, do you share our view regarding the acceptability of the Vinnichenko treaty, but without Vinnichenko and his gang? I await a reply to these questions, so that I may prepare the credentials and arrange for your journey to Brest.

People's Commissar
J. Stalin
Petrograd,
February 24, 1918
Published for the first time



THE UKRAINIAN KNOT

At the end of February, before the conclusion of the peace with Germany, the People's Secretariat of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic sent a delegation to Brest with a declaration that it was prepared to sign the treaty concluded by the former Kiev Rada with the German coalition.

The notorious Hoffmann, representative of the German command in Brest, refused to receive the delegation of the People's Secretariat, declaring that he saw no necessity for peace negotiations with the latter.

Simultaneously, German and Austro-Hungarian shock troops, in conjunction with Petlura-Vinnichenko Haydamak detachments, began the invasion of the Soviet Ukraine.

Not peace, but war with the Soviet Ukraine—that was the meaning of Hoffmann's reply.

Under the treaty signed by the former Kiev Rada, the Ukraine was to release 30 million poods of grain to Germany by the end of April. We say nothing of the "free export of ores" which Germany demanded.

The People's Secretariat of the Soviet Ukraine was undoubtedly aware of this provision of the treaty and knew what it was doing when it officially consented to sign the Vinnichenko peace.

Nevertheless, the German Government, represented by Hoffmann, declined to enter into peace negotiations with the People's Secretariat, which is recognized by all the Soviets of the Ukraine, urban and rural. It preferred an alliance with corpses, an alliance with the deposed and expelled Kiev Rada, to a peace treaty with the People's Secretariat, which is recognized by the Ukrainian people and is alone capable of providing the "necessary quantity" of grain.

This means that the object of the Austro-German invasion is not

only the securing of grain, but, and chiefly, the overthrow of Soviet power in the Ukraine and the restoration of the old bourgeois regime.

It means that the Germans not only want to pump millions of poods of grain out of the Ukraine, but are also trying to rob the Ukrainian workers and peasants of their rights by taking from them the power they have won at the cost of their blood and turning it over to the landlords and capitalists.

The Austrian and German imperialists are bringing on their bayonets a new and shameful yoke which is not a whit better than the old, Tatar yoke. Such is the meaning of the invasion from the West.

This, apparently, is realized by the Ukrainian people, and they are feverishly preparing to resist. Formation of a peasant Red Army, mobilization of a workers' Red Guard, a number of successful skirmishes with the "civilized" bandits after the first outbreaks of panic, recapture of Bakhmach, Konotop, Nezhin and an approach to Kiev, mounting enthusiasm of the masses, who are marching in their thousands to give battle to the enslavers—that is how the people's Ukraine is retaliating to the bandit invasion.

To counter the foreign tyranny advancing from the West, the Soviet Ukraine is raising a war of liberation, a patriotic war—such is the meaning of the developments in the Ukraine.

This means that every pood of grain and scrap of metal the Germans get they will have to take in battle, in a desperate conflict with the Ukrainian people.

It means that the Germans will have to conquer the Ukraine outright before they can secure grain and put Petlura and Vinnichenko on the throne.

The "swift blow" with which the Germans reckoned to kill two birds with one stone (secure grain and smash the Soviet Ukraine) stands every chance of developing into a protracted war of the foreign enslavers against the Ukraine's twenty millions, whose bread and liberty they want to take away.

Need it be added that the Ukrainian workers and peasants will not spare their energies in their heroic struggle against the "civilized" ban-

dits?

Need it be demonstrated that the patriotic war begun in the Ukraine has every reason to count on the utmost support of all Soviet Russia?

And what if the war in the Ukraine assumes a protracted character and turns in the end into a war of all that is upright and noble in Russia against the new tyranny from the West?

And what if the German workers and soldiers come to realize at last in the course of this war that the rulers of Germany are governed not by the aim of "defending the German Fatherland," but simply by the insatiable appetite of a bloated imperialist beast, and, having realized this, draw the appropriate practical conclusions?

Is it not clear from this that in the Ukraine the major knot of the whole existing international situation is now being tied—the knot of the workers' revolution begun in Russia, on the one hand, and the imperialist counter-revolution advancing from the West on the other?

The bloated imperialist beast meeting its doom in Soviet Ukraine—will this not be the outcome of the exorable logic of events?

Izvestia, No. 47,
March 14, 1918
Signed: J. Stalin



A TATAR-BASHKIR SOVIET REPUBLIC

Two months have already elapsed since the Third Congress of Soviets proclaimed a federal system for the Russian Republic, but the border regions, still occupied with establishing Soviet power in their areas, have not yet expressed themselves clearly and definitely on the concrete forms of federation. If we do not count the Ukraine, which is now being brutally ravaged by "civilized" bandits, and the Crimea and the Don region, which have already expressed themselves in favour of a federal tie with Russia, Tatar-Bashkiria seems to be the only region whose revolutionary organizations have definitely charted a plan of federation with Soviet Russia. We are referring to that clear-cut general outline of the organization of a Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic about which everyone is now talking and which was elaborated by the very influential Soviet organizations of the Tatars and Bashkirs.

In compliance with the wishes of the Tatar-Bashkir revolutionary masses, and in accordance with the decision of the Third Congress of Soviets proclaiming a Russian Federation of Soviet Republics, the People's Commissariat for the Affairs of Nationalities, in conformity with the instructions of the Council of People's Commissars, has drafted the following statute for a Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic of the Russian Soviet Federation. It is for the constituent congress of Soviets of Tatar-Bashkiria, which will be convened very shortly, to elaborate the concrete forms and details of the statute. The Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars will, we have no reason to doubt, endorse the results of the work of this congress.

People's Commissar
J. Stalin
Pravda, No. 53,
March 23, 1918

TRANSCAUCASIAN COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARIES UNDER A SOCIALIST MASK

Of all the border regions of the Russian Federation, Transcaucasia is presumably the most distinguished for the abundance and diversity of the nationalities it comprises. Georgians and Russians, Armenians and Azerbaijan Tatars, Turks and Lesghians, Ossetians and Abkhazians—this is a far from complete picture of the national diversity of the seven-million population of Transcaucasia.

Not one of these national groups has clearly defined national boundaries, they all live intermingled and interspersed, and not only in the towns but in the countryside as well. That, in fact, explains why the common struggle of the Transcaucasian national groups against the centre in Russia is so frequently obscured by the bitter struggle they wage among themselves. And that creates a very "convenient" opportunity to camouflage the class struggle with national flags and tinsel.

Another and no less characteristic feature of Transcaucasia is its economic backwardness. Leaving aside Baku, that industrial oasis of the region, where foreign capital provides the main impulse, Transcaucasia is an agrarian country with more or less developed commercial activity in its periphery, near the sea coast, and with still strongly rooted survivals of a purely feudal order in the centre. To this day the Tiflis, Yelizavetpol and Baku gubernias swarm with Tatar feudal beys and Georgian feudal princes, who own enormous latifundia, command special armed bands and are the arbiters of the destiny of the Tatar, Armenian and Georgian peasants. That, in fact, explains the bitter character of the agrarian "disorders" in which the discontent of the peasants frequently finds expression. It is here, too, that we must seek the reason for the weakness and uncrystallized state of the working class movement in Transcaucasia (not counting Baku), a movement which is often eclipsed by the agrari-

an "disorders." All this creates a favourable soil for a political coalition of the propertied classes and socalled "socialist" intellectuals, the majority of whom are of aristocratic origin, against the workers' and peasants' revolution which is now flaring up in the country.

The February revolution did not substantially alter the conditions of the labouring classes of the region. The soldiers, the most revolutionary element in the rural areas, were still away at the front. And the workers, on the whole weak as a class, owing to the economic backwardness of the region, and still not developed into a strong, organized unit, were entranced with the political liberties they had secured and apparently had no intention of going any further. The entire power remained in the hands of the propertied classes. They clung to it tightly and bided their time, gladly leaving it to the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik strategists to lull the workers and peasants with sage speeches about the bourgeois character of the Russian revolution, the unfeasibility of a socialist revolution, and so on.

The October Revolution sharply changed the situation. It upset all relationships at one stroke and raised the question of the transfer of power to the labouring classes. The cry, "All power to the workers and peasants!" reverberated like thunder through the land and roused the oppressed masses. And when this cry, launched in the North of Russia, began to be put into effect there, the propertied classes of Transcaucasia clearly perceived that the October Revolution and Soviet power spelled their inevitable doom. It therefore became a matter of life and death for them to fight the Soviet power. And the "socialist" Menshevik and Socialist Revolutionary intellectuals, having already tasted of the tree of knowledge of power, now that they were faced with the prospect of losing power, automatically found themselves in alliance with the propertied classes.

Such was the origin of the anti-Soviet coalition in Transcaucasia.

The Transcaucasian Commissariat, with its Tatar beys like Khan-Khoisky and Khasmamedov, on the one hand, and Georgian aristocratic intellectuals like Jordania and Gegechkori, on the other, is the living incarnation of this anti-Soviet coalition.

For the purpose of a coalition of classes within the national groups,

"National Councils"—Georgian, Tatar, Armenian—have been set up. Their moving spirit is the Menshevik Jordania.

For the purpose of a coalition of the propertied strata of all the principal Transcaucasian nationalities, a Transcaucasian Commissariat has been set up. Its leader is the Menshevik Gegechkori.

For the purpose of uniting the "whole population" of the region in the struggle against the Soviet power, a so-called "Transcaucasian Diet" has been set up, consisting of Transcaucasian Socialist-Revolutionary, Menshevik, Dashnak and khanite members of the Constituent Assembly. Its ornament, otherwise president, is the Menshevik Chkheidze.

Here you have both "socialism" and "national self-determination," and in addition something more real than this old tinsel, namely, a real alliance of the propertied strata against the workers' and peasants' power.

But tinsel cannot keep you going for long. An alliance demands "action." And "action" was promptly forthcoming at the first sign of real danger. We are referring to the return of the revolutionary soldiers from the Turkish Front after the peace negotiations began. These soldiers had to pass through Tiflis, the capital of the antiSoviet coalition. In the hands of the Bolsheviks, they might have constituted a serious threat to the existence of the Transcaucasian Commissariat. A danger of a very real order. And in the face of this danger all the "socialist" tinsel was discarded. The counter-revolutionary character of the coalition became manifest. The Commissariat and the "National Councils" treacherously opened fire on and disarmed the units returning from the front, and armed savage "national" hordes. In order to lend greater firmness to the "action" and secure itself from the North, the Transcaucasian Commissariat entered into an agreement with Karaulov and Kaledin, sent the latter whole wagon-loads of cartridges, helped him to disarm those units which it had been unable to disarm by itself, and is generally supporting his fight against the Soviet power with every means at its disposal. Safeguarding the propertied classes of Transcaucasia from the revolutionary soldiers, and not shunning any means in doing so—such is the essence of this vile "policy." Inciting armed detachments of unenlightened Moslems against the Russian soldiers, luring the latter into ambushes prepared in advance and shooting and slaughtering them—such are the

methods of this "policy." A consummate example of this shameful disarming "policy" was the shooting down at Shamkhor, between Yelizavetpol and Tiflis, of Russian soldiers proceeding from the Turkish Front against Kaledin.

Here is what Bakinsky Rabochy[1] reports about it:

> In the first half of January 1918, on the railway line between Tiflis and Yelizavetpol, armed bands of Moslems many thousand strong, headed by members of the Yelizavetpol Moslem National Committee and with the support of an armoured train sent by the Transcaucasian Commissariat, forcibly disarmed a number of military units leaving for Russia. Thousands of Russian soldiers were killed or mutilated; the railway line was strewn with their corpses. They were deprived of about 15,000 rifles, some 70 machine guns and a score of artillery pieces.

Such are the facts.

An alliance of the landlords and bourgeoisie against the revolutionary soldiers of Transcaucasia, operating under the official guise of Menshevism—such is the meaning of these facts.

We consider it necessary to cite some excerpts from articles in Bakinsky Rabochy dealing with the Yelizavetpol-Shamkhor events.

> The Mensheviks are trying to conceal the truth about the Yelizavetpol events. Even Znamya Truda, the organ of their allies of yesterday, the Tiflis Socialist-Revolutionaries, notes their attempts to 'hush up the matter' and demands a public debate on the question in the regional centre.
>
> We welcome this demand of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, because the future fate of the revolution in Transcaucasia will largely depend on whether or not the men responsible for the Shamkhor tragedy are officially exposed and full light is shed on the events of January 6-12.
>
> We declare that the man chiefly responsible for the Yelizavetpol events is the one-time leader of the Caucasian SocialDemocrats and the now so-called 'father of the Georgian nation'—Noah Nikolayevich Jordania. It was under his chairmanship that the presidium of the regional centre resolved to disarm the troop trains and arm national regiments with their weapons. It was he who signed the telegram sent to the Yelizavetpol Moslem National Committee ordering the disarmament of the troop trains held up near Shamkhor. It was he, Noah Jordania, who sent delegations from Tiflis with similar instructions to disarm the troop trains. This was of-

1 *Bakinsky Rabochy* (*Baku Worker*)—organ of the Baku Bolshevik organization. Issues appeared in 1906, in September and October 1908, and from April 1917 to August 1918. On July 25, 1920, after the victory of Soviet power in Azerbaijan, the newspaper resumed publication under the name *Azerbaijanskaya Bednota* (*Azerbaijan Poor*), but resumed its former name on November 7, 1920. It is now the organ of the Central Committee and Baku Committee of the Azerbaijan Communist Party (Bolsheviks).

ficially stated by the soldier Krupko, member of a delegation, at a largely attended meeting of the Civilian Committee in Yelizavetpol. It was Noah Jordania and his always over-zealous assistant, N. Ramishvili, who sent the armoured train under the command of Abkhazava, who distributed arms to the Moslems and helped them in shooting thousands of soldiers and disarming the troop trains.

Noah Jordania is trying to exculpate himself and affirms that he did not sign the telegram. Dozens of people, Armenians and Moslems, declare that the telegram was signed by him, and this telegram exists. Jordania says that when he learned of the complications he telephoned to Abkhazava and requested him to refrain from forcibly disarming the troop trains and to let them pass through. Abkhazava was killed, and this statement cannot be verified, but we are prepared to grant that Jordania did talk with him...

But apart from a dead man, on whom, as the saying goes, all blame can be thrown, there are living witnesses who deny Jordania's testimony and corroborate the address of the telegram, Jordania's signature, the sending of a delegation with instructions to disarm the soldiers, etc.

If they are not telling the truth why does Jordania not take action against them? Why does he and his friends want to 'hush up the matter'?

No, citizens Jordania, Ramishvili and Co., it is upon you that lies the grim responsibility for the blood of the thousands of soldiers killed on January 7-12.

Can you exonerate yourselves of this heinous crime? But we are not concerned with any personal exoneration.

Jordania interests us in this case not as a person, but as the leader of the party which decides the policy in Transcaucasia, as the most authoritative and responsible representative of the Transcaucasian government.

He perpetrated his criminal act, firstly, by decision of the presidium of the regional centre and the Inter-National Council, and, secondly, with the undoubted knowledge of the Transcaucasian Commissariat. The charge we hurl at Jordania extends to the whole Menshevik Party, to the regional centre and the Transcaucasian Commissariat, where Messrs. Chkhenkeli and Gegechkori, acting in a close and open bloc with the Moslem beys and khans, are doing everything to kill the revolution. We mention Jordania and Ramishvili because their names are linked with the telegrams and orders and the dispatch of the 'bandit' armoured train. It is with them that the investigation for the elucidation of the truth should begin.

And there are other names which must be mentioned; there is another criminal nest that must be wiped out. This is the Moslem National Committee in Yelizavetpol, made up entirely of reactionary beys and khans, which on the evening of January 7, on the basis of Jordania's telegram, resolved to disarm the troop trains 'at all costs,' and with incredible shamelessness and bloodthirstiness carried out its resolve on January 9-12.

The Menshevik press is trying to represent the Yelizavetpol events as nothing more than one of the 'bandit' raids on a railway usual in Transcaucasia. That is a most shameless lie!

It was not bandits, but thousands of Moslem civilians, officially directed by the

Moslem National Committee, lured by the prospect of rich booty and confident that they were acting on the orders of the Transcaucasian authorities, who did the criminal work at Shamkhor and Dallyar. The Moslem National Committee openly massed thousands of Moslems in Yelizavetpol, armed them, entrained them at Yelizavetpol station and sent them to Shamkhor. And when the 'victory' was won, eye-witnesses say, 'Socialist-Revolutionary' Safikyurdsky triumphantly rode into the town sitting astride a gun captured from the 'enemy' and escorted by other heroes from the Moslem Committee.

What talk then can there be of bandit raids? (*Bakinsky Rabochy,* Nos. 30 and 31.)

So much for the chief heroes of this criminal adventure.

And here are documents exposing the men behind it:

Telegram to All Soviets from N. Jordania, Chairman of the Regional Centre of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, on the Disarming of Troop Trains.

To all the Transcaucasian Soviets.

From Tiflis. No. 505, a. Accepted: 6.1.1918, disp. No. 56363. Received: Naumov. 59 words. Delivered: 5-28-24. Circular.

In view of the fact that military units leaving for Russia are taking their weapons with them and that in the event of the armistice breaking down the national units may find themselves without sufficient arms to defend the front, the regional centre of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies has resolved to request all Soviets to take measures to deprive the departing units of their weapons and to report each such action to the regional centre.

Jordania, Chairman of Regional Centre.

Telegram From Captain Abkhasava to Magalov, Commander, Tatar Cavalry Regiment.

Yelizavetpol.

To Commander Magalov, Tatar Cavalry Regiment, from Dzegam. No. 42. Accepted: 7.1.1918 from Zhu No. 1857. Received: Vata. 30 words. Delivered: 7th, 15.00 hours.

Five armed troop trains and a gun on the way. They have seized representatives of the Soviet. Am proceeding by an armoured train to give resistance. Request assistance with all arms.

Captain Abkhazava.

Ds. Shatirashvili. (*Bakinsky Rabochy*, No. 33.)

Such are the documents.

Thus, in the course of the events the "socialist" tinsel dropped away and gave place to the counter-revolutionary "actions" of the Transcaucasian Commissariat. Chkheidze, Gegechkori and Jordania are only us-

ing their party flag to cover up the abominations of the Transcaucasian Commissariat. The logic of facts is stronger than all other logic.

In disarming the Russian soldiers arriving from the front, and thus fighting the "external" revolutionaries, the counter-revolutionary Transcaucasian Commissariat hoped to kill two birds with one stone: on the one hand, it was destroying a serious revolutionary force, a Russian revolutionary army on which, chiefly, the Bolshevik Committee of the region might rely; on the other, it was obtaining in this way the "necessary" weapons for arming the Georgian, Armenian and Moslem national regiments, which constitute the chief support of the counter-revolutionary Menshevik Commissariat. War against "external" revolutionaries was thus intended to ensure "civil peace" in Transcaucasia. And Messrs. Gegechkori and Jordania carried out this treacherous policy the more resolutely the more secure they felt their "rear, " that is, from the direction of the North Caucasus, with its Kaledins and Filimonovs.

But the course of events upset all the calculations of the Transcaucasian counter-revolutionaries.

The fall of Rostov and Novocherkassk, which had been the refuges of Kaledin and Kornilov, thoroughly shattered the "northern rear." It was liquidated altogether when the whole North Caucasian railway was cleared all the way to Baku. The tide of Soviet revolution sweeping down from the North unceremoniously invaded the kingdom of the Transcaucasian coalition and menaced its existence.

Things developed just as "unfavourably" within Transcaucasia itself.

The Transcaucasian soldiers returning from the front spread the agrarian revolution through the countryside. The mansions of Moslem and Georgian landlords began to go up in flames. The pillars of the feudal survivals were vigorously attacked by the "Bolshevized" soldierpeasants. Evidently, the Transcaucasian Commissariat's empty promises to turn over the land to the peasants could no longer satisfy the peasants swept by the agrarian tide. Action was demanded of it—and revolutionary, not counter-revolutionary action.

Nor did the workers lag behind events; they could not. Firstly, the revolution sweeping down from the North and bringing new gains to

the workers naturally roused the Transcaucasian proletariat to a new struggle. Even the workers of sleepy Tiflis, that stronghold of Menshevik counter-revolution, began to turn their backs on the Transcaucasian Commissariat and declare in favour of Soviet power. Secondly, after the triumph of the Soviets in the North Caucasus, which under Kaledin and Filimonov had supplied Tiflis with grain, the food shortage was bound to become more acute, and this naturally provoked a number of food "riots"—revolutionary North Caucasus categorically refuses to feed counter-revolutionary Tiflis. Thirdly, the shortage of currency notes (coupons are no substitute!) disrupted economic life, and primarily railway transport, which undoubtedly added to the discontent of the urban masses. Lastly, revolutionary proletarian Baku, which recognized the Soviet power from the very first days of the October Revolution and is waging an indefatigable struggle against the Transcaucasian Commissariat, kept the Transcaucasian proletariat active and served as an infectious example, as a living beacon illuminating the path to socialism.

All this, taken together, could not but revolutionize the whole political situation in Transcaucasia. So much so, that in the end even the "most reliable" national regiments began to be "disaffected" and to pass over to the Bolsheviks.

The Transcaucasian Commissariat was faced with the alternatives:

Either to side with the workers and peasants against the landlords and capitalists, which would mean the collapse of the coalition.

Or to wage a determined fight against the peasants and the working class movement in order to preserve the coalition with the landlords and capitalists.

Messrs. Jordania and Gegechkori chose the latter course.

To begin with, the Transcaucasian Commissariat branded the agrarian movement of the Georgian and Tatar peasants as "banditry" and "hooliganism," and began to arrest and shoot the "ringleaders."

For the landlords against the peasants!

Next, the Commissariat banned all the Bolshevik newspapers in Tiflis, and began to arrest and shoot workers who protested against this outrage.

For the capitalists against the workers!

Lastly, things have gone so far that Messrs. Jordania and Gegechkori are encouraging Armenian-Tatar massacres, evidently as a "lightning conductor"—a disgrace to which even the Cadets have not yet sunk!

The Transcaucasian Commissariat, the Transcaucasian Diet and the "National Councils" against the workers and peasants—that is the meaning of the "new" course.

Thus, the Transcaucasian counter-revolutionaries are furthering and supplementing their fight against the "external" revolutionaries, the Russian soldiers, with a fight against the internal revolutionaries, "their own" workers and peasants.

A very interesting illustration of this "change of front" in the policy of the Transcaucasian coalitionists is to be found in a letter received the other day by the Council of People's Commissars from a comrade in the Caucasus, an eye-witness of the counter-revolutionary excesses of Messrs. Gegechkori and Jordania. I shall reproduce it in full and without alteration. Here it is:

> Further incidents have occurred here in the past few days, and the situation is now very serious. On the morning of February 9 four of our comrades were arrested, among them a member of the now Bolshevik Committee, F. Kalandadze. Warrants were issued for the arrest of other comrades: Filipp Makharadze, Nazaretyan, Shaverdov and other members of the regional committee. Only Mikha Tskhakaya was spared, presumably because of his illness. All have gone underground. This was accompanied by the banning of our newspapers, Kavkazsky Rabochy, Brdzola (Georgian), and Banvori Kriv (Armenian), and the sealing up of our printing plant.
>
> This aroused the indignation of the workers. That same day, the 9th, a meeting was held in the railway shops, attended by some three thousand workers. They decided unanimously, with only four abstentions, to declare a strike in support of the demand for the release of the comrades and the removal of the ban on the newspapers. It was decided to stay out until the demands were met. But the strike was only partial. The out-and-out Menshevik gang, who did not raise objections at the meeting and did not vote against, went on working. That same day there was a meeting of compositors and printers, who decided by 226 votes to 190 to hold a one-day protest strike in support of the same demands. More unanimous were the strike decisions of the electricians, leather workers, tailors, the arsenal shops, and the Tolle, Zargaryants and other factories.
>
> The indignation was shared by the townsfolk. But the next day, February 10, an incident occurred which caused the arrests and the newspapers to be forgotten.
>
> The strike committee of the railway and other workers had appointed a protest meeting for that day, on the 10th, in the morning, to be held in the Alexander Gar-

dens. Despite the measures taken to prevent the meeting, more than 3,000 workers and soldiers turned out (there were not many soldiers because the troop trains are located 15 versts from the city). Kavtaradze, Makharadze, Nazaretyan and other comrades who had gone into hiding also appeared at the meeting. While the meeting was in progress militiamen and 'Red Guards' (about two companies strong) entered the gardens. Carrying red banners, and making reassuring gestures, they stole up to the gathering.

Part of the public who were already intending to disperse decided to stay on, taking the newcomers for sympathizers, and even greeted them with cheers. Chairman Kavtaradze was about to stop the speaker on the platform in order to welcome the newcomers, when the latter suddenly formed a cordon, surrounded the meeting and opened fierce fire with rifles and machine guns. They aimed chiefly at the presidium on the platform. Eight persons were killed and more than twenty wounded. A comrade who resembled Kavtaradze and was dressed like him received ten bullets and was killed, and the 'Red Guards' shouted to one another that Kavtaradze was killed. Part of the public dispersed, the rest dropped to the ground. The firing continued about a quarter of an hour.

At this very moment the first session of the enlarged Transcaucasian Diet had just opened, and Chkheidze was addressing it to the accompaniment of the rifles and machine guns which were blazing away right near the palace.

This massacre, started so treacherously and without warning, has aroused fresh indignation among the workers, and I think that it has finally and definitely estranged them from the Mensheviks.

Nazaretyan and Tsintsadze were overtaken after the meeting and led away to be shot, but they were saved by Merkhalev, a Socialist-Revolutionary. The Socialist-Revolutionaries are 'indignant,' are protesting and so on. The Dashnaktsakans are indignant too, and so is the whole town. But nothing can be done. They have brought in from the country districts armed ''Red Guards' and a Moslem Savage Division and are running riot. They are publicly threatening to shoot all our leading comrades. The day the meeting was fired on, many officers appeared in the town wearing white armlets. They were whiteguards who began to scour the city looking for Bolsheviks. They took one man who looked like Shaumyan off a tram car and shot him point blank. They shouted out that it was Shaumyan, but they were disappointed.

Yesterday, the 11th, a meeting was held at the troop trains at which some of our comrades were present. There are about 6,000 soldiers there, but without artillery. They decided to demand the release of the arrested comrades, the removal of the ban on our newspapers and an investigation of the incident of the 10th (the firing on the meeting, at which, incidentally, one of the soldiers from these troop trains was killed). Yesterday they sent a delegation with an ultimatum, and gave 24 hours for a reply.

The time limit expires today. It is reported that the Commissariat is massing forces for resistance. I have no details yet. The responsible comrades are not returning from the troop trains yet, because they fear that they may be arrested on the way; they have been elected to the Revolutionary Military Committee of the troop

trains there. I am awaiting more detailed information.

A meeting of the City Duma has been appointed for tomorrow. The Socialist-Revolutionaries and Dashnaks will make a protest; we shall have our representatives there too. The city is in a state of deep alarm. Women demonstrated today outside the Duma in connection with the food shortage which has begun to make itself felt. Lightning meetings are being held everywhere in the city. A peasant movement is breaking out all over Georgia under the influence of the Georgian soldiers returning from Russia, who are all either Bolsheviks or pro-Bolsheviks. The Mensheviks say it is a movement of rioters and bandits, and are sending 'Red Guards' to suppress it. Some of our comrades in Gori have been arrested. It is reported today that our soldiers there have been disarmed and that shootings have already begun. There is information from Kutais that the town is in the hands of the Bolsheviks, headed by Budu Mdivani. The Mensheviks have massed forces there from all parts. I have had no reply yet from the messengers we sent; I expect it any minute. Yesterday a Bolshevik, the old Tsertsvadze, was arrested in Mukhrani; he had gone there in connection with the peasant action which was expected yesterday against the Mukhrani princes and the crown estates.

Nine men have been arrested and are at present imprisoned in the Metekhi. Because of these arrests, the Socialist-Revolutionary Red Guards who guarded this prison have refused to do so any longer and have offered us their services.

Yesterday the strike committee of representatives from the enterprises I enumerated at the beginning of this letter issued an appeal for a general strike. Today it is being discussed everywhere. We shall see what stuff the Tiflis proletariat is made of.

At the opening of the Diet on February 10 only the Mensheviks (there are 37 of them) and one Moslem were present—and nobody else. The Moslem deputy asked for the sitting to be adjourned to the 13th, which was done. The Dashnaks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries will probably also send their deputies."

That is the "picture."

It is hard to say whether this counter-revolutionary Commissariat, on which history has already passed sentence of death, can go on existing much longer. This, at any rate, the very near future will show. One thing, however, is certain: the recent events have definitely torn the socialist mask from the faces of the Menshevik social-counter-revolutionaries, and the whole revolutionary world can now clearly see that in the Transcaucasian Commissariat and its appendages, the "Diet" and "National Councils," we are faced with a most vicious counter-revolutionary bloc directed against the workers and peasants of Transcaucasia.

Such are the facts.

Well, and everyone knows that talk and tinsel are short-lived, but facts and deeds live on...

Pravda, Nos. 55 and 56,
March 26 and 27, 1918
Signed: J. Stalin

ORGANISATION OF A RUSSIAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

Pravda Interview

In connection with the discussion that has developed in the past few days in the Soviet press on the principles and methods of constituting a Russian Federation, our correspondent requested the opinion of Comrade Stalin, People's Commissar for the Affairs of Nationalities.

The following is Comrade Stalin's reply to a series of questions put by our correspondent.

Bourgeois-Democratic Federations

Of all the existing federal unions, the most characteristic of the bourgeois-democratic system are the American and Swiss federations. Historically, they evolved from independent states, through confederations, into federations, but in fact they became unitary states, federalism being preserved only in form. This whole process of development—from independence to unitarism—proceeded to the accompaniment of violence, oppression and national wars. Suffice it to recall the war between the Southern and Northern states of America[1] and the war between the Sonderbund[2] and the other cantons in Switzerland. Nor can one refrain from observing that the Swiss cantons and the American states were built not on national, nor even on economic lines, but quite

1 The American Civil War of 1861-65, which ended in the victory of the Northern states and the defeat of the separatist tendencies of the Southern states and the establishment of a centralized state.

2 Sonderbund—a reactionary alliance of the seven Catholic cantons in Switzerland, formed in 1845. In 1847 an armed struggle broke out between the Sonderbund and the other cantons, which favoured a centralized government for Switzerland. The war ended with the defeat of the Sonderbund and the conversion of Switzerland from a union of states into an integral federal state.

by chance—by virtue of the chance seizure of this or that territory by colonial immigrants or village communities.

How the Russian Federation Now in Process of Formation Differs from Them

The federation now being built in Russia presents, and should present, an entirely different picture.

Firstly, the regions which have separated out in Russia represent quite definite units as regards manner of life and national composition. The Ukraine, the Crimea, Poland, Transcaucasia, Turkestan, the Middle Volga, and the Kirghiz territory are distinct from the centre not only because of their geographical location (border regions!), but also because they are integral economic territories having a population with a specific manner of life and national composition.

Secondly, these regions are not free and independent territories, but units which were forcibly squeezed into the all-Russian political organism, and which are now striving to secure the necessary freedom of action in the shape either of federal relations or complete independence. The history of the "union" of these territories is one long tale of violence and oppression on the part of the former Russian governments. The establishment of a federal system in Russia will mean the emancipation of these territories and the peoples inhabiting them from the old imperialist yoke. From unitarism to federalism!

Thirdly, in the Western federations the shaping of the state is in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Small wonder, then, that "union" there could not be effected without violence. Here, in Russia, on the contrary, the shaping of the political structure is in the hands of the proletariat, the sworn enemy of imperialism. In Russia, therefore, the federal system can, and must, be built on the basis of a free union of peoples.

That is the essential difference between the federation in Russia and the federations of the West.

Structural Principles of the Russian Federation

It is clear from this, Comrade Stalin continued, that the Russian Federation is not a union of independent cities (as caricaturists in the bourgeois press think), or of regions generally (as some of our comrades believe), but a union of definite historically evolved territories, each distinguished by a specific manner of life and national composition. The point is not the geographical location of certain regions, or even that certain areas are separated from the centre by stretches of water (Turkestan), or mountain ranges (Siberia), or steppes (Turkestan again). This geographical federalism, such as is preached by Latsis, has nothing in common with the federalism proclaimed by the Third Congress of Soviets. Poland and the Ukraine are not separated from the centre by mountain ranges or stretches of water. Nevertheless it would not enter anyone's head to assert that the absence of these geographical attributes precludes the right of these regions to free self-determination.

On the other hand, Comrade Stalin said, it is unquestionable that the peculiar form of federalism advocated by the Moscow regionalists, who would artificially unite fourteen gubernias around Moscow, has likewise nothing in common with the resolution on federation of the Third Congress of Soviets. Undoubtedly, the central textile area, which embraces only a few gubernias, does in a way represent an integral economic unit, and as such it will undoubtedly be administered by a regional authority of its own, as an autonomous part of the Supreme Council of National Economy. But what can there be in common between backwoods Kaluga and industrial Ivanovo-Voznesensk, and on what principle they are "united" by the present regional Council of People's Commissars is beyond comprehension.

Composition of the Russian Federal Republic

Obviously, not every area or unit, and not every geographical territory can or should become a member of the federation, but only definite regions which naturally combine a specific manner of life, a specific national composition, and a certain minimum integrality of economic territory. Such are Poland, the Ukraine, Finland, the Crimea, Transcaucasia (incidentally, the possibility is not excluded that Transcaucasia may

break up into a number of definite national-territorial units, e.g., Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan-Tatar, etc.), Turkestan, the Kirghiz territory, the Tatar-Bashkir territory, Siberia and so on.

Rights of Federating Regions, Rights of National Minorities

The rights of these federating regions will be definitely delimited in the process of constituting the Soviet Federation as a whole, but the general outline of these rights can be indicated already. Military and naval affairs, foreign affairs, railways, post and telegraph, currency, trade agreements and general economic, financial and banking policy will probably all come within the province of the central Council of People's Commissars. All other affairs, and primarily the methods of implementation of general decrees, education, judicature, administration, etc., will come within the province of the regional Councils of People's Commissars. No compulsory "state" language—either in the judicature or in the educational system! Each region will select the language or languages which correspond to the composition of its population, and there will be complete equality of languages both of the minorities and the majorities in all social and political institutions.

Structure of the Central Authority

The structure of the central authority, its manner of constitution, is determined by the specific features of the Russian Federation. In America and Switzerland, federalism resulted in practice in a two-chamber system: on the one hand, a parliament elected on the basis of general elections, and, on the other, a federal council constituted by the states or cantons. That is the two-chamber system which in practice leads to the usual bourgeois legislative red tape. Needless to say, the labouring masses of Russia would not reconcile themselves to such a two-chamber system. And this apart from the fact that such a system is wholly incompatible with the elementary demands of socialism.

We think, Comrade Stalin continued, that the supreme organ of power of the Russian Federation should be the Congress of Soviets elected by all the labouring masses of Russia, or the Central Executive Committee, acting as its deputy. Moreover, we shall have to discard

the bourgeois prejudice regarding the infallibility of the "principle" of universal suffrage. The suffrage will probably be granted only to those sections of the population which are exploited, or which at least do not exploit the labour of others. That is a natural corollary of the fact of the dictatorship of the proletariat and poor peasants.

The Executive Organ of Power

As to the organ of executive power of the Russian Federation, i.e., the central Council of People's Commissars, it will be elected at the Congresses of Soviets, presumably from candidates nominated by the centre and the federating regions. Thus between the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars there will not be, and should not be, any so-called second chamber. Without a doubt, practice may, and probably will, evolve other and more expedient and flexible forms of combining the interests of the regions and the centre in the structure of authority. But one thing is certain: namely, that whatever forms may be evolved in practice, they will not resurrect the obsolete two-chamber system which has been buried by our revolution.

Transitional Function of Federalism

These, in my opinion, Comrade Stalin continued, are the general contours of the Russian Federation whose process of constitution we are now witnessing. Many are inclined to regard the federal system as the most stable, and even as ideal, and America, Canada and Switzerland are often cited as examples. But this infatuation with federalism is not warranted by history. In the first place, America and Switzerland are no longer federations: they were federations in the 1860's, but they have in fact become unitary states since the end of the last century, when all authority was transferred from the states or cantons to the central federal government.

History has shown that federalism in America and Switzerland was only a transitional step from the independence of the states or cantons to their complete union. Federalism proved quite expedient as a transitional step from independence to imperialist unitarism, but it became out of date and was discarded as soon as the conditions matured for the

union of the states or cantons into a single integral state.

Shaping the Political Structure of the Russian Federation; Federalism in Russia—a Transitional Step to Socialist Unitarism

In Russia, constitutional development is proceeding in a reverse way. Compulsory tsarist unitarism is being replaced by voluntary federalism, in order that, in the course of time, federalism may be replaced by an equally voluntary and fraternal union of the labouring masses of all the nations and races of Russia. As in America and Switzerland, Comrade Stalin concluded, federalism in Russia is destined to serve as a means of transition—transition to the socialist unitarism of the future.

Pravda, Nos. 62 and 63,
April 3 and 4, 1918



ONE IMMEDIATE TASK

THE PAST TWO MONTHS of development of the revolution in Russia, especially the period following the conclusion of peace with Germany and the suppression of the bourgeois counter-revolution at home, may be described as a period of consolidation of Soviet power in Russia and the beginning of a systematic reconstruction of the outlived social and economic system on new, socialist lines. The growing scale of nationalization of mills and factories, the increasing control over the major branches of trade, the nationalization of the banks, the daily developing, richly diverse activities of the Supreme Council of National Economy—that organizational nucleus of the socialist society which is already close at hand—all go to show how deeply Soviet power is penetrating into the pores of social life. The power at the centre has become a real people's power that has sprung from the depths of the labouring masses. Therein lies the strength and might of Soviet power. This, evidently, is being sensed even by those former enemies of the Soviet regime, the bourgeois intellectuals—the technicians, engineers, office workers and people with specialized knowledge generally—who yesterday were still sabotaging the regime, but are today prepared to serve it.

But Soviet power has not yet succeeded in becoming a people's power to quite the same extent in the border regions inhabited by culturally backward elements. The revolution begun in the centre spread to the border regions, especially the eastern, with a certain amount of delay. Conditions as regards language and manner of life in these regions, which are moreover economically backward, have somewhat complicated the consolidation of Soviet power there. In order that the power there might become a people's power, and the labouring masses become socialist, it is necessary, among other things, to devise special methods of drawing the labouring and exploited masses of these regions into the process of revolutionary development. It is necessary to raise the masses

to the level of Soviet power, and to identify their finest representatives with it. But this is impossible unless these regions are autonomous, that is, have their own schools, courts, administrations, organs of power and social, political and cultural institutions, and unless the labouring masses of these regions are fully guaranteed the right to use their own language in all spheres of social and political activity.

It was with this object in view that the Third Congress of Soviets proclaimed a federal system for the Russian Soviet Republic.

The bourgeois autonomous groups which arose last November and December in the Volga-Tatar, the Bashkir and Kirghiz regions and the Turkestan region are being gradually exposed by the course of the revolution. In order completely to sever "their own masses" from them and rally them around the Soviets, it is necessary to "take" their autonomy from them, first cleanse it of its bourgeois contamination, and then convert it from bourgeois into Soviet autonomy. The bourgeois nationalist groups demand autonomy in order to make it an instrument for enslaving "their own" masses. That is why, while "recognizing the central Soviet power," they refuse to recognize the local Soviets, and demand that there shall be no interference in their "internal affairs." In view of this some of the local Soviets have decided to repudiate every form of autonomy whatsoever, and prefer to "settle" the national question by force of arms. But this course is absolutely unsuitable for the Soviet power. It is a course that is capable only of rallying the masses behind the bourgeois-national upper sections, and of giving the latter the appearance of being saviours of the "motherland," defenders of the "nation," which by no means fits in with the plans of the Soviet power. Not repudiation, but recognition of autonomy is the immediate task of the Soviet power. But this autonomy must be based on the local Soviets. Only in this way can the power become a people's power, the masses' own power. Consequently, autonomy must ensure power to the lower, not the upper, sections of the given nation. That is the whole point.

It is for this reason that the Soviet Government preclaims the autonomy of the Tatar-Bashkir territory. For this reason, too, it is planned to proclaim the autonomy of the Kirghiz territory, the Turkestan region, etc. All this on the basis of the recognition of the local volost, uyezd and urban Soviets of these border regions.

All the necessary material and data must be collected for determining the character and form of autonomy of these territories. Commissions must be appointed for convening constituent congresses of the Soviets and Soviet organs of the given peoples, at which the geographical boundaries of these autonomous units shall be defined. These congresses must be convened. This essential preparatory work must be done immediately in order that a future All-Russian Congress of Soviets may be in a position to frame a Constitution of the Russian Soviet Federation.

The Soviets of the Tatar-Bashkir territory and their Moslem Commissariats have already set to work. By the 10th or 15th of April, a conference of representatives of the Soviets and Moslem Commissariats of Kazan, Ufa, Orenburg and Yekaterinburg will meet in Moscow to appoint a commission for convening a constituent congress of Soviets of Tatar-Bashkiria.

In the Kirghiz territory and Turkestan measures in this direction are only just beginning to be taken. The Soviets of these regions should set to work at once, and enlist in it all the Soviet and revolutionary elements of the peoples concerned. No division into national curiae, with representation from national "minorities" and "majorities," as certain bourgeois nationalist groups are suggesting, should be allowed. Such division only sharpens national animosities, reinforces the barriers between the labouring masses of the nationalities, and bars the backward peoples from the path to enlightenment and culture. The elections to the constituent congresses must be based, and autonomy founded, not on splitting the labouring and democratic masses of the nationalities into separate national detachments, but on rallying them around the respective unions of Soviets.

Hence the task of the Soviets is to gather materials on the autonomy of the border regions, to establish socialist national commissariats of the Soviets, to appoint commissions for convening constituent congresses of Soviets of the autonomous regions, to convene these congresses, and to establish close ties between the labouring sections of the peoples exercising self-determination and the organs of Soviet power in the regions.

The People's Commissariat for the-Affairs of Nationalities will do everything in its power to facilitate this difficult and responsible work of the Soviets in the localities.

People's Commissar
J. Stalin
Pravda, No. 67,
April 9, 1918

GENERAL PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIALIST FEDERATIVE SOVIET REPUBLIC

Draft Approved by the Commission Appointed by the All-Russian C.E.C. for Drafting the Constitution of the Soviet Republic[1]

The main objective of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic adapted to the present transitional period is to establish a dictatorship of the urban and rural proletariat and the poor peasantry, in the form of a strong all-Russian Soviet power, for the purpose of completely suppressing the bourgeoisie, abolishing the exploitation of man by man, and introducing socialism, under which there will be neither division into classes nor a state power.

1) The Russian Republic is a free socialist society of all the working people of Russia, united in urban and rural Soviets of Deputies.

2) The Soviets of Deputies of regions distinguished by a specific manner of life and national composition are combined into autonomous regional unions, headed by regional Congresses of Soviets and their executive bodies.

3) The Soviet regional unions are combined on a federal basis into a Russian Socialist Republic, at the head of which is the All-Russian Congress of Soviets and, in the intervals between congresses, the

1 The Commission of the All-Russian C.E.C. for drafting the Constitution of the R.S.F.S.R. was set up on April 1, 1918, and was headed by J. V. Stalin and Y. M. Sverdlov. It took as the basis for its work the "Declaration of the Rights of the Toiling and Exploited Peoples" and the resolution on "Federal Institutions of the Russian Republic" adopted, on J. V. Stalin's report, by the Third Congress of Soviets. J. V. Stalin's draft of "General Provisions of the Constitution of the R.S.F.S.R." was discussed and adopted by the Commission on April 19, 1918.

All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

Izvestia, No. 82,
April 25, 1918

TELEGRAM TO THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF SOVIET OF THE TURKESTAN REGION[1]

You may rest assured, comrades, that the Council of People's Commissars will support the establishment of autonomy in your region on a Soviet basis. We welcome your initiative and are firmly convinced that you will cover the whole region with a network of Soviets, and will work in full contact with the already existing Soviets. We request you to send the commission for convening a constituent congress of Soviets, which you have undertaken to appoint, to us in Moscow for the purpose of jointly determining the relations between the organ of authority of your region and the Council of People's Commissars.

We hail your Congress and hope that it will accomplish with credit the tasks entrusted to it by history.

Lenin
Stalin
April 22, 1918
Izvestia, No. 83,
April 26, 1918

1 [15] The Fifth Congress of Soviets of the Turkestan region sat from April 20 to May 1, 1918. It proclaimed the autonomy of the Turkestan Soviet Federative Republic and elected a Central Executive Committee and a Council of People's Commissars.



THE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UKRAINE

Izvestia Interview

Interviewed by our correspondent, Comrade Stalin, Chairman of the Soviet peace delegation, whom the Council of People's Commissars has called from Kursk to Moscow to report, stated the following:

Conclusion of an Armistice

The first objective of the Soviet peace delegation was to establish an armistice at the front, on the Ukrainian border. It was on these lines that our peace delegation began negotiations with the German-Ukrainian command. We have succeeded in securing a truce on the Kursk, Bryansk and Voronezh fronts. The next question is to secure a truce on the Southern Front. Thus, the conclusion of an armistice and the establishment of a demarcation line constitute, in our opinion, the first stage of the peace negotiations.

Subsequent Negotiations

Our next objective—the opening of the peace negotiations themselves—was complicated by the fact that we had to wait a long time for the arrival of the delegation from the Central Rada. When it did at last arrive in Vorozhba, news was received of the coup d'état and the abolition of the Small and Grand Radas in the Ukraine, which, of course, hampered the establishment of an armistice and the preliminary arrangements for determining the time and place for opening the negotiations.

For the latter purpose, we have sent a special parliamentary to Konotop, the place proposed by the UkrainianGerman command, and

where its general headquarters is located. Our delegate has been given wide powers in the matter of arranging the place of negotiations.

Effect of the Coup d'État in the Ukraine

It is difficult to say definitely what effect the coup d'état in the Ukraine will have on the peace negotiations, since we do not know the attitude of the new Ukrainian Government towards the peace negotiations. Nothing was said on this point in Hetman Skoropadsky's manifesto. Before the coup we had a definite peace programme of the Ukrainian Rada. But what the territorial programme of the new Ukrainian Government is, we do not know.

In general, however, the Ukrainian coup has so far had no adverse effect on the peace negotiations. On the contrary, there is reason to believe that the coup does not preclude the possibility of peace being arranged between the Soviet Government and the Ukrainian Government. It should be observed that since the coup the vacillations and delays of the Ukrainians in respect to the preliminary arrangements for the peace negotiations have ceased.

Causes of the Coup d'État

At the end of the interview Comrade Stalin touched on the causes of the coup d'état in the Ukraine.

In my opinion, the coup was inevitable. The reasons for it lay in the self-contradictory position of the Central Rada: on the one hand, it played with socialism; on the other, it called in foreign troops to fight the Ukrainian workers and peasants. The Central Rada made itself dependent financially and militarily on Germany, and at the same time it handed out a heap of promises to the Ukrainian workers and peasants, with whom it was soon waging determined warfare. By this last step the Ukrainian Rada placed itself in a position in which, at the critical moment of the assault of the bourgeois and landlord elements, it had nobody to rely on.

And, in fact, the Central Rada could not have remained in power long by virtue of the law of the class struggle, since in the process

of a revolutionary movement only such elements can firmly establish themselves in power as are supported by one class or another. Only two possible outcomes were therefore conceivable in the Ukraine: either a dictatorship of the workers and peasants, which the Central Rada could not help to bring about owing to its petty-bourgeois nature; or a dictatorship of the bourgeois and landlord elements, to which also the Rada could not consent. It preferred a half-way position, and thereby signed its own death warrant.

Izvestia, No. 90,
May 9, 1918

SPEECHES DELIVERED AT A CONFERENCE ON THE CONVENING OF A CONSTITUENT CONGRESS OF SOVIETS OF THE TATAR-BASHKIR SOVIET REPUBLIC

MAY 10-16, 1918[1]

May 10

1. SPEECH AT THE OPENING OF THE CONFERENCE

COMRADES, this conference has been called on the initiative of the Commissariat for the Affairs of Nationalities and in agreement with the Council of People's Commissars, in the person of its Chairman.

The purpose of the conference is to set up a commission for convening a constituent congress of Soviets of your region. The purpose of the future congress will be to determine the frontiers and character of TatarBashkir autonomy. The idea of autonomy springs from the very nature of the October Revolution, which brought liberty to the nationalities. The Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia issued by the Council of People's Commissars in the October days, and the decision of the Third Congress of Soviets proclaiming Russia a federation of autonomous regions distinguished by a specific manner of life and composition of the population, are only a formal expression of the nature of the October Revolution.

The Third Congress of Soviets laid down general provisions of the

1 The conference on the convening of a constituent congress of the Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic met in Moscow from May 10 to 16, 1918. It was attended by representatives of the Tatars, Bashkirs, Chuvashes and Maris, and was presided over by J. V. Stalin. It appointed a commission for the convening of a constituent congress of Soviets of the Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic. The outbreak of civil war prevented the holding of the congress.

Constitution of the Soviet Republic, and called upon the labouring elements of the peoples of Russia to say in what concrete political forms they would like to constitute themselves in their regions, and in what relations they would like to stand to the centre. Of all the regions, Finland and the Ukraine, I think, are the only ones that have declared themselves definitely. They have declared in favour of independence. And when the Council of People's Commissars became convinced that not only the bourgeoisie, but also the proletarian elements of these countries were striving for independence, these countries received what they demanded without any hindrance.

As to the other regions, their labouring elements have proved to be rather inert in the matter of the national movement. But the greater their inertia the greater was the activity displayed by the bourgeoisie. Nearly everywhere, in all the regions, bourgeois autonomous groups were formed which set up "National Councils," split their regions into separate national curiae, with national regiments, national budgets, etc., and thus turned their countries into arenas of national conflict and chauvinism. These autonomous groups (I am referring to the Tatar, Bashkir, Kirghiz, Georgian, Armenian and other "National Councils")—all these "National Councils" were out for one thing only, namely, to secure autonomy so that the central government should not interfere in their affairs and not control them. "Give us autonomy and we shall recognize the central Soviet power, but we cannot recognize the local Soviets and they must not interfere in our affairs; we shall organize ourselves as we wish and can, and shall treat our national workers and peasants as we please." That is the sort of autonomy—essentially bourgeois in character—aimed at by the bourgeoisie who demand full power over "their" working people within the framework of autonomy.

It goes without saying that the Soviet power cannot sanction autonomy of this kind. To grant autonomy in order that all power within the autonomous unit may belong to the national bourgeoisie, who insist upon non-interference on the part of the Soviets, to surrender the Tatar, Bashkir, Georgian, Kirghiz, Armenian and other workers to the tender mercies of the Tatar, Georgian, Armenian and other bourgeois—that is something to which the Soviet power cannot consent.

Autonomy is a form. The whole question is what class content is

put into this form. The Soviet power is not at all opposed to autonomy. It is in favour of autonomy—but only such autonomy in which the entire power belongs to the workers and peasants, and in which the bourgeois of all nationalities are debarred not only from power, but even from participation in the election of government bodies.

Such autonomy will be autonomy on a Soviet basis.

There are two types of autonomy. One is purely nationalistic. It is built on the principle of extra-territoriality, on the basis of nationalism. The outcome of this type of autonomy is "National Councils," with national regiments around these councils, division of the population into national curiae, and the national strife which is bound to follow from this. That type of autonomy spells inevitable doom for the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies. It is the type of autonomy which the bourgeois Rada was out for. In order to grow and develop, the Rada had naturally to wage war on the workers' and peasants' Soviets. That has also been the outcome of the existence of the Armenian, Georgian and Tatar National Councils in Transcaucasia. Gegechkori was right when he said to the Transcaucasian Soviets and the Commissariat: "Do you know that the Commissariat and the Soviets have become a fiction, since all power has actually passed into the hands of the National Councils, which possess their own national regiments?"

That type of autonomy we reject in principle.

We propose another type of autonomy, autonomy for regions where one or several nationalities predominate. No national curiae, no national barriers! Autonomy must be Soviet autonomy, based on Soviets. This means that the division of the population of the given region must be on class, not national lines. Class Soviets as the basis of autonomy, and autonomy as the form of expression of the will of these Soviets—such is the nature of the Soviet autonomy we propose.

The bourgeois world has elaborated one definite form of relation between autonomous regions and the central authority. I am referring to the United States of America, Canada and Switzerland. In these countries the central authority consists of a national parliament of the whole country, elected by the entire population of the states (or cantons), and, parallel with this, a federal council, chosen by the governments of the

states (or cantons). The result is a two-chamber system, with its legislative red tape and the stifling of all revolutionary initiative.

We are opposed to such a constitution of authority in our country. We are opposed to it not only because socialism categorically repudiates such a two-chamber system, but also because of the practical exigencies of the period we are passing through. The fact is that in the present transitional period, when the bourgeoisie has been broken but not crushed, when the disruption of economic life and of the food supply, aggravated by the machinations of the bourgeoisie, has not yet been eliminated, and when the old, capitalist world has been shattered but the new, socialist world has not yet been completely built—at such a moment the country needs a strong all-Russian power capable of crushing the enemies of socialism completely and organizing a new, communist economy. In short, what we need is that which has come to be called the dictatorship of the urban and rural proletariat. To set up sovereign local and regional authorities parallel with the central authority at such a moment would in fact result in the collapse of all authority and a reversion to capitalism. For this reason, all functions of importance to the whole country must be left in the hands of the central authority, and the regional authorities must be vested chiefly with administrative, political and cultural functions of a purely regional nature. These are: education, justice, administration, essential political measures, forms and methods of application of the general decrees in adaptation to the national conditions and manner of life—and all this in the language native to and understood by the population. Hence the generally recognized type of regional union, headed by a regional Central Executive Committee, is the most expedient form of such autonomy.

That is the type of autonomy the necessity of which, in the present transitional period, is dictated both by the interests of consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and by the common struggle of the proletarians of all the nations of Russia against bourgeois nationalism, that last bulwark of imperialism.

All this clearly enough defines the tasks of our conference. The conference will hear reports from the localities, so as to obtain a general idea of the demands of the labouring masses of the nationalities of this region. It will then trace a rough preliminary chart of the territory, the

labouring population of which will be invited to take part in electing a regional constituent congress of Soviets, the right to elect being granted to the labouring masses organized in the Soviets not only of the given autonomous territory, but also of the adjacent districts. Lastly, the conference will elect a commission, which will be entrusted with the convening of the regional constituent congress of Soviets. It will be left to this constituent congress to decide the question of autonomy, to define the jurisdiction of the autonomous government, and definitely to fix the frontiers of the region.

Such are the tasks of this conference.

In opening the conference, I wish to express the assurance that it will accomplish its task with credit.

May 16

2. Speech at the Closing of the Conference

Permit me to say on behalf of the central Soviet power that the Council of People's Commissars has always regarded it as its sacred duty to meet the aspirations of the movement for emancipation of the oppressed and exploited masses of the peoples of the East, and especially of the Moslem East, the most down-trodden of all. The whole character of our revolution, the very nature of Soviet power, the entire international situation, and lastly even the geographical position of Russia, situated as it is between imperialist Europe and oppressed Asia, are all factors which undoubtedly dictate to the Soviet power a policy of rendering fraternal support to the oppressed peoples of the East in their struggle for emancipation.

Of all forms of oppression existing today, national oppression is the most subtle and dangerous. Subtle, because it serves so conveniently to mask the wolfish countenance of the bourgeoisie. Dangerous, because it so astutely diverts the lightning from the bourgeoisie by stirring up national conflicts. If the European sharks succeeded in hurling the workers against one another in the world slaughter, and if they have succeeded until now in keeping the slaughter going, one of the reasons is that the power of the bourgeois nationalism which is befogging the minds of the workers of Europe has not yet spent itself. Nationalism is the last posi-

tion from which the bourgeoisie must be driven in order to vanquish it completely. But nationalism cannot be smashed by disregarding the national question, ignoring and denying its existence, as some of our comrades do. Far from it! National nihilism only injures the cause of socialism, because it plays into the hands of the bourgeois nationalists. In order to smash nationalism, it is necessary first of all to tackle and solve the national question. But in order to solve the national question openly and in a socialist way, it must be tackled on Soviet lines and be fully and entirely subordinated to the interests of the labouring masses organized in Soviets. Thus, and only thus, can the last intellectual weapon of the bourgeoisie be struck from its hands. The Autonomous Tatar-Bashkir Republic now in process of formation is the practical way of solving this general problem which is of such importance for our entire revolution. May this Autonomous Republic serve as a living beacon to the Moslem peoples of the East, lighting the path to their emancipation from oppression.

I hereby close the conference on the convening of a constituent congress of Soviets of the Tatar-Bashkir Republic, and wish you success in the building of your autonomous republic.

Pravda, Nos. 96 and 101,
May 18 and 24, 1918

ANOTHER LIE

Nashe Vremya,[1] No. 97 (evening edition), prints a dispatch from its own correspondent giving the text of a German wireless message from Constantinople which alleges that "the Bolsheviks, having received strong reinforcements from Turkestan and Astrakhan, passed to the offensive, and, notwithstanding the heroic resistance of the Moslems, captured the city of Baku." I publicly declare that this provocative message is devoid of all truth.

Baku recognized the power of the Soviets from the first days of the revolution, and recognizes it now. There was no Bolshevik attack on Baku, nor could there have been. There was merely an adventurist attack of a handful of Tatar and Russian landlords and generals, who suffered complete fiasco because of the detestation in which they are held by the Moslem and Russian workers and peasants. There was no fight between Bolsheviks and Moslems, nor could there have been. The Baku Soviet power was, and remains, the power of the workers and peasants of all the nationalities of Baku and the Baku area, and, above all, the power of the Moslem people.

People's Commissar
J. Stalin
Pravda, Nos. 97,
May 19, 1918

1 *Nashe Vremya* (*Our Time*)—an evening newspaper of Socialist-Revolutionary trend published in Moscow from December 1917 to July 1918.

THE SITUATION IN THE CAUCASUS

I. Transcaucasia

The situation in Transcaucasia is growing more and more ominous. The declaration of the independence of Transcaucasia by the Diet (April 22), which was to have untied the hands of the Tiflis "government," actually threw it into the toils of the international sharks. How the so-called "peace negotiations" in Batum18 will end, the immediate future will show. One thing is certain: the independence of the Tiflis Mensheviks and their government of the Russian revolution will inevitably turn into their slavish dependence on the Turkish and German "civilized" wolves. It will be an alliance of the Menshevik rulers of Tiflis with the Turkish and German imperialists against the Russian revolution. Menshevik Chkhenkeli in the role of a future Caucasian Golubovich—isn't that truly an edifying picture, Messrs. the Martovs and Dans?

Diet member Karchikyan reports from Tiflis:

> Tiflis is in a state of unrest; the Armenians have resigned from the cabinet, and the workers and peasants are demonstrating in the streets against the government for having proclaimed Transcaucasia independent. Demonstrations are being held in Kutais, Honi, Lechhum, Gori and Dushet demanding a referendum on the question of independence.

All Armenia is protesting against the usurpers of the Tiflis self-styled "government" and demanding the resignation of its deputies from the Diet. And the Moslem centre, Baku, the citadel of Soviet power in Transcaucasia, which has rallied around itself all Eastern Transcaucasia from Lenkoran and Kuba to Yelizavetpol, is affirming with arms in hand the rights of the Transcaucasian peoples, who are striving might and main to preserve their tie with Soviet Russia. We say nothing of heroic Abkhazia,[1] on the Black Sea coast, which has unanimously risen against the

1 The uprising in Abkhazia against the counter-revolutionary Transcaucasian

blackguard bands of the Tiflis "government" and is repelling their assault on Sukhum arms in hand. "All Abkhazia, young and old, has risen against the band of two thousand invaders from the South, and already for eight days has been defending the approaches to Sukhum twenty versts south of the city," we are informed by Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Committee Eshba. Some reports say that the advance of the Transcaucasian detachments is being supported from the sea by a flotilla of armed transports and a group of destroyers. Furthermore, it appears that under the Brest-Litovsk Peace, and according to the Germans' interpretation, not only must we not advance from the sea to protect Sukhum, but we have not even the right to defend ourselves. Such is the real support rendered by the German "peacemakers" to the Transcaucasian aggressors. This being so, it is not difficult to understand that the fate of Sukhum is practically decided in advance. The population of Transcaucasia is opposed to the Tiflis "government." The population of Transcaucasia is opposed to secession from Russia. The workers and peasants of Transcaucasia are in favour of a referendum, notwithstanding the handful of Diet members, because nobody, positively nobody, has authorized the Diet to sever Transcaucasia from Russia.

Such is the picture.

No wonder the more shamefaced of the Mensheviks—Jordania, Tsereteli and even (even!) Gegechkori—have washed their hands of the matter and are leaving the filthy work to the more unscrupulous of the Mensheviks.

We are informed from Tiflis that when Kars was surrendered by the Armenians, the Turkish corps commander at Kars declared that he considered the dispatch of Turkish forces to occupy Baku and save the Moslems in the Baku area inevitable, if the Transcaucasian government itself did not succeed soon in doing so. Parallel with this, "it was given to be understood that this was inevitable in a letter from Wehib Pasha to the Prime Minister of the Transcaucasian government."

Diet broke out in March 1918. The organs of the Transcaucasian Commissariat were abolished and Soviet power was proclaimed. The Mensheviks moved large forces against the insurrectionaries and, in spite of the latter's heroic resistance, they were crushed on May 17, 1918. This was followed by savage reprisals, which were also extended to the civilian population.

We have no documentary verification of these reports, but one thing is certain, namely, that if the Turkish "saviours" do advance on Baku, they will encounter strong resistance from the mass of the population, and from the Moslem workers and peasants in the first place.

Needless to say, the Soviet Government will exert every effort to protect the inalienable rights of the labouring masses of Transcaucasia against the encroachments of the invader.

II. The North Caucasus

In 1917 a handful of retired North Caucasian generals of the type of Filimonov, Karaulov, Chermoyev and Bammatov proclaimed themselves a Federation of Highlanders, named themselves the government of the North Caucasus from the Black Sea to the Caspian, and surreptitiously prepared to take action in conjunction with Kaledin. In November 1917, after the victory of Soviet power in the centre of Russia, this pseudo-government coquetted with the British and French Military Missions, trying to undermine the truce on the RussoGerman Front. In the early part of 1918, after the collapse of the Kaledin adventure, this mysterious "government" disappeared from the political scene and confined itself to organizing bandit attacks on trains and treacherous assaults on civilian inhabitants of towns and villages. By the spring of this year everyone had forgotten it, because genuine Soviets of people's deputies had firmly established themselves in the North Caucasus, in the Kuban and Terek regions, and had rallied around themselves broad sections of all the North Caucasian races and peoples without exception. Kabardinians and Cossacks, Ossetians and Georgians, Russians and Ukrainians rallied in a broad ring around the Terek Soviet; Chechens and Ingushes, Cossacks and Ukrainians, workers and peasants, filled the numerous Soviets of the Kuban region with their representatives. At their congresses, the broad labouring sections of all these races and peoples publicly proclaimed their indissoluble tie with Soviet Russia. All this could not but compel the self-styled "government" of the Chermoyevs and Bammatovs to slink from the political stage. Everybody considered this astonishing "government" dead and buried. True, in March of this year a close friend of the Bammatovs, the so-called Imam of Daghestan, made his existence known by organizing bandit raids on the

railway at Petrovsk and Derbent. But already in mid-April the Imam's adventure was liquidated by Soviet detachments of Baku workers and by the Daghestanians themselves, who drove the Imam and his suite of Russian officers into the Daghestanian mountains.

But imperialism would not be imperialism if it were not able to call up the shades of the dead from the "other world" in furtherance of its own purposes in this world. Only a week ago we were handed an official statement signed by Chermoyev and Bammatov, who have risen from the dead, announcing the formation of an independent (don't laugh!) North Caucasian state stretching from the Black Sea to the Caspian (nothing more, nor less!).

"The Federation of Caucasian Highlanders," the proclamation of this self-styled government reads, "has resolved to: secede from Russia and form an independent state."

> The boundaries of the new state will be: in the North—the geographical borders which the Daghestan, Terek, Stavropol, Kuban and Black Sea regions and provinces possessed in the former Russian Empire; in the West—the Black Sea; in the East—the Caspian Sea; in the South—a border, the details of which will be determined in agreement with the government of Transcaucasia.

Thus, the Transcaucasian "government" is establishing "relations" with the Turkish and German "liberators," and the North Caucasian "government" with the Transcaucasian. It is all perfectly clear. The North Caucasian adventurers, having become disillusioned with the British and French, are now reckoning on the latter's enemies. And since there is no limit to the Turks' and Germans' lust for conquest, it is to be presumed that the possibility is not excluded of an "agreement" between the North Caucasian adventure-seekers and the Turkish and German "liberators."

We have no doubt that the latter will give assurances of their fidelity to the German treaty, of their readiness to maintain friendly relations and so forth. But since it is deeds, not words, that are believed nowadays, and the deeds of these gentry are all too definite, the Soviet Government will have to mobilize all its forces to protect the peoples of the North Caucasus from possible attempts at conquest.

People's Commissar

J. Stalin
Pravda, No. 100,
May 23, 1918

CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN THE CAUCASUS

From the People's Commissariat for the Affairs of Nationalities

A report appeared in the Sunday newspapers stating that Baku and the Apsheron Peninsula had been captured by the British. It reads:

> May 24. The Odessa newspapers report that persons arriving from Baku say that three weeks ago motor-borne British troops entered the city, having penetrated to the Caucasus from Mesopotamia, via Persia. The detachment is a large one and evidently constitutes a vanguard. Some say that the British are establishing contact with Kornilov's detachments. Another newspaper reports that the British have occupied the Apsheron Peninsula and Baku and are advancing from there in the direction of Tiflis, Alexandropol, Sarikamysh, Kars and Erzerum.

The People's Commissariat for the Affairs of Nationalities deems it necessary to state that this provocative report, which moreover comes from the most mysterious sources, has no basis in fact. No British detachments have appeared, or could have appeared, in Baku, if only because the entire Baku Gubernia and all Eastern Transcaucasia are guarded by Soviet troops, who at the first signal are prepared to give battle to any external force, no matter in what guise it may appear. A report from Commissar Extraordinary Shaumyan of May 25 states that "Baku and the Baku area are not menaced at present from any quarter, if we do not count the Tatar landlords, who the other day executed a raid on Ajikabul and were hurled back far to the west by Soviet units"

As to the situation in South Transcaucasia, that area really is menaced; not on the part of the British, however, but on the part of the Turks, who are advancing along the Alexandropol-Djulfa railway towards Tabriz, "in order to repulse the British in North Persia."

Here is what Karchikyan, member of the Transcaucasian Diet, re-

ports in this connection on May 20:

> On May 13, in Batum, Turkey presented a demand insisting that Turkish troops be allowed to advance into Persia by the Alexandropol-Djulfa railway, on the grounds that the British are pressing from the direction of Mosul and the Turks are under the necessity of occupying North Persia without delay. The Turks are backing their demand with force. On the morning of the 15th they began to bombard Alexandropol. Taken by surprise, our troops were unable to check the advance, and surrendered Alexandropol on the 16th. On the 17th, the Turks demanded free passage for their troops to Djulfa, promising not to molest the population. Otherwise, they threatened, they would force their way through. In view of the fact that the Alexandropol retreat had thrown our troops into complete disarray, and that in the event of resistance being offered the whole population of the Surmalinsky and Echmiadzinsky uyezds would be put to a terrible ordeal, we were compelled to agree to the Turks' demand. The inhabitants of the Alexandropol Uyezd have left to a man and have assembled in the Bambak-Lori area. Similarly the inhabitants of the Surmalinsky Uyezd. I have received news today that the inhabitants of the Akhalkalaki Uyezd have also abandoned their homes and are moving in the direction of Tsalka. The delegation in Batum lodged a protest against the ultimatum, but did not make it a casus belli and decided to continue the negotiations.

Reporting these facts, the People's Commissariat for the Affairs of Nationalities feels obliged to state that the purpose of the false reports from Odessa is evidently to vindicate the Turkish incursion, undertaken in defiance of all law with the object of seizing the Persian railway.

Pravda, No. 104,
May 28, 1918

THE DON AND THE NORTH CAUCASUS
(Machinations and the Facts)

At the first meeting of the peace conference in Kiev,[1] the Ukrainian delegation announced that it had statements from the Don, North Caucasian and other "governments," declaring that they had seceded from Russia and had established friendly relations with the Ukrainian-German Government. "We are not opposed to negotiating with representatives of the Soviet Government," Mr. Shelukhin, the Chairman of the Ukrainian delegation, said, "but we should like to know to what regions the authority of the Russian Federation extends, because I have statements from a number of governments (Don, North Caucasian, etc.), declaring that they do not wish to remain parts of Russia."

Far from remonstrating against this move of the Ukrainians, the Turks and Germans, in a number of official statements, support the claims of the abovementioned semi-legal "governments," and seize on them as a formal pretext for the "self-determination" (i.e., seizure) of new territories...

But what are these mysterious "governments"? Where do they come from?

It is strange, in the first place, that the patron of these "governments" and the official sponsor of this whole campaign should be the Ukrainian Hetman Government, which came into being only yesterday by the grace... not of the people at any rate. By what right does the Ukrainian delegation venture to speak in this way to the Soviet power, which was freely chosen by tens of millions of inhabitants of the Russian Federation, and which, moreover, has rallied around itself the broad regional

1 The reference is to the peace conference between representatives of the R.S.F.S.R. and of the Ukrainian Hetman Government which opened in Kiev on May 23, 1918.

Soviets of the Don, Kuban, Black Sea and Terek, which were elected by millions of inhabitants of these regions? In face of this, what weight can the present Ukrainian Government have, which was not only not elected by the people, but is not even backed by a stage-managed Diet elected on a limited suffrage, in the nature, at least, of a Landtag representing the upper classes? Furthermore, it may be taken for granted that if the peace conference were taking place not in Kiev, but somewhere in neutral territory, the recently overthrown Ukrainian Rada would not fail to come forward and declare that a treaty with the Hetman Government cannot be binding on the Ukrainian people, who do not recognize this government. Two questions would then arise: 1) whose credentials in such a case should be recognized as the more valid, those of the Hetman Government, or those of the Ukrainian Rada? and 2) what could the present Ukrainian delegation, which sets such high value on "declarations" of every kind, say in its own vindication?

It is no less strange, in the second place, that Germany, which supports the statement of the Ukrainian delegation and is assiduously coquetting with the adventurist "governments" of the Don and the North Caucasus in the interests of "self-determination," has not a single word to say about the self-determination of Polish Poznan, Danish Schleswig-Holstein, or French AlsaceLorraine. Need it be shown that, in comparison with the mass protests of the Danes, Poles and French in those regions, the adventurist declarations of the hastily concocted "governments" of South Russia whom nobody recognizes lose all weight, all value, and all semblance of decency?

But all this is a "trifle." Let us pass to the main thing.

Well, then, how did these mythical South Russian "governments" originate?

> On October 21, 1917, in Vladikavkaz"—the Don "government" says in its "Note"—"a treaty was signed establishing a new federal state, the South-Eastern Federation, comprising the population of the territories of the Don, Kuban and Astrakhan Cossack troops, the highlanders of the North Caucasus and the Black Sea coast, and the free peoples of South-East Russia."
>
> We find almost the same thing said in a wireless message from the representatives of the North Caucasian "government," Chermoyev and Bammatov, delivered to us on May 16:

> The peoples of the Caucasus lawfully elected a National Assembly, which, meeting in May and September 1917, proclaimed the establishment of a Federation of Caucasian Highlanders." And further: "The Federation of Caucasian Highlanders has resolved to secede from Russia and form an independent state, whose boundaries will be: in the North—the geographical borders which the Daghestan, Terek, Stavropol, Kuban and Black Sea regions and provinces possessed in the former Russian Empire; in the West—the Black Sea; in the East—the Caspian Sea.

It thus appears that on the eve of the victory of the October Revolution, which overthrew the Kerensky Government, groups of adventurers linked with that Government gathered in Vladikavkaz and, without even taking the trouble to ask the consent of the population, proclaimed that they were "authorized" governments, and that the South of Russia had seceded from Russia. Of course, in a free country like Russia no one is debarred from indulging in separatist dreams, and it will be readily admitted that the Soviet power could not, and was not obliged to, rush to follow the adventurist declarations of dreamers who had no link whatever with the peoples of South Russia. We have no doubt that if Germany were to grant the citizens the same liberty as that now enjoyed in Russia, then Poznan, Alsace-Lorraine, Poland, Courland, Estland, etc., would be covered by a network of national governments which would have far weightier grounds for calling themselves governments than the Bogayevskys, Krasnovs, Bammatovs and Chermoyevs who have been expelled by their own peoples and are now in exile...

Such is the story of the origin of the mythical "governments" of South Russia.

The "Note" of the Don "government" and Chermoyev's wireless message refer to the past, to September and October 1917, and to Vladikavkaz, as the refuge of the retired generals. But nearly a year has passed since then. In the interval Don, Kuban-Black Sea and Terek Regional People's Soviets have been formed, which unite around themselves millions of the population: Cossacks and inogorodnie,[2*] Abkhazians and Russians, Chechens and Ingushes, Ossetians and Kabardinians, Georgians and Armenians. The inhabitants of these regions recognized the Soviet power long ago and widely exercise the right to self-determination granted them. As to Vladikavkaz, the former residence of the Karaulovs, Bogayevskys, Chermoyevs and Bammatovs, it has long ago proclaimed

2 The name given by the Cossacks to all those residing in the Cossack regions but not belonging to the Cossack order.—*Tr.*

itself the seat of the Terek People's Soviet. What value, then, can the fossil generals and their adventurist declarations of the summer of 1917 have in face of these generally known facts? In September and October the Kerensky Government still existed in Russia and was fulminating against the Bolshevik Party, which had then been driven underground, but which is now in power. If September and October 1917 are of such sacramental significance to the Ukrainian delegation and the German Government, why do they not invite to the peace conference the remnants of the Kerensky Government, which was then still extant, as they are now inviting the remnants of the "government" of the Chermoyevs and Karaulovs, who were also extant in September and October 1917?

Or again: in what way exactly is September 1917 preferable to April 1918, when the Ukrainian Rada, which was about to send a delegation for negotiations with the Soviet Government, was hurled in one instant into political oblivion "on the basis" of the German "interpretation" of the principle of self-determination of nations?

Or, lastly: why is the declaration of Cossack General Krasnov, who has been expelled by the Cossacks, and who towards the end of 1917 was taken prisoner by the Soviet troops at Gatchina and then released by the Soviet Government on parole—why is his declaration considered "a political act of major importance," while the declaration, for example, of the Crimean Council of People's Commissars, which had rallied around itself hundreds of thousands of Russian and Tatar inhabitants, and which thrice proclaimed by radio the indissolubility of the tie between the Crimea and the Russian Federation, is considered of no political importance?

Why does General Krasnov, who has been expelled by the Cossacks, enjoy the special patronage of the Ukrainian-German rulers, while the members of the Crimean Council of People's Commissars, which was freely elected by the population, have bean savagely shot?

Obviously, the point here is not whether the "declarations" are genuine or not, nor whether these "declarations" are supported by the masses. Nor, still less, is it the interpretation of "self-determination," which is being barbarously defiled and distorted by official bandits. The point simply is that the "declarations" are highly useful to the Ukrainian-German lovers of imperialist machinations, because they are a convenient

camouflage for their efforts to seize and enslave new territories.

It is significant that of a whole series of delegations from the so-called Don government, delegations just as "lawful" as General Krasnov's, the Ukrainian-Germans selected the latter, because none of the others adhered to the German "orientation." Moreover, the fictitiousness and unreality of the Krasnov-Bogayevsky "government" is so obvious, that a number of Ministers appointed by Krasnov (Paramonov, Minister of Education, and Semyonov, Minister of Agriculture) offically declined on the ground that they "had been appointed Ministers by General Krasnov in their absence." But the UkrainianGerman self-determinators are evidently not in the least put out by this, because Krasnov is a very convenient screen for them.

It is no less significant that the so-called SouthEastern Federation, which went to its eternal rest in January, suddenly returned to life in May somewhere in the Ukraine, or even in Constantinople, and, what is more, not all the peoples of the North Caucasus yet know that the "governments" which they had buried long ago continue to "exist" illegally, perhaps in Constantinople, or maybe in Kiev, from where they intend to enact laws for them. The Ukrainian-German selfdeterminators are evidently not put out by this ingenuous machination either, since they can make capital out of it.

Such are the "affairs" of the power-lusting South Russian adventurers, on the one hand, and the political machinators, on the other.

But what is the attitude towards independence of the peoples of South Russia themselves, in whose name Messrs. the self-determinators pretend to be acting?

Let us begin with the Don. Already since February there exists an autonomous Don Soviet Republic, which is uniting around itself the overwhelming majority of the population of the region. It is no secret to anybody that the regional congress held in April and attended by more than 700 delegates, publicly confirmed the indissolubility of the tie with Russia, of which the Don Republic constitutes an autonomous part.

Here is what the Central Executive Committee of the Don Republic had to say of the claims of the newbaked Krasnov-Bogayevsky "government" in its resolution of May 28:

> The Central Executive Committee of the Don Soviet Republic desires to inform the Council of People's Commissars and the peace conference in Kiev that there is no governmental authority in the Don except the Central Executive Committee and its Presidium. Any other persons who have proclaimed or may proclaim themselves the government are state criminals, who will be committed to trial by a people's court for high treason. We have been informed that a delegation has appeared at the peace conference which professes to represent the Don government. We, as the state power, apprise the Council of People's Commissars and the peace conference in Kiev that no delegates who are not furnished with credentials from the Soviet Government of the Don Republic should be allowed to take part in the peace negotiations, and if any such should have appeared, we declare that they are usurpers and impostors, who will be committed to trial as state criminals. The Central Executive Committee insists that this bogus delegation from the 'Don government' be ejected from the peace conference, since it is unlawful and must not be allowed to take part in the peace negotiations.
>
> Chairman, Central Executive Committee, V. Kovalyov
> Secretary, V. Puzhilev
>
> (Adopted May 28) Tsaritsyn.

Let us pass now to the Kuban. Everyone knows that there is a Kuban-Black Sea Autonomous Soviet Republic which unites around itself 90 per cent of the population of all the departments and districts of the region without exception.

Everyone knows that in April of this year a largely attended congress of the Kuban-Black Sea region, in which Chechens and Ingushes took part, and at which Y. Poluyan, a Cossack, presided, solemnly confirmed the indissolubility of the region's tie with Russia, and just as solemnly outlawed all adventure-seekers of the Filimonov and Krasnov type. Incidentally, the fact that tens of thousands of Kubanians are now under arms and staunchly defending Soviet Russia from Sukhum to Bataisk is eloquent testimony enough of the sentiments and sympathies of the Kuban and the Black Sea region. We say nothing of the fleet, whose destruction the benefactors of the Krasnovs and Filimonovs are awaiting so impatiently...

Lastly, the Terek region. It is no secret to anyone that there is a Terek Regional People's Soviet which unites around itself all, or practically all (95 per cent), of the auls, stanitsas, villages and hamlets, to say nothing of the towns. At the first regional congress in January of this year, all the delegates without exception declared themselves in favour of the Soviet power and the indissolubility of the tie with Russia. The second

congress, held in April, which was still broader and more numerously attended than the first, solemnly confirmed the tie with Russia and proclaimed the region an Autonomous Soviet Republic of the Russian Federation. The third regional congress, now in progress, is going a step further and passing from word to deed, calling upon the citizens to take up arms in defence of the Terek, and not only the Terek, against the encroachments of uninvited guests. The so-called Note of the so-called Don government talks a great deal about the "free peoples of the South-East," who, it alleges, are anxious to secede from Russia. Believing that facts are the best refutation of "declarations," we shall let the facts speak for themselves.

Let us first hear the resolution of the Terek People's Soviet:

> The Terek People's Soviet learns from telegraphic dispatches that alleged delegates from the North Caucasus now in Constantinople have proclaimed the independence of the North Caucasus and have notified this to the imperial Turkish Government and other powers.
>
> The Terek People's Soviet, comprising the Chechen, Kabardinian, Ossetian, Ingush, Cossack and inogorodnie groups, affirms that the peoples of the Terek region have never delegated anyone anywhere for the above-mentioned purpose, and that if any individuals now in Constantinople pretend to be delegates of the peoples of the Terek region and act in the name of these peoples, they are nothing but impostors and adventurers.
>
> The Terek People's Soviet expresses its astonishment at the political shortsightedness and naïveté of the Turkish Government in allowing itself to be imposed upon by swindlers.
>
> The Terek People's Soviet, comprising the above-mentioned groups, declares that the peoples of the Terek region constitute an inalienable part of the Russian Federative Republic.
>
> The Terek People's Soviet protests against the action of the Transcaucasian government in associating the North Caucasus with the proclamation of independence of Transcaucasia (see *Narodnaya Vlast*, organ of the Terek People's Soviet).
>
> (Resolution adopted unanimously. May 9.)

And now let the Chechens and Ingushes, who are being calumniated by the usurpers and their patrons, have their say. Here is a resolution of their group, representing all, or nearly all, the Ingushes and Chechens:

> This special meeting of the Chechen-Ingush group of the Terek People's Soviet, having considered the report that the North Caucasus has been proclaimed independent, unanimously adopts the following resolution: Declaration of the independence of the North Caucasus is an act of extreme importance which can be made only with the knowledge and consent of the entire population concerned.

> The Chechen-Ingush group affirms that the Chechen-Ingush people have not sent any delegates to conduct negotiations of any kind with the Ottoman delegation in Trapezund or with the Ottoman Government in Constantinople, and that the question of independence was never discussed in any body or assembly expressing the will of the Chechen-Ingush people.
>
> Consequently, the Chechen-Ingush group regards the persons who have the impudence to speak in the name of the people, who did not elect them, as impostors and enemies of the people.
>
> The Chechen-Ingush group declares that the only salvation for all the North Caucasian highlanders and for the liberties won by the revolution lies in close unity with the Russian revolutionary democracy.
>
> This is dictated not only by their innate love of liberty, but also by those economic relations which in the last decades have closely cemented the North Caucasus and Central Russia into one inseparable whole.
>
> (Adopted May 9. See *Narodnaya Vlast*, organ of the Terek People's Soviet.)

And here is an excerpt from a fiery speech delivered by Comrade Sheripov, a representative of the Ingushes and Chechens, at the meeting of the Terek People's Soviet, an excerpt explicit enough to put a stop to all insinuations against the Daghestanians:

> Thanks to the great Russian revolution, we have received that fair and lovely liberty for which our ancestors fought for centuries and, vanquished, threw themselves on the bayonet's point. Now that we have received a guarantee of the right to self-determination, the people will never surrender this right to anyone. Today we hear talk of the independence of the North Caucasus coming from the lips of landlords, princes, provocateurs and spies and all against whom Shamiel waged a mortal struggle for fifty years. Attempts are being made by these enemies of the people to declare the independence of the Caucasus and proclaim it an Imamate. But let me tell you that Shamiel cut off the heads of the ancestors of these princes, and that is how he would act now. Our group, which represents the Ingush and Chechen people, expressed its opinion on the declaration of independence of the North Caucasus in the resolution it adopted at its special sitting. (See above. Reproduced from *Narodnaya Vlast*.)

Such are the facts.

Is all this known to the German-Ukrainian-Turkish self-determinators? Of course! Because the regional Soviets of South Russia act quite openly, in the eyes of all, and the agents of these gentry read our newspapers attentively enough not to miss generally known facts.

What, then, is the purpose of the above-mentioned statement of the Ukrainian delegation concerning the mythical "governments," a statement which the Germans and Turks are supporting by word and deed?

Only one, namely: to use these bogus "governments" as a screen for the seizure and enslavement of new territories. The Germans used the Ukrainian Rada as a camouflage when they advanced "on the basis of the Brest treaty" (oh, of course!) and occupied the Ukraine. But now, apparently, the Ukraine can no longer serve as a screen and camouflage, yet the Germans need to make another advance. Hence the demand for a new camouflage, a new screen. And since demand creates supply, the Krasnovs and Bogayevskys, the Chermoyevs and Bammatovs were not slow in coming forward and offering their services. And it is not at all improbable that in the near future the Krasnovs and Bogayevskys, directed and supplied by the Germans, will advance against Russia, for the "liberation" of the Don, while the Germans once again vow and swear their fidelity to the Brest treaty. The same must be said of the Kuban, Terek, etc.

That is the whole point!

The Soviet Government would be burying itself alive if it did not muster every ounce of its strength to resist the invaders and enslavers.

And that is what it will do.

People's Commissar
J. Stalin
Pravda, No. 108,
June 1, 1918

TELEGRAM TO V. I. LENIN

Arrived in Tsaritsyn on the 6th.[1] Despite the confusion in every sphere of economic life, order can be established.

In Tsaritsyn, Astrakhan and Saratov the grain monopoly and fixed prices were abolished by the Soviets, and there is chaos and profiteering. Have secured the introduction of rationing and fixed prices in Tsaritsyn. The same must be done in Astrakhan and Saratov, otherwise all grain will flow away through these profiteering channels. Let the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars also demand that these Soviets put a stop to profiteering.

Rail transport is completely dislocated owing to the efforts of the multiplicity of collegiums and revolutionary committees. I have been obliged to appoint special commissars; they are already establishing order despite the protests of the collegiums. The commissars are discovering heaps of locomotives in places where the collegiums did not suspect their existence. Investigation has shown that eight or more through trains a day can be sent by the Tsaritsyn-Povorino-Balashov-Kozlov-Ryazan-Moscow line. Am now accumulating trains in Tsaritsyn. Within a week we shall proclaim a "Grain Week" and shall dispatch to Moscow right away about one million poods with a special escort of railwaymen,

1 On May 29, 1918, the Council of People's Commissars appointed J. V. Stalin General Director of Food Affairs in South Russia. His mandate read:

> People's Commissar Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, Member of the Council of People's Commissars, has been appointed by the Council of People's Commissars General Director of Food Affairs in South Russia and is vested with extraordinary powers. Local and regional Councils of People's Commissars, Soviets, Revolutionary Committees, military staffs and chiefs of detachments, railway organizations and station masters, organizations of the river and maritime merchant fleet, post and telegraph, and food organizations, and all commissars and emissaries are hereby ordered to carry out the instructions of Comrade Stalin.
>
> Chairman, Council of People's Commissars
> *V. Ulyanov (Lenin)*

of which I shall give you due notice.

The hold-up in river transport is due to the fact that Nizhni-Novgorod has not been sending steamers, presumably because of the Czechoslovaks. Give orders that steamers be sent to Tsaritsyn immediately.

We have information that in the Kuban, in Stavropol, there are fully reliable purchasing agents who are busy getting out the grain from the South. A line is already being laid from Kizlyar to the sea; the Hasav YurtPetrovsk line has not yet been restored. Let us have Shlyapnikov, civil engineers, intelligent workmen, also locomotive crews.

Have sent a messenger to Baku, and shall be leaving for the South myself in a day or two. Chief Trade Agent Zaitsev will be arrested today for bag-trading and speculating in government goods. Tell Schmidt not to send any more scoundrels. Let Kobozev see to it that the five-man collegium in Voronezh[222] in its own interests does not create difficulties for my agents.

It is reported that Bataisk has been captured by the Germans.

People's Commissar
Stalin
Tsaritsyn,
June 7, 1918
First published in 1936,
in the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolutsia*, No. 7

2 The five-man collegium was the administrative and technical directing body of the Board of the Moscow-Kiev-Voronezh and other railways with head offices in Voronezh.

LETTER TO V. I. LENIN

To Comrade Lenin.

I am hurrying to the front, and writing only on business.

1) The railway south of Tsaritsyn has not yet been restored. I am firing or telling off all who deserve it, and I hope we shall have it restored soon. You may rest assured that we shall spare nobody, neither ourselves nor others, and shall deliver the grain in spite of everything. If our military "experts" (bunglers!) had not been asleep or loafing about the line would not have been cut, and if the line is restored it will not be thanks to, but in spite of, the military.

2) Large quantities of grain have accumulated on rail south of Tsaritsyn. As soon as the line is cleared we shall be sending you grain by through trains.

3) I Have received your communication.[1] Everything will be done to forestall possible surprises. You may rest assured that our hand will not flinch...

4) I have sent a letter by messenger to Baku.[2]

5) Things in Turkestan are bad; Britain is operating through Afghanistan. Give somebody (or me) special authority (military) to take urgent measures in South Russia before it is too late.

Because of the bad communications between the border regions

1 On the night of July 6, 1918, V. I. Lenin informed J. V. Stalin of the revolt of the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries in Moscow. V. I. Lenin's note, which was received in Tsaritsyn over the direct wire by J. V. Stalin personally, stated: "These wretched hysterical adventurers, who have become a tool of the counter-revolutionaries, must be ruthlessly suppressed everywhere... Therefore, show no mercy to the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, and keep us regularly informed..." (*Pravda*, No. 21, January 21, 1936).

2 For this letter, which was addressed to S. G. Shaumyan, Chairman of the Baku Council of People's Commissars, see *Documents on the History of the Civil War in the U.S.S.R.*, Vol. I, 1940, p. 289.

and the centre someone with broad powers is needed here on the spot so that urgent measures can be taken promptly. If you appoint someone (whoever it is) for this purpose, let us know by direct wire, and send his credentials also by direct wire, otherwise we risk having another Murmansk.[3]

I send you a telegraphic tape on Turkestan.

That is all for the present.

Yours,

Stalin
Tsaritsyn,
July 7, 1918
Published, in part,
in *Pravda*, No. 301,
December 21, 1929

3 The reference is to the occupation of Murmansk by British troops in 1918.



LETTER TO V. I. LENIN

Comrade Lenin,

Just a few words.

1) If Trotsky is going to hand out credentials right and left without thinking—to Trifonov (Don region), to Avtonomov (Kuban region), to Koppe (Stavropol), to members of the French Mission (who deserve to be arrested), etc.—it may be safely said that within a month everything here in the North Caucasus will go to pieces, and we shall lose this region altogether. Trotsky is behaving in the way Antonov did at one time. Knock it into his head that he must make no appointments without the knowledge of the local people, otherwise the result will be to discredit the Soviet power.

2) If you don't let us have aeroplanes and airmen, armoured cars and 6-inch guns, the Tsaritsyn Front cannot hold out and the railway will be lost for a long time.

3) There is plenty of grain in the South, but to get it we need a smoothly-working machine which does not meet with obstacles from troop trains, army commanders and so on. More, the military must assist the food agents. The food question is naturally bound up with the military question. For the good of the work, I need military powers. I have already written about this, but have had no reply. Very well, in that case I shall myself, without any formalities, dismiss army commanders and commissars who are ruining the work. The interests of the work dictate this, and, of course, not having a paper from Trotsky is not going to deter me.

J. Stalin
Tsaritsyn,
July 10, 1918



LETTER TO V. I. LENIN

The situation in the South is no easy one. The Military Council inherited a state of utter disruption, caused partly by the inertness of the former commander, and partly by a conspiracy on the part of persons appointed by him to the various divisions of the Military Area. Everything had to be started afresh: we got the supply services properly organized, instituted an operations division, established contact with all sectors of the front, rescinded the old and, in my opinion, criminal orders, and only after this launched an offensive on Kalach and southward towards Tikhoretskaya. We launched the offensive in the hope that Mironov's and Kikvidze's sectors in the North, including the Povorino sector, were securely guaranteed against defeat. But it turned out that these sectors were the weakest and the least secure. You know of the retreat of Mironov and the others to the North-East, of the capture of the whole railway line from Lipki to Alexikovo by the Cossacks, and of the dispatch of Cossack guerilla groups to the Volga and their attempts to cut communication along the Volga between Kamyshin and Tsaritsyn.

Furthermore, the Rostov Front and Kalnin's groups generally lost their stamina owing to lack of shells and cartridges and have surrendered Tikhoretskaya and Torgovaya, and are apparently in process of complete disintegration (I say "apparently," because we have still been unable to receive accurate information about the Kalnin group).

I say nothing about the critical position of Kizlyar, Bryanskoye and Baku. The pro-British orientation is definitely discredited, but the situation on that front is anything but favourable. Kizlyar, Prokhladnaya, Novo-Georgievskoye and Stavropol are in the hands of Cossack insurgents. Only Bryanskoye, Petrovsk, Mineralniye Vody, Vladikavkaz, Pyatigorsk and, I believe, Yekaterinodar are still holding out.

Thus, a situation has been created in which communications with the food areas of the South have been severed, and the Tsaritsyn area it-

self, which connects the centre with the North Caucasus, has in its turn been cut off, or practically cut off, from the centre.

It was in view of this that we decided to call off the offensive in the direction of Tikhoretskaya, to take up a defensive position, withdraw the combat units from the Tsaritsyn Front and from them form a northern striking force of about six thousand men, and direct them along the left bank of the Don as far as the Khoper River. The aim of this move is to clear the TsaritsynPovorino line, turn the enemy's flank, disorganize him and hurl him back. We have every reason to believe that we shall be able to execute this plan in the very near future.

The unfavourable situation described above is to be attributed:

1) To the fact that the front-line soldier, the "competent muzhik," who in October fought for the Soviet power, has now turned against it (he heartily detests the grain monopoly, the fixed prices, the requisitions and the measures against bag-trading).

2) To the Cossack make-up of Mironov's troops (the Cossack units which call themselves Soviet are unable and unwilling to wage a resolute fight against the Cossack counter-revolutionaries; the Cossacks came over in whole regiments to Mironov in order to receive weapons, acquaint themselves with the disposition of our forces on the spot, and then desert to Krasnov, carrying whole regiments along with them; the Cossacks surrounded Mironov three times, because they knew every inch of his sector, and, of course, utterly routed him).

3) To the fact that Kikvidze's units are built on the detachment principle, which makes liaison and coordinated action impossible.

4) To the isolation, because of all these reasons, of Sievers' forces, which have lost their support on the left flank.

One favourable factor on the Tsaritsyn-Gashun Front is the complete elimination of the muddle due to the detachment principle, and the timely removal of the socalled experts (staunch supporters either of the Cossacks or of the British and French), which has made it possible to win the sympathy of the military units and establish iron discipline in them.

Now that communications with the North Caucasus have been cut, the position as regards food has become hopeless. Over seven hundred wagon-loads are standing on rail in the North Caucasus, and over a million and a half poods are ready for dispatch, but it is quite impossible to get the freight out because of the interruption of communications both by rail and by sea (Kizlyar and Bryanskoye are no longer in our hands). There is quite a lot of grain in the Tsaritsyn, Kotelnikovo and Gashun districts, but it has to be harvested, and Chokprod[1] is not adapted for this work, and has been unable to adapt itself to this day. The crop must be gathered and hay must be pressed and accumulated in one spot, but Chokprod has no presses. The grain harvest must be organized on a large scale, but Chokprod's organizers are utterly incompetent. The result is that food deliveries are in a bad way.

With the capture of Kalach we secured several tens of thousands of poods of grain. I have sent twelve lorries to Kalach, and as soon as we can get it to the railway I shall send it to Moscow. Good or bad, harvesting is proceeding. I hope to secure several tens of thousands of poods of grain in the next few days and send it to you also. We have more cattle here than we need, but there is very little hay, and without hay dispatch of cattle in large quantities is impossible. It would be well to organize at least one canning factory, establish a slaughter-house, etc. But, unfortunately, so far I have been unable to find men of knowledge and initiative. I ordered the Kotelnikovo agent to arrange for the salting of meat on a large scale; the work has begun and there are already results, and if the business develops there will be enough meat for the winter (40,000 head of cattle have accumulated in the Kotelnikovo district alone). There is no less cattle in Astrakhan than in Kotelnikovo, but the local food commissariat is doing nothing. The representatives of the Perishable Foods Procurements Board are fast asleep, and it may be confidently prophesied that they will procure no meat. I have sent an agent named Zalmayev there to procure meat and fish, but I have had no word from him yet.

The Saratov and Samara gubernias are far more promising as far as food is concerned: there is plenty of grain there, and I believe Yakubov's expedition will be able to get out half a million poods or even more.

In general, it should be said that until communications with the

1 Chokprod—Extraordinary Regional Food Committee in South Russia.

North Caucasus are restored, we cannot count (very much) on the Tsaritsyn area (as far as food is concerned).

Yours,
J. Stalin
Tsaritsyn,
August 4, 1918
First published in 1931,
in *Lenin Miscellany*, XVIII



LETTER TO V. I. LENIN[1]

Dear Comrade Lenin,

The fight is on for the South and the Caspian. In order to keep all this area (and we CAN keep it!) we need several light destroyers and a couple of submarines (ask Artyom about the details). I implore you, break down all obstacles and so facilitate the immediate delivery of what we request. Baku, Turkestan and the North Caucasus will be ours (unquestionably!), if our demands are immediately met.

Things at the front are going well. I have no doubt that they will go even better (the Cossacks are becoming completely demoralized).

Warmest greetings, my dear and beloved Ilyich.

Yours,

J. Stalin
August 31, 1918
First published in 1938,
in the magazine *Bolshevik*,
No. 2

1 On receiving J. V. Stalin's letter, V. I. Lenin deleted the superscription and subscription and sent it to Petrograd as his personal directive.



TELEGRAM TO SVERDLOV, CHAIRMAN OF THE ALL-RUSSIAN CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Having learned of the villainous attempt of the hirelings of the bourgeoisie on the life of Comrade Lenin, the world's greatest revolutionary and the tried and tested leader and teacher of the proletariat, the Military Council of the North Caucasian Military Area is answering this vile attempt at assassination by instituting open and systematic mass terror against the bourgeoisie and its agents.

Stalin
Voroshilov
Tsaritsyn,
August 31, 1918
Soldat Revolutsii (Tsaritsyn),
No. 21, September 1, 1918

TELEGRAM TO THE COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS

The offensive of the Soviet troops of the Tsaritsyn area has been crowned with success: Ilovlya Station has been captured in the North, Kalach, Lyapichev and the Don bridge in the West, and Lashki, Nemkovsky and Demkin in the South. The enemy has been utterly routed and hurled back across the Don. Tsaritsyn is secure. The offensive continues.

People's Commissar
Stalin
Tsaritsyn,
September 6, 1918
Published in 1939,
in the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolutsia*, No. 1



TELEGRAM TO VOROSHILOV, COMMANDER OF THE FRONT, TSARITSYN

Convey our fraternal greetings to the heroic flotilla crews and all the revolutionary troops on the Tsaritsyn Front, who are selflessly fighting to establish firmly the power of the workers and peasants. Tell them that Soviet Russia notes with admiration the heroic exploits of Kharchenko's and Kolpakov's communist and revolutionary regiments, Bulatkin's cavalry, Alyabyev's armoured trains and the Volga naval flotilla.

Hold high your Red banners, carry them forward fearlessly, mercilessly root out the counter-revolution of the landlords, generals and kulaks, and show the whole world that Socialist Russia is invincible.

Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars
V. Ulyanov-Lenin

People's Commissar and Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front
J. Stalin

Moscow,
September 19, 1918
Izvestia, No. 205,
September 21, 1918



THE SOUTHERN FRONT
Izvestia Interview

Before returning to the Southern Front, People's Commissar for the Affairs of Nationalities Comrade Stalin gave our correspondent his impressions of the situation on the Tsaritsyn Front.

First of all, Comrade Stalin said, two gratifying facts should be noted: one is the promotion to administrative posts in the rear area of working men with an ability not only for agitating in favour of Soviet power, but also for building the state on a new, communist basis; the second is the appearance of a new corps of commanders consisting of officers promoted from the ranks who have had practical experience in the imperialist war, and who enjoy the full confidence of the Red Army men.

Mobilization is proceeding splendidly, thanks to the radical change of sentiment among the population, who have realized the necessity of taking up arms against the counter-revolutionary bands.

Firm discipline prevails in all our units. Relations between Red Army men and commanders leave nothing to be desired.

What about the food problem in the army?

Strictly speaking, we have no such problem in the army. Thanks to a well-organized system of supply bases, established by the battle sectors themselves, the front is experiencing no shortage of food. The daily ration of a Red Army man today consists of two pounds of bread, and meat, potatoes and cabbage.

The food supply at the front is entirely in the hands of the Army Food Commission of the Supreme Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic. It is this Commission that has organized the proper supply of the units at the front.

Agitation at the front, Comrade Stalin said, is carried on through

the newspapers Soldat Revoluztsii[1] and Borba,[2] and through pamphlets, leaflets, etc. The troops are cheerful and confident.

A big defect in the equipment of our army is the lack of a standard uniform for the soldiers. It would be desirable to design a new uniform as quickly as possible and introduce it at the front at once.

The recent decree of the Central Executive Committee introducing incentives for heroic action on the part of individual Red Army men and whole units, in the shape of special insignia for the former and standards for the latter, is a measure of great importance, said Comrade Stalin.

Even before the issue of this decree, he said, units which had been awarded revolutionary standards then fought like lions.

As to the state of the enemy units opposing us, ninety percent of their effectives consist of so-called inogorodnie, most of them Ukrainians, and volunteer officers. The Cossacks constitute no more than ten percent. The enemy has the advantage of possessing a mobile cavalry, which with us is still in embryo.

I want to remark in conclusion, Comrade Stalin said, that whereas our combat units are being welded and cemented, the enemy is undergoing complete disintegration.

Izvestia, No. 205,
September 21, 1918

1 *Soldat Revolutsii* (*Soldier of the Revolution*)—army newspaper of the Tsaritsyn Front, started on J. V. Stalin's initiative. From August 7, 1918, it appeared as the organ of the Military Council of the North Caucasian Military Area, from September 26 (No. 42) as the organ of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front, and from October 29 (No. 69) until it ceased publication, as the organ of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Tenth Army.

2 *Borba* (*Struggle*) began publication in May 1917 as the organ of the Tsaritsyn Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), and towards the end of 1917 became the organ of the Tsaritsyn Soviet of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants' and Cossacks' Deputies. It continued publication until March 1933.

THE LOGIC OF FACTS
(In Reference to the "Theses" of the Central Committee of the Mensheviks)

We have received a document entitled "Theses and Resolution of the Central Committee" of the Menshevik Party (October 17-21, 1918). This document sums up the activities of the Soviet Government since October 1917 and formulates certain future prospects which are apparently of great moment for the development of the Menshevik Party. But the most valuable thing in the document is the conclusions it draws, for they refute the whole practical activity of the Mensheviks in the year of revolution. We consider it necessary here and now to give the reader certain of our impressions, postponing an analysis of the "Theses and Resolution" to another occasion.

I. The October Revolution

Exactly a year ago, the country was languishing in the throes of imperialist war and economic disruption. The armies at the front, weary and exhausted by suffering, were no longer capable of fighting. Meanwhile, the British imperialists (Buchanan!) were more and more getting the country into their toils and trying in every way to keep it in the imperialist war. Riga had been surrendered[130] and preparations were being made to surrender St. Petersburg too, merely in order to prove the necessity of the war and of a military dictatorship. The bourgeoisie realized all this, and were openly working for a military dictatorship and the crushing of the revolution.

What were the Bolsheviks doing at that time?

The Bolsheviks were preparing for revolution. They considered that

1 Riga was surrendered to the Germans by General Kornilov on August 21, 1917.

the only way out of the blind alley of war and economic disruption was for the proletariat to take power. They considered that without such a revolution, a break with imperialism and the deliverance of Russia from its clutches was inconceivable. They convened a Congress of Soviets, as the sole heir to power in the country.

First revolution, then peace!

What were the Mensheviks doing at that time?

They stigmatized the Bolsheviks' "undertaking" as "counter-revolutionary adventurism." They considered the Congress of Soviets unnecessary and tried to prevent its convocation, and dubbed the Soviets themselves "antiquated huts" which were doomed to be broken up. Instead of these Soviet "huts," they proposed a "permanent building" of the "European" type—the Pre-parliament,[231] where they, in conjunction with Milyukov, elaborated plans for "radical agrarian and economic reforms." Instead of a break with imperialism, they proposed an Allied conference in Paris as a possible way out of the war. To them, a "consistent peace policy" meant the attendance of Menshevik Skobelev at this conference and the dubious efforts of Menshevik Axelrod to convene a congress of the Scheidemanns, Renaudels and Hyndmans.

Since then a year has passed. The "Bolshevik revolution" has succeeded in sweeping away the crafty machinery of the home and foreign imperialists. For Russia, the old imperialist war has become a memory. She has thrown off the yoke of imperialism. She is conducting, and hopes to continue conducting, an independent foreign policy. It is now clear to all that, without the October Revolution, Russia would not have extricated herself from the blind alley of imperialist war, the peasants would not have received land, and the workers would not be managing the mills and factories.

What do the Mensheviks, their Central Committee, say now? Listen to them:

---

2 The Pre-parliament, or Provisional Council of the Republic, was a consultative organ of the bourgeois Provisional Government formed from members of the Democratic Conference held in Petrograd, September 14-22, 1917. It was created by the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks with the idea of stopping the spread of the revolution and switching the country from the path of Soviet revolution to bourgeois parliamentarism.

> The Bolshevik revolution of October 1917 was a historical necessity, since, by breaking the links between the labouring masses and the capitalist classes, it expressed the desire of the labouring masses to subordinate the trend of the revolution wholly to their own interests, without which the deliverance of Russia from the clutches of Allied imperialism, the pursuance of a consistent peace policy, the introduction of radical agrarian reform, and the regulation by the state of the entire economic life in the interests of the masses would have been inconceivable, and since this stage of the revolution has had the tendency to enlarge also the scope of the influence which the Russian revolution had on the course of world developments (see "Theses and Resolution").

That is what the Menshevik Central Committee says now.

Incredible, but a fact. The "Bolshevik revolution was," it appears, "a historical necessity," "without which the deliverance of Russia from the clutches of Allied imperialism," the "pursuance of a consistent peace policy," the "introduction of radical agrarian reform" and the "regulation by the state of the entire economic life in the interests of the masses" "would have been inconceivable."

But that is just what the Bolsheviks affirmed a year ago, and what the Menshevik Central Committee opposed so fiercely!

Yes, just that.

Life, you see, teaches and corrects the most incorrigible. It is all-powerful and gets its way in spite of everything...

II. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat

Some ten months ago the Constituent Assembly was about to meet, and the utterly routed bourgeois counterrevolutionaries were again mustering their forces and rubbing their hands in glee in anticipation of the "downfall" of Soviet power. The foreign imperialist (Allied) press hailed the Constituent Assembly. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries were arranging "private" conferences and elaborating a plan for the transfer of power from the Soviets to the Constituent Assembly, the "master of the land of Russia." Regeneration of the "honest coalition" and correction of the Bolsheviks' "blunders" loomed in the offing.

What were the Bolsheviks doing at that time?

They were continuing the work already begun of establishing the power of the proletariat. They considered that the "honest coalition"

and its organ, the bourgeois-democratic Constituent Assembly, were doomed by history, because they were aware that a new force had appeared on the scene—the power of the proletariat, and a new form of government—the Republic of Soviets. In the early part of 1917 the slogan of a Constituent Assembly was a progressive one, and the Bolsheviks supported it. At the end of 1917, after the October Revolution, the slogan of a Constituent Assembly became reactionary, because it ceased to correspond to the altered relative strength of the contending political forces in the country. The Bolsheviks considered that in the circumstances of the imperialist war in Europe and the victorious proletarian revolution in Russia, only two kinds of power were conceivable: either a dictatorship of the proletariat, in the shape of a Republic of Soviets, or a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, in the shape of a military dictatorship—and that any attempt to steer a middle course and resurrect the Constituent Assembly would inevitably lead to a return to the old, reactionary regime, the liquidation of the October conquests. The Bolsheviks had no doubt that bourgeois parliamentarism and a bourgeois-democratic republic represented a past stage of the revolution...

Since then ten months have elapsed. The Constituent Assembly, which attempted to put an end to Soviet power, was dissolved. The peasants in the country did not even notice its dissolution, while the workers acclaimed it with jubilation. One section of supporters of the Constituent Assembly went to the Ukraine and called in the aid of the German imperialists against the Soviets. Another section of supporters of the Constituent Assembly went to the Caucasus and found consolation in the arms of the Turkish and German imperialists. Still another section of supporters of the Constituent Assembly went to Samara and, in conjunction with the British and French imperialists, waged war on the workers and peasants of Russia. The slogan of a Constituent Assembly was thus turned into a bait for political simpletons and a screen for the fight of the home and foreign counterrevolutionaries against the Soviets.

How did the Mensheviks behave at that time?

They fought the Soviet power and consistently supported the now counter-revolutionary slogan of a Constituent Assembly.

What do the Mensheviks, their Central Committee, say now? Listen to them:

It:

> rejects all political collaboration with classes hostile to the democracy, and refuses to have any part in government combinations, even though hidden behind a democratic flag, that are based upon 'countrywide' coalitions of the democracy and the capitalist bourgeoisie or upon dependence on foreign imperialism and militarism (see the "Theses").

And further:

> All attempts by the revolutionary democracy, with the backing of the urban non-proletarian masses and the labouring masses of the countryside, to re-establish a democratic republic by means of an armed struggle against the Soviet Government and the masses which support it, have been and are being accompanied, owing to the character of the international situation and the political immaturity of the Russian democratic petty bourgeoisie, by such a re-grouping of social forces as tends to undermine the very revolutionary significance itself of the struggle for the re-establishment of a democratic system, and involves a direct threat to the fundamental socialist gains of the revolution. The desire for agreement with the capitalist classes at all costs and for the utilization of foreign weapons in the struggle for power deprives the policy of the revolutionary democracy of all independence and converts it into a tool of these classes and imperialist coalitions (see "Theses and Resolution").

In a word, coalition is "rejected" emphatically and unreservedly, and the fight for a democratic republic and a Constituent Assembly is recognized as counterrevolutionary, since it "involves a direct threat to the fundamental socialist gains of the revolution."

There can be only one conclusion: Soviet power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, is the only conceivable revolutionary power in Russia.

But that is just what the Bolsheviks have been affirming all along, and what the Mensheviks were only yesterday opposing!

Yes, just that.

The logic of facts, you see, is stronger than all other logic, the Menshevik not excluded...

III. Petty-Bourgeois Muddle

And so: it is a fact that after a year of fighting against Bolshevik "adventurism," the Menshevik Central Committee is forced to admit that the "Bolshevik revolution" of October 1917 was a "historical necessity."

It is a fact that after a long fight for a Constituent Assembly and

an "honest coalition," the Menshevik Central Committee, although unwillingly and reluctantly, is forced to recognize as unsuitable a "country-wide" coalition and as counter-revolutionary the struggle for the "re-establishment of the democratic system" and the Constituent Assembly.

True, this recognition comes a year late, after the counter-revolutionary character of the Constituent Assembly slogan and the historical necessity of the October Revolution have become commonplace truths—a tardiness utterly unbefitting the Menshevik Central Committee, which lays claim to a leading role in the revolution. But such is the fate of the Mensheviks: this is not the first time they are lagging behind events, and not the last time, we presume, that they are parading in old Bolshevik breeches...

It might be thought that after such an admission on the part of the Menshevik Central Committee, there should be no more room for serious differences. Nor would there be, if we were dealing not with the Menshevik Central Committee, but with consistent revolutionaries capable of thinking things out to their conclusion and knowing what follows from what. But the whole trouble is that we are dealing here with a party of pettybourgeois intellectuals who are forever vacillating between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between revolution and counter-revolution. Hence the inevitable contradictions between the word and the deed, the perpetual uncertainty and mental waverings.

Just listen to this! The Menshevik Central Committee, you see:

> Continues to regard popular rule, unlimited democracy, as the political form in which alone the social emancipation of the proletariat can be worked for and realized. It looks upon a democratic republic, organized by a freely-elected and sovereign Constituent Assembly, and upon universal and equal suffrage, etc., not only as a means of politically educating the masses and uniting the proletariat as a class in support of its own interests, a means for which no substitute has been found, but also as the only soil on which a socialist proletariat can carry on its work of social creation (see "Theses and Resolution").

Incredible, but a fact. On the one hand, a "struggle for the re-establishment of a democratic system," it appears, "involves" a "direct threat to the fundamental socialist gains of the revolution," in view of which it is proclaimed counter-revolutionary; on the other, the Menshevik Central Committee "continues" to declare itself for the already buried "sovereign Constituent Assembly"! Or perhaps the Menshevik Central

Committee thinks that a Constituent Assembly can be achieved without an "armed struggle"? But in that case, what about the "historical necessity of the Bolshevik revolution," which discarded the "sovereign Constituent Assembly"?

Or further. The Menshevik Central Committee demands nothing more nor less than: "The abolition of extraordinary agencies of police repression and extraordinary tribunals," and "the cessation of political and economic terror" (see "Theses and Resolution").

On the one hand, it recognizes the "historical necessity" of the dictatorship of the proletariat, whose function it is to suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie, and, on the other, it demands the abolition of certain very important instruments of power without which this suppression is inconceivable! But in that case, what about the gains of the October Revolution, which the bourgeoisie is combating by every means, including the organization of terrorist actions and criminal conspiracies? How can one recognize the October Revolution as a "historical necessity," without recognizing the results and consequences that inevitably follow from it?!

Will the Menshevik Central Committee ever extricate itself from this involved petty-bourgeois muddle?

IV. What Next?

Incidentally, it does try to extricate itself from it. Listen to this:

Standing for the re-establishment of a united and independent Russia on the basis of the gains of the revolution won by the efforts of the democracy itself, and repudiating, therefore, all interference on the part of foreign capitalists in Russia's domestic affairs," the Menshevik Party:

> is in political solidarity with the Soviet Government, inasmuch as the latter stands for the liberation of the territory of Russia from occupation, in particular foreign occupation, and opposes these attempts of the non-proletarian democracy to extend or preserve the area of occupation. But this political solidarity in the matter of imperialist intervention could lead to direct support of the military actions of the Soviet Government for the liberation of the occupied territories of Russia only if this Government were to display a real readiness to build its relations with the non-Bolshevik democracy in the border regions on a basis of mutual agreement, and not of suppression and terror (see "Theses and Resolution").

Thus, instead of fighting the Soviet power—"agreement" with it.

"Political solidarity with the Soviet Government." We do not know how complete this solidarity is, but need it be said that the Bolsheviks will not object to the solidarity of the Menshevik Central Committee with the Soviet power? We are fully alive to the difference between solidarity with the Soviet Government and solidarity, say, with the "Constituent Assembly" members in Samara.

"Direct support of the military actions of the Soviet Government." We do not know how many troops the Menshevik Central Committee could place at the disposal of the Soviet power, what military forces it could contribute to the Soviet army. But need it be said that the Bolsheviks would only welcome military support of the Soviet power? We are fully alive to the profundity of the difference between military support of the Soviet Government and participation of the Mensheviks, say, in the "Defence Conference"[3] during the imperialist war under Kerensky.

All that is so. But experience has taught us not to take people at their word; we are accustomed to judge parties and groups not only by their resolutions, but, and chiefly, by their deeds.

And what are the deeds of the Mensheviks?

The Mensheviks in the Ukraine have to this day not broken with Skoropadsky's counter-revolutionary government and are fighting the Soviet elements in the Ukraine with every means in their power, thus supporting the rule of the home and foreign imperialists in the South.

The Mensheviks in the Caucasus long ago formed an alliance with the landlords and capitalists, proclaimed sacred war on the supporters of the October Revolution, and called in the aid of the German imperialists.

The Mensheviks in the Urals and Siberia have made common cause with the British and French imperialists and have given, and are continuing to give, practical help in abolishing the gains of the October Revolution.

---

3 The "Defence Conference" was convened in Petrograd on August 7, 1917, by the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik Central Executive Committee of the Soviets with a view to mobilizing the forces and resources of the population for the continuation of the imperialist war.

The Mensheviks in Krasnovodsk have opened the gate of the Transcaspian area to the British imperialists, helping them to suppress Soviet power in Turkestan.

Lastly, a section of the Mensheviks in European Russia preaches the necessity of "active" "struggle" against the Soviet power and organizes counter-revolutionary strikes in the rear of our army, which is shedding its blood in a war for the liberation of Russia, thus making the "support of the military actions of the Soviet Government" advocated by the Menshevik Central Committee a practical impossibility.

All these anti-socialist and counter-revolutionary Menshevik elements in the centre and in the border regions of Russia continue to this day to consider themselves members of the Menshevik Party, whose Central Committee now solemnly proclaims its "political solidarity" with the Soviet power.

We ask:

1) What is the attitude of the Central Committee of the Menshevik Party to the above-mentioned counterrevolutionary Menshevik elements?

2) Does it intend to break with them emphatically and irrevocably?

3) Has it taken even the first step in this direction?

All these are questions to which we do not find answers either in the "resolution" of the Menshevik Central Committee or in the practical activities of the Mensheviks.

Yet it is unquestionable that only by emphatically breaking with the counter-revolutionary Menshevik elements could the Menshevik Central Committee further that "mutual agreement" which it is now advocating.

Pravda, No. 234,
October 29, 1918
Signed: J. Stalin



SPEECH DELIVERED AT A PLENARY MEETING OF THE MOSCOW SOVIET OF WORKERS', SOLDIERS' AND PEASANTS' DEPUTIES ON THE SITUATION ON THE SOUTHERN FRONT

October 29, 1918 (Newspaper Report)

There is no need to prove that the strength of Soviet Russia is growing, Comrade Stalin said. Its successes are sufficient proof of that. But never before have the enemies of Soviet Russia tried so stubbornly to break us. The plan of the enemies of Soviet Russia is to wrest her richest grain regions from her and compel her to capitulate without a fight. Five or six months ago, Samara and Siberia were selected for the execution of this plan. The past two months have made it clear to our enemies that this plan is unfeasible. Now they are trying to repeat the adventure in the South. The South exercises a great attractive power. There are no less than 150 million poods of available grain there. There are also hundreds of thousands of poods of coal. South Russia is even more important strategically. A new international knot is being tied in this region. This can be seen from the activity going on there. A new government has been formed in Yekaterinodar, headed by Krasnov. Three armies have united there. In their effort to seize possession of the South, the counter-revolutionaries are aiming their main blow at Tsaritsyn. In August, Krasnov issued an order for the capture of Tsaritsyn. The order was not carried out, and Krasnov's army had to seek safety in flight. In October, Krasnov issued another order: to capture Tsaritsyn by October 15 at any cost and link up with the Czechoslovaks. No less than forty regiments of the combined armies of a number of generals were thrown into action. However, the generals had to seek safety in flight—so that one of them even lost his boots. (*Laughter*.)

Only then did the generals realize that our army represents a real and growing force, too powerful for them to cope with.

Wherein lies the strength of our army? Why is it beating its enemies so effectively?

The strength of our army lies in its political consciousness and discipline. Political consciousness and proletarian discipline—these are among the reasons for our success on the Southern Front.

Another reason is the appearance of a new corps of Red officers. They are mostly former privates who received their baptism of fire in a number of engagements and well understand the job of fighting. They are leading our troops to victory.

These are the chief factors determining the successes of our army. That is why I think that the blackguard bands will never succeed in vanquishing our army in the South.

Izvestia, No, 237,
October 30, 1918

THE SOUTH OF RUSSIA
Pravda Interview

People's Commissar Stalin, who recently returned from his mission in the South, gave our correspondent his impressions of the situation on the Southern Front.

Importance of the Southern Front

Its strategical position alone, situated as it is between the Don counter-revolutionaries and the AstrakhanUral-Czechoslovak bands, shows how important the Southern Front is. The proximity of the British sphere of influence (Enzeli, Krasnovodsk) only adds to its importance. South Russia's rich resources (grain, oil, coal, cattle, fish) are in themselves enough to inflame the voracious appetites of the imperialist wolves who are striving to wrest this important area from Russia. Furthermore, it is certain that with the approach of autumn and the liquidation of the Samara adventure the centre of military operations will shift to the South. That, in fact, explains the "feverish" activity which the southern counter-revolutionaries are now displaying in hastily forming a new (brand new!) "all-Russian government" composed of those tsarist menials Shipov, Sazonov and Lukomsky, in uniting Krasnov's, Denikin's and Skoropadsky's bands into one army, in appealing for help to Britain, and so on.

Tsaritsyn the Main Target

It is on Tsaritsyn that the enemy is concentrating his heaviest fire. That is understandable, because the capture of Tsaritsyn and the severance of our communications with the South, would ensure the achievement of all the enemy's objectives: connection would be established between

the Don counter-revolutionaries and the Cossack top sections of the Astrakhan and Ural troops and a united counter-revolutionary front stretching from the Don to the Czechoslovaks would be created; the counter-revolutionaries, domestic and foreign, would secure a firm hold of the South and the Caspian; the Soviet forces in the North Caucasus would be in a helpless plight...

That is the chief reason for the stubborn efforts of the southern whiteguards to capture Tsaritsyn.

Krasnov issued an order for the capture of Tsaritsyn as far back as August. His bands hurled themselves with frenzy against our front and tried to break it, but were beaten off by our Red Army and thrown back beyond the Don.

A fresh order to capture Tsaritsyn was issued in the early part of October, this time by the counter-revolutionary Cossack Assembly in Rostov. The enemy massed no less than forty regiments gathered from the Don, Kiev (Skoropadsky's officer regiments!) and the Kuban (Alexeyev's "volunteers"!). But this time, too, Krasnov's bands were repulsed by the iron hand of our Red Army. A number of the enemy's regiments were surrounded by our troops and wiped out, leaving their guns, machine guns and rifles in our hands. Generals Mamontov, Antonov, Popov and Tolkushkin and a whole pack of colonels were forced to seek safety in flight.

Wherein Lies the Strength of Our Army?

The successes of our army are due in the first place to its political consciousness and discipline. Krasnov's soldiers are amazingly obtuse and ignorant and are completely isolated from the outside world. They do not know what they are fighting for. "We had to fight because we were ordered to," they say on being interrogated when taken prisoner.

Not so our Red Army man. He proudly calls himself a soldier of the revolution; he knows that he is fighting not to protect capitalist profits but for the emancipation of Russia, and knowing this he goes into battle boldly and with his eyes open. The yearning for order and discipline among our Red Army men is so strong that not infrequently they themselves punish "disobedient" and ill-disciplined comrades.

A no less important factor is the appearance of a regular corps of Red officers who have been promoted from the ranks and who received their baptism of fire in a number of engagements. These Red officers are the chief cementing force of our army, welding it into a single disciplined organism.

But the strength of the army is not due to its personal qualities alone. An army cannot exist for long without a strong rear. For the front to be firm, it is necessary that the army should regularly receive replenishments, munitions and food from the rear. A great role in this respect has been played by the appearance in the rear of expert and competent administrators, chiefly consisting of advanced workers, who conscientiously and indefatigably attend to the duties of mobilization and supply. It may be safely said that without these administrators Tsaritsyn would not have been saved.

All this is converting our army into a formidable force capable of smashing any resistance on the part of the enemy.

Everything is tending towards the tying of a new international knot in the South. The appearance in Yekaterinodar of a "new" "all-Russian government" composed of British proteges, the combining of the three counter-revolutionary armies (Alexeyev's, Skoropadsky's and Krasnov's), which have once already been beaten by our forces at Tsaritsyn, the rumours that Britain is contemplating intervention, the fact that Britain is supplying the Terek counter-revolutionaries from Enzeli and Krasnovodsk—all these are not just chance happenings. Their abortive adventure in Samara they are now trying to resume in the South. But they will not have—will certainly not have—that without which victory is unthinkable, namely, an army which has its heart in the foul work of counter-revolution and is capable of fighting to the end. One powerful assault will be sufficient, and the counter-revolutionary adventure will collapse like a house of cards. The earnest of this is the heroism of our army, the demoralization in the ranks of the Krasnov-Alexeyev "armies," the growing unrest in the Ukraine, the increasing might of Soviet Russia, and, lastly, the steady spread of the revolutionary movement in the West. The southern adventure will meet with the same fate as the Samara adventure.

Pravda, No. 235,
October 30, 1918



THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

October 24 and 25, 1917, in Petrograd

THE MOST IMPORTANT of the events which hastened the October uprising were: the intention of the Provisional Government (after having surrendered Riga) to surrender Petrograd, the Kerensky Government's preparations to remove to Moscow, the decision of the command of the old army to dispatch the entire Petrograd garrison to the front and leave the capital undefended, and, lastly, the feverish activity of the Black Congress[1] in Moscow, headed by Rodzyanko—activity for organizing the counter-revolution. All this, coupled with the growing economic disruption and the unwillingness of the men at the front to continue the war, made a swift and efficiently organized uprising inevitable as the only way out of the existing situation.

The Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party had already in the closing days of September decided to mobilize all the forces of the Party for the organization of a successful uprising. With that in view, the Central Committee resolved to set up a Revolutionary Military Committee in Petrograd, to secure the retention of the Petrograd garrison in the capital, and to convene an All-Russian Congress of Soviets. Only such a congress could succeed to power. The preliminary winning of the Moscow and Petrograd Soviets, the most influential in the rear and at the front, was an indispensable part of the general plan of organization of the uprising.

Acting on the instructions of the Central Committee, Rabochy Put,[2] the Central Organ of the Party, began openly to call for an upris-

1 The Black Congress—a conference of big landlords, manufacturers, clergymen and army generals and officers held in Moscow on October 12-14, 1917, under the chairmanship of Rodzyanko, with the object of uniting the forces of counter-revolution for the struggle against Bolshevism and the mounting revolution.

2 *Rabochy Put* (*Worker's Path*)—a newspaper, the Central Organ of the Bolshevik Party replacing *Pravda* when the latter was closed down by the Provisional Gov-

ing, preparing the workers and peasants for the decisive battle.

The first open clash with the Provisional Government arose over the banning of the Bolshevik newspaper, Rabochy Put. It was shut down by order of the Provisional Government. It was re-opened in revolutionary fashion, by order of the Revolutionary Military Committee. The seals were removed and the commissars of the Provisional Government were sent off. That was on October 24.

On October 24, commissars of the Revolutionary Military Committee forcibly ejected the representatives of the Provisional Government from a number of major government institutions, which resulted in the latter coming under the control of the Revolutionary Military Committee and the disorganization of the whole machinery of the Provisional Government. That same day (October 24) the entire garrison, all the regiments in Petrograd, decisively went over to the Revolutionary Military Committee, with the sole exception of some of the military cadet schools and an armoured car battalion. The Provisional Government showed signs of irresolution. Only in the evening did it dispatch shock battalions to occupy the bridges and succeeded in raising some of them. The Revolutionary Military Committee countered this by sending sailors and Vyborg Red Guards, who removed and dispersed the shock battalions and occupied the bridges themselves. With this, the open uprising began. A number of our regiments were dispatched with orders to cordon off the whole area around the Staff Headquarters and the Winter Palace. In the Winter Palace the Provisional Government was in session. The passing of the armoured car battalion to the side of the Revolutionary Military Committee (late at night on October 24) hastened the success of the uprising.

On October 25 the Congress of Soviets opened, and to it the Revolutionary Military Committee turned over the power it had won.

Early in the morning of October 26, after the bombardment of the Winter Palace and the Staff Headquarters by the Aurora, and after skirmishes between Soviet troops and military cadets in front of the Winter Palace, the Provisional Government capitulated.

---

ernment in the July days of 1917. It appeared from September 3 to October 26, 1917, and its editor-in-chief was J. V. Stalin.

The moving spirit of the revolution from beginning to end was the Central Committee of the Party, headed by Comrade Lenin. Vladimir Ilyich was then living in hiding in Petrograd, in the Vyborg District. On the evening of October 24 he was called to the Smolny to take charge of the movement.

An outstanding role in the October uprising was played by the sailors of the Baltic Fleet and the Red Guards from the Vyborg District. Owing to their extraordinary courage, the role of the Petrograd garrison was confined chiefly to rendering moral and to some extent military support to the vanguard fighters.

Pravda, No. 241,
November 6, 1918
Signed: J. Stalin



THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION

The national question must not be regarded as something self-contained and fixed for all time. Being only part of the general question of the transformation of the existing order, the national question is wholly determined by the conditions of the social environment, by the kind of power in the country and by the whole course of social development in general. This is being strikingly borne out in the period of revolution in Russia, when the national question and the national movement in the border regions of Russia are rapidly and obviously changing their character in accordance with the course and outcome of the revolution.

I. The February Revolution and the National Question

In the period of the bourgeois revolution in Russia (February 1917) the national movement in the border regions bore the character of a bourgeois liberation movement. The nationalities of Russia, which for ages had been oppressed and exploited by the "old regime," for the first time felt their strength and rushed into the fight with their oppressors. "Abolish national oppression"—such was the slogan of the movement. "All-national" institutions sprang up overnight throughout the border regions of Russia. The movement was headed by the national, bourgeois-democratic intelligentsia. "National Councils" in Latvia, the Estonian region, Lithuania, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, the North Caucasus, Kirghizia and the Middle Volga region; the "Rada" in the Ukraine and in Byelorussia; the "Sfatul Tsării" in Bessarabia; the "Kurultai" in the Crimea and in Bashkiria; the "Autonomous Government" in Turkestan—such were the "all-national" institutions around which the national bourgeoisie rallied its forces. It was a

question of emancipation from tsarism—the "fundamental cause" of national oppression—and of the formation of national bourgeois states. The right of nations to self-determination was interpreted as the right of the national bourgeoisies in the border regions to take power into their own hands and to take advantage of the February Revolution for forming "their own" national states. The further development of the revolution did not, and could not, come within the calculations of the above-mentioned bourgeois institutions. And the fact was overlooked that tsarism was being replaced by naked and barefaced imperialism, and that this imperialism was a stronger and more dangerous foe of the nationalities and the basis of a new national oppression.

The abolition of tsarism and the accession to power of the bourgeoisie did not, however, lead to the abolition of national oppression. The old, crude form of national oppression was replaced by a new, refined, but all the more dangerous, form of oppression. Far from abandoning the policy of national oppression, the LvovMilyukov-Kerensky Government organized a new campaign against Finland (dispersal of the Diet in the summer of 1917) and the Ukraine (suppression of Ukrainian cultural institutions). What is more, that Government, which was imperialist by its very nature, called upon the population to continue the war in order to subjugate new lands, new colonies and nationalities. It was compelled to this not only because of the intrinsic nature of imperialism, but also because of the existence of the old imperialist states in the West, which were irresistibly striving to subjugate new lands and nationalities and threatening to narrow its sphere of influence. A struggle of the imperialist states for the subjugation of small nationalities as a condition for the existence of these states—such was the picture which was revealed in the course of the imperialist war. This unsightly picture was in no way improved by the abolition of tsarism and the appearance of the Milyukov-Kerensky Government on the scene. Since the "all-national" institutions in the border regions displayed a tendency to political independence, naturally they encountered the insuperable hostility of the imperialist government of Russia. Since, on the other hand, while establishing the power of the national bourgeoisie, they remained deaf to the vital interests of "their own" workers and peasants, they evoked grumbling and discontent among those. What were known as the "na-

tional regiments" only added fuel to the flames: they were impotent against the danger from above and only intensified and aggravated the danger from below. The "all-national" institutions were left defenceless against blows from without and explosions from within. The incipient bourgeois national states began to fade before they could blossom.

Thus, the old bourgeois-democratic interpretation of the principle of self-determination became a fiction and lost its revolutionary significance. It was clear that under such circumstances there could be no question of the abolition of national oppression and establishing the independence of the small national states. It became obvious that the emancipation of the labouring masses of the oppressed nationalities and the abolition of national oppression were inconceivable without a break with imperialism, without the labouring masses overthrowing "their own" national bourgeoisie and taking power themselves.

That was strikingly borne out after the October Revolution.

II. The October Revolution and the National Question

The February Revolution harboured irreconcilable inner contradictions. The revolution was accomplished by the efforts of the workers and the peasants (soldiers), but as a result of the revolution power passed not to the workers and peasants, but to the bourgeoisie. In making the revolution the workers and peasants wanted to put an end to the war and to secure peace. But the bourgeoisie, on coming to power, strove to use the revolutionary ardour of the masses for a continuation of the war and against peace. The economic disruption of the country and the food crisis demanded the expropriation of capital and industrial establishments for the benefit of the workers, and the confiscation of the landlords' land for the benefit of the peasants, but the bourgeois Milyukov-Kerensky Government stood guard over the interests of the landlords and capitalists, resolutely protecting them against all encroachments on the part of the workers and peasants. It was a bourgeois revolution, accomplished by the agency of the workers and peasants for the benefit of the exploiters.

Meanwhile, the country continued to groan under the burden of the imperialist war, economic disintegration and the breakdown of the

food supply. The front was falling to pieces and melting away. Factories and mills were coming to a standstill. Famine was spreading through the country. The February Revolution, with its inner contradictions, was obviously not enough for "the salvation of the country." The Milyukov-Berensky Government was obviously incapable of solving the basic problems of the revolution.

A new, socialist revolution was required to lead the country out of the blind alley of imperialist war and economic disintegration.

That revolution came as a result of the October uprising.

By overthrowing the power of the landlords and the bourgeoisie and replacing it by a government of workers and peasants, the October Revolution resolved the contradictions of the February Revolution at one stroke. The abolition of the omnipotence of the landlords and kulaks and the handing over of the land for the use of the labouring masses of the countryside; the expropriation of the mills and factories and their transfer to control by the workers; the break with imperialism and the ending of the predatory war; the publication of the secret treaties and the exposure of the policy of annexations; lastly, the proclamation of self-determination for the labouring masses of the oppressed peoples and the recognition of the independence of Finland—such were the basic measures carried into effect by the Soviet power in the early period of the Soviet revolution.

That was a genuinely socialist revolution.

The revolution, which started in the centre, could not long be confined to that narrow territory. Once having triumphed in the centre, it was bound to spread to the border regions. And, indeed, from the very first days of the revolution, the revolutionary tide spread from the North all over Russia, sweeping one border region after another. But here it encountered a dam in the shape of the "National Councils" and regional "governments" (Don, Kuban, Siberia) which had been formed prior to the October Revolution. The point is that these "national governments" would not hear of a socialist revolution. Bourgeois by nature, they had not the slightest wish to destroy the old, bourgeois order; on the contrary, they considered it their duty to preserve and consolidate it by every means in their power. Essentially imperialist, they had not

the slightest wish to break with imperialism; on the contrary, they had never been averse to seizing and subjugating bits and morsels of the territory of "foreign" nationalities whenever opportunity offered. No wonder that the "national governments" in the border regions declared war on the socialist government in the centre. And, once they had declared war, they naturally became hotbeds of reaction, which attracted all that was counter-revolutionary in Russia. Everyone knows that all the counter-revolutionaries thrown out of Russia rushed to these hotbeds, and there, around them, formed themselves into whiteguard "national" regiments.

But, in addition to "national governments," there are in the border regions national workers and peasants. Organized even before the October Revolution in their revolutionary Soviets patterned on the Soviets in the centre of Russia, they had never severed connections with their brothers in the North. They too were striving to defeat the bourgeoisie; they too were fighting for the triumph of socialism. No wonder that their conflict with "their own" national governments grew daily more acute. The October Revolution only strengthened the alliance between the workers and peasants of the border regions and the workers and peasants of Russia, and inspired them with faith in the triumph of socialism. And the war of the "national governments" against the Soviet power brought the conflict of the national masses with these "governments" to the point of a complete rupture, to open rebellion against them.

Thus was formed a socialist alliance of the workers and peasants of all Russia against the counter-revolutionary alliance of the bourgeois national "governments" of the border regions of Russia.

The fight of the border "governments" is depicted by some as a fight for national emancipation against the "soulless centralism" of the Soviet regime. But that is quite untrue. No regime in the world has permitted such extensive decentralization, no government in the world has ever granted to the peoples such complete national freedom as the Soviet power in Russia. The fight of the border "governments" was, and is, a fight of bourgeois counter-revolution against socialism. The national flag is tacked on to the cause only to deceive the masses, as a popular flag which conveniently conceals the counterrevolutionary designs of the national bourgeoisie.

But the fight of the "national" and regional "governments" proved an unequal one. Attacked from two sides—from without by the Soviet power of Russia, and from within by "their own" workers and peasants—the "national governments" were obliged to retreat after the very first engagements. The uprising of the Finnish workers and torppari[1] and the flight of the bourgeois "Senate"; the uprising of the Ukrainian workers and peasants and the flight of the bourgeois "Rada"; the uprising of the workers and peasants in the Don, Kuban, and Siberia and the collapse of Kaledin, Kornilov and the Siberian "government"; the uprising of the poor peasants of Turkestan and the flight of the "autonomous government"; the agrarian revolution in the Caucasus and the utter impotence of the "National Councils" of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan—all these are generally known facts which demonstrated the complete isolation of the border "governments" from "their own" labouring masses. Utterly defeated, the "national governments" were "obliged" to appeal for aid against "their own" workers and peasants to the imperiaIists of the West, to the agelong oppressors and exploiters of the nationalities of the world.

Thus began the period of foreign intervention and occupation of the border regions—a period which once more revealed the counter-revolutionary character of the "national" and regional "governments."

Only now did it become obvious to all that the national bourgeoisie was striving not for the liberation of "its own people" from national oppression, but for liberty to squeeze profits out of them, for liberty to retain its privileges and capital.

Only now did it become clear that the emancipation of the oppressed nationalities was inconceivable without a rupture with imperialism, without the overthrow of the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nationalities, without the transfer of power to the labouring masses of these nationalities.

Thus, the old, bourgeois conception of the principle of self-determination, with its slogan "All power to the national bourgeoisie," was exposed and cast aside by the very course of the revolution. The socialist conception of the principle of self-determination, with its slogan "All

1 Torppari—landless peasants in Finland, who were forced to rent land from the big proprietors on extortionate terms.

power to the labouring masses of the oppressed nationalities," entered into its own and it became possible to apply it.

Thus, the October Revolution, having put an end to the old, bourgeois movement for national emancipation, inaugurated the era of a new, socialist movement of the workers and peasants of the oppressed nationalities, directed against all oppression—including, therefore, national oppression—against the power of the bourgeoisie, "their own" and foreign, and against imperialism in general.

III. The Worldwide Significance of the October Revolution

Having triumphed in the centre of Russia and embraced a number of the border regions, the October Revolution could not stop short at the territorial borders of Russia. In the atmosphere of the imperialist world war and the general discontent among the masses, it could not but spread to neighbouring countries. Russia's break with imperialism and its escape from the predatory war; the publication of the secret treaties and the solemn renunciation of the policy of annexations; the proclamation of the national freedom and recognition of the independence of Finland; the declaring of Russia a "federation of Soviet national republics" and the battle cry of a determined struggle against imperialism issued to the world by the Soviet Government—all this could not but deeply affect the enslaved East and the bleeding West.

And, indeed, the October Revolution is the first revolution in world history to break the age-long sleep of the labouring masses of the oppressed peoples of the East and to draw them into the fight against world imperialism. The formation of workers' and peasants' Soviets in Persia, China and India, modelled on the Soviets in Russia, is sufficiently convincing evidence of this.

The October Revolution is the first revolution in world history to provide the workers and soldiers of the West with a living, salvation-bringing example and to impel them on to the path of real emancipation from the yoke of war and imperialism. The uprising of the workers and soldiers in Austria-Hungary and Germany, the formation of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the revolutionary struggle of the subject peoples of Austria-Hungary against national oppression

is sufficiently eloquent evidence of this.

The chief point is not at all that the struggle in the East and even in the West has not yet succeeded in shedding its bourgeois-nationalist features; the point is that the struggle against imperialism has begun, that it is continuing and is inevitably bound to arrive at its logical goal.

Foreign intervention and the occupation policy of the "external" imperialists merely sharpen the revolutionary crisis, by drawing now peoples into the struggle and extending the area of the revolutionary battles with, imperialism.

Thus, the October Revolution, by establishing a tie between the peoples of the backward East and of the advanced West, is ranging them in a common camp of struggle against imperialism.

Thus, from the particular question of combating national oppression, the national question is evolving into the general question of emancipating the nations, colonies and semi-colonies from imperialism.

The mortal sin of the Second International and its leader, Kautsky, consists, incidentally, in the fact that they have always gone over to the bourgeois conception of national self-determination, that they have never understood the revolutionary meaning of the latter, that they were unable or unwilling to put the national question on the revolutionary footing of an open fight against imperialism, that they were unable or unwilling to link the national question with the question of the emancipation of the colonies.

The obtuseness of the Austrian Social-Democrats of the type of Bauer and Renner consists in the fact that they have not understood the inseparable connection between the national question and the question of power, that they tried to separate the national question from politics and to confine it to cultural and educational questions, forgetting the existence of such "trifles" as imperialism and the colonies enslaved by imperialism.

It is asserted that the principles of self-determination and "defence of the fatherland" have been abrogated by the very course of events under the conditions of a rising socialist revolution. Actually, it is not the principles of self-determination and "defence of the fatherland" that have been abrogated, but the bourgeois interpretation of these princi-

ples. One has only to glance at the occupied regions, which are languishing under the yoke of imperialism and are yearning for liberation; one has only to glance at Russia, which is waging a revolutionary war for the defence of the socialist fatherland from the imperialist robbers; one has only to reflect on the present events in Austria-Hungary; one has only to glance at the enslaved colonies and semi-colonies, which have already organized their own Soviets (India, Persia, China)—one has only to glance at all this to realize the whole revolutionary significance of the principle of self-determination in its socialist interpretation.

The great world-wide significance of the October Revolution chiefly consists in the fact that:

1) It has widened the scope of the national question and converted it from the particular question of combating national oppression in Europe into the general question of emancipating the oppressed peoples, colonies and semi-colonies from imperialism;

2) It has opened up wide possibilities for their emancipation and the right paths towards it, has thereby greatly facilitated the cause of the emancipation of the oppressed peoples of the West and the East, and has drawn them into the common current of the victorious struggle against imperialism;

3) It has thereby erected a bridge between the socialist West and the enslaved East, having created a new front of revolutions against world imperialism, extending from the proletarians of the West, through the Russian revolution, to the oppressed peoples of the East.

This in fact explains the indescribable enthusiasm which is now being displayed for the Russian proletariat by the toiling and exploited masses of the East and the West.

And this mainly explains the frenzy with which the imperialist robbers of the whole world have now flung themselves upon Soviet Russia.

Pravda, Nos. 241 and 250,
November 6 and 19, 1918
Signed: J. Stalin



PARTITION WALL

Between socialist Russia and the revolutionary West a partition wall has been erected in the shape of the occupied regions.

Whereas in Russia the Red flag has been waving for over a year now, and in the West, in Germany and Austria-Hungary, outbreaks of proletarian uprisings are multiplying daily and hourly, in the occupied regions, in Finland, Estland, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Poland, Bessarabia, the Ukraine and the Crimea, bourgeois nationalist "governments" continue to drag out a wretched existence by the grace of the imperialists of the West whose time is coming to an end.

Whereas in the East and in the West "great" monarchs and "sovereign" imperialists have already been relegated to the nether regions, in the occupied areas petty kinglets and puny robbers continue to rule, committing lawlessness and violence against the workers and peasants, arresting and shooting them.

More, these out-of-date "governments" are feverishly organizing their "national" whiteguard "regiments," are preparing for "action," are conspiring with the not yet abolished imperialist governments and laying plans for the "expansion" of "their" territories.

These shadows, rotting alive, of already overthrown "great" monarchs, and these puny "national" "governments" which have been placed by the will of fate between the two tremendous conflagrations of revolution, in the East and in the West, are now dreaming of extinguishing the general fire of revolution in Europe, of perpetuating their ludicrous existence, of turning back the wheel of history!

That which the "sovereign" monarchs of "great" Germany and Austria-Hungary failed to accomplish, these petty "kinglets" dream of accomplishing "at one stroke," with the help of a couple of disorganized whiteguard "regiments."

We do not doubt that the mighty waves of revolution in Russia and the West will ruthlessly sweep away the counter-revolutionary dreamers in the occupied regions. We do not doubt that the hour is near when the "kinglets" of these regions will follow in the footsteps of their former "sovereign" patrons in Russia and Germany.

We have no reason to doubt that the counterrevolutionary partition wall between the revolutionary West and socialist Russia will in the end be swept away.

The first signs of revolution in the occupied regions have already appeared. The strikes in Estland, the demonstrations in Latvia, the general strike in the Ukraine, the universal revolutionary ferment in Finland, Poland and Latvia—all these are the first signs. Needless to say, revolution and Soviet governments in these regions are matters of the very near future.

Proletarian revolution, awe-inspiring and mighty, is on the march through the world. The old "lords" of the earth in the East and the West bend their heads before it in fear and trembling, and their old crowns are falling. The occupied regions and their petty "kinglets" can be no exception.

Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 2,
November 17, 1918
Editorial
Signed: J. Stalin



DON'T FORGET THE EAST

At a time when the revolutionary movement is rising in Europe, when old thrones and crowns are tumbling and giving place to revolutionary Soviets of Workers and Soldiers, and the occupied regions are ejecting the creatures of imperialism from their territories, the eyes of all are naturally turned to the West. It is there, in the West, that the chains of imperialism, which were forged in Europe and which are strangling the whole world, must first of all be smashed. It is there, first of all in the West, that the new, socialist life must vigorously develop. At such a moment one "involuntarily" tends to lose sight of, to forget the far-off East, with its hundreds of millions of inhabitants enslaved by imperialism.

Yet the East should not be forgotten for a single moment, if only because it represents the "inexhaustible" reserve and "most reliable" rear of world imperialism .

The imperialists have always looked upon the East as the basis of their prosperity. Have not the inestimable natural resources (cotton, oil, gold, coal, ores) of the East been an "apple of discord" between the imperialists of all countries? That, in fact, explains why, while fighting in Europe and prating about the West, the imperialists have never ceased to think of China, India, Persia, Egypt and Morocco, because the East was always the real point at issue. It is this that chiefly explains why they so zealously maintain "law and order" in the countries of the East—without this, imperialism's far rear would not be secure.

But it is not only the wealth of the East that the imperialists need. They also need the "obedient" "man power" which abounds in the colonies and semi-colonies of the East. They need the "compliant" and cheap "labour power" of the Eastern peoples. They need, furthermore, the "obedient" "young lads" of the countries of the East from whom they recruit the so-called "coloured" troops which they will not hesitate to hurl against "their own" revolutionary workers. That is why they call

the Eastern countries their "inexhaustible" reserve.

It is the task of communism to break the age-long sleep of the oppressed peoples of the East, to infect the workers and peasants of these countries with the emancipatory spirit of revolution, to rouse them to fight imperialism, and thus deprive world imperialism of its "most reliable" rear and "inexhaustible" reserve.

Without this, the definite triumph of socialism, complete victory over imperialism, is unthinkable.

The revolution in Russia was the first to rouse the oppressed peoples of the East to fight imperialism. The Soviets in Persia, India and China are a clear symptom that the age-long sleep of the workers and peasants of the East is becoming a thing of the past.

Revolution in the West will undoubtedly give a new spur to the revolutionary movement in the East, will infuse it with courage and faith in victory.

And no little help in revolutionizing the East will be rendered by the imperialists themselves, with their new annexations, which are drawing new countries into the fight against imperialism and extending the base of world revolution.

It is the duty of the Communists to intervene in the growing spontaneous movement in the East and to develop it further, into a conscious struggle against imperialism.

From that standpoint, the resolution of the recent Conference of Moslem Communists,[136] calling for more intense propaganda in the East—in Persia, India and China—is undoubtedly of profound revolutionary significance.

Let us hope that our Moslem comrades will carry outtheir highly important decision.

For the truth must be grasped once and for all that whoever desires the triumph of socialism must not forget the East.

---

1 [36] The reference is to the First Congress of Moslem Communists held in Moscow in November 1918. It elected a Central Bureau of Moslem Organizations of the R.C.P.(B.).

Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 3,
November 24, 1918
Editorial



THE UKRAINE IS LIBERATING ITSELF[1]

The Ukraine with its natural wealth has long been an object of imperialist exploitation.

Before the revolution the Ukraine was exploited by the Western imperialists quietly, so to speak, without "military operations." French, Belgian and British imperialists organized huge enterprises in the Ukraine (coal, metal, etc.), acquired the majority of the shares and proceeded to suck the blood out of the Ukrainian people in the usual, "lawful" and unobtrusive way.

After the October Revolution the picture changed.

The October Revolution snapped the threads of imperialism and proclaimed the land and the factories the property of the Ukrainian people, making it impossible for the imperialists to exploit in the "ordinary," "unobtrusive" way. Imperialism was thus expelled from the Ukraine.

But imperialism had no desire to yield and positively refused to reconcile itself to the new situation. Hence the "necessity" for the forcible enslavement of the Ukraine, the "necessity" for its occupation.

The Austro-German imperialists were the first to undertake the occupation of the Ukraine. The "Rada" and the "Hetmanship," with their "independence," were only playthings and a convenient screen for this occupation, giving outward "sanction" to the exploitation of the Ukraine by the Austro-German imperialists.

Who is not familiar with the endless humiliations and tribulations undergone by the Ukraine during the Austro-German occupation, the destruction of workers' and peasants' organizations, the complete disruption of industry and railway transport, the hangings and shootings, which were such commonplace features of Ukrainian "independence"

1 This article, with certain alterations, was also published as an editorial in *Pravda*, No. 261, December 1, 1918.

under the aegis of the AustroGerman imperialists?

But the defeat of Austro-German imperialism and the victory of the German revolution have fundamentally changed the situation in the Ukraine. The road is now open for the liberation of labouring Ukraine from the imperialist yoke. The ruination and enslavement of the Ukraine are coming to an end. The fires of revolution now spreading in the Ukraine will consume the last remnants of imperialism and its "national" hangerson. The "Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government"[238] which has risen on the tide of revolution will build a new life based on the rule of the Ukrainian workers and peasants. The "Manifesto" of the Ukrainian Soviet Government, which restores the landlords' land to the peasants, the mills and factories to the workers, and full liberty to the labouring and exploited—this historic "Manifesto" will reverberate like thunder through the Ukraine, striking fear into the hearts of its enemies, and ring out like a joyful peal of bells, gladdening and consoling the oppressed sons of the Ukraine.

But the struggle is not yet over, the victory is not yet secure. The real struggle in the Ukraine has only just begun.

At a time when German imperialism is at its last gasp and the "Hetmanship" in its death agony, British and French imperialism is massing forces and preparing to land troops in the Crimea for the occupation of the Ukraine. They, the Anglo-French imperialists, want to fill the place left vacant by the German invaders of the Ukraine. At the same time, a "Ukrainian Directory"[339] is appearing on the scene, headed by the adventurer Petlura, with the slogan of the old "independence" in a "new" form—as a new screen, one more convenient than the "Hetmanship," for the new, AngloFrench, occupation of the Ukraine!

The real struggle in the Ukraine is still to come.

---

2 The Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government of the Ukraine was set up in the latter part of November 1918, its seat being first Kursk, and then Sudja. K. E. Voroshilov and F. A. Sergeyev (Artyom) were among its members. On November 29, 1918, the Ukrainian Soviet Government issued a manifesto announcing the overthrow of the Hetman and the establishment of Soviet power in the Ukraine.

3 The Ukrainian Directory—a counter-revolutionary nationalist government formed in Kiev at the close of 1918 by Ukrainian nationalists headed by Petlura and Vinnichenko. It was overthrown by an insurrection of the Ukrainian workers and peasants in February 1919.

We have no doubt that the Ukrainian Soviet Government will be able to administer a fitting rebuff to the new uninvited guests—the would-be enslavers from Britain and France.

We have no doubt that the Ukrainian Soviet Government will be able to expose the reactionary role of the adventure-seekers of the Vinnichenko-Petlura camp who, willingly or unwillingly, are paving the way for the incursion of the Anglo-French enslavers.

We have no doubt that the Ukrainian Soviet Government will be able to rally around itself the workers and peasants of the Ukraine and lead them with credit to battle and victory.

We call upon all loyal sons of the Soviet Ukraine to come to the aid of the young Ukrainian Soviet Government and help it in its glorious fight against the stranglers of the Ukraine.

The Ukraine is liberating itself. Hasten to its aid!

Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 4
December 1, 1918
Editorial
Signed: Stalin



LIGHT FROM THE EAST[1]

Slowly but surely, the tide of the liberation movement is rolling from east to west, into the occupied regions. Slowly but just as surely, the "new" bourgeoisrepublican "governments" of Estland, Latvia, Lithuania and Byelorussia are receding into oblivion and making way for the power of the workers and peasants. The partition wall between Russia and Germany is crumbling and disappearing. The slogan of bourgeois nationalism "All power to the national bourgeoisie" is being superseded by the slogan of proletarian socialism "All power to the labouring masses of the oppressed nationalities."

A year ago, after the October Revolution, the liberation movement advanced in the same direction and under the same slogan. The bourgeois-national "governments" that were formed at that time in the border regions sought to hold back the tide of the socialist movement advancing from Russia and declared war on the Soviet power. They wished to establish separate bourgeois states in the border regions in order that the national bourgeoisie might retain power and privileges in its hands. The reader will recall that this counter-revolutionary scheme failed: attacked from within by "their own" workers and peasants, these "governments" were forced to retreat. The occupation by German imperialism which followed interrupted the process of emancipation of the border regions and tipped the scales in favour of the bourgeois-national "governments." Now, after the rout of German imperialism and the expulsion of the forces of occupation from the border regions, the process of the struggle for emancipation has been resumed with fresh vigour and in new and more salient forms.

The Estland workers were the first to raise the standard of revolt.

1 This article was simultaneously published in *Pravda*. (No. 273, December 15, 1918) as an unsigned editorial.

The Estland Labour Commune[2] is victoriously advancing, shattering the foundations of the Estland bourgeois-republican "government" and rousing to struggle the labouring masses of the Estland towns and villages. In reply to the request of the Estland Soviet Government, the Russian Soviet Government has solemnly recognized the independence of the Estland Socialist Republic. Need it be demonstrated that this act was the duty and obligation of the Russian Soviet Government? Soviet Russia has never looked upon the Western regions as its possessions. It has always considered that these regions are the inalienable possession of the labouring masses of the nationalities inhabiting them, that these labouring masses have the full right freely to determine their political destiny. Naturally, this does not exclude, but rather presumes the rendering of every assistance by Soviet Russia to our Estland comrades in their struggle for the emancipation of the working people of Estland from the bourgeois yoke.

The workers of Latvia have likewise set to work to liberate their martyred fatherland. The re-establishment of Soviets in Verro, Valka, Riga, Libau and other parts of Latvia, the attempts of the Riga workers to secure the necessary political liberties by revolutionary means, the swift advance of the Latvian Riflemen on Riga—all this indicates that the same fate awaits the bourgeois-republican "government" in Latvia as in Estland. We have information that the establishment of a Provisional Soviet Government is to be officially proclaimed in Latvia within the next few days.[3] Needless to say, this act, if it really occurs, will expedite and give constitutional shape to the emancipation of Latvia from imperialism.

The workers and peasants of Lithuania are following in the footsteps of the Latvian workers. The formation of Soviets—as yet only

2 Estland Labour Commune—the Estland Soviet Republic, established on November 29, 1918, after the Red Army had liberated Narva from German occupation. On December 7, 1918, the Council of People's Commissars endorsed a decree, drafted by J. V. Stalin, recognizing the independence of the Estland Soviet Republic.

3 Soviet power in Latvia was proclaimed in the middle of December 1918. On December 17 the Provisional Soviet Government of Latvia issued a manifesto to the working people announcing the transfer of state power to the Soviets. It stated: "We know that on this difficult path, in this strenuous struggle, we are not alone. Behind us stands the R.S.F.S.R., with which we shall continue to be closely bound, and not by external ties alone."

semi-legal, it is true—in Vilna, Shauli, Kovno and other parts of Lithuania; the unparalleled revolutionary activity displayed by the Lithuanian agricultural workers in preventing the big farms from being pillaged by the landlords; the rapid advance of the Lithuanian Riflemen into the heart of Lithuania; and, lastly, the projected establishment, as we are informed, of a Provisional Soviet Government of Lithuania—all this indicates that the notorious Lithuanian Tariba[4] will not escape the fate of its counterparts in Latvia and Estland.

The ephemeral nature of the national "governments" in the occupied regions is due not only to the fact that they are bourgeois in character and alien to the interests of the workers and peasants, but also, and chiefly, to the fact that they are mere appendages of the occupation authorities, which could not but rob them of all moral prestige in the eyes of the mass of the population. Looked at from this standpoint, the occupation period undoubtedly played a beneficial part in the development of the border regions, as it thoroughly exposed the rottenness and treachery of the national bourgeoisie.

The trend is obviously such that any day now the Western regions and their labouring masses, which until now were the victims of the fraudulent machinations of the imperialists, will seize their freedom and at long last stand on their own feet...

In the North, in Finland, things are still "quiet." But beneath this surface quietness deep internal work is undoubtedly proceeding, on the part of the workers and torppari, on the one hand, who are straining for emancipation, and of the Svinhufvud Government, on the other, which keeps changing its Ministers with suspicious frequency and is continually conspiring with British imperialist agents. The withdrawal of the occupation forces from Finland will undoubtedly hasten the liquidation of Svinhufvud's band of criminals, who have quite deservedly earned the profound contempt of the broad mass of the population of Finland.

In the South, in the Ukraine, things are not so quiet as in Finland. Far from it! The insurrectionary troops are gathering strength and organizing as they advance southward. After an exemplarily organized

4 The Lithuanian Tariba (bourgeois National Council) was set up in September 1917 under the control of the German occupation authorities.

three days' strike,[5] Kharkov has passed under the control of the Soviet of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies. The Petlurites, the German invaders and Skoropadsky's agents are forced to reckon with the will of the workers. In Yekaterinoslav, a Soviet of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies is functioning openly. The celebrated Manifesto of the Ukrainian Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government was printed openly and posted up in the streets of Yekaterinoslav. The "authorities" were powerless to prevent this "audacious act." We say nothing of the powerful insurrectionary movement of the Ukrainian peasants, who look upon the Manifesto of the Ukrainian Soviet Government as their gospel.

And in the far South, in the North Caucasus, even the Ingushes, Chechens, Ossetians and Kabardinians are passing over in whole groups to the Soviet power and, arms in hand, are freeing their land from the hired bands of British imperialism.

Need it be said that all this is bound to have its effect on the oppressed peoples of the West, and above all on the peoples of Austria-Hungary, who are still passing through the period of the bourgeois-national liberation movement, but who have already, by virtue of the logic of facts, entered the phase of struggle against imperialism?

At the centre of all these stupendous developments is the standard-bearer of world revolution, Soviet Russia, inspiring the workers and peasants of the oppressed peoples with faith in victory, and supporting their liberation struggle for the benefit of world socialism.

Of course, the other camp—the camp of the imperialists—is not dozing either. Its agents are prowling through all countries, from Finland to the Caucasus and from Siberia to Turkestan, supplying the counter-revolutionaries, hatching criminal conspiracies, organizing a crusade against Soviet Russia, and forging chains for the peoples of the West. But it is surely obvious that the imperialist gang have already lost all moral prestige in the eyes of the oppressed peoples, that they have lost forever their former halo of standardbearers of "civilization" and "hu-

5 The three days' strike in Kharkov in the early part of December 1918 was provoked by the arrest of the presidium of the Kharkov Soviet by the Petlurites. The strike embraced all the factories, the tramway service and the power station. The Petlura authorities were forced to release the arrested men, after which the Soviet called off the strike.

manitarianism," and that they are prolonging their predatory existence with the help of bribery and hired bands, and by keeping the so-called "coloured" peoples of Africa in darkness and slavery...

Light is coming from the East!

The West, with its imperialist cannibals, has become a breeding ground of darkness and slavery. The task is to destroy this breeding ground, to the joy and comfort of the working people of all countries.

Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 6,
December 15, 1918
Editorial
Signed: J. Stalin



THINGS ARE MOVING

The process of liberation of the Western regions goes forward. The tide of revolution is steadily mounting, breaking down all obstacles in its path. The agents of the old world and the arch-reactionaries of Estland, Latvia and Lithuania are fleeing before it like the devil from holy water.

The Estland Riflemen are already surrounding Taps, an important junction. Acting on the orders of the Council of People's Commissars, our navy is guarding Soviet Estland against possible surprises from the sea. The Red flag of socialism is waving over Estland. The labouring masses of Estland are jubilant. The liberation of Revel is not far off. Needless to say, if British forces attempt to enter Estland and occupy it, they will encounter the solid resistance of the entire Estonian people.

In Lithuania, the revolutionary conflagration is growing. Vilna is already in the hands of the Soviet of Workers' and Landless Peasants' Deputies. The recent impressive demonstrations in Vilna[1] have thoroughly demoralized the Tariba, that creature of the Kaiser. The ardent greetings sent by the Vilna Soviet to the Council of People's Commissars and the Red Army[2] speak eloquently enough of the character of the

1 Demonstrations and a general political strike were held in Vilna and other Lithuanian cities on December 16 1918, at the call of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania and Byelorussia in protest against the policy of the bourgeois Tariba and the German occupation authorities. The slogan of the Vilna demonstration, in which some 20,000 workers and the poorer elements of the city took part, was "All power to the Soviets!" The demonstrators also demanded that the Germans should cease removing railway equipment and other property from Lithuania and should release political prisoners.

2 The greetings to the Council of People's Commissars and Red Army were adopted by the Vilna Soviet on December 16, 1918. The greetings to the C.P.C. said: "The Council of People's Commissars, headed by the tried and tested leader of the world proletariat, Comrade Lenin, is the guiding star of the working class of Lithuania in the struggle now developing for its complete emancipation."

liberation movement in Lithuania. The fact that in Kovno, Shauli and other towns, and in villages and rural areas, Soviets are functioning under the very nose of the hangman General Hoffmann shows how strong the onslaught of the Soviet revolution is. With its fiery manifesto, the Lithuanian Workers' Government[3] formed in Vileika will undoubtedly constitute a reliable rallying centre for the revolutionary forces of Lithuania. The Lithuanian Red Riflemen will bring liberation to their country. The recognition of the Lithuanian Workers' Government by the Soviet Government of Russia[4] will strengthen their faith in final victory.

The revolution is mounting swiftly and irresistibly in Latvia. The glorious Latvian Red Riflemen have already captured Valka and are victoriously surrounding Riga. The recently formed Soviet Government of Latvia is leading the Latvian workers and landless peasants to victory with a sure hand. Exposing the equivocal policy of the Berlin Government and the German occupation authorities, it declares unreservedly in its Manifesto:

> We emphatically reject all intervention on behalf of our feudal and bourgeois enemies, even if such intervention is threatened by a government that calls itself so-

---

The greetings to the Red Army stated: "...We, the workers of Lithuania, observe with the deepest admiration the heroic gallantry you are displaying in the struggle against the armed forces of counter-revolution. We also greet the worker and peasant sons of Lithuania who have joined the Red Army and are sacrificing their lives for the general emancipation of the working class and, in particular, of their brothers who are groaning under the yoke of brutal occupation..."

3 The Provisional Revolutionary Workers' Government of Lithuania was formed in the early part of December 1918, with the Bolshevik V. S. Mickevičius-Kapsukas at its head. On December 16, 1918, it issued a manifesto declaring: "1. All power in the country is transferred to the Soviets of Workers' and Landless and Small Peasants' Deputies. 2. The power of the German occupation authorities is abolished. 3. The Kaiser's Tariba in Lithuania with its Council of Ministers is deposed and outlawed."

4 The independence of the Lithuanian Soviet Republic was recognized by a decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the R.S.F.S.R. signed by Lenin on December 22, 1918. A resolution of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, adopted on the report of J. V. Stalin on December 23, 1918, stated: "Now that the Soviet Republics of Estland, Latvia and Lithuania have been established as a result of the revolutionary struggle of the proletarian and peasant masses, the Central Executive Committee re-affirms that the fact that these countries formerly belonged to the old tsarist empire does not impose any obligations upon them. At the same time the Central Executive Committee expresses the firm confidence that only now, with the recognition of full liberty of self-determination and with the transfer of power to the working class, will a free, voluntary and indestructible union of the working people of all the nations inhabiting the territory of the former Russian Empire be created..."

cialist.

The Latvian Soviet Government relies only on the assistance of the revolutionary proletariat of all countries, and of Russia first and foremost. It says:

> We call for aid and expect it from the genuinely revolutionary proletariat of the whole world, and especially of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic.

Need it be said that the Soviet Government of Russia will render every possible assistance to Latvia now in process of liberation and to its heroic Riflemen?

In the North, in Finland, all is still "quiet." But beneath the surface of quiet and tranquility the counter-revolutionaries are not slumbering and are preparing for new battles. Svinhufvud's resignation and the appointment of Mannerheim imply the renunciation of internal "reforms" and indicate that Britain is planning an attack on Petrograd, through Finland. And that, of course, is bound to intensify the revolutionary crisis which is ripening in Finland.

In the Ukraine, the smoothly staged flight of Skoropadsky and the recognition of Vinnichenko's Directory by the Entente reveal a new picture, a picture of the new "work" of Entente diplomacy. Evidently, Mr. Petlura, who only yesterday was brandishing the sword of "independence," is today inclining in favour of the forces of the Entente, that is, of Krasnov and Denikin, which are "coming" to his aid. The insurrectionary troops and the Soviets are proclaimed to be the chief enemy of the Ukraine. And the chief friend is the "welcome guest"—the Entente and its friends, the Krasnov and Denikin whiteguards, who have already occupied the Donets Basin. Having sold the Ukraine once to the Germans, Mr. Petlura is now selling it again to the British imperialists. Needless to say, the Ukrainian workers and peasants will take account of this new act of treachery on the part of Vinnichenko and Petlura. The rapidly growing revolutionary movement in the Ukraine and the process of disintegration which has already begun in the ranks of Petlura's army are sufficiently convincing evidence of this.

Things are moving...

Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 7,

December 22, 1918
Editorial

LETTER TO V. I. LENIN FROM THE EASTERN FRONT[1]

To Comrade Lenin,

Chairman of the Council of Defence.

The investigation has begun. We shall keep you regularly informed of its progress. Meanwhile we consider it necessary to bring one urgent need of the Third Army to your attention. The fact is that of the Third Army (more than 30,000 men), there remain only about 11,000 weary and battered soldiers who can scarcely contain the enemy's onslaught. The units sent by the Commander-in-Chief are unreliable, in part even hostile and require thorough sifting. To save the remnants of the Third Army and to prevent a swift enemy advance on Vyatka (according to all reports from the command of the front and the Third Army, this is a very real danger it is absolutely essential urgently to transfer at least three thoroughly reliable regiments from Russia and place them at the disposal of the army commander. We urgently request you to exert pressure on the appropriate military authorities to this end. We repeat, unless this is done Vyatka runs the risk of suffering the same fate as Perm. Such is the general opinion of the comrades concerned, and all the facts at our disposal lead us to endorse it.

1 In connection with the catastrophic situation which had arisen on the Eastern Front, and particularly in the sector of the Third Army, the C.C., R.C.P.(B.), on the motion of V. I. Lenin, decided on December 30, 1918, to send J. V. Stalin to the Eastern Front. On January 1, 1919, a commission consisting of two members of the C.C., J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky, was appointed by the Central Committee of the Party and the Council of Defence to investigate the reasons for the surrender of Perm and the reverses at the front, as well as to adopt measures for the restoration of Party and Soviet work in the area of the Third and Second Armies. On January 3, 1919, J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky left for the Eastern Front, where they carried out a great deal of work for restoring the fighting efficiency of the Third Army and strengthening the front and rear. By the end of the month, thanks to their labours, a decisive turn was achieved on the Eastern Front.

Stalin
F. Dzerzhinsky
Vyatka,
January 5, 1919,
8 p. m.
First published
in *Pravda*, No. 301,
December 21, 1929

REPORT TO V. I. LENIN

To Comrade Lenin.

We have received your ciphered telegram. We have already informed you of the reasons for the catastrophe as revealed by the investigation[1]: an army with fatigued units and with no reserves nor a firm command, and, moreover, occupying a flank position open to envelopment from the North—such an army could not but collapse in the face of a serious assault of superior and fresh enemy forces. In our opinion, the trouble lay not only in the weakness of the Third Army agencies and the immediate rear, but also

1) In the General Staff and the Area Military Commissariats, which formed and sent to the front units which were patently unreliable;

2) In the All-Russian Commissars Bureau, which supplied the units being formed in the rear with callow youths, not commissars;

3) In the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic, whose so-called instructions and orders disorganized the control of the front and the armies. Unless the necessary changes are made at central headquarters, there can be no guarantee of success at the fronts.

Here are our replies to the military.

1) The two regiments. Two regiments surrendered: the 1st Soviet

1 On January 13, 1919, J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky sent V. I. Lenin and the Party Central Committee a "Brief Preliminary Report" on the progress of the inquiry into the reasons for the Perm disaster. It also outlined the measures proposed by the commission for restoring the situation in the Third Army sector and to enable the army to pass to the offensive. In response to the report, V. I. Lenin, on January 14, sent the following telegram:

> To Stalin and Dzerzhinsky at their address in *Glazov*.
>
> Have received and read your first ciphered dispatch. Earnestly request both of you personally to supervise the carrying out of the proposed measures on the spot, otherwise there will be no guarantee of success.—Lenin.

and a regiment of sailors from Petrograd. They did not begin any hostile actions against us. It was the 10th Cavalry Regiment of the 10th Division stationed in the village of Ilyinskoye, which had been formed by the Ural Area Military Commissariat, that started hostile actions. Further, we managed to forestall a mutiny of the 10th Regiment of Engineers, stationed at Ochersky Zavod, which had also been formed by the Area Military Commissariat. The reason for the desertions to the enemy, as well as for the hostile actions, was the counter-revolutionary spirit of the regiments, which is to be attributed to the old methods of mobilization and formation, under which no preliminary sifting was made of the men called up for service, and also to the absence of even a minimum of political educational work in the regiments.

2) Motovilikha. The machinery of the plant and the equipment of the electrical shop were dismantled and inventorized in proper time and loaded on rail; but they were not moved out, nor were they destroyed. The responsibility lies with the Central Collegium,[2] the chief transportation officer and the Revolutionary Military Council of the army, which displayed incredible mismanagement. Five-sixths of Motovilikha's workers were left behind in Perm, as also were the entire technical staff of the plant and its raw materials. According to available information, the plant can be restarted in about a month and a half. Rumours of a revolt of the Motovilikha workers on the eve of the fall of Perm are not confirmed; there was only serious unrest due to bad food supply.

3) Demolition of the bridge and valuable installations. The bridge, etc., were not blown up owing to mismanagement on the part of the Revolutionary Military Council of the army and lack of liaison between the retreating units and army headquarters. It is asserted that the comrade whose duty it was to blow up the bridge could not accomplish his mission because he was killed by whiteguards a few minutes before the charge was to be fired. It has been impossible so far to verify this version because of the flight of the bridge guards and the departure of a whole number of "Soviet" officials "no one

2 Central Collegium—the local agency of the All-Russian Evacuation Commission.

knows whereto."

4) Reserves at Perm. The reserves consisted of one still weak and unreliable "Soviet regiment," which upon its arrival at the front immediately went over to the enemy. There were no other reserves.

5) Losses of matériel and men. It is still impossible to construct a full picture of the losses because of the disappearance of a number of documents and the desertion to the enemy of a number of the "Soviet" specialists concerned.

According to the scanty data available, our losses were: 297 locomotives (of which, 86 in disrepair), about 3,000 railway wagons (probably more), 900,000 poods of oil and paraffin, several hundred thousand poods of caustic soda, two million poods of salt, five million rubles' worth of medical supplies, the storehouses of the Motovilikha plant and the Perm railwayshops with the vast amount of materials they contained, the machinery and parts of the Motovilikha plant, the machinery of the steamers of the Kama flotilla, 65 wagon-loads of leather, 150 wagon-loads of food belonging to the army supply division, the huge warehouse of the District-Water Transport Board containing cotton wool, textiles, mineral oil, etc., ten cars of wounded, the axle stores of the railways which included large stocks of American axles, 29 guns, 10,000 shells, 2,000 rifles, 8 million cartridges; over 8,000 men killed, wounded or missing in the period December 22 to 29. The railway specialists and practically all the supply specialists have remained in Perm. The counting of losses continues.

6) Present fighting strength of the army. The Third Army consists at present of two divisions (29th and 30th), with 14,000 bayonets and 3,000 sabres, 323 machine guns and 78 guns. Reserves: a brigade of the 7th Division sent from Russia which has not yet been sent into action because of its unreliability and need of thorough sifting. The three regiments promised by Vatsetis have not yet arrived (and will not, because yesterday, it appears, they were redirected to Narva).[3]

3 This refers to the three regiments which were to be sent to the Third Army by the Commander-in-Chief in response to the request of J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky. When forwarding this report to the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic, V. I. Lenin wrote in the margin: "...In my opinion it is *simply outrageous* that

The units in action are battered and worn out and are holding their positions with difficulty.

7) Control system of the Third Army. Outwardly, the system of control seems the usual one and "according to the manual." Actually, there is no system at all—the administration is utterly incompetent, has no liaison with the combat area, and the divisions are virtually autonomous.

8) Have adequate measures been taken to halt the retreat? Of the measures taken, the following may be considered of serious value: 1) advance of the Second Army towards Kungur, which is undoubtedly of great support to the Third Army, and 2) the dispatch to the front, thanks to the efforts of Stalin and Dzerzhinsky, of 900 fresh and fully reliable bayonets with the object of raising the fallen morale of the Third Army. Within a couple of days we shall dispatch to the front two squadrons of cavalry and the 62nd Regiment of the 3rd Brigade (already sifted). Another regiment will be leaving in ten days. The front of the Third Army knows this and sees the solicitude of the rear, and its morale is stiffening. Without a doubt, the situation is better than it was a fortnight ago. In places the army is even assuming the offensive, and not without success. If the enemy allows us another couple of weeks' respite, that is, if he does not bring up fresh forces to the front, there is hope that a stable situation will be created in the Third Army's area.

We are at present engaged in liquidating a northern enveloping movement of several enemy detachments in the direction of Vyatka, along the road that runs through Kaigorod. One reason, incidentally, why we have come to Vyatka is to send a ski detachment to Kaigorod, which we shall do. As to other measures (for strengthening the rear), we are mobilizing personnel, rank-and-file and otherwise, and appointing them to the army units in the rear, and are purging the Glazov and Vyatka Soviets. But, of course, the results of this work will not make themselves felt for some time.

This exhausts the measures taken. They can by no means be considered adequate, because the weary units of the Third Army cannot hold

---

Vatsetis ordered the three regiments to Narva. *Countermand it!!*" (see *Lenin Miscellany*, XXXIV, p. 90).

on for long without at least partial replacement. It is therefore necessary to send us at least two regiments. Only then may the stability of the front be considered guaranteed. Apart from this, it is necessary:

1) To replace the army commander;

2) To send three efficient political workers;

3) To dissolve immediately the Regional Party Committee, Regional Soviet, etc., with a view to the speedy mobilization of the evacuated officials.

J. Stalin
F. Dzerzhinsky
Vyatka, January 19, 1919

P.S. We shall be returning to Glazov in a few days to complete the investigation.

First published in 1942,
in Lenin Miscellany, XXXIV

SPEECH DELIVERED AT A JOINT MEETING OF PARTY AND SOVIET ORGANISATIONS IN VYATKA

January 19, 1919 (Record in the Minutes)

As to the general situation, it should be said that for the immediate future a certain stability at the front is assured and it is just now that a Revolutionary Military Committee of the Vyatka Gubernia must be formed. If the enemy advances, he will have the aid of counter-revolutionary revolts from within, which can only be coped with by a small and mobile organization such as the Revolutionary Military Committee should be.

It is necessary at once to form a new centre, comprising representatives of:

1) The Gubernia Executive Committee;

2) The Regional Soviet;

3) The Gubernia Party Committee;

4) The Extraordinary Commission;

5) The Area Military Commissariat.

All forces and resources must be concentrated in the hands of the Vyatka Revolutionary Military Committee. However, the current work of the Soviet bodies should not be suspended; on the contrary, it must be intensified.

Similar organs must be formed in the uyezds, on the same pattern as the gubernia centre.

Given such a network of revolutionary committees, contact with the localities will be assured.

And only then shall we be ready for a new offensive.

Comrade Stalin formulated his proposal as follows:

With the object of strengthening and securing the rear and uniting the activities of all the Soviet and Party organizations of the Vyatka Gubernia, a Vyatka Revolutionary Military Committee shall be set up, the decisions of which, as the highest organ of Soviet power in the gubernia, shall be binding on the above-mentioned institutions and organizations.

First published in the newspaper
Gorkovskaya Kommuna, No. 290,
December 18, 1934

REPORT TO COMRADE LENIN BY THE COMMISSION OF THE PARTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE AND THE COUNCIL OF DEFENCE ON THE REASONS FOR THE FALL OF PERM IN DECEMBER 1918

General Picture of the Disaster

That disaster was inevitable was already apparent towards the end of November, when the enemy, after having surrounded the Third Army in a semi-circle along a line stretching from Nadezhdinsky, through Verkhoturye, Baranchinsky, Kyn, Irginsky and Rozhdestvensky, to the left bank of the Kama, and making strong demonstrations on his right flank, launched a fierce attack on Kushva.

The Third Army at that time consisted of the 30th Division, the 5th Division, a Special Brigade, a Special Detachment and the 29th Division, totalling about 35,000 bayonets and sabres, with 571 machine guns and 115 guns (see "Order of Battle").

The morale and efficiency of the army were deplorable, owing to the weariness of the units, the result of six months of continuous fighting without relief. There were no reserves whatever. The rear was totally insecure (a series of demolitions of the railway track in the rear of the army). The food supply of the army was haphazard and uncertain (at the most difficult moment, when a furious assault was launched against the 29th Division, its units were in action for five days literally without bread or other food).

Although it occupied a flank position, the Third

Army was not secured against envelopment from the North (no measures were taken to post a special group of units on the army's ex-

treme left flank to guard it against envelopment). As to the extreme right flank, the neighbouring army, the Second, being immobilized by a vague directive from the Commander-in-Chief (not to involve the Second Army in action after the capture of Izhevsk and Votkinsk, because it was to be given another assignment), and compelled to remain immobile for ten days, was not in a position to render timely support to the Third Army by advancing at the most crucial moment, before the surrender of Kushva (close of November).

Thus, left to its own devices (in the South) and open to enemy enveloping operations (in the North), weary and battered, without reserves and without the rear being at all secure, poorly fed (29th Division) and abominably shod (30th Division) at a time when the temperature stood at 35 degrees below zero, drawn out along a vast line stretching from Nadezhdinsky to the left bank of the Kama south of Osa (over 400 versts), and with a weak and inexperienced army headquarters, the Third Army could not, of course, withstand the onslaught of the enemy's superior and fresh forces (five divisions), which, in addition, were led by experienced commanders.

On November 30 the enemy occupied Viya Station, severing our left flank from the centre, and annihilated practically the entire 3rd Brigade of the 29th Division (only the brigade commander, the chief of staff and the commissar escaped; armoured train No. 9 fell into the enemy's hands). On December 1 the enemy occupied Krutoy Log Station in the Lysva sector and captured our armoured train No. 2. On December 3 the enemy occupied Kushvinsky Zavod (Verkhoturye and the whole northern area, being cut off from the centre, were evacuated by our forces). On December 7 the enemy occupied Biser. On December 9—Lysva. Between December 12 and 15—Chusovskaya, Kalino and Selyanka Stations, the 1st Soviet Replacements Battalion going over to the side of the enemy. On December 20 the enemy occupied Valezhnaya Station. On December 21—Gori and Mostovaya, the 1st Soviet Rifle Regiment deserting to the enemy. The enemy approached Motovilikha, with our forces in general retreat. On the night of the 24th-25th the enemy occupied Perm without a fight. The so-called artillery defence of the city proved a farce, leaving 29 guns in the enemy's hands.

Thus, in twenty days, the army in its disorderly retreat retired more

than 300 versts, from Verkhoturye to Perm, losing in this period 18,000 men, scores of guns and hundreds of machine guns. (After the fall of Perm the Third Army consisted only of two divisions, with a total of 17,000 bayonets and sabres instead of 35,000, with 323 machine guns instead of 571, and 78 guns instead of 115. See "Order of Battle.")

Strictly speaking, it was not a retreat, still less could it be called an organized withdrawal of units to new positions; it was an absolutely disorderly flight of an utterly routed and completely demoralized army, with a staff which was neither capable of realizing what was happening nor of foreseeing the inevitable disaster, incapable, too, of adopting timely measures to preserve the army by withdrawing it to prepared positions, even at the price of territory. The noisy laments of the Revolutionary Military Council and Third Army headquarters that the disaster was a "surprise" only prove that these institutions were out of touch with the army, had no inkling of the fatal significance of the events at Kushva and Lysva, and were incapable of directing the army's actions.

All these factors account for the unparalleled confusion and inefficiency which characterized the absolutely disorderly evacuation of a number of towns and places in the area of the Third Army, the shameful affair about the demolition of the bridge and destruction of the abandoned property, and, lastly, the matter of the guarding of the city and of its so-called artillery defence.

Although talk of evacuation had already begun in August, nothing, or nearly nothing, was done for its practical organization. Nobody, not a single organization, attempted to call to order the Central Collegium, which got in the way of the institutions, engaged in endless debates on a plan of evacuation, but did nothing, absolutely nothing, to arrange for the evacuation (it did not even prepare a list of "its own freight").

Nobody, not a single institution, attempted to establish effective control over the Ural Railway Administration, which proved suspiciously incapable of combating the skilfully organized sabotage of railway personnel.

The appointment of chief transportation officer Stogov as chief of evacuation on December 12 did not advance the work of evacuation one iota, because, despite his solemn pledge to evacuate Perm without

delay ("I pledge my head that everything will be evacuated"), Stogov had no plan of evacuation, no evacuation staff, and no military force with which to curb the disorderly and unauthorized attempts at "evacuation" on the part of individual institutions and disorganized military units (seizure of locomotives, wagons, etc.). The result was that all sorts of rubbish—broken chairs and similar lumber—were evacuated, while trains already loaded with machinery and parts of the Motovilikha plant and the Kama flotilla, trains carrying wounded soldiers or precious American axles, and hundreds of sound locomotives and other valuables remained unevacuated.

The Regional Party Committee, the Regional Soviet, and the Revolutionary Military Council and army headquarters could not but know all this, but evidently they "refrained from interfering," since the investigation reveals that these institutions did not exercise systematic control over the activities of the evacuation agencies.

Already in October army headquarters began to talk of arranging an artillery defence of Perm. But it went no farther than talk, because 26 guns (plus another 3 which were not in proper working order), with all their horses and harness were left to the enemy without a single shot having been fired. The investigation shows that if headquarters had taken the trouble to check what the brigade commander was doing in regard to placing the guns, it would have realized that, in view of the disorderly retreat of the military units and the general state of disorganization on the eve of the fall of Perm (December 23), and in view of the fact that the brigade commander, in disobedience of orders, had postponed the emplacement of the guns until the 24th (this brigade commander deserted to the enemy on the 24th), the only thing to be done was to save the guns themselves by removing them, or at least to put them out of action, but that there certainly could be no question of an artillery defence. That neither of these things was done can only be attributed to the negligence and inefficiency of headquarters.

Similar inefficiency and mismanagement is to be discerned in the matter of the demolition of the Kama bridge and the destruction of the property left behind in Perm. The bridge had been mined several months before Perm fell, but the mining was not checked by anybody (no one undertakes to affirm that the charge was in full working order

the day before the bridge was to be blown up). The discharge of the mine was entrusted to a "fully reliable" comrade (Medvedyev), but no one undertakes to affirm that the bridge guards were fully reliable, that they stood by Medvedyev up to the last minute when the charge was to be fired, that Medvedyev was fully protected by the guards against attack on the part of whiteguard agents. It is therefore impossible to establish:

1) Whether (as some assert) Medvedyev really was killed by whiteguard agents just before the charge was to be fired, when the bridge guards fled "no one knows whereto";

2) Whether Medvedyev himself ran away because he did not want to blow up the bridge;

3) Or whether, perhaps, Medvedyev did all in his power to blow up the bridge, but it was not blown up because the wiring was defective, or the charges were damaged, perhaps by the fire of the enemy, who was shelling the bridge, or perhaps before the shelling, Medvedyev being killed maybe later when the enemy arrived on the scene.

Further, the Revolutionary Military Council and army headquarters had made no attempt to assign to any precise and definite agency or individual the task of destroying the unevacuated property. More, these institutions were not found to have formal (written) orders making compulsory the destruction or demolition of the abandoned installations and property. This explains why property mostly of minor value (railway wagons, for instance) was destroyed (burned), on the initiative of individuals, while very valuable property (textiles, uniforms, etc.) was left untouched. Moreover, the burning or blowing up of unevacuated property was forbidden by certain official persons, ostensibly in order to "prevent panic" (these persons have not been found).

To this picture of general disruption and disorganization of the army and the rear, and mismanagement and irresponsibility on the part of army, Party and Soviet institutions, must be added the incredible, almost wholesale desertion of responsible officials to the enemy. Banin, the engineer in charge of the defence works, and all his staff, railway engineer Adrianovsky and all the experts of the area railway administration, Sukhorsky, chief of army transportation, and his staff, Bukin, chief of mobilization of the Area Military Commissariat, and his staff, Ufimtsev,

commander of the guard battalion, Valyuzhenich, commander of the artillery brigade, Eskin, chief of special formations, the commander of the engineer battalion and his second-in-command, the commandants of Perm I and Perm II Stations, the entire accountant's division of the army supply department, half the members of the Central Collegium—all these and many others remained in Perm and went over to the side of the enemy.

All this could not but increase the general panic that seized not only the retreating units but even the Revolutionary Committee which had been set up on the eve of the fall of Perm and which had failed to maintain revolutionary order in the city, and the Gubernia Military-Commissariat, which lost contact with the various parts of the city, resulting in the non-withdrawal from Perm of two companies of the guard battalion, who were afterwards massacred by the Whites, and the loss of a ski battalion, who were also slaughtered by the Whites. The provocative firing skilfully organized by White agents in various parts of the city (December 23 and 24) added to and enhanced the general panic.

The Third Army and the Reserves

The weariness of the Third Army (six months of continuous fighting without relief) and the lack of any reliable reserves were the immediate causes of the defeat. Drawn out in a thin line 400 versts long, and liable to envelopment from the North, which compelled it to extend the line still further northward, the Third Army presented a most convenient target for enemy penetration at any point. All this, as well as the lack of reserves, was known to the Revolutionary Military Councils of the Eastern Front and the Republic already in September (see, in the "Appendix," the telegrams of responsible officers of the Third Army demanding "replacements" and "reserves," reporting the weariness of the Third Army's units, etc.), but Central Headquarters either sent no reserves at all, or sent small contingents of worthless troops. The demands for replacements and references to the weariness of the army became particularly frequent after the loss of Kushva in the early part of December. On December 6 Lashevich (army commander) appealed to the Eastern Front for reserves, pleading the hopelessness of the situation, but Smilga (Eastern Front) replied: "Unfortunately, reinforcements cannot be sent." On

December 11 Trifonov, member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Third Army, informed Smilga (Eastern Front) over the direct wire: "It is very probable that we shall be forced to abandon Perm in the next few days. All we need is two or three firm regiments. Try to secure them from Vyatka or some nearby point." Reply of Smilga (Eastern Front): "Reinforcements cannot be sent. Commander-in-Chief declines to help." (See "Appendix.") In the period AugustDecember 13,153 men in all, with 3,388 bayonets, 134 machine guns, 22 guns and 977 horses, arrived as reinforcements for the Third Army on orders from the centre. Of these, the 1st Kronstadt Regiment of Marines (1,248 men) surrendered to the enemy, the 11th Separate Marines Battalion (834 men) deserted, the 5th Field Battery of the Kronstadt Fortress were placed under arrest for brutally killing their commander, and the Finns and Estonians (1,214 men) were recalled to the West. As to the indents for 22 companies promised by the centre, the latter simply did nothing about them. And the 3rd Brigade of the 7th Division (three regiments) promised by the centre arrived in Glazov only in the early part of January, when Perm had already fallen. Moreover, the very first acquaintance with the brigade was enough to show that it had no place in the Red Army (a distinctly counter-revolutionary attitude, disaffection towards the Soviet power, existence within the brigade of a solid group of kulak elements, threats to "surrender Vyatka," etc.). Furthermore, the brigade was not ready for action (no firing skill, baggage train of the summer type), the commanders were unacquainted with their regiments, and political educational work was negligible. Only towards the end of January, after three or four weeks of purging and thorough sifting of the brigade and strongly reinforcing it with Communists as rank-and-file Red Army men, and after intensive political educational work, was it converted into a competent fighting unit (of its three regiments, one was sent to the front on January 20, the second can be sent not earlier than January 30, and the third not earlier than February 10). Further evidence of these same shortcomings in our system of formation is the case of the 10th Cavalry Regiment and the 10th Regiment of Engineers stationed at Ochersky Zavod (they were both formed by the Ural Area Military Commissariat), the first of which attacked our units in the rear, and the second tried to do so too, but unsuccessfully, because of the precautionary measures taken.

The shortcomings in the system of formation are due to the follow-

ing circumstances: down to the end of May the Red Army was formed on the voluntary principle (under the direction of the All-Russian Formation Board), enlistment being confined to workers and peasants who did not exploit the labour of others (see "Certificate Card" and "Personal Card" drawn up by the All-Russian Formation Board). This, possibly, is one of the reasons for the staunchness of the formations of the volunteer period. When the All-Russian Formation Board was dissolved at the end of May and the work of formation turned over to the All-Russian General Staff, the picture changed for the worse. The All-Russian General Staff took over in its entirety the system of formation which prevailed in tsarist days, and enrolled for Red Army service all mobilized men regardless of their property status. The points concerning the property status of mobilized men contained in the "Personal Card" of the All-Russian Formation Board were not included in the "Personal and Record Card" drawn up by the All-Russian General Staff (see "Personal and Record Card" of the All-Russian General Staff). True, on June 12, 1918, the Council of People's Commissars issued the first decree on the mobilization of workers and peasants who do not exploit the labour of others, but it was evidently not reflected in the practical work of the All-Russian General Staff, nor in its orders, nor in the "Personal and Record Card." This chiefly explains why it was that the result of the work of our formation agencies was not so much a Red Army as a "popular army." Only in mid-January, when the Commission of the Council of Defence pressed the Ural Area Military Commissariat to the wall and demanded all documents and orders of the General Staff relative to methods of formation—only then did the All-Russian General Staff find time to give serious thought to the system of formation and it issued the telegraphic order to all Area Military Commissariats: "Fill in points 14, 15 and 16 of the personal and record cards, indicating party affiliation (of the recruit), whether he exploits the labour of others, and whether he has been through a general training course" (this telegraphic order of the General Staff was sent out on January 18, 1919. See "Appendix"). And this after eleven divisions were considered formed already by December 1, and part of them, already dispatched to the front, had displayed all the signs of being whiteguard formations.

The defects in the system of formation were aggravated by the amazing negligence of the Area Military Commissariat in regard to the main-

tenance of the new formations (wretched food and clothing, no bathhouses, etc. See "Testimony of the Commission of Inquiry of the Vyatka Party Committee"), and by the absolutely indiscriminate appointment of unverified officers as commanders, many of whom lured their units over to the enemy.

Lastly, the General Staff did not see to it that men mobilized in one locality should be transferred for formation to another locality (in a different military area), which would have substantially checked mass desertion. We say nothing about the absence of any satisfactory political educational work in the units (weakness and incompetence of the All-Russian Commissars Bureau).

It is quite understandable that such semi-whiteguard reserves, as far as the centre sent them at all (half of them usually deserted on the way), could not be of any material support to the Third Army. Yet the units of the Third Army were so fatigued and worn out that during the retreat soldiers would lie down in whole groups in the snow and beg their commissars to shoot them: "We can't stand on our feet, let alone march. We're worn out. Put us out of our misery, comrades." (See "Testimony of Divisional Commissar Mrachkovsky.")

Conclusions

This practice of fighting without reserves must be stopped. A system of permanent reserves must be introduced, otherwise it will be impossible either to maintain present positions, or to exploit successes. Without this, disaster will be inevitable.

But reserves can be of value only if the old system of mobilization and formation practised by the General Staff is radically amended, and the composition of the General Staff itself is changed.

It is necessary, firstly, that mobilized men be divided strictly into propertied men (unreliable) and non-propertied men (who are alone suitable for Red Army service).

It is necessary, secondly, that men mobilized in one locality should be transferred for formation to another locality, and that the principle in dispatching men to the front should be: "the further from their home

gubernia, the better" (abandonment of the territorial principle).

It is necessary, thirdly, to discard the practice of forming large, unwieldy units (divisions), which are unfitted for conditions of civil war, and to lay down that the maximum combat unit should be the brigade.

It is necessary, fourthly, to establish strict continuous control over those Area Military Commissariats (first replacing their personnel), which evoke indignation among the Red Army men (mass desertion at the best) by their criminal negligence in the matter of billeting, victualling and outfitting the units under formation.

It is necessary, lastly, to replace the personnel of the All-Russian Commissars Bureau, which supplies the military units with whipper-snapper "commissars" who are quite incapable of organizing political educational work on any satisfactory basis.

As a result of non-observance of these conditions, what our formation agencies are sending to the front is not so much a Red Army as a "popular army," and the word "commissar" has become a term of opprobrium.

In particular, if the fighting efficiency of the Third Army is to be preserved, it is absolutely essential to supply it at once with reserves to the extent of at least three reliable regiments.

Control System of the Army and Instructions of the Centre

The Revolutionary Military Council of the Third Army consists of two men, one of whom (Lashevich) commands, and as to the other (Trifonov), we have failed to discover either what his functions are, or what he is actually doing: he does not look after supply, he does not look after the political education services of the army, and generally he does not seem to be doing anything whatever. In point of fact, there is no Revolutionary Military Council at all.

Army headquarters has no contact with its combat area; it has no special representatives in the divisions and brigades to keep it informed and to see to it that the orders of the army commander are strictly obeyed by the commanders of divisions and brigades; army headquarters contents itself with the official reports (often inaccurate) of the division and

brigade commanders; it is completely in their hands (they behave like feudal princes). This accounts for army headquarters' lack of liaison with its combat area (it knows nothing about the real state of affairs there) and the lack of centralized control within the army (constant wailing of army headquarters regarding the weakness of the junctions between the army's combat units). Centralized control is lacking not only within the army, but also between the various armies of the front (Eastern). It is a fact that from the 10th to the end of November, when the Third Army was shedding its blood in unequal combat, its neighbour, the Second Army, remained immobile for two whole weeks. Yet it is clear that if the Second Army, which had completed the Izhevsk-Votkinsk operation on November 10, had advanced (which it could have done quite easily, because at that time there were no enemy forces opposing it, or practically none), the enemy could not even have started any serious operation against Perm (since his rear would have been threatened by the Second Army), and the Third Army would have been saved.

The investigation has revealed that the lack of coordination between the Second and Third Armies was due to the isolation of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic from the front and the ill-considered instructions of the Commander-in-Chief. Front Commander Kamenev, when interrogated by us, had the following to say in this connection:

> Before the capture of Izhevsk and Votkinsk, in the early part of November, not later than the 10th, we had received instructions that after the capture of these points the Second Army was to be transferred to another front, the exact location not being specified. Having received such an instruction, the army could not be adequately used; it could not be brought into contact with the enemy, otherwise it would have been impossible to disengage it in time. The situation meanwhile was very serious, yet the army confined itself to clearing the area of whiteguard bands. It was not before Shternberg and Sokolnikov interceded and went to Serpukhov that the instruction was rescinded. But this took ten days. Ten days were thus wasted, during which the army was forced to remain immobile. Then the sudden summons of Shorin, commander of the Second Army, to Serpukhov paralysed the Second Army, which was linked with his personality, and forced it to remain immobile for another five days. In Serpukhov, Shorin was received by Kostyaev, who asked him whether he was a General Staff officer, and on learning that he was not, dismissed him, saying that it had been intended to appoint him assistant commander of the Southern Front but they 'had thought better of it' (see "Statement of the Commander of the Eastern Front").

It is necessary in general to draw attention to the unpardonable

thoughtlessness with which the Commanderin-Chief issues instructions. Gusev, member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Eastern Front, states (December 26): "Recently the Eastern Front received three telegraphic instructions in the space of five days: 1) Main direction—Orenburg. 2) Main direction—Yekaterinburg. 3) Go to the support of the Third Army" (see Gusev's letter to the C.C., R.C.P.). Bearing in mind that every new instruction requires a certain amount of time to execute, it will be easily seen how light-minded was the attitude of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic and the Commander-in-Chief towards their own instructions.

It should be stated that the third member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Eastern Front, Smilga, fully associates himself with the statements of the other two members, Kamenev and Gusev. (See "Smilga's Testimony," January 5.)

Conclusions

The army cannot do without a strong Revolutionary Military Council. Its Revolutionary Military Council should consist of at least three members, one of whom supervises the army's supply services, the second its political education services, and the third commands. Only in this way can the army function properly.

Army headquarters must not content itself with the official reports (not infrequently inaccurate) of the commanders of divisions and brigades; it must have its representatives—agents who keep it regularly informed and are keenly alert to see that the orders of the army commander are strictly observed. Only in this way can contact between headquarters and army be assured, the virtual autonomy of divisions and brigades abolished, and effective centralized control of the army established.

An army cannot operate as a self-contained and absolutely autonomous unit. In its operations it is entirely dependent on the armies adjacent to it, and above all on the instructions of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic. Other things being equal, the most efficient army may suffer disaster if the instructions of the centre are faulty and if effective contact with the adjacent armies is lacking. It is necessary to establish on the fronts, and on the Eastern Front in the first place, a

system of strictly centralized control of operations of the various armies for the execution of a definite and thoroughly thought-out strategic directive. Arbitrary or ill-considered defining of instructions, and failure to pay serious heed to all the factors involved, with the consequent rapid change of instructions and the vagueness of the instructions themselves, as is the case with the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic, makes it impossible to direct the armies, results in loss of effort and time, and disorganizes the front. The Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic must be reformed into a narrow group, closely connected with the fronts and consisting, say, of five persons (two of them being experts, a third exercising supervision over the Central Supply Department, a fourth over the General Staff, and the fifth over the All-Russian Commissars Bureau), sufficiently experienced not to act arbitrarily and light-mindedly in the control of the armies.

Insecurity of the Rear and Work of the Party and Soviet Institutions

The investigation reveals that the rear of the Third Army was completely disrupted. The army was forced to fight on two fronts: against the enemy, whom it at any rate knew and could see, and against elusive inhabitants in the rear who, under the direction of whiteguard agents, blew up railway tracks and created all sorts of difficulties, so much so that the railway in the rear of the army had to be guarded by a special armoured train. All the Party and Soviet institutions are unanimous in affirming that the population of the Perm and Vyatka gubernias are "solidly counter-revolutionary." The Regional Party Committee and Regional Soviet, as well as the Perm Gubernia Executive Committee and Gubernia Party Committee assert that the villages in this area are "solidly kulak." When we remarked that there were no such things as solidly kulak villages, that the existence of kulaks without exploited is inconceivable, since kulaks must have somebody to exploit, the abovementioned institutions shrugged their shoulders and declined to give any other explanation. Further and more thorough investigation has revealed that the Soviets contain unreliable elements, that the Committees of Poor Peasants are controlled by kulaks, that the Party organizations are weak, unreliable and isolated from the centre, that Party work is ne-

glected, and that the local functionaries endeavour to compensate for the general weakness of the Party and Soviet institutions by intensifying the activities of the Extraordinary Commissions, which, in view of the general breakdown of Party and Soviet work, have become the sole representatives of Soviet power in the provinces. Only the wretchedness of the work of the Soviet and Party organizations, which lacked even a minimum of guidance from the Central Executive Committee (or the People's Commissariat of Home Affairs) and the Central Committee of the Party, can explain the amazing fact that the revolutionary decree on the extraordinary tax, which was designed to drive a wedge in the countryside and rouse the poor peasants in support of Soviet power, was turned into a most dangerous weapon of the kulaks, used by them to unite the countryside against the Soviet power (as a rule, on the initiative of the kulaks ensconced in the Committees of Poor Peasants, taxes were levied on a per capita instead of a property basis, which infuriated the poor peasants and facilitated the agitation of the kulaks against taxes and the Soviet power). Yet all the functionaries without exception confirm that the "misunderstandings" arising in connection with the extraordinary tax were one of the principal factors, if not the only important one, which made the countryside counter-revolutionary. No guidance of the current work of the Soviet organizations on the part of the People's Commissariat of Home Affairs or the Central Executive Committee is to be observed (it is characteristic that by January 26 the re-election of the Committees of Poor Peasants in the Perm and Vyatka gubernias had not yet begun). Nor is any guidance of the current work of the Party organizations to be observed on the part of the Central Committee. All the time we have been at the front we have succeeded in unearthing only one document from the Central Committee of the Party. It orders the transfer of Comrade Korobovkin from Perm to Penza, and is signed by a "secretary" by the name of Novgorodtseva. (This order was not carried out because of its manifest inexpediency.)

The result of all these circumstances was that the Party and Soviet institutions were deprived of backing in the villages, lost contact with the poor peasants and began to place all their reliance in the Extraordinary Commissions and in repressive measures, under which the countryside is groaning. The Extraordinary Commissions themselves, inasmuch as their work was not supplemented by and conducted par-

allel with positive agitational and constructive work by the Party and Soviet institutions, fell into a state of complete and utter isolation, to the detriment of the prestige of the Soviet power. An ably conducted Party and Soviet press might have promptly brought the disease spots of our institutions to light; but the Perm and Vyatka Party and Soviet press is not distinguished either by ability in organizing its work or by its understanding of the current tasks of Soviet power (nothing but empty talk about a "world social" revolution is to be found in it; the concrete tasks of Soviet power in the countryside, the reelection of the volost Soviets, the extraordinary tax, the aims of the war against Kolchak and the other whiteguards—all these are "low" themes which the press proudly shuns). Consider the significance, for example, of the fact that of the 4,766 officials and employees of the Soviet institutions in Vyatka, 4,467 occupied the same posts in the gubernia rural administration in tsarist times; or, to put it plainly, the old tsarist Zemstvo institutions have been simply re-named Soviet institutions (do not forget that these "Soviet officials" control the entire leather-producing area of the Vyatka Gubernia). This striking fact was revealed by our questionnaire in mid-January. Did the Regional Party Committee and Regional Soviet, the local press and the local Party officials know about it? Of course, not. Did the Central Committee of the Party, the Central Executive Committee and the People's Commissariat of Home Affairs know about it? Of course, not. But how can the centre direct if it has no idea of the chief disease spots not only in the provinces generally, but even in our provincial Soviet institutions?

Conclusions

A severe handicap to our armies is the instability of the rear, which is mainly to be explained by neglect of Party work, inability of the Soviets to carry out the directives of the centre, and the abnormal (almost isolated) position of the local Extraordinary Commissions.

In order to strengthen the rear it is necessary:

1) To institute a strict system of regular reports from the local Party organizations to the Central Committee; to send regular circular letters of the Central Committee to the local Party organizations;

to set up a press department of the Central Organ to direct the provincial Party press; to organize a school for training Party officials (mainly from workers) and arrange for the proper distribution of officials. All these measures should be entrusted to a Secretariat of the Party Central Committee to be organized within the Central Committee.

2) Strictly to delimit the sphere of jurisdiction of the Central Executive Committee and the People's Commissariat of Home Affairs in the direction of the current work of the Soviets; to merge the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission with the People's Commissariat of Home Affairs;[1] to make it the duty of the People's Commissariat of Home Affairs to see that the decrees and orders of the central authority are correctly and promptly carried out by the Soviets; to make it the duty of the gubernia Soviets to present regular reports to the People's Commissariat of Home Affairs; to make it the duty of the People's Commissariat of Home Affairs to issue the necessary regular instructions to the Soviets; to institute a press department of the Izvestia of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee[2] to direct the provincial Soviet press.

3) To set up a Control and Inspection Commission under the Council of Defence to investigate "defects in the machinery" of the People's Commissariats and their corresponding local departments both in the rear and at the front.

---

1 On the question of merging the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission with the People's Commissariat of Home Affairs Comrade Dzerzhinsky expresses a dissenting opinion.

2 *Izvestia of the A.R.C.E.C.* (*Gazette of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee*)—a daily newspaper first published on February 28, 1917, as the *Izvestia of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies*. On August 1, 1917, after the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets, it became the organ of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and began to appear under the title of the *Izvestia of the Central Executive Committee and the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies*. On October 27, 1917, after the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, it became the official organ of the Soviet Government. On March 12, 1918, its place of publication was transferred to Moscow and its title was changed to *Izvestia of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Peasants', Workers', Soldiers' and Cossacks' Deputies*. On June 22, 1918, it became the organ of the A.R.C.E.C. and the Moscow Soviet, and later the organ of the C.E.C. of the U.S.S.R. and the C.E.C. of the R.S.F.S.R.

Supply and Evacuation Agencies

The chief malady in the sphere of supply is the incredible overlapping of supply agencies and the lack of co-ordination between them.

The army and the population of Perm received their food supplies from Ural Supply, Gubernia Supply, City Supply, the Uyezd Supply Boards and the Supply Department of the Third Army. For all that, the work of supply proceeded very badly, for the army (29th Division) starved and the population of Perm and the Motovilikha workers went hungry, the bread ration having been systematically reduced until it dropped to starvation level (1/4 lb.).

The confusion in supplying the army, due to lack of co-ordination among the above-mentioned supply agencies, is aggravated by the fact that the People's Commissariat of Food takes no account of the loss of the Perm Gubernia and still issues its indents for supplies to the Third Army on the Perm and other remote gubernias instead of transferring them to Vyatka. It should also be mentioned that the People's Commissariat of Food has not yet proceeded to haul grain to the river wharves, nor the Waterways Board to repair its steamers, and this undoubtedly may create serious complications in the matter of supply in the future.

The supply of the army with munitions is suffering even more severely from the overlapping of agencies and from bureaucratic red tape. The Central Supply Department, the Central Ordnance Department, the Extraordinary Supply Commission and the Ordnance Division of the Third Army are continually getting into each other's way, hampering and preventing the active work of supply. In illustration, we consider it appropriate to quote some excerpts from a telegram sent by the Commander of the Third Army to the Commander of the Front (with a copy to Trotsky) on December 17, 1918, just before the fall of Perm:

> Chief of Supply, Eastern Front, stated in his telegram No. 3249 that an indent for six thousand Japanese rifles had been issued on the Yaroslavl Area. This indent, as may be seen from telegram No. 493 of Chief of Staff of the Military Council of the Republic Kostyaev, was endorsed by the Commander-in-Chief. A month ago Third Army headquarters sent an agent to receive the rifles. On his arrival at the Yaroslavl Area Ordnance Department he wired that nothing was known there about the matter, since no order had been received from the Central Ordnance Department (C.O.D.). The agent proceeded to the C.O.D. in Moscow, and wired from there that the rifles could not be issued without the consent of the Commander-in-Chief. Yesterday we received a wire from the agent stating that C.O.D.

> categorically refused to issue the rifles and that he had returned. In his telegram No. 208 Chief of Supply of the Revolutionary Military Council stated that the Second Army had been ordered to deliver six thousand rifles to the Third Army, and Commander Second Army in his telegram No. 1560 requested that an agent be urgently sent to Izhevsk to receive the rifles. The agent was sent to Izhevsk, but he was not issued the rifles on the plea that no order had been received. Commander Second Army in his telegram No. 6542 and Chief of Supply Eastern Front in his telegram No. 6541 requested that the Izhevsk factory be ordered to release the rifles. Down to the 16th of this month no order had been sent to the factory, and according to information received from the agent all available rifles in Izhevsk are to be dispatched to the centre on Monday. Ten thousand rifles have thus been lost to the army on these two indents. The state of the army is well known. Replenishments cannot be sent to the front without rifles, and because of lack of replenishments the front is melting away, leading to the results with which you are familiar. The indent for rifles wad issued to the Yaroslavl Area Ordnance Department with the consent of the Commanderin-Chief, and Commander Third Army therefore officially accuses the C.O.D. of sabotage and insists upon an inquiry.

The substance of this telegram is fully corroborated by Front Commander Kamenev. (See "Statements of the Commander of the Front.")

Similar confusion and overlapping of agencies reigned in the sphere of evacuation. The Area Chief of Railways proved totally incapable of checking the skilfully organized sabotage of railway personnel. Frequent train accidents, traffic jams and mysterious disappearances of freight needed by the army took the area administration by surprise at the most trying moments of the evacuation, yet it did nothing, or was incapable of doing anything, to put an effective stop to the evil. The Central Collegium "worked," that is, debated, but took absolutely no measures for the orderly evacuation of freight. The chief transportation officer of the Third Army, who was also chief of evacuation, did absolutely nothing to get out the most valuable freight (machinery and parts of the Motovilikha plant, etc.). All sorts of rubbish was evacuated, and all organizations without exception had a finger in the work of evacuation, and the result was confusion and chaos.

Conclusions

In order to improve the supply of the army, it is necessary:

1) To put an end to the overlapping of central army supply agencies (Central Supply Department, Extraordinary Supply Commission, Central Ordnance Department—each of which acts as it sees fit)

and to reduce them to one, which should be held strictly accountable for the prompt fulfilment of indents.

2) To instruct the army supply division to maintain a fortnight's supply of rations in reserve with each division.

3) To instruct the People's Commissariat of Food to issue indents for the armies on gubernias in their immediate vicinity—in particular, to transfer (promptly) its indents for the Third Army to the Vyatka Gubernia.

4) To instruct the People's Commissariat of Food to proceed immediately to haul grain to the river wharves, and the Waterways Board to proceed to repair its steamers.

In order to ensure efficient evacuation, it is necessary:

1) To abolish the local Central Collegiums.

2) To set up under the Supreme Council of National Economy a single evacuation agency, with the right to allocate evacuated property.

3) To instruct this agency, in case of need, to send special agents to direct the work of evacuation on the spot, always, as an indispensable condition, enlisting the co-operation of representatives of the military authorities and railway administration of the given area.

4) To appoint to the various area railway administrations, especially of the Ural Area (in view of the unsatisfactory nature of its personnel) responsible agents of the People's Commissariat of Railways who will be capable of commanding the obedience of the railway experts and breaking the sabotage of railway personnel.

5) To instruct the People's Commissariat of Railways to proceed immediately to transfer locomotives and wagons from areas where they are in abundance to the grain-growing areas, as well as to repair damaged locomotives.

Total Losses of Matériel and Men

It is impossible to establish an exhaustive picture of the losses in view of the "disappearance" of a number of documents and the desertion to the

enemy of a whole number of Soviet officials and experts concerned. According to available data, our losses are: 419,000 cubic sazhens of wood fuel and 2,383,000 poods of coal, anthracite and peat; 66,800,000 poods of ore and other raw materials; 5,000,000 poods of basic materials and products (cast iron, aluminium, tin, zinc, etc.); 6,000,000 poods of open-hearth and Bessemer ingots, bars and slabs; 8,000,000 poods of iron and steel (structural steel, sheet iron, wire, rails, etc.); 4,000,000 poods of salt; 255,000 poods of caustic and calcined soda; 900,000 poods of oil and paraffin; 5,000,000 rubles' worth of medical supplies; the storehouses of the Motovilikha plant and the Perm railway shops; the railway axle stores, including large stocks of American axles; the warehouses of the District Water Transport Board, containing cotton wool, textiles, mineral oil, nails, carts, etc.; 65 wagonloads of leather; 150 wagon-loads of food belonging to the army supply division; 297 locomotives (86 out of order); over 3,000 railway wagons; some 20,000 killed, captured and missing soldiers and 10 cars of wounded; 37 guns, 250 machine guns, over 20,000 rifles, over 10,000,000 cartridges, over 10,000 shells.

We say nothing of the loss of the entire railway network, valuable installations, etc.

Measures Taken to Strengthen the Front

By January 15, 1,200 bayonets and sabres who could be relied on had been sent to the front; two squadrons of cavalry were dispatched two days later, and the 62nd Regiment of the 3rd Brigade (after thorough sifting) on the 20th. These units made it possible to halt the enemy's advance, wrought a complete change in the morale of the Third Army, and opened our advance on Perm, which so far is proceeding successfully. The 63rd Regiment of the same brigade (after having undergone a month's purge) will be sent to the front on January 30. The 61st Regiment cannot be sent before February 10 (it needs very thorough sifting). In view of the weakness of the extreme left flank, open to the danger of being turned by the enemy, the ski battalion in Vyatka was reinforced with volunteers (1,000 in all), supplied with quick-firing guns and sent from Vyatka on January 28 in the direction of Cherdyn to link up with the extreme left flank of the Third Army. Another three reliable regiments must be sent from Russia to support the Third Army if its

position is to be really strengthened and if it is to be able to exploit its successes.

In the rear of the army a thorough purging of Soviet and Party institutions is under way. Revolutionary Committees have been formed in Vyatka and the uyezd towns. A start has been made in forming strong revolutionary organizations in the countryside, and this work is continuing. All Party and Soviet work is being re-organized on new lines. The military control agencies have been purged and re-organized. The Gubernia Extraordinary Commission has been purged and reinforced with new Party workers. The congestion on the Vyatka railway line is being relieved. Experienced Party workers need to be sent and prolonged socialist work will be required before the rear of the Third Army is thoroughly strengthened.

Concluding their report, the Commission considers it necessary to stress once again the absolute necessity for the establishment of a Control and Inspection Commission under the Council of Defence for the investigation of so-called "defects in the machinery" of the People's Commissariats and their local departments in the rear and at the front.

In correcting shortcomings in the work of the centre and the localities the Soviet power usually resorts to the method of disciplining and punishing offending officials. While recognizing that this method is absolutely necessary and fully expedient, the Commission, however, considers it insufficient. Shortcomings in work are due not only to the laxity, negligence and irresponsibility of some of the officials, but also to the inexperience of others. The Commission has found in the localities quite a number of absolutely honest, tireless and devoted officials who, nevertheless, committed a number of blunders in their work owing to insufficient experience. If the Soviet power had a special apparatus to accumulate the experience gained in the work of building the socialist state and to pass it on to the already existing young officials who are ardently desirous of helping the proletariat, the building of a socialist Russia would proceed much faster and less painfully. This body should be the above-mentioned. Control and Inspection Commission under the Council of Defence. The activities of this Commission might supplement the work of the centre in tightening discipline among officials.

The Commission:

J. Stalin
F. Dzerzhinsky
January 31, 1919,
Moscow
First published
in *Pravda*, No. 16,
January 16, 1935



THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

A YEAR AGO, and even before the October Revolution, Russia, as a state, presented a picture of disintegration. Side by side with the old "boundless Russian Empire" there were a whole series of new small "states" all pulling in different directions—such was the picture.

The October Revolution and the Brest Peace deepened and furthered the process of disintegration. People no longer spoke of Russia, but of Great Russia. The bourgeois governments formed in the border regions were imbued with hostility towards the socialist Soviet Government in the centre and declared war on it.

Parallel with this, there was undoubtedly a very strong urge on the part of the workers' and peasants' Soviets in the border regions for unity with the centre. But this urge was swamped, and later suppressed, by the counter-trend of the foreign imperialists who had begun to interfere in our internal affairs.

The Austro-German imperialists took the lead in this and skilfully exploited the disintegration of the old Russia, plentifully supplying the border governments with all they needed for their fight against the centre, occupying the border regions in certain parts, and generally contributing to the complete disintegration of Russia. The Entente imperialists had no wish to lag behind the Austro-Germans and adopted a similar course.

The enemies of the Bolshevik Party of course (of course!) laid the blame for the disintegration on the Soviet Government. But it will be easily understood that the Soviet Government could not, and had no wish to, counteract the inevitable process of temporary disintegration. The Soviet Government realized that the unity of Russia, forcibly maintained with imperialist bayonets, was bound to break down with the

downfall of Russian imperialism. The Soviet Government could not maintain unity with the methods used by Russian imperialism without being false to its own nature. The Soviet Government was aware that not any sort of unity was needed for socialism, but only fraternal unity, and that such unity could come only in the shape of a voluntary union of the labouring classes of the nationalities of Russia, or not at all...

The rout of Austro-German imperialism changed the whole picture. On the one hand, there developed in the border regions which had experienced the horrors of occupation a powerful gravitation towards the Russian proletariat and its forms of state structure which overwhelmed the separatist efforts of the border governments. On the other, there was no longer that foreign armed force (Austro-German imperialism) which had prevented the labouring masses of the occupied regions from manifesting their own political complexion. The mighty revolutionary upsurge which followed in the occupied regions, and the formation of a number of worker and peasant national republics, left no doubt regarding the political aspirations of the occupied regions. To the requests for recognition made by the Soviet national governments, the Soviet Government of Russia replied by unreservedly recognizing the full independence of the newly-formed Soviet republics. In acting thus the Soviet Government was adhering to its old and tried policy, which rejects all coercion against nationalities and demands full freedom of development for their labouring masses. The Soviet Government realized that only on a basis of mutual confidence could mutual understanding arise, and that only on a basis of mutual understanding could a firm and indestructible union of the peoples be built.

Again the enemies of the Soviet Government did not fail to accuse it of making "another attempt" to dismember Russia. The more reactionary of them, realizing how powerfully the border regions were gravitating to the centre, proclaimed a "new" slogan: re-establishment of "Greater Russia"—by fire and sword, by the overthrow of the Soviet Government, of course. The Krasnovs and Denikins, the Kolchaks and Chaikovskys, who only yesterday had been trying to break Russia up into a number of separate counter-revolutionary hotbeds, now suddenly conceived the "idea" of an "allRussian state." The agents of British and French capital, whose political instinct cannot be denied,

and who only yesterday were gambling on the disintegration of Russia, now changed their play so abruptly that they formed not one, but two "all-Russian" governments simultaneously (in Siberia and in the South). All this speaks convincingly of the irrepressible gravitation of the border regions to the centre, which the home and foreign counter-revolutionaries are now trying to exploit.

It need scarcely be said that, after the year and a half of revolutionary work of the labouring masses of the nationalities of Russia, the counter-revolutionary appetites of the would-be restorers of the "old Russia" (together with the old regime, of course) are doomed to disappointment. But the more utopian the plans of our counter-revolutionaries, the more realistic is seen to be the Soviet Government's policy, which is entirely based upon the mutual and fraternal confidence of the peoples of Russia. What is more, in the present state of international affairs, this policy is the only realistic and the only revolutionary one.

This is eloquently attested, for example, by the recent declaration of the Congress of Soviets of the Byelorussian Republic[1] establishing a federal connection with the Russian Soviet Republic. The fact is that the Byelorussian Soviet Republic, whose independence was recently recognized, has now, at its Congress of Soviets, voluntarily proclaimed its union with the Russian Republic. In its declaration of February 3, the Byelorussian Congress of Soviets affirms that "only a free and voluntary union of the working people of all the now independent Soviet Republics can ensure the triumph of the workers and peasants in their struggle against the capitalist world."

"A voluntary union of the working people of all the independent Soviet Republics." This is precisely the course the Soviet Government has consistently advocated for uniting the peoples, and which is now yielding its beneficent fruits.

The Byelorussian Congress of Soviets decided, furthermore, to

1 The First Byelorussian Congress of Soviets, which opened on February 2, 1919, in Minsk and was attended by 230 delegates, proclaimed Byelorussia an independent Soviet Socialist Republic, adopted the Constitution of the Byelorussian S.S.R. and elected a Central Executive Committee. Recognition of the independence of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee was announced by the latter's Chairman, Y. M. Sverdlov, who took part in the work of the congress.

unite with the Lithuanian Republic, and recognized the necessity for a federal tie between the two republics and the Russian Soviet Republic. Telegraphic dispatches state that the Soviet Government of Lithuania holds the same view, and, it appears, a conference of the Lithuanian Communist Party, the most influential of all the Lithuanian parties, approves the attitude of the Soviet Government of Lithuania. There is every reason to hope that the Congress of Soviets of Lithuania[256] now being convened will follow the same course.

This is one more confirmation of the correctness of the Soviet Government's policy on the national question.

Thus, from the breakdown of the old imperialist unity, through independent Soviet republics, the peoples of Russia are coming to a new, voluntary and fraternal unity.

This path is unquestionably not of the easiest, but it is the only one that leads to a firm and indestructible socialist union of the labouring masses of the nationalities of Russia.

Izvestia, No. 30,
February 9, 1919
Signed: J. Stalin

2 The First Congress of Soviets of Lithuania, which met in Vilna from February 18 to 20, 1919, and was attended by 220 delegates, examined, among other matters, the report of the Lithuanian Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government, the question of union with Byelorussia. The congress recognized the necessity for the union of the Lithuanian and Byelorussian Soviet Republics and their federation with the Russian Soviet Republic and declared in its resolution: "Keenly conscious of our inseparable bond with all the Soviet Socialist Republics, the congress instructs the Workers' and Peasants' Government of the Socialist Soviet Republic of Lithuania and Byelorussia to inaugurate negotiations forthwith with the workers' and peasants' governments of the R.S.F.S.R., Latvia, the Ukraine and Estland with a view to constituting all these republics into a single R.S.F.S.R."



TO THE SOVIETS AND THE PARTY ORGANISATIONS OF TURKESTAN

With the liberation of the Eastern border regions, it becomes the task of Party and Soviet officials to draw the labouring masses of the nationalities of these regions into the common work of building a socialist state. It is necessary to raise the cultural level of the labouring masses and to educate them in a socialist way, to promote a literature in the local languages, to appoint local people who are most closely connected with the proletariat to the Soviet organizations and draw them into the work of administering the territory.

Only in that way can Soviet power become near and dear to the working people of Turkestan.

It should be borne in mind that Turkestan, because of its geographical position, is a bridge connecting socialist Russia with the oppressed countries of the East, and that in view of this the consolidation of Soviet power in Turkestan may exert a supreme revolutionizing influence on the entire East. The above-mentioned task is therefore of exceptional importance to Turkestan.

The People's Commissariat for the Affairs of Nationalities draws attention to a series of decisions of the Central Committee of the Party, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of Soviets and the Council of People's Commissars couched in the spirit of the circular letter, and expresses its full conviction that the Party and Soviet officials of Turkestan, and, first and foremost, the national departments of the Soviets, will discharge with credit the task entrusted to them.

Member of the Bureau of the Party Central Committee,

People's Commissar

J. Stalin
Moscow,
February 12, 1919
Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 7,
March 2, 1919



TWO CAMPS

THE WORLD has definitely and irrevocably split into two camps: the camp of imperialism and the camp of socialism.

Over there, in their camp, are America and Britain, France and Japan, with their capital, armaments, tried agents and experienced administrators.

Here, in our camp, are Soviet Russia and the young Soviet republics and the growing proletarian revolution in the countries of Europe, without capital, without tried agents or experienced administrators, but, on the other hand, with experienced agitators capable of firing the hearts of the working people with the spirit of emancipation.

The struggle between these two camps constitutes the hub of present-day affairs, determines the whole substance of the present home and foreign policies of the leaders of the old and the new worlds.

Estland and Lithuania, the Ukraine and the Crimea, Turkestan and Siberia, Poland and the Caucasus, and, finally, Russia itself are not aims in themselves. They are only an arena of struggle, of a mortal struggle between two forces: imperialism, which is striving to strengthen the yoke of slavery, and socialism, which is fighting for emancipation from slavery.

The strength of imperialism lies in the ignorance of the masses, who create wealth for their masters and forge chains of oppression for themselves. But the ignorance of the masses is a transient thing and inevitably tends to be dispelled in the course of time, as the dissatisfaction of the masses grows and the revolutionary movement spreads. The imperialists have capital—but who does not know that capital is powerless in the face of the inevitable? For this reason, the rule of imperialism is impermanent and insecure.

The weakness of imperialism lies in its powerlessness to end the war

without catastrophe, without increasing mass unemployment, without further robbery of its own workers and peasants, without further seizures of foreign territory. It is a question not of ending the war, nor even of victory over Germany, but of who is to be made to pay the billions spent on the war. Russia emerged from the imperialist war rejuvenated, because she ended the war at the cost of the imperialists, home and foreign, and laid the expense of the war on those who were directly responsible for it by expropriating them. The imperialists cannot do this; they cannot expropriate themselves, otherwise they would not be imperialists. To end the war in imperialist fashion, they are "compelled" to doom the workers to starvation (wholesale unemployment due to the closing down of "unprofitable" plants, additional indirect taxation, a terrific rise in prices of food); they are "compelled" to plunder Germany, Austria-Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, the Ukraine, the Caucasus, Turkestan, Siberia.

Need it be said that all this broadens the base of revolution, shakes the foundations of imperialism and hastens the inevitable catastrophe?

Three months ago imperialism, drunk with victory, was rattling the sabre and threatening to overrun Russia with its armed hordes. How could "poverty-stricken" and "savage" Soviet Russia hold out against the "disciplined" army of the British and French, who had smashed "even" the Germans, for all their vaunted technical equipment? So they thought. But they overlooked a "trifle," they failed to realize that peace, even an "indecent" peace, would inevitably undermine the "discipline" of their army and rouse its opposition to another war, while unemployment and high living costs would inevitably strengthen the revolutionary movement of the workers against their imperialists.

And what did we find? The "disciplined" army proved unfit for purposes of intervention: it sickened with an inevitable disease—demoralization. The boasted "civil peace" and "law and order" turned into their opposite, into civil war. The hastily concocted bourgeois "governments" in the border regions of Russia proved to be soap bubbles, unsuitable as a camouflage for intervention, which had been undertaken, of course (of course!), in the name of "humanitarianism" and "civilization." As to Soviet Russia, not only did their hope for a "walk over" fail; they even deemed it necessary to retreat a little and invite her to a "conference," on

the Princes' Islands.[1] For the successes of the Red Army, the appearance of new national Soviet republics which were infecting neighbouring countries with the spirit of revolution, the spread of revolution in the West and the appearance of Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets in the Entente countries were arguments that were more than persuasive. What is more, things have reached a point where even Clemenceau the "implacable," who only yesterday refused to issue passports to the Berne Conference[2] and who was preparing to devour "anarchistic" Russia, is today, having been rather mauled by the revolution, not averse to availing himself of the services of that honest "Marxist" broker, the old Kautsky, and wants to send him to Russia to negotiate—that is to say, "investigate."

Truly:

"Where are they now, the haughty words, The lordly strength, the royal mien?"[3]

All these changes took place in the space of some three months.

We have every ground for affirming that the trend will continue in the same direction, for it has to be admitted that in the present moment of "storm and stress" Russia is the only country in which social and economic life is proceeding "normally," without strikes or anti-government demonstrations, that the Soviet Government is the most stable of all the existing governments in Europe, and that the strength and prestige of Soviet Russia, both at home and abroad, are growing day by day in direct proportion to the decline of the strength and prestige of the imperialist governments.

The world has split into two irreconcilable camps: the camp of imperialism and the camp of socialism. Imperialism in its death throes is clutching at the last straw, the "League of Nations," trying to save itself by uniting the robbers of all countries into a single alliance. But its efforts are in vain, because time and circumstances are working against

1 The Council of the Entente, with the professed aim of establishing peace in Russia, decided to invite the Soviet Government and the Kolchak, Denikin and other counter-revolutionary governments to send representatives to a conference to be held in February 1919 on the Princes' Islands, in the Sea of Marmora. The conference did not take place.

2 Berne Conference—a conference of social-chauvinist and Centrist parties of the Second International held in Berne, Switzerland, February 3-10, 1919.

3 From A. V. Koltsov's poem, "The Forest" (See A. V. Koltsov, *Complete Collection of Poems*, Leningrad 1939, p. 90).

it and in favour of socialism. The tide of socialist revolution is irresistibly rising and investing the strongholds of imperialism. Its thunder is re-echoing through the countries of the oppressed East. The soil is beginning to burn under the feet of imperialism. Imperialism is doomed to inevitable destruction.

Izvestia, No, 41,
February 22, 1919
Signed: J. Stalin



OUR TASKS IN THE EAST

With the advance of the Red Army eastward and the opening of the road to Turkestan, a number of new tasks confront us.

The population of the eastern part of Russia is characterized neither by the homogeneity of the central gubernias, which facilitates socialist construction, nor by the cultural maturity of the western and southern border regions, which made it possible swiftly and painlessly to clothe the Soviet power in appropriate national forms. In contrast to these border regions and the centre of Russia, the eastern regions—the Tatars, Bashkirs, Kirghiz, Uzbeks, Turkmen, Tajiks and a whole number of other ethnic groups (a total of about thirty million inhabitants)—present a great diversity of culturally backward peoples who either have not yet emerged from medievalism, or have only recently entered the phase of capitalist development.

This circumstance undoubtedly complicates and somewhat handicaps the tasks of Soviet power in the East.

In addition to the complications of a purely internal character connected with the manner of life, there are complications of a "historical" character, introduced, so to speak, from without. We are referring to the tsarist government's imperialist policy aimed at crushing the peoples of the East, the insatiable greed of the Russian merchants who acted as masters in the eastern regions, and, also, the jesuitical policy of the Russian priests, who strove by fair means or foul to drag the Moslem peoples into the bosom of the Orthodox Church—circumstances which aroused in the eastern peoples a feeling of distrust and hatred of everything Russian.

It is true that the triumph of the proletarian revolution in Russia and the Soviet Government's policy of emancipating the oppressed peoples have undoubtedly helped to eliminate the atmosphere of national

enmity and have won for the Russian proletariat the confidence and respect of the peoples of the East. More, there is every ground for asserting that the peoples of the East, their more enlightened representatives, are beginning to regard Russia as the bulwark and banner of their liberation from the chains of imperialism. Nevertheless, restricted culture and backward manner of life cannot be done away with at one stroke and they still make (and will continue to make) their influence felt in the building of Soviet power in the East.

It is these handicaps that the Programme Drafting Commission of the Russian Communist Party[1] has in mind when it says in its draft that as regards the question of national freedom "the R.C.P. upholds the historical and class standpoint, giving consideration to the stage of historical development in which the given nation finds itself—whether it is on the way from medievalism to bourgeois democracy, or from bourgeois democracy to Soviet democracy," and that "the proletariat of those nations which were oppressor nations must exercise particular caution and be particularly heedful of the survivals of national sentiment among the labouring masses of the oppressed or unequal nations."

Our task is:

1) In every way to raise the cultural level of the backward peoples, to build a broad system of schools and educational institutions, and to conduct our Soviet agitation, oral and printed, in the language which is native to and understood by the surrounding labouring population.

2) To enlist the labouring masses of the East in the building of the Soviet state and to render them the utmost assistance in forming their volost, uyezd and other Soviets comprised of people who support the Soviet power and are closely connected with the local population.

3) To do away with all disabilities, formal and actual, whether inherited from the old regime or arisen in the atmosphere of civil war, which prevent the peoples of the East from displaying the maximum indepen-

1 The commission for drafting the programme of the R.C.P.(B.), of which V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin were members, was set up by the Seventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) on March 8, 1918. The commission's draft was taken as the basis of the programme adopted by the Eighth Congress. The passages from the draft quoted in this article were embodied in the final text of the programme without alteration (see *Resolutions and Decisions of C.P.S.U.(B.) Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee Plenums*, Part 1, 6th ed., 1940, p. 287).

dent activity in emancipating themselves from the survivals of medievalism and of the national oppression which has already been shattered.

Only in this way can Soviet power become near and dear to the enslaved peoples of the boundless East.

Only in this way can a bridge be erected between the proletarian revolution of the West and the anti-imperialist movement of the East, thus forming an allembracing ring around dying imperialism.

The task is to build a citadel of Soviet power in the East, to plant a socialist beacon in Kazan and Ufa, in Samarkand and Tashkent, which will light the path to emancipation for the tormented peoples of the East.

We have no doubt that our devoted Party and Soviet officials, who bore the whole brunt of the proletarian revolution and of the war with imperialism, will discharge with credit this further duty which is laid upon them by history.

Pravda, No. 48,
March 2, 1919
Signed: J. Stalin

TWO YEARS
February-March 1917

The bourgeois revolution in Russia. The MilyukovKerensky Government. The Mensheviks and SocialistRevolutionaries are the dominant parties in the Soviets. Out of the 400-500 members of the Petrograd Soviet, barely 40-50 are Bolsheviks. At the First Conference of Soviets of Russia,[1] the Bolsheviks with difficulty muster 15-20 per cent of the votes. At this time the Bolshevik Party is the weakest of the socialist parties in Russia. Its organ, *Pravda*,[2] is everywhere abused as "anarchistic." Its speakers, when they call for a fight against the imperialist war, are dragged from the platform by soldiers and workers. Comrade Lenin's famous theses on Soviet power[3] are not accepted by the Soviets. For the defencist parties of the social-patriotic brand—the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries—it is a period of complete triumph.

Meanwhile, the imperialist war does not stop and continues to do

1 The reference is to the All-Russian Conference of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies convened by the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet and held in Petrograd, March 29 to April 3, 1917.

2 *Pravda* (*Truth*)—a daily Bolshevik workers' newspaper founded on the instructions of V. I. Lenin and on the initiative of J. V. Stalin, and published in St. Petersburg from April 22, 1912, to July 8, 1914. It resumed publication after the February Revolution, on March 5, 1917, as the Central Organ of the Bolshevik Party. On March 15, 1917, J. V. Stalin was appointed a member of its editorial board. On his return to Russia in April 1917, V. I. Lenin took over the direction of *Pravda*. V. M. Molotov, Y. M. Sverdlov, M. S. Olminsky and K. N. Samoilova were among the newspaper's regular contributors. At the period referred to in the article, *Pravda*, in spite of the vilification and persecution to which it was subjected, contributed immensely to rallying the workers and revolutionary soldiers and peasants around the Bolshevik Party, exposed the imperialist bourgeoisie and its hangers-on, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, and worked for a transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to a socialist revolution.

3 V. I. Lenin's April Theses—see "The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution" (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 24, pp. 1-7).

its deadly work, disrupting industry, undermining agriculture, dislocating the food supply and the transport system, and devouring fresh tens and hundreds of thousands of lives.

February-March 1918

The proletarian revolution in Russia. The KerenskyKonovalov bourgeois government is overthrown. Power is in the hands of the Soviets in the centre and in the provinces. The imperialist war is liquidated. The land becomes the property of the people. Workers' control is established. A Red Guard is formed. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries fail in their attempt to turn over "all power" to the Constituent Assembly in Petrograd. The Constituent Assembly is dismissed and the attempt at bourgeois restoration fails. Successes of the Red Guards in the South, the Urals, Siberia. The utterly routed Mensheviks and SocialistRevolutionaries retire to the border regions, where they unite with the counter-revolutionaries, conclude an alliance with imperialism and declare war on Soviet Russia.

The Bolsheviks are now the strongest and most united of all the parties in Russia. Already at the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets in October 1917 the Bolshevik Party commanded an absolute majority of the votes (65-70 percent). The subsequent development of the Soviets is unswervingly in favour of the Bolsheviks. This applies not only to the Workers' Soviets, where 90 per cent of the members are Bolsheviks, and not only to the Soldiers' Soviets, where 60-70 percent of the members are Bolsheviks, but also to the Peasants' Soviets, where, too, the Bolsheviks have won a majority.

But the Bolshevik Party is now not only the strongest, it is the only socialist party in Russia. For the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, who hobnobbed with the Czechoslovaks and Dutov, with Krasnov and Alexeyev, with the Austro-German and the AngloFrench imperialists, have lost every vestige of moral prestige among the proletarian strata of Russia.

However, this exceptionally favourable situation within the country is offset and counteracted by the fact that Russia still has no foreign allies, that socialist Russia represents an island surrounded by a sea of

belligerent imperialism. The workers of Europe are exhausted, bleeding... but they are occupied with the war and have no time to ponder over the socialist order in Russia, the road of salvation from war, and so on. As to the European "socialist" parties, how can they, who have sold their sword to the imperialists, do otherwise than revile the Bolsheviks—those "restless" people who are "subverting" the workers with their "costly," "dangerous experiments"?

It is not surprising, therefore, that there is in this period a particularly strong tendency in the Bolshevik Party to widen the base of the proletarian revolution, to draw the workers of the West (and also of the East) into the revolutionary movement against imperialism, to establish permanent ties with the revolutionary workers of all countries.

February-March 1919

Further consolidation of Soviet power in Russia. Extension of its territory. Organization of the Red Army. Red Army successes in the South, North, West and East. Establishment of Soviet republics in Estland, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia and the Ukraine. Defeat of Austro-German imperialism, and proletarian revolutions in Germany, Austria, Hungary. The ScheidemannEbert Government and the German Constituent Assembly. A Soviet republic in Bavaria. Political strikes all over Germany with the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" and "Down with Ebert and Scheidemann!" Strikes and Workers' Soviets in Britain, France, Italy. Demoralization of the old armies and the appearance of Soldiers' and Sailors' Soviets in the Entente countries. The Soviet system becomes the universal form of proletarian dictatorship. Strengthening of Left-wing communist elements in the European countries and the formation of Communist Parties in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Switzerland. They arrange contact and coordinated action. Disintegration of the Second International. International conference of revolutionary socialist parties in Moscow[4] and foundation of a common militant organ of the mil-

4 The international conference of revolutionary socialist parties was held in Moscow, March 2-6, 1919, and was attended by 52 delegates from the major countries of Europe and America. V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin and V. V. Vorovsky were among the delegates from the Russian Communist Party. The conference proclaimed itself the First Congress of the Communist International. The central item of the agenda was V. I. Lenin's report on bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The con-

itant workers of all countries—the Third, Communist International. The isolation of the proletarian revolution in Russia comes to an end: Russia now has allies. The imperialist "League of Nations" in Paris and its auxiliary, the social-patriotic conference in Berne, try to bar the European workers from the "Bolshevik contagion," but fail in their object: Soviet Russia has become, as it was bound to become, the standard-bearer of the world proletarian revolution, the centre of attraction for the advanced revolutionary forces of the West and the East. From a "purely Russian product," Bolshevism becomes a formidable international force which is shaking the very foundations of world imperialism.

That is now admitted even by the Mensheviks, who, having "laid aside their concern" for the Constituent Assembly, and having lost their "army," little by little pass over into the camp of the Republic of Soviets.

Nor is it now denied even by the Right-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries, who, having lost the Constituent Assembly to the Kolchaks and Dutovs, are compelled to seek safety in the Land of Soviets.

Summing up

These two years of proletarian struggle have fully confirmed what the Bolsheviks foresaw: the bankruptcy of imperialism and the inevitability of a world proletarian revolution; the rottenness of the Right-wing "socialist" parties and the decay of the Second International; the international significance of the Soviet system and the counter-revolutionary character of the Constituent Assembly slogan; the world significance of Bolshevism and the inevitable creation of a militant Third International.

Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 8,
March 9, 1919
Signed: J. Stalin

---

gress elected the Executive Committee of the Third, Communist International.



IMPERIALISM'S RESERVES

The war between imperialism and socialism continues. National "liberalism" and "patronage" of "small" nations; the "peaceableness" of the Entente and its "renunciation" of intervention; the call for "disarmament" and the "readiness" for negotiation; the "concern" for the "Russian people" and "desire" to "assist" it with all "available means"—these and much else of a like nature are only a screen for the intensified supply of tanks and munitions to the enemies of socialism, an ordinary diplomatic manoeuvre designed to veil the "search" for new forms, "acceptable" to "public opinion," of strangling socialism, of strangling the "small" nations, colonies and semi-colonies.

Some four months ago Allied imperialism, having vanquished its Austro-German rivals, was emphatically and categorically insisting on armed interference (intervention!) in "Russian affairs." No negotiations with "anarchistic" Russia! The plan of the imperialists was to transfer part of their "released" forces to the territory of Russia, incorporate them in the whiteguard units of the Skoropadskys and Krasnovs, the Denikins and Bicherakhovs, the Kolchaks and Chaikovskys, and constrict the seat of revolution, Soviet Russia, in an "iron ring." But that plan was wrecked by the tide of revolution. The workers of Europe, swept by the revolutionary movement, launched a fierce campaign against armed intervention. The "released forces" proved to be manifestly unsuited for an armed fight against revolution. More, on coming in contact with the insurrectionary workers, they themselves became "infected" with Bolshevism. Very eloquent proof of this was the capture by the Soviet forces of Kherson and Nikolayev, where the Entente troops refused to wage war on the workers. As to the projected "iron ring," it not only did not prove "deadly" but, what is more, itself developed a number of fissures. The plan of outright and undisguised intervention thus turned out to be clearly "inexpedient." It is this that explains the recent statements of Lloyd George and Wilson on the "permissibility" of negotiating with

the Bolsheviks and on "non-interference" in Russia's internal affairs, the proposal to send the Berne commission to Russia,[1] and, lastly, the projected invitation (the second!) of all the "de facto" governments in Russia to a "peace" conference.[2]

But it was not only this factor that dictated the renunciation of undisguised intervention. It is also to be attributed to the fact that in the course of the struggle a new scheme, a new, disguised form of armed intervention was conceived, one more complicated, it is true, than open intervention, but on the other hand more "convenient" for the "civilized" and "humane" Entente. We are referring to the alliance of the bourgeois governments of Rumania, Galicia, Poland, Germany and Finland hastily concocted by imperialism against Soviet Russia. It is true that only yesterday these governments were at each other's throats on the plea of "national" interests and national "liberty." It is true that only yesterday cries went up from all the housetops about a "patriotic war" of Rumania against Galicia, of Galicia against Poland, of Poland against Germany. But what did the "fatherland" count for in comparison to the financial wealth of the Entente, once the latter had ordered the cessation of "internecine warfare"! Once the Entente had ordered the establishment of a united front against Soviet Russia, could they, the hirelings of imperialism, do anything but "spring to attention"! Even the German Government, reviled and trampled in the mud as it was by the Entente, even it lost all sense of self-respect and begged to be allowed to take part in the crusade against socialism in the interests... of the Entente! Clearly, the Entente has every reason to rub its hands in glee as it prates about "non-interference" in Russia's affairs and "peace" negotiations with the Bolsheviks. What is the sense of undisguised intervention, which is "dangerous" to imperialism and moreover demands costly sacrifices, when

1 The Berne commission—a commission consisting of Kautsky, Hilferding, Longuet and others, appointed by the social-chauvinist conference in Berne "to investigate social and political conditions in Russia." In reply to a request to allow the commission to enter Russia, the Soviet Government stated on February 19, 1919, that although it did not regard the Berne Conference as a socialist conference, or as representing the working class in any way, it nevertheless had no objection to allowing the commission to enter Soviet Russia. However, the visit of "the eminent inspectors from Berne," as V. I. Lenin called the commission, did not take place.

2 It was reported in the British press at the close of February 1919 that the Council of the Entente intended to renew the invitation to a conference on the Princes' Islands.

there is a possibility of organizing at the expense of others, of "small" nations, "absolutely safe" intervention disguised under a national flag? A war of Rumania, Galicia, Poland and Germany against Russia? But, surely, this is a war for "national existence," for the "protection of the eastern frontier," a war against Bolshevik "imperialism," a war waged by the Rumanians, Galicians, Poles and Germans "themselves." What has the Entente got to do with it? True, the Entente is supplying them with money and arms, but that is simply a financial operation hallowed by the international law of the "civilized" world. Is it not clear that the Entente is as innocent as a dove, that it is "against" intervention?

Thus, imperialism has been compelled to pass from a policy of sabre-rattling, a policy of open intervention, to a policy of masked intervention, a policy of drawing dependent nations, small and big, into the fight against socialism.

The policy of open intervention failed because of the growth of the revolutionary movement in Europe, because of the sympathy entertained by the workers of all countries for Soviet Russia. That policy was utilized to the full by revolutionary socialism to expose imperialism.

There can be no doubt that in the end the policy of calling on the last reserves, the so-called "small" nations, the policy of drawing the latter into the war against socialism, will similarly fail. And not only because the growing revolution in the West is, despite everything, sapping the foundations of imperialism, and not only because the revolutionary movement is steadily swelling within the "small" nations themselves, but also because contact of the "armed forces" of these nations with the revolutionary workers of Russia is bound to "infect" them with the virus of Bolshevism. Socialism will avail itself of every opportunity to open the eyes of the workers and peasants of these nations to the predatory character of imperialism's "paternal concern."

The inevitable result of the imperialist policy of masked intervention will be that it will draw the "small" nations into the sphere of the revolution and extend the base of socialism.

Izvestia, No. 58,
March 16, 1919

Signed: J. Stalin

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH ON THE MILITARY QUESTION DELIVERED AT THE EIGHTH CONGRESS OF THE R.C.P.(B.)[1]

March 21, 1919

All the questions touched upon here boil down to one: is Russia to have, or not to have, a strictly disciplined regular army?

Six months ago, after the collapse of the old, tsarist army, we had a new, a volunteer army, an army which was badly organized, which had a collective control, and which did not always obey orders. This was at a time when an Entente offensive was looming. The army was made up principally, if not exclusively, of workers. Because of the lack of discipline in this volunteer army, because it did not always obey orders, because of the disorganization in the control of the army, we sustained defeats

1 The Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) met in Moscow on March 18-23, 1919. Its agenda included the following items: 1) Report of the Central Committee; 2) Programme of the R.C.P.(B.); 3) The Communist International; 4) Military situation and military policy; 5) Work in the countryside; 6) Organizational questions; 7) Election of the Central Committee. The report of the Central Committee and the reports on the Party Programme and on the work in the countryside were made by V. I. Lenin.

The military question was discussed at plenary meetings of the congress and in a military section. There was a so-called "Military Opposition" at the congress, comprising former "Left Communists" and some Party workers who had not formerly participated in any opposition grouping but who were dissatisfied with Trotsky's leadership of the army. They attacked Trotsky for his distortions of the Party's military policy and for his anti-Party practices, but at the same time they defended the survivals of guerilla mentality in the army and other incorrect views on questions concerning the building of the army. V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin spoke against the "Military Opposition." The congress, while rejecting a number of the proposals of the "Military Opposition" (Smirnov's project), condemned Trotsky's position as harmful. The Military Commission appointed by the congress, of which Stalin and Yaroslavsky were members, drafted a resolution on the military question which was adopted by the congress unanimously.

For the Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) and its decisions on military and other questions, see the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.), Short Course,* Moscow 1952, pp. 358-63.

and surrendered Kazan to the enemy, while Krasnov was successfully advancing from the South... The facts show that a volunteer army cannot stand the test of criticism, that we shall not be able to defend our Republic unless we create another army, a regular army, one infused with the spirit of discipline, possessing a competent political department and able and ready to rise at the first command and march against the enemy.

I must say that those non-working-class elements—the peasants—who constitute the majority in our army will not voluntarily fight for socialism. A whole number of facts bear this out. The series of mutinies in the rear and at the fronts, the series of excesses at the fronts show that the non-proletarian elements comprising the majority of our army are not disposed to fight for communism voluntarily. Hence our task is to re-educate these elements, infusing them with a spirit of iron discipline, to get them to follow the lead of the proletariat at the front as well as in the rear, to compel them to fight for our common socialist cause, and, in the course of the war, to complete the building of a real regular army, which is alone capable of defending the country.

That is how the question stands.

...Either we create a real workers' and peasants' army, a strictly disciplined regular army, and defend the Republic, or we do not, and in that event our cause will be lost.

...Smirnov's project is unacceptable, because it can only undermine discipline in the army and make it impossible to build a regular army.

First published in:
J. Stalin, On the Opposition. Articles and Speeches (1921-27),
Moscow and Leningrad, 1928

THE RE-ORGANISATION OF STATE CONTROL

Report Delivered at a Meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee

April 9, 1919 (Newspaper Report)

Comrade Stalin pointed out that the department of State Control was the only one which had not undergone the purging and reconstruction to which all the others had been subjected. To achieve real and genuine control, not control on paper, it was necessary, in the opinion of the speaker, to re-organize the existing State Control staff by replenishing it with new and fresh forces. The existing workers' control bodies should be united into a single whole, and all the forces engaged in control should be incorporated in the general State Control. Hence, the basic idea of the re-organization was to democratize State Control and to bring it into closer contact with the masses of workers and peasants.

The draft decree[1] submitted by the speaker was unanimously approved.

Izvestia, No. 77,
April 10, 1919

1 The draft decree on the re-organization of State Control was drawn up by a commission which included J. V. Stalin and Y. M. Sverdlov. The draft was examined by the Council of People's Commissars at sittings on March 8 and April 3, 1919, at which J. V. Stalin made the reports on the draft. V. I. Lenin took a direct part in the drafting and final framing of the decree.

THE SHOOTING OF THE TWENTY-SIX BAKU COMRADES BY AGENTS OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM

We present for the attention of our readers two documents[1] which testify to the savage murder of responsible officials of Soviet power in Baku by the British imperialists in the autumn of last year. These documents are taken from the Baku Socialist-Revolutionary newspaper *Znamya Truda*[2] and the Baku newspaper *Yedinaya Rossiya*,[3] that is to say from the very same circles which only yesterday called in the aid of the British and betrayed the Bolsheviks, and which are now forced by the course of events to denounce their allies of yesterday.

The first document tells of the barbarous shooting without trial of 26 Soviet officials of the city of Baku (Shaumyan, Djaparidze, Fioletov, Malygin and others) by the British Captain Teague-Jones on the night of September 20, 1918, on the road from Krasnovodsk to Ashkhabad, to which he was convoying them as war prisoners. Teague-Jones and his Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik partners hoped at first to hush up the matter, intending to circulate false testimony to the effect that the Baku Bolsheviks had died a "natural" death in prison or hospital. But evidently this plan fell through, for it turns out that there exist eye-witnesses who refuse to keep silent and who are ready thoroughly to expose the British savages. This document is signed by Chaikin, a Socialist-Revolutionary.

The second document recounts a conversation that the author of

1 The two documents—"Execution of the Twenty-Six Commissars" and "Conversation Between General Thomson and Mr. Chaikin, March 23, 1919"—were appended to the article (*Izvestia*, April 23, 1919).

2 *Znamya Truda* (*Banner of Labour*)—a newspaper published by the Socialist-Revolutionary Committee in Baku from January 1918 to November 1919.

3 *Yedinaya Rossiya* (*United Russia*)—a newspaper of Cadet trend published by the so-called Russian National Committee of Baku from December 1918 to July 1919.

the first document, Chaikin, had with the British General Thomson towards the close of March 1919. General Thomson demanded that Chaikin should name the eye-witnesses of the savage murder of the 26 Baku Bolsheviks by Captain Teague-Jones. Chaikin was prepared to present the documents and to name the witnesses on condition that a commission of inquiry were set up composed of representatives of the British command, the population of Baku and the Turkestan Bolsheviks. Chaikin furthermore demanded a guarantee that the Turkestan witnesses would not be assassinated by British agents. Since Thomson refused to agree to the appointment of a commission of inquiry and would give no guarantee of the personal safety of the witnesses, the conversation was broken off and Chaikin left. The document is interesting because it indirectly confirms the barbarity of the British imperialists, and not merely testifies but cries out against the impunity and savagery of the British agents who vent their ferocity on Baku and Transcaspian "natives" just as they do on Negroes in Central Africa.

The story of the 26 Baku Bolsheviks is as follows. In August 1918, when the Turkish forces had come within a short distance of Baku and the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik members of the Baku Soviet, against the opposition of the Bolsheviks, had secured the support of the majority of the Soviet and had called in the aid of the British imperialists, the Baku Bolsheviks, headed by Shaumyan and Djaparidze, being in the minority, resigned their authority and left the field clear for their political opponents. The Bolsheviks decided, with the consent of the newly-formed British, Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik authority in Baku, to evacuate to Petrovsk, the nearest seat of Soviet power. But on the way to Petrovsk the steamer carrying the Baku Bolsheviks and their families was shelled by British ships which had followed in pursuit and was convoyed to Krasnovodsk. This was in August.

The Russian Soviet Government applied on several occasions to the British command, demanding the release of the Baku comrades and their families in exchange for British prisoners, but the British command invariably refrained from replying. Already in October information began to come in from private persons and organizations to the effect that the Baku comrades had been shot. On March 5, 1919, Astrakhan received a radio message from Tiflis stating that "Djaparidze and Shaumyan are

not in the hands of the British command; according to local information, they were killed last September near Kizyl-Arvat by the arbitrary act of a group of workers." This, apparently, was the first official attempt on the part of the British assassins to lay the blame for their atrocious act on the workers, who were boundlessly devoted to Shaumyan and Djaparidze. Now, after the publication of the above-mentioned documents, it must be taken as proven that our Baku comrades, who had quitted the political arena voluntarily and were on their way to Petrovsk as evacuees, actually were shot without trial by the cannibals from "civilized" and "humane" Britain.

In the "civilized" countries it is customary to talk about Bolshevik terror and Bolshevik atrocities, and the Anglo-French imperialists are usually depicted as foes of terror and shooting. But is it not clear that the Soviet Government has never dealt with its opponents so foully and basely as the "civilized" and "humane" British, and that only imperialist cannibals who are corrupt to the core and devoid of all moral integrity need to resort to murder by night, to criminal attacks on unarmed political leaders of the opposing camp? If there are any who still doubt this, let them read the documents we print below and call things by their proper names.

When the Baku Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries invited the British to Baku and betrayed the Bolsheviks, they thought they would be able to "use" the British "guests" as a force; they believed that they would remain the masters of the country and the "guests" would eventually go back home. Actually, the reverse happened: it was the "guests" that became the absolute masters, while the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks became direct accessories to the foul and villainous murder of the 26 Bolshevik commissars. And the Socialist-Revolutionaries were compelled to go into opposition, cautiously exposing their new masters, while the Mensheviks are compelled to advocate in their Baku newspaper *Iskra*[4] a bloc with the Bolsheviks against the "welcome guests" of yesterday.

Is it not clear that the alliance of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks with the agents of imperialism is an "alliance" of slaves and

4 *Iskra* (*Spark*)—a newspaper published by the Menshevik Committee in Baku from November 1918 to April 1920.

menials with their masters? If there are still any who doubt this, let them read the "conversation" between General Thomson and Mr. Chaikin reproduced below and honestly say whether Mr. Chaikin resembles a master, and General Thomson a "welcome guest."

Izvestia, No. 85,
April 23, 1919
Signed: J. Stalin



TELEGRAM TO THE INSPECTOR-EXTRAORDINARY OF STATE CONTROL, SHCHIGRY

In the course of the inquiry into the causes of the agrarian disorders, besides inquiring into the general political sentiment of the peasant masses of the uyezd, please pay attention to the following:

1) The policy of the Land Department and the State Farms Board in the organizing of state farms. Have there been cases of irregular appropriation of peasant holdings for the organization of state farms? Has their organization been accompanied by other coercive actions materially affecting the condition of the peasant farms?

2) The policy of the Land Department in the organizing of collective farming. Have there been elements of coercion in the organizing of agricultural communes and artels, common ploughing, etc.? Has the organizing of collective farming been accompanied by infringements of the vital interests of the local peasantry?

3) The policy of the Chief Sugar Board in nationalizing land for sugar-beet plantations. Is nationalization being carried out in a way which is against the fundamental interests of the peasants? Are the nationalized tracts of land making it difficult for the peasants to use their holdings? Have there been other actions liable to incense the peasants (e.g., assignment of land to sugar refineries obviously in excess of their actual requirements; nationalization of tracts of land not formerly used for sugar-beet cultivation, etc.)?

4) Also the following questions: Is not the agrarian unrest due to land shortage in the district? Has the land of non-labouring elements been placed at the disposal of the peasants, and on what conditions? Are there any actions in general on the part of the Uyezd Land Department or any of its officials, or on the part of volost

land departments, likely to incense the peasants because they do not conform with the instructions of the centre or the requirements of expediency? Also, have there been instances of passivity or abuse of office on the part of the authorities?

Wire State Control acknowledgement of receipt of this telegram and what measures are taken.

People's Commissar of State Control
J. Stalin
May 7, 1919
Published for the first time

NOTE TO V. I. LENIN FROM PETROGRAD BY DIRECT WIRE[1]

The dispatch of units is undoubtedly better organized now than it was some three months ago, but it is also clear to me that neither the Commander-in-Chief nor his chief of staff know anything about the units which are being sent to Petrograd. Hence such surprises as the arrival of mere handfuls of men under the guise of regiments of the 2nd Brigade or the Cavalry Brigade from Kazan. At any rate, Petrograd has received so far only six hundred men from military schools who are really fit for action.

But the chief thing, of course, is not the quantity, but the quality of the units. All we need to drive the whole pack beyond Narva is three infantry regiments—fit for action, of course—and at least one cavalry regiment. If you could have seen your way to meet this small request in time, the Estonians would have been driven back before now.

However, there is no cause for alarm, since the situation at the front has become stable, the front line has stiffened, and in places our forces are already advancing.

Today, I inspected our Karelian fortifications and on the whole found the situation tolerable. The Finns are maintaining a stubborn silence and, strangely enough, have not taken advantage of the opportunity. But this is to be attributed to the fact that their own position at home is growing more and more unstable, as we are assured by Finnish comrades familiar with the state of affairs.

1 In connection with Yudenich's offensive of May 1919 and the threat of encirclement and capture of Petrograd by the Whites, J. V. Stalin was sent to the Petrograd Front as plenipotentiary of the Council of Defence, which furnished him with a mandate, dated May 17, 1919, stating that he was being sent on a mission to the Petrograd and other areas of the Western Front "for the adoption of all urgent measures necessitated by the situation on the Western Front." J. V. Stalin arrived in Petrograd on May 19, 1919.

I was shown today a proposal of the Commanderin-Chief to cut down the navy on account of the fuel crisis. I conferred on this subject with all our naval men and have arrived at the conviction that the Commanderin-Chief's proposal is absolutely incorrect. Reasons: first, if big units are to be converted into floating rafts it will be impossible to operate their guns, that is, the latter will simply not shoot, because there is a direct connection between the movement of a ship and the action of its guns; secondly, it is not true that we have no large-calibre shells—the other day twelve bargeloads of shells were "discovered"; thirdly, the fuel crisis is passing, because we have already succeeded in accumulating four hundred and twenty thousand poods of coal, apart from mazut, and are receiving a trainload of coal daily; fourthly, I have convinced myself that our navy is being turned into a real navy, with well-disciplined sailors who are prepared to defend Petrograd might and main.

I do not want to mention here the number of battle units already fit for action, but I consider it my duty to say that with the naval forces available we could defend Petrograd with credit against any attack from the sea.

In view of this, I, and all the Petrograd comrades, insist that the Commander-in-Chief's proposal be rejected.

Further, I consider it absolutely essential that coal deliveries be increased to two trainloads a day for a period of three or four weeks. This, our naval men assure us, will enable us to put our submarine and surface fleet definitely in fighting trim.

Stalin
Written May 25, 1919
First published in the symposium
Documents on the Heroic
Defence of Petrograd in 1919,
Moscow, 1941

TELEGRAM TO V. I. LENIN

Following the capture of Krasnaya Gorka, Seraya Loshad[1] has been taken. Their guns are in perfect order. A rapid check of all the forts and fortresses is under way.

Naval experts assert that the capture of Krasnaya Gorka from the sea runs counter to naval science. I can only deplore such so-called science. The swift capture of Gorka was due to the grossest interference in the operations by me and civilians generally, even to the point of countermanding orders on land and sea and imposing our own.

I consider it my duty to declare that I shall continue to act in this way in future, despite all my reverence for science.

Stalin
June 16, 1919
First published in
Pravda, No. 301,
December 21, 1929

1 Succumbing to the counter-revolutionary agitation of white-guards connected with the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, the garrisons of Krasnaya Gorka and Seraya Loshad, two forts near Petrograd, mutinied against the Soviet Government on June 13, 1919. That day, on J. V. Stalin's orders, vessels of the Baltic Fleet put out to sea to take action against the mutineers. At the same time a Coastal Army Group, with marine detachments as its core, was formed in Oranienbaum. On June 14, J. V. Stalin arrived in Oranienbaum and conferred with representatives of the naval and army commands and commanders and commissars of units and detachments. The plan he proposed for the capture of Krasnaya Gorka by a simultaneous blow from sea and land was adopted. The attack was launched on June 15 by the Coastal Group and other units, supported by vessels of the Baltic Fleet, the operation being personally directed by J. V. Stalin from the battle lines. The mutineers were overwhelmed at the approaches to Krasnaya Gorka, and at 0.30 a.m. on June 16 the fort was captured. Seraya Loshad was taken a few hours later.



NOTE TO V. I. LENIN FROM PETROGRAD BY DIRECT WIRE

I CONSIDER IT NECESSARY to draw your attention to the following questions.

First. Kolchak is the most serious enemy, because he has sufficient space for retreat, sufficient man power for his army, and a rear abounding in food. Compared with Kolchak, General Rodzyanko is a mere gnat, because he has neither food in his rear, nor space for retreat, nor sufficient man power. The mobilization of twenty age classes, to which he is now compelled to resort in his two or three uyezds owing to lack of man power, will mean the end of him, since the peasants cannot stand mobilization on such a scale and are bound to turn away from him. Consequently, under no circumstances should forces be withdrawn from the Eastern Front for the Petrograd Front in such numbers as might compel us to halt our offensive on the Eastern Front. In order to force Rodzyanko back to the Estland frontier (there is no point in our going any further) one division will be sufficient, and its removal will not involve halting the offensive on the Eastern Front. Please give this your special attention.

Second. We have unearthed a big conspiracy in the Kronstadt area. The battery commanders of all the forts in the entire Kronstadt fortified area are implicated. The aim of the conspiracy was to seize possession of the fortress, take control of the fleet, open fire on the rear of our troops, and clear the road to Petrograd for Rodzyanko. The relevant documents have fallen into our hands.

It is now clear to me why Rodzyanko, with his relatively small forces, advanced so brazenly on Petrograd. The insolence of the Finns is now also understandable. Understandable, too, are the wholesale desertions of our combat officers. So is the strange fact that at the moment

of the betrayal of Krasnaya Gorka the British warships vanished from the scene; the British, obviously, considered that direct interference on their part (intervention!) would not be "convenient," and preferred to turn up after the fortress and the fleet had fallen into the hands of the Whites, with the object of "helping the Russian people" to establish a new, "democratic system."

Obviously, Rodzyanko and Yudenich (to the latter can be traced all the threads of the conspiracy, which was financed by Britain through the Italian, Swiss and Danish embassies) based their whole scheme on the expectation of a successful issue of the conspiracy, which, I hope, we have nipped in the bud (all persons implicated have been arrested and the investigation is proceeding).

My request: make no relaxations in regard to the arrested embassy officials, keep them in strict confinement until the completion of the investigation, which is revealing a host of new threads.

I shall give you a more detailed account within three or four days, by which time I hope to come to Moscow for a day, if you have no objection.

I am sending the map. I could not do so until now simply because I was away all the time on front-line business, mostly at the front itself.

Stalin
June 18, 1919,
3 a. m.
First published in
Pravda, No. 53,
February 23, 1941

THE PETROGRAD FRONT

Pravda Interview

Comrade Stalin, who returned from the Petrograd Front a few days ago, gave our correspondent his impressions of the situation at the front.

1. The Approaches to Petrograd

The approaches to Petrograd are those points, proceeding from which the enemy, if he is successful, may surround Petrograd, cut it off from Russia and finally take it. These points are: a) the Petrozavodsk sector, with Zvanka as the line of advance; objective—to envelop Petrograd from the East; b) the Olonets sector, with Lodeinoye Polye as the line of advance; objective—to turn the flank of our Petrozavodsk forces; c) the Karelian sector, with Petrograd as the direct line of advance; objective—to seize Petrograd from the North; d) the Narva sector, with Gatchina and Krasnoye Selo as the line of

advance; objective—to capture Petrograd from the SouthWest, or, at least, to capture the Gatchina-Tosno line and envelop Petrograd from the South; e) the Pskov sector, with Dno-Bologoye as the line of advance; objective—to cut Petrograd off from Moscow; and, lastly, f) the Gulf of Finland and Lake Ladoga, which offer the enemy the possibility of landing forces west and east of Petrograd.

2. The Enemy's Forces

The enemy's forces in these sectors are a motley lot and of various strengths. In the Petrozavodsk sector, Serbs, Poles, British, Canadians and a group of Russian whiteguard officers are operating, all of them maintained with funds supplied by the so-called Allies. The Olonets

sector is held by White Finns, hired on two or three months' contract by the Finnish Government and commanded by German officers who remained behind after the German occupation. The Karelian sector is manned by so-called regular Finnish units. The Narva sector is manned by Russian units, recruited from Russian war prisoners, and by Ingermanland units recruited from the local inhabitants. These units are commanded by Major-General Rodzyanko. The forces in the Pskov sector also consist of Russian units made up of war prisoners and local inhabitants, and are commanded by Balakhovich. Operating in the Gulf of Finland are destroyers (5 to 12) and submarines (2 to 8)—British and Finnish, according to available information.

To judge by all the evidence, the enemy's forces on the Petrograd Front are not large. The Narva sector, where the enemy is most active, suffers no less from a shortage of "man power" than the other, less active, though no less important, sectors.

This, indeed, explains why, in spite of the fact that already two months ago The Times[1] was jubilantly predicting the fall of Petrograd "within two or three days," the enemy, far from having attained his general objective—the surrounding of Petrograd—has not in this period scored even a single partial success on any one of the sectors, in the sense of capturing some decisive point.

Apparently, the vaunted "North-West Army" commanded by General Yudenich from his vantage ground in Finland, the army on which that old fox Guchkov reposed his hopes in his report to Denikin, has so far not even been hatched.

3. The Enemy's Calculations

Judging by all the evidence, the enemy reckoned not only, or, rather, not so much, on his own forces as on the forces of his supporters, the whiteguards in the rear of our forces, in Petrograd and at the fronts. These were, firstly, the so-called embassies of bourgeois states which continued to exist in Petrograd (French, Swiss, Greek, Italian, Dutch, Danish, Rumanian, etc.), which financed the whiteguards and engaged

1 *The Times*—a London daily, founded in 1788, influential organ of the British big bourgeoisie. It urged support of Yudenich's offensive.

in espionage on behalf of Yudenich and the British, French, Finnish and Estonian bourgeoisie. These gentry scattered money right and left, buying everyone in the rear of our army who was open to be bought. Next, the venal elements among the Russian officers, who have forgotten Russia, have lost all sense of honour and are ready to desert to the enemies of workers' and peasants' Russia. Lastly, the have-beens, the bourgeois and landlords who had suffered at the hands of the Petrograd proletariat and who, as it later appeared, had accumulated weapons and were waiting for a suitable moment to stab our forces in the back. These were the forces upon which the enemy reckoned when he marched on Petrograd. To capture Krasnaya Gorka, the key to Kronstadt, and thus put the fortified area out of action, raise revolt in the forts and shell Petrograd, and then, combining a general offensive at the front with a revolt within Petrograd at the moment of general confusion, surround and capture the centre of the proletarian revolution—such were the enemy's calculations.

4. The Situation at the Front

However, the enemy miscalculated. Krasnaya Gorka, which the enemy managed to occupy for twenty-four hours thanks to internal treachery on the part of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, was swiftly restored to Soviet Russia by a powerful blow struck from sea and land by the Baltic sailors. The Kronstadt strongpoints, which at one moment had begun to waver owing to the treachery of the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Menshevik defencists and the venal section of the officer class, were promptly brought to order by the iron hand of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Baltic Fleet. The so-called embassies and their spies were arrested and removed to less troublesome places. In some of the embassies, moreover, machine guns, rifles (in the Rumanian Embassy even one gun), secret telephone exchanges, etc., were discovered. A sweeping search carried out in the bourgeois quarters of Petrograd unearthed four thousand rifles and several hundred bombs.

As to the enemy's general offensive, far from being crowned with success, as The Times had loudly proclaimed, it never even succeeded in getting started. The Finnish Whites at Olonets, who were trying to occupy Lodeinoye Polye, have been overwhelmed and driven back into Finland. The enemy's Petrozavodsk group, which was stationed only a

few versts from Petrozavodsk, is now rapidly retreating under the onslaught of our units, which have turned its flank. The enemy's Pskov group has lost the initiative, is making no headway, and in places is even retreating. As to the enemy's Narva group, the most active, far from having attained its objective, it is continuously retiring under the onslaught of our units and is disintegrating and melting away on the roads to Yamburg under the blows of the Red Army. The Entente's jubilations thus appear to have been premature. The hopes of Guchkov and Yudenich have been disappointed. The Karelian sector is still passive and nothing yet can be said about it, because the Finnish Government, after its reverses at Vidlitsa Zavod,[2] has noticeably moderated its tone and dropped its shrill abuse of the Russian Government, and, what is more, the so-called incidents on the Karelian Front have practically ceased.

Whether this is the calm before the storm, only the Finnish Government knows. At all events, it may be said that Petrograd is prepared for all possible surprises.

5. The Navy

I cannot refrain from saying a few words about the navy. It is a subject for congratulation that the Baltic Fleet, which was believed to be non-existent, is being most effectively regenerated. This is admitted by our enemies as well as our friends. Equally gratifying is the fact that the scourge of venality with which a section of the Russian officer class is afflicted has least of all contaminated the commanding personnel of the navy. Here we have men who, to their honour be it said, prize the dignity and independence of Russia higher than British gold. Even more gratifying is the fact that the Baltic sailors have become their old selves again, and by their valorous deeds have revived the finest traditions of the Russian revolutionary navy. Had it not been for these factors Petrograd would not have been safeguarded against the most dangerous surprises from the sea. A most typical illustration of the regeneration of our navy was

2 Vidlitsa Zavod, on the eastern shore of Lake Ladoga, was the major base of the Finnish whiteguards operating in the Olonets sector of the Petrograd Front. On June 27, 1919, units of the Red Army, supported by vessels of the Onega Flotilla and the Baltic Fleet, launched a surprise attack and captured Vidlitsa Zavod, destroyed the headquarters of the so-called Olonets Volunteer Army and seized rich stores of ammunition, equipment and victuals. The Finnish whiteguards were driven back into Finland.

the unequal engagement fought in June by two of our destroyers against four enemy destroyers and three submarines, from which, thanks to the gallantry of our sailors and the skillful direction of the commander of the detachment, our destroyers emerged victorious, having sunk one of the enemy's submarines.

6. Summing Up

Rodzyanko is often compared with Kolchak as a menace to Soviet Russia, being regarded as no less dangerous than Kolchak. The comparison is incorrect. Kolchak really is dangerous, because he has space to which to retire, he has the man power with which to replenish his units, and he has the food with which to feed his army. The misfortune of Rodzyanko and Yudenich is that they have not enough space, man power, or food. Finland and Estland, of course, do to some extent represent a base for the formation of whiteguard units from Russian war prisoners. But, firstly, war prisoners cannot provide either sufficient or fully reliable men for the whiteguard units. Secondly, because of the mounting revolutionary unrest in Finland and Estland, the conditions in these countries themselves are not favourable for the formation of whiteguard units. Thirdly, the territory seized by Rodzyanko and Balakhovich (in all about two uyezds) is being gradually and systematically narrowed, and the vaunted "North-West Army," if it is destined to be born at all, will soon have no room for deployment and manoeuvre. Because—and this must be acknowledged—neither Finland nor Estland, for the present at least, are placing "their own territory" at the disposal of Rodzyanko, Balakhovich and Yudenich. The "North-West Army" is an army without a rear. It goes without saying that such an "army" cannot exist for long, unless of course some new and weighty international factor favourable to the enemy interferes with the chain of developments—which, however, to judge by all the signs, he has no grounds to anticipate.

The Red Army at Petrograd should win.

Pravda, No. 147,
July 8, 1919

LETTER TO V. I. LENIN ABOUT THE SITUATION ON THE WESTERN FRONT[1]

To Comrade Lenin.

The situation on the Western Front is becoming more and more ominous.

The old, battered and weary units of the Sixteenth Army, which is being hard pressed by the most active enemy on the Western Front—the Poles—are not only unable to withstand the onslaught, are not only unable to defend themselves, but have even become incapable of covering the retreat of their batteries, which are, naturally, falling into the hands of the enemy. I am afraid that, with its units in such a state, the Sixteenth Army in its retreat to the Berezina will find itself without guns or baggage trains. There is also the danger that the battered and absolutely demoralized cadres of the majority of the regiments may soon be incapable of assimilating replenishments, which moreover—it must be said—are arriving with preposterous delay.

The enemy is driving towards the Berezina along two main directions: towards Borisov, and towards Slutsk and Bobruisk. And he is driving successfully, for he has already advanced some thirty versts in the direction of Borisov, and in the South, with the capture of Slutsk, he has seized possession of the key to Bobruisk—the splendid highway, the only one in the area.

If Borisov is captured, and if, as is likely, the severely battered 17th Division of the Sixteenth Army rolls back as a result, the Fifteenth Army

1 At the beginning of July 1919 the Polish whiteguards launched a general offensive and created a direct threat to the Soviet Republic from the West. J. V. Stalin was instructed by the Central Committee of the Party to take over personal direction of the Western Front. He was appointed a member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Western Front, and he arrived at front headquarters in Smolensk on July 9, 1919.

will be in jeopardy, and Polotsk and Dvinsk will be directly menaced. And if Bobruisk is captured and the enemy strikes at Rechitsa (which is his direct aim), the entire Pripyat group of the Sixteenth Army, that is, the 8th Division, will automatically suffer disaster, Gomel will be directly threatened, and the flank of the Twelfth Army will be laid bare.

In brief, if we allow the enemy to knock out our Sixteenth Army, and he is already doing it, we shall be letting down the Fifteenth and Twelfth Armies, and we shall then have to repair not only the Sixteenth Army but the whole front, and at a far heavier cost.

Evidently, we are approximately in the same position as that of the Eastern Front last year, when Vatsetis and Kostyaev allowed Kolchak to knock out first our Third Army, then the Second and then the Fifth, thereby quite unnecessarily wrecking the work of the whole front for a good half year.

On the Western Front, this prospect has every chance of becoming a reality.

I have already written before that the Western Front represents a threadbare garment which cannot be patched up without trained reserves, and that the enemy has only to deliver one serious blow at one of the important points to make the whole front reel, or rather, shake.

Unfortunately, these apprehensions of mine are now beginning to be borne out.

Yet the enemy in the West, who is united under a single command, has not yet brought into action those Russian corps which he has ready, or nearly ready, in Riga, Warsaw and Kishinev.

About three weeks ago I believed that one division would be enough to enable us to launch an offensive and occupy the Molodechno and Baranovichi junctions. Now one division may not be enough even to enable us to hold the Borisov-Bobruisk-Mozyr line.

A successful offensive is not even to be thought of, because for this we should now (August 11) need at least two or three divisions.

Now decide yourself: can you let us have one division, if only in successive brigades, or are you going to allow the enemy to smash the already crumbling Sixteenth Army? But decide without delay, because

every hour is precious.

Yours,

J. Stalin

P. S. This letter has been read and approved by all the members of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Western Front, not excluding the Front Commander. A similar statement will be sent in a day or two to the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic.

—J. St.

Smolensk,
August 11, 1919
Published for the first time

LETTER TO V. I. LENIN FROM THE SOUTHERN FRONT[1]

Comrade Lenin,

About two months ago General Headquarters did not object in principle to the main blow being delivered from west to east, through the Donets Basin. And if it rejected it nevertheless, it was on the plea of the "legacy" left by the retreat of the southern troops in the summer, that is, the haphazard grouping of troops in the area of the present South-Eastern Front, the reforming of which (the grouping) would entail considerable loss of time, to Denikin's advantage. It was only for this reason that I did not object to the officially adopted direction of the blow. But now the situation has radically changed, and with it the grouping of forces: the Eighth Army (the major army on the former Southern Front) has moved into the area of the Southern Front and is directly facing the Donets Basin; Budyonny's Cavalry Corps (another major force) has likewise moved into the Southern Front area; and a new force has been added—the Latvian Division, which within a month will have been replenished and will again represent a formidable force to Denikin.

You see that the old grouping (the "legacy") no longer exists. What then induces General Headquarters to insist on the old plan? Nothing, apparently, but obstinacy—if you like, factionalism, factionalism of the most obtuse kind and most dangerous to the Republic, which is cultivated in General Headquarters by that "strategic" bantam cock Gusev. The other day General Headquarters issued instructions to Shorin to advance from the Tsaritsyn area on Novorossiisk through the Don

1 By decision of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) of September 26, 1919, J. V. Stalin was sent to the Southern Front to organize the defeat of Denikin. He arrived at front headquarters on October 3. The plan he proposed for routing Denikin was approved by the Central Committee of the Party.

steppe by a line along which it may be convenient for our aviators to fly, but along which our infantry and our artillery will find it quite impossible to plod. It does not need to be proved that this insane (projected) campaign through a hostile environment and where there are absolutely no roads threatens us with utter disaster.

It should not be difficult to understand that such a campaign against Cossack villages, as recent experience has shown, can only rally the Cossacks around Denikin and against us in defence of their villages, can only serve to set up Denikin as the saviour of the Don, can only create a Cossack army for Denikin, that is, can only strengthen Denikin.

Precisely for this reason it is essential at once, without loss of time, to change the old plan, which has already been abolished in practice, and replace it by a plan under which the main blow will be directed from the Voronezh area, through Kharkov and the Donets Basin, on Rostov. Firstly, here we shall have an environment that is not hostile, but on the contrary, sympathetic to us, which will facilitate our advance. Secondly, we shall secure a most important railway network (Donets) and the major supply artery of Denikin's army—the Voronezh-Rostov line (the loss of which will leave the Cossack army without supplies in the winter, because the Don River, by which the Don Army is supplied, will have frozen over, and the East Donets Railway, Likhaya-Tsaritsyn, will be cut). Thirdly, by this advance we shall be cutting Denikin's army in two, one part of which, the Volunteer Army, we shall leave to Makhno to devour, while the Cossack armies we shall threaten with the danger of being outflanked. Fourthly, we shall be in a position to set the Cossacks at loggerheads with Denikin, who, if our advance is successful, will endeavour to move the Cossack units westward, to which the majority of the Cossacks will not agree, if, of course, by that time we put before them the issue of peace, of negotiations for peace, and so on. Fifthly, we shall secure coal, and Denikin will be left without coal.

This plan must be adopted without delay, since General Headquarters' plan of transfer and distribution of regiments threatens to nullify our recent successes on the Southern Front. I say nothing of the fact that General Headquarters is ignoring, and; has virtually rescinded, the recent decision of the Central Committee and the Government—"Everything for the Southern Front."

In short, the old plan, which has already been abolished in reality, must under no circumstances be galvanized into life. That would be dangerous to the Republic; it would most certainly improve Denikin's position. It must be replaced by another plan. Conditions and circumstances are not only ripe for such a change, they imperatively dictate it. In that event the distribution of regiments will also proceed on different lines.

Without this, my work on the Southern Front will become meaningless, criminal and futile, which will give me the right, or rather will force me, to go anywhere, even to the devil himself, only not to remain on the Southern Front.

Yours,

Stalin
Serpukhov,
October 15, 1919
First published in
Pravda, No. 301,
December 21, 1929



TELEGRAM TO V. I. LENIN

The Cavalry Corps of Shkuro and Mamontov, created after such long effort by the Entente and Denikin as the backbone of the counter-revolution, have been utterly routed at Voronezh by Comrade Budyonny's Cavalry Corps. Voronezh is in the hands of the Red heroes. A mass of trophies has been captured and is now being counted. It is already ascertained that all the enemy's personally named armoured trains have been captured, the General Shkuro Armoured Train first among them. Pursuit of the routed enemy continues. The halo of invincibility created around the names of Generals Mamontov and Shkuro has been shattered by the valour of the Red heroes of Comrade Budyonny's Cavalry Corps.

Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front

Stalin
October 25, 1919
Petrogradskaya Pravda, No. 244,
October 26, 1919

SPEECH AT THE OPENING OF THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIAN CONGRESS OF COMMUNIST ORGANISATIONS OF THE PEOPLES OF THE EAST

November 22, 1919

Comrades,

On behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party I have been charged with opening this Second Congress of representatives of the Moslem communist organizations of the East.[1]

Since the First Congress, a year has elapsed. This interval has been marked by two important events in the history of socialism. The first is the revolutionizing of Western Europe and America and the birth of Communist Parties over there, in the West; the second is the awakening of the peoples of the East, the growth of the revolutionary movement in the East, among the oppressed peoples of the East. Over there, in the West, the proletarians are threatening to demolish the vanguard of the imperialist powers and to take power into their own hands. Here the proletarians are threatening to disrupt imperialism's rear, the East, the source of its wealth, because the East is the basis on which the wealth of imperialism is built; it is from there that it derives its strength, and it is to there that it proposes to retire if it is beaten in Western Europe.

A year ago, in the West, world imperialism was threatening to surround Soviet Russia with a tight ring. It now turns out that it is itself

1 The Second All-Russian Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East met in Moscow from November 22 to December 3, 1919. It was attended by some 80 delegates representing Moslem communist organizations of Turkestan, Azerbaijan, Khiva, Bukhara, Kirghizia, Tataria, Chuvashia, Bashkiria, the Caucasus and individual towns (Perm, Vyatka, Orenburg, etc.). V. I. Lenin gave a report to the congress on current affairs. The congress heard a report on the activities of the Central Bureau of the Moslem organizations of the R.C.P.(B.), discussed the Eastern question and other questions, and outlined the tasks of Party and Soviet organizations in the East.

surrounded, because it is being struck at both on the flanks and in the rear. When, a year ago, the delegates to the First Moslem Congress of the Peoples of the East were about to leave for their homes, they vowed to do everything in their power to rouse the peoples of the East from their slumber and to erect a bridge between the revolution in the West and the oppressed peoples in the East. Reviewing this work now, we may note with satisfaction that this revolutionary activity has not been in vain, that a bridge has been erected against those who strangle the liberty of all the oppressed peoples.

Lastly, if our forces, our Red forces, have advanced eastward so swiftly, not the least factor contributing to this, of course, has been your work, comrade delegates. If the road to the East is now open, that too the revolution owes to the supreme efforts of our comrades, the delegates here, in the work they have latterly accomplished.

Only the solidarity of the Moslem communist organizations of the peoples of the East—and, first and foremost, of the Tatars, Bashkirs, Kirghiz and the peoples of Turkestan—can explain those rapid developments which we observe in the East.

I have no doubt, comrades, that this Second Congress, which is more comprehensive both quantitatively and qualitatively than the First, will be able to continue the work already begun of awakening the peoples of the East, the work of strengthening the bridge erected between West and East, the work of emancipating the working masses from the age-long yoke of imperialism.

Let us hope that the banner raised at the First Congress, the banner of the emancipation of the labouring masses of the East, the banner of the destruction of imperialism, will be borne with honour to the goal by the militants of the Moslem communist organizations. (*Applause*.)

Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 46,
December 7, 1919



GREETINGS TO PETROGRAD FROM THE SOUTHERN FRONT

The Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front expresses comradely thanks for your greetings and for the Red banners which you have promised the regiments of the Southern Front.

The Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front will not forget that Petrograd was the first to come to the assistance of the Southern Front by sending thousands of advanced and battle-steeled workers, who inspired our divisions with faith in victory and completely transformed our front.

It is above all to those workers, the worthy sons of Red Petrograd, that the Southern Front owes its latest successes.

Rest assured, comrades, that the troops of the Southern Front will justify the expectations of the Russian proletariat, and will with honour bear forward the banners presented to them until complete victory is won.

Kiev and Kupyansk are already in our hands, and the moment is not far off when the Red banners will be unfurled over Rostov and Novocherkassk.

Greetings to the workers of Petrograd! Greetings to the glorious sailors of the Baltic Fleet!

Stalin
Petrogradskaya *Pravda*, No. 289,
December 18, 1919

THE MILITARY SITUATION IN THE SOUTH

I. Abortive Plans of the Entente

In the spring of 1919 a combined Kolchak-DenikinYudenich campaign was conceived against Soviet Russia. The main blow was to be delivered by Kolchak, with whom Denikin hoped to link up in Saratov for a joint advance on Moscow from the East. Yudenich was to strike an auxiliary blow, at Petrograd.

The aim of the campaign, as formulated in Guchkov's report to Denikin, was "to crush Bolshevism at one stroke, by depriving it of its basic vital centres—Moscow and Petrograd."

The plan of the campaign was sketched by Denikin in a letter to Kolchak which fell into our hands when we seized Grishin-Almazov's headquarters in the spring of 1919. "The main thing," Denikin wrote to Kolchak, "is not to stop at the Volga, but to drive forward to the heart of Bolshevism, Moscow. I hope to meet you in Saratov... The Poles will do their work, and as to Yudenich, he is ready, and will strike at Petrograd without loss of time..."

That is what Denikin wrote in the spring, when Kolchak's offensive on the Volga was in full swing.

However, that plan failed. Kolchak was thrown back beyond the Urals. Denikin was halted on the River SeimLiski-Balashov line. Yudenich was pressed back beyond Yamburg.

Soviet Russia remained safe and sound.

But the Entente cannibals did not lose heart. By the autumn of 1919 a plan for a new crushing campaign was conceived. Kolchak, naturally, was ruled out. The centre of operations was transferred from the East to the South, whence Denikin was to strike the main blow. As in

the spring, Yudenich was to deliver an auxiliary blow—another march on Petrograd. General Mai-Mayevsky, the former commander of the Volunteer Army, stated in a speech on the day after Orel was captured that he would be in Moscow with his troops "not later than the end of December, by Christmas 1919."

The Denikinites were so self-confident that already in October Donets capitalists were offering a prize of one million rubles (in tsarist money) to the regiment of the Volunteer Army which first entered Moscow...

But it was the will of fate that this plan, too, should fail. Denikin's troops were hurled back beyond the Poltava-Kupyansk-Chertkovo line. Yudenich was routed and thrown back beyond the Narva. As to Kolchak, after his defeat at Novo-Nikolayevsk, nothing but a memory had remained of his army.

This time, too, Russia remained safe and sound.

The failure of the counter-revolutionaries this time was so unexpected and sudden that the vanquishers of imperialist Germany, the old wolves of the Entente, were obliged publicly to declare that "Bolshevism cannot be conquered by force of arms." The confusion of the imperialist fakirs was such that they lost the faculty of discerning the real causes of the defeat of the counter-revolution, and began to compare Russia, now with "shifting sands" where even the "very best general" was sure to fail, now with a "boundless desert" where even the "best armies" were sure to perish.

II. Causes of the Defeat of the Counter-Revolution

What are the causes of the defeat of the counter-revolution, and of Denikin in the first place?

A) The instability of the rear of the counter-revolutionary forces. No army in the world can be victorious without a stable rear. Well, Denikin's rear (and Kolchak's too) is quite unstable. This instability of the rear of the counter-revolutionary forces is due to the social character of the Denikin-Kolchak government which mustered these forces. Denikin and Kolchak bring with them the yoke not only of the landlords and capitalists, but also of British and French capital. The victory of Denikin

and Kolchak would mean the loss of Russia's independence, would turn her into a milch cow of the British and French plutocrats. In this respect the DenikinKolchak government is a supremely anti-popular, anti-national government. In this respect the Soviet Government is the only popular and only national government, in the best sense of the words, because it brings with it not only the emancipation of the working people from capitalism, but also the emancipation of the whole of Russia from the yoke of world imperialism, the conversion of Russia from a colony into an independent and free country.

Is it not obvious that the Denikin-Kolchak government and its armies cannot command either the respect or the support of the broad strata of the Russian population?

Is it not obvious that the Denikin-Kolchak armies cannot possess that passionate desire for victory and that enthusiasm without which victory is altogether impossible?

The Denikin-Kolchak rear is falling to pieces, and is sapping the foundations of the front, because the Denikin-Kolchak government is a government which spells bondage for the Russian people, a government which arouses the maximum distrust among the broad strata of the population.

The rear of the Soviet armies grows stronger and stronger and nourishes the Red front with its sap because the Soviet Government is a government which is emancipating the Russian people and which enjoys the maximum confidence of the broad strata of the population.

B) The peripheral position of the counter-revolution. Even at the beginning of the October Revolution a certain geographical demarcation between the revolution and the counter-revolution was to be observed. As the civil war developed, the areas of revolution and counter-revolution became sharply defined. Inner Russia, with its industrial and cultural and political centres, Moscow and Petrograd, and with its nationally homogeneous population, principally Russian, became the base of the revolution. The border regions of Russia, however chiefly the southern and eastern border regions, which have no major industrial or cultural and political centres, and whose inhabitants are nationally heterogeneous to a high degree—consisting, on the one hand, of privileged

Cossack colonizers, and, on the other, of subject Tatars Bashkirs and Kirghiz (in the East) and Ukrainians, Chechens, Ingushes and other, Moslem, peoples—became the base of counter-revolution.

It will be easily understood that there is nothing unnatural in this geographical distribution of the contending forces in Russia. For, indeed, who else could constitute the base of the Soviet Government, if not the proletariat of Petrograd and Moscow? Who else could constitute the backbone of the Denikin-Kolchak counterrevolution, if not that ancient tool of Russian imperialism, the Cossacks, who are privileged and organized as a military caste, and who have long exploited the non-Russian peoples of the border regions? Is it not clear that no other "geographical distribution" was possible?

But the consequence of this was (and is) a number of fatal and inevitable disadvantages for the counter-revolution, and an equal number of inevitable advantages for the revolution.

For the success of troops operating in a period of bitter civil war it is absolutely essential that the human environment whose elements nourish and whose sap sustains them should be solid and united. This unity may be national (especially in the early phase of civil war), or class (especially in the developed phase of civil war). Without such unity, prolonged military success is inconceivable. But the fact of the matter is that for the armies of Denikin and Kolchak, the border regions of Russia (eastern and southern) do not, and cannot, either from the national or the class standpoint, represent even that minimum unity of the human environment without which (as I have already said) serious victory is impossible.

For, indeed, what national unity can there be between the national aspirations of the Tatars, Bashkirs and Kirghiz (in the East) and the Kalmyks, Chechens, Ingushes and Ukrainians (in the South), on the one hand, and the essentially-Russian autocratic administrations of Kolchak and Denikin, on the other?

Or again: what class unity can there be between the privileged Cossacks of the Urals, Orenburg, the Don and the Kuban, on the one hand, and, on the other, all the other inhabitants of the border regions, not excepting the Russian "inogorodnie," who have always been oppressed

and exploited by their neighbours, the Cossacks?

Is it not obvious that armies composed of such heterogeneous elements are bound to break up under the first serious blow of the Soviet armies, that every such blow is bound to increase the gravitation of the non-Cossack elements of the border regions of Russia towards the Soviet Government, which categorically rejects dominant-nation ambitions and willingly meets their national aspirations?

In contradistinction to the border regions, inner Russia presents an entirely different picture. Firstly, it is nationally united and solid, because nine-tenths of its population consist of Great Russians. Secondly, achievement of the class unity of the human environment which nourishes the front and the immediate rear of the Soviet armies is facilitated by the fact that this environment includes the proletariat of Petrograd and Moscow, which is popular among the peasants and is rallying them solidly around the Soviet Government.

This, incidentally, explains that striking contact in Soviet Russia between rear and front, a contact of which the Kolchak-Denikin government has never been able to boast. The Soviet Government has only to issue a call for assistance to the front for Russia instantly to put up a whole array of new regiments.

It is here, too, that we must seek the source of that amazing strength and unparalleled resilience which Soviet Russia usually displays at critical moments.

Here, too, must be sought the explanation of the fact, so incomprehensible to the civilized witch doctors of the Entente, that "when the counter-revolutionary armies reach certain boundaries (the boundaries of inner Russia!), they inevitably sustain disaster..."

But besides these deep-seated causes of the defeat of the counter-revolutionaries, and of Denikin in the first place, there are other, more immediate causes (we are referring chiefly to the Southern Front).

They are:

1) Improvement in the matter of reserves and replenishments on the Soviet Southern Front.

2) Improvement in the matter of supply.

3) The flow to the front of communist workers from Petrograd, Moscow, Tver and Ivanovo-Voznesensk, who have joined our southern regiments and completely transformed them.

4) Repair of the machinery of control, which had been completely shattered by Mamontov's raids.

5) Skillful resort by the command of the Southern Front to flank blows during the offensive.

6) Methodical character of the offensive itself.

III. Present Situation on the Southern Front

Of all Denikin's units, the force that must be regarded as the most serious is the Volunteer Army (infantry), because it is the most competent and has a large reserve of regular officers in its regiments, and Shkuro's and Mamontov's Cavalry Corps. The task of the Volunteer Army was to capture Moscow; that of Shkuro's and Mamontov's cavalry was to pierce our southern armies and disrupt their rear.

The first decisive successes of our infantry were scored in the battles at Orel, in the Kromy-Dmitrovsk area. Here our infantry routed the First (the best) Corps of the Volunteer Army, General Kutepov's Corps, with its Kornilov, Drozdov, Markov and Alexeyev Divisions.

The first decisive successes of our cavalry were scored in the battles at Voronezh, in the area of the rivers Ikorets, Usman, Voronezh and Don. Here Comrade Budyonny's cavalry group first encountered the combined forces of Shkuro's and Mamontov's Corps face to face, and overthrew them.

Our successes at Orel and Voronezh laid the foundation for the subsequent southward advance of our armies. The successes at Kiev, Kharkov, Kupyansk and Liski were only a sequel and development of our basic successes at Orel and Voronezh. The Volunteer Army is now retreating in disorder under the pressure of our units, with its communications and control disrupted, and having lost not less than half its old effectives in killed, wounded and captured. It may be confidently affirmed that unless it is withdrawn to the rear and thoroughly overhauled, it will soon cease to have any fighting capacity.

As to Shkuro's and Mamontov's cavalry group, although it has been reinforced with two new Kuban corps (General Ulagay's and General Naumenko's) and General Chesnokov's Composite Division of Uhlans, it cannot present any serious threat to our cavalry. This was demonstrated in the recent fighting at Lisichansk, where the reinforced Shkuro-Mamontov group was utterly routed by our cavalry, abandoning seventeen guns, eighty machine guns and more than a thousand dead.

Of course it cannot be said that Denikin's armies are already smashed. Denikin's armies have not yet reached the degree of decomposition of Kolchak's armies. Denikin is still capable of certain tactical, and maybe even strategic, ruses. Nor should it be forgotten that in ten weeks we have succeeded in capturing from Denikin in all only about 150 guns, 600 machine guns, 14 armoured trains, 150 locomotives, 10,000 railway wagons, and 16,000 prisoners. But one thing is indubitable: Denikin's armies are irresistibly following Kolchak's down the inclined plane, while our armies are growing stronger from day to day, both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Therein lies the guarantee of Denikin's ultimate destruction.

Serpukhov, December 26, 1919
Pravda, No. 293,
December 28, 1919
Signed: J. Stalin

P. S.[1] This article was written before Denikin's front was breached by our troops at Taganrog. That, in fact, explains its cautious character. But now, when Denikin's front has been pierced, when the Volunteer divisions are cut off from Denikin's Don and Caucasian armies, when in two days' fighting at the approaches to Taganrog (January 1 and 2) our forces have captured from the enemy over two hundred guns, seven armoured trains, four tanks and masses of other trophies, and when our forces, after liberating Taganrog, are besieging the seats of counter-revolution, Novocherkassk and Rostov—now it may quite confidently be

1 The postscript was added by J. V. Stalin when the article was reprinted in *Revolutsionny Front*, a magazine published by the Revolutionary Military Council of the South-Western Front and the Council of the Ukrainian Labour Army.

said that the destruction of Denikin's armies is in full swing.

Another blow, and complete victory will be ensured.

Kursk,
January 7, 1920
The magazine Revolutsionny Front, No. 1,
February 15, 1920
Signed: J. Stalin

ORDER OF THE DAY TO THE UKRAINIAN LABOUR ARMY

March 7, 1920

In accordance with directive No. 1247/op/123/sh of the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the R.S.F.S.R., and Order No. 271 of the Revolutionary Military Council of the South-Western Front, the 42nd Division is incorporated in the Ukrainian Labour Army as from March 7.[1]

The gallant 42nd Division, which heroically fought the enemies of Russia side by side with other divisions at the front, and with them utterly defeated Denikin's Volunteer Army, must now lay aside its weapons in order to give battle to economic disruption and provide the country with coal.

Commanders of the 42nd Division! In the battles with Denikin you proved your ability to lead the Red Army men from victory to victory—show now that you are capable of gaining no lesser victories in the battle with the coal crisis!

Commissars of the 42nd Division! You proved your ability to maintain exemplary order and discipline among the Red Army men on the battlefields—show now that you are capable of maintaining the sacred banner of labour discipline untarnished in the battle for coal!

Red Army men of the 42nd Division! You proved your ability to fight the enemies of workers' and peasants' Russia honourably and de-

1 The Ukrainian Labour Army was formed in February 1920 and comprised military units detailed from the South-Western Front for work of economic construction, chiefly the rehabilitation of the Donbas. The Council of People's Commissars of the R.S.F.S.R., in conjunction with the All-Ukrainian Revolutionary Committee, set up a Council of the Labour Army to direct its activities, consisting of representatives of economic People's Commissariats and the Revolutionary Military Council of the South-Western Front, under the chairmanship of J. V. Stalin, member and plenipotentiary representative of the Council of Defence.

votedly—show now that you are capable of labouring just as honourably and devotedly in transporting coal to the stations, loading it into wagons and convoying the coal trains to their destination.

Remember that coal is just as important for Russia as victory over Denikin.

In the Urals, the regiments of the Third Army have already distinguished themselves in procuring and transporting wood fuel. In the Volga area, the regiments of the Reserve Army have covered themselves with glory in the work of repairing locomotives and railway wagons. The 42nd Division must demonstrate that it is not inferior to others by meeting the country's needs in transporting, loading and conveying coal.

Workers' and Peasants' Russia expects this of you.

Chairman of the Ukrainian Labour Army Council.
J. Stalin
First published in 1940
in the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolutsia*, No. 3

SPEECHES AT THE FOURTH CONFERENCE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS) OF THE UKRAINE[1]

March 17-23, 1920

March 17

1. Speech at the Opening of the Conference

Comrades, until now the one basic task confronting you, the Communists of the Ukrainian rear and front, has been to halt the advance of the Poles, rout Petlura and drive out Denikin. This task is being carried out successfully, as is now admitted by enemies as well as by friends.

Now that the Ukraine has been delivered from the most ferocious enemy of the revolution, Denikin's army, you have another and no less important and complex task before you—to rehabilitate the Ukraine's shattered economy. There is no doubt that you, who have succeeded in coping with Denikin, will also succeed in coping with economic disruption, that you will be able to devote all your strength, all that energy which distinguishes the Communists from other parties, to checking

1 The Fourth All-Ukrainian Conference of the Ukrainian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) was held in Kharkov, March 17-23, 1920, and was attended by 278 delegates. Its agenda contained the following items: 1) Political and organizational report of the C.C., Ukr.C.P.(B.); 2) Relations between the Ukrainian Soviet Republic and the R.S.F.S.R.; 3) Attitude towards other political parties; 4) Economic policy; 5) The land question and work in the countryside; 6) The food question; 7) Election of the C.C., Ukr.C.P.(B.) and of delegates to the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.).

J. V. Stalin took part in the conference as the representative of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.). The central question at the conference was that of economic policy. The anti-Party "Democratic Centralism" group (Sapronov, etc.), who in the discussion on this question opposed the principle of one-man management in industry, received a rebuff. On the question of work in the countryside, the conference adopted an important decision providing for the formation in the Ukraine of unions of small and landless peasants (Committees of Poor Peasants). The conference elected J. V. Stalin as a delegate to the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.).

the disruption and aiding your comrades in the North.

There are symptoms that in the North this task is beginning to be fulfilled. The communiques from the Labour Armies indicate that more and more railway locomotives and wagons are being repaired, and more and more fuel is being produced. The industries of the Urals are likewise growing and forging ahead. I have no doubt that you will do as well as our comrades in the North.

The Communists will most assuredly succeed in this task, because our Party is solid, united and devoted, and because above all this is our motto: "Finish the work begun even if you have to die for it." Only thanks to its discipline and solidarity is the Party able effectively to direct thousands of its workers to all the districts and regions. This discipline and solidarity enabled us to triumph over imperialism, and they permit us to hope that we shall likewise triumph over our other enemy—economic disruption.

March 19

2. Report on Economic Policy

I have to report on our immediate tasks in the sphere of economic construction.

A year ago, when our Federation was surrounded by a tight ring of armies subsidized by the international imperialists, the Council of Defence issued the slogan: "Everything for the front!" This meant that all our constructive efforts had to be concentrated on the supply and reinforcement of the front. A year's experience has shown that the Council of Defence was right, for in this year our ferocious enemies were hurled back—Yudenich, Kolchak and Denikin have been as good as routed. Thus the slogan "Everything for the front!" has been put into practice and has yielded good results.

A couple of months ago the Council of Defence issued another slogan: "Everything for the national economy!" This means that all our constructive work must be put on a new, an economic footing, that all our vital forces must be brought to the economic altar. This, however, does not mean that we no longer have any military task. Two attempts

of the Entente to strike down Soviet Federative Russia—the first from the East, with the help of Kolchak, and the second from the South, with the help of Denikin—have failed. Now, apparently, a new blow is being planned—from the West. The Entente is not so stupid as not to exploit the forces of the Polish gentry, if only with the object of preventing our Federation from tackling new constructive tasks. Moreover, we do not yet know what immediate prospects open out in connection with the German coup.[2] Evidently, the West is pregnant with certain new, but quite apparent complications. It therefore must not be said that, in redirecting all our efforts to the work of rehabilitating the national economy, we are turning our backs on the military tasks. Nevertheless, the basic slogan must always be basic.

What induced the Council of Defence and the Central Committee of our Party to issue the new slogan? The fact, comrades, that on looking about us after the defeat of the external enemy, we found a picture of utter economic disruption.

What problems are involved in the task of repairing the war-shattered national economy?

The basic problem in the restoration of the national economy is fuel. All imperialist wars have been fought for the sake of fuel. All the stratagems of the Entente were designed to deprive us of fuel.

There are three types of fuel: coal, oil and wood.

Let us begin with the problem of coal.

In 1916, i.e., before the revolution, we used to produce not less than 140-150 million poods of coal each month, and sent out not less than 120 million poods to other parts. Now we are producing not more than 18 million poods of coal and anthracite, and are sending out not more than 4-5 million poods. The picture is clear.

The second type of fuel is oil. Our chief source of oil fuel is the Baku area. In 1916, we secured in all about 500 million poods of oil from Baku, some 100 million from Grozny, and about 15 million from the Urals (Emba). As you know, our chief source of oil—Baku—is not

2 The reference is to the counter-revolutionary Kapp putsch in Berlin on March 13, 1920, organized by German reactionaries. The Kapp Government was driven out a few days later as the result of a general strike of the workers.

in our hands. Grozny is not worth talking about. In what state it will be when we get it back I do not know. As a fuel source, it possesses very rich oil deposits. Its output last year was as high as 200 million poods. But in what state we shall get it back, I do not know. All we know is that the Whites have wrecked it thoroughly.

The third type of fuel is wood. In former days, measured in terms of coal, about 500 million poods of wood fuel were obtained annually. The output now is not more than 50 percent of this amount, according to the estimates of the Chief Timber Committee.

As you see, as far as fuel is concerned our situation is critical.

The second problem is iron and steel. To all intents and purposes, almost our only source of ore, pig iron and finished products was, and is, the Donets-Krivoy Rog Basin. Pig iron output in 1916 was not less than 16 million poods each month. We had not less than 65 blast furnaces operating in the Donbas. Not a single one of the 65 is operating today. In 1916 our iron and steel plants produced some 14 million poods of semi-manufactures each month. They are now producing not more than five percent of this figure. In 1916 we produced about 12 million poods of finished products each month. Today—two or three percent of this figure. As far as iron and steel are concerned, we are in a pretty bad way too.

The third problem is grain. If we are to restore industry, we must feed the workers. Lack of grain is our chief handicap and the chief cause of our industrial paralysis. Before the war we used to harvest some 5,000 million poods of grain annually in the territory of the Federation. Of this, over 500 million poods were exported to other countries. All the rest went for internal consumption. Even in 1914, when the war began and the frontiers closed, we managed to export some 300 million poods of grain in ten months. Subsequently, exports dropped to 30 million poods.

All this indicates that there are, as there must be, surpluses of grain in the country. Obviously, if we are asked whether the objective possibility exists of securing grain and creating that grain reserve without which it will be impossible to set industry on its feet, we can answer that it undoubtedly does exist. For us to procure the 300 million pood reserve

which our comrades talk so loudly about is, objectively speaking, quite possible. The whole problem is to create a flexible machinery, to give heed to the sentiment of the peasants, to display patience and proficiency, and to assign to this work forces possessing the necessary managerial ability to turn word into deed. In this matter I could cite our experience in the Ukraine. Not so long ago it was estimated that at least 600 million poods of grain of the last harvest had accumulated in the Ukraine. With a certain effort, these six hundred million poods might have been procured. But our food agencies decided to issue a demand for not more than 160 million poods, and further decided that it would be possible to obtain about 40 million poods by March. But this amount was not secured. Owing to the laxity of our agencies, and because of the regular manhunt conducted by Makhno's men against our food officials, and because of the kulak revolts in a number of districts, we succeeded in obtaining only about two million poods instead of forty million.

The next problem is sugar. In 1916 we produced about 115 million poods of sugar. Requirements amounted to 100 million poods. Today we have only about three million.

Such is the state of our war-shattered national economy today.

This state of the Federation's economic affairs naturally compels us to issue the slogan: "Everything for the national economy!"

What does this slogan imply? What it amounts to is that all agitational and constructive work must be re-organized along new, economic lines. We shall now have to promote economic non-commissioned officers and officers from the ranks of the workers to teach the people how to battle against economic disruption and build a new economy. Only in the course of the battle against the disruption will new constructive work be possible, and this requires the training of officers of labour. If last year we arranged emulation among the military units, now we must do the same thing among the workers in our industrial establishments, in the mills and factories, on the railways, in the mines. Evidently, we shall have to draw not only the workers, but also the peasants and other labouring elements into this movement.

Next, it should be observed, in addition to all that has been said, that the local economic bodies, especially the regional and district ones,

will have to be granted more extensive rights, more independence in the matter of rehabilitating industry than has been the case hitherto. The position until now was that the work was directed by the Chief Boards, and the Chief Boards alone; now we shall have to pay special attention to the localities and give them the opportunity, at last, to display their initiative, without which it will be difficult to get our economy on its feet.

Lastly, we must pay attention to supporting the organizations which the Council of Defence has converted from military to economic work. I refer to the Councils of the Labour Armies. Experience has shown that it is not always expedient mechanically to assign whole army units to economic work. Here we have to arrange a certain co-ordination between the work of the reserve units and of the working people in the rear.

Passing to the Ukrainian Labour Army, I must say that for a number of reasons it has only recently started work. The first task was to find out the present situation, and then to consider what practical measures were necessary. What we found out presents a dismal picture. Railway transport is in a particularly bad way. It must be said that on the four Ukrainian railways—the South-Western, the South, the Donets and the Yekaterininskaya—there are quite a number of locomotives, but 70 percent of them are out of order. The consequence is that, instead of the 45 pairs of trains which used to run daily on the Kharkov-Moscow line, we now manage to run only four or five, at most eight, pairs.

Having gathered all this information about the situation in the Ukraine, the Labour Army Council decided on a number of practical measures, of which I must mention the following:

First, to militarize labour in the coal industry, and also to mobilize the rural population for labour duty in transporting coal.

Secondly, to bring new forces from among the workers into industry, because we know that of the 250,000 workers engaged in industry before the revolution, only 80,000 remain. But in order to enlist these new forces, arrangements must first be made for their food supply, and we are adopting a number of measures in this direction.

Thirdly, to set up a Central Board at the head of the coal industry, which would have under its direction a health administration, a com-

munications department, a supply department, a military tribunal and a political department.

All this is necessary in order to get the industries and transport services of the Ukraine going properly, to ensure the regular supply of man power, food, medical aid and political workers, to discourage self-seekers and labour deserters from sneaking out of the Donets Basin, and to implant labour discipline in industry and transport. By arrangement with the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party and the Central Committee of the Ukraine, from now on the Chairman of the Donets Gubernia Committee of the Communist Party will also be chief of the Political Department of the coal industry. All distribution of Party forces and their transfer from district to district for duty in the coal industry will now come within the jurisdiction of the Political Department.

These, in general, are the measures which must be carried out if we are to start work on repairing the warshattered national economy of the Federation and put it on the way to its maximum development.

Concluding my report, I submit for your attention the theses of the C.C., R.C.P. on economic construction.[3]

March 20

3. Reply to the Discussion on the Report on Economic Policy

It is to be noted that none of the delegates attempted to put forward any other resolution in opposition to the Central Committee's theses. The resolution of the Kharkov Conference is only an addendum to the resolutions of the Seventh Congress of Soviets,[4] and one which does not

3 This refers to the theses of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) on "Immediate Tasks of Economic Construction," prepared for the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.). They were published in *Izvestia* of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.), No. 14, March 12, 1920.

4 The Seventh All-Russian Congress of Soviets, which met from December 5 to 9, 1919, in Moscow, heard a report by V. I. Lenin on the work of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars and discussed the military situation, Soviet development, the food situation, the fuel situation and other questions. The decisions adopted on the main items of the agenda (resolutions on "Organization of Food Affairs in the R.S.F.S.R.," "Soviet Development," "Organization of Fuel Affairs in the R.S.F.S.R.") concerned the organization of Soviet economy and Soviet administration.

touch upon a whole series of problems dealt with in the Central Committee's theses concerning the immediate tasks of economic construction.

I have already said that the basic task now is to rehabilitate the coal industry. In view of this, the Council of the Ukrainian Labour Army is concentrating its chief attention on organizing a coal industry board capable of ensuring regular supply and implanting discipline in the industry.

As you know, our industry throughout the Federation is just now passing through a phase of laxity and guerilla mentality similar to the phase the Red Army was in a year and a half ago. At that time the Party centre issued a call to pull the army together, to implant discipline, and to convert the guerilla units into regular units. The same thing must be done now with respect to industry, which has broken down. This broken down industry must be pulled together and organized, otherwise we shall not extricate ourselves from the chaos.

One comrade said here that the workers do not fear militarization, because the better workers are sick and tired of the lack of order. That is perfectly true. The workers are sick and tired of mismanagement, and they will gladly accept leadership capable of introducing order and implanting labour discipline in industry.

March 23

4. Speech at the Closing of the Conference

In his closing speech, Comrade Stalin summed up the work of the All-Ukrainian Conference. He gave an appraisal of the decisions taken on various questions, dwelling on the resolutions adopted on work in the countryside and in economic construction. The latter question will be finally decided at the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.[5]

The resolution of the Kharkov conference referred to was a resolution on economic construction adopted by the Kharkov Gubernia Conference of the Ukrainian Communist Party on March 15, 1920, following the report on economic policy.

5 The Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) met in Moscow from March 29 to April 5, 1920. It discussed the following questions: 1) Report of the Central Committee; 2) Immediate tasks of economic construction; 3) The trade union movement; 4) Tasks of the Communist International; 5) Organizational questions; 6) Attitude towards the

The cardinal problem of our policy—work in the countryside—has, in my opinion, been settled correctly. I consider that here, in the Ukraine, we are passing through the same stage of development in the countryside as that in Russia a year and a half ago, when the Volga area and many areas of Central Russia were in a phase of revolt. This period will become a thing of the past here as it has in Russia.

In our work in the countryside we have to rely upon the poor peasant. The middle peasant will come over to our side only when he becomes convinced that the Soviet regime is strong. Only then will the middle peasant side with us.

From these considerations it may be said that the resolution you have adopted is unquestionably correct.

There is another important question which was decided at the conference, namely, the affiliation of the Borotbists[6] to our Party. The Borotbists are a party which drew its nourishment from the countryside. Now that the Borotbists have merged with our Party, we are in a position to implement the alliance between the proletariat and the poor peasants in full measure. As you know, this alliance is the basis of the might and strength of our Federative Republic.

Permit me to congratulate you on the fruitful work of your conference.

I hereby declare the conference closed. (*Applause.*)

Reproduced from the records of the Secretariat of the Ukrainian Labour Army Staff and the report in the Kharkov newspaper *Kommunist*, Nos. 62, 64, 65 and 66,

---

co-operatives; 7) Transition to the militia system; 8) Election of the Central Committee. The political report of the Central Committee was made by V. I. Lenin, who also spoke on economic construction and co-operative affairs.

The congress defined the immediate economic tasks of the country in the sphere of transport and industry. Special attention was devoted to the question of a single economic plan, the pivotal item in which was the electrification of the national economy. The congress rebuffed the anti-Party "Democratic Centralism" group (Sapronov, Ossinsky, etc.), which opposed one-man management in industry.

6 Borotbists—Ukrainian Left Socialist-Revolutionaries who had formed a separate party in May 1918. Their name derived from their central organ, *Borotba* (*Struggle*). In March 1920, owing to the growing influence of the Bolsheviks among the Ukrainian peasant masses, the Borotbists were compelled to dissolve their party and apply for membership in the Ukrainian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). The Fourth Conference of the Ukr.C.P.(B.) decided to admit them to the Party, but they were accepted only after re-registration. In subsequent years many of the Borotbists took the path of double-dealing and deception of the Party and led the movement of the anti-Soviet counter-revolutionary nationalist elements in the Ukraine, proving themselves to be vile enemies of the Ukrainian people.

March 18, 21, 23 and 24, 1920

LENIN AS THE ORGANISER AND LEADER OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

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

The first group usually confines itself to an outward acceptance, to a ceremonial avowal of Marxism. Being unable or unwilling to grasp the essence of Marxism, being unable or unwilling to put it into practice, it converts the living, revolutionary principles of Marxism into lifeless, meaningless formulas. It does not base its activities on experience, on what practical work teaches, but on quotations from Marx. It does not derive its instructions and directions from an analysis of living reality, but from analogies and historical parallels. Discrepancy between word and deed is the chief malady of this group. Hence the disillusionment and perpetual grudge against fate, which time and again lets it down and makes a "dupe" of it. The name for this group is Menshevism (in Russia), [and] opportunism (in Europe). Comrade Tyszka (Jogiches) described this group very aptly at the London Congress[1] when he said that it does not stand by, but lies down on the point of view of Marxism.

The second group, on the contrary, attaches prime importance not to the outward acceptance of Marxism, but to its realization, its application in practice. What this group chiefly concentrates its attention on is determining the ways and means of realizing Marxism that best answer the situation, and changing these ways and means as the situation changes. It does not derive its directions and instructions from historical analogies and parallels, but from a study of surrounding conditions. It does not base its activities on quotations and maxims, but on practical

1 The London Congress—the Fifth Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, which met from April 30 to May 19, 1907, in London.

experience, testing every step by experience, learning from its mistakes and teaching others how to build a new life. That, in fact, explains why there is no discrepancy between word and deed in the activities of this group, and why the teachings of Marx completely retain their living, revolutionary force. To this group may be fully applied Marx's saying that Marxists cannot rest content with interpreting the world, but must go further and change it.[2] The name for this group is Bolshevism, communism.

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

I. Lenin as the Organizer of the Russian Commiunist Party

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

The task was to separate the sheep from the goats, to dissociate oneself from alien elements, to organize cadres of experienced revolutionaries in the localities, to provide them with a clear programme and firm tactics, and, lastly, to gather these cadres into a single, militant organization of professional revolutionaries, sufficiently secret to withstand the

2 See Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Moscow 1951, p. 365.

onslaughts of the gendarmes, but at the same time sufficiently connected with the masses to lead them into battle at the required moment.

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

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

The immense service Lenin rendered the Russian proletariat and its Party was that he exposed the whole danger of the Mensheviks' "plan" of organization at a time when this "plan" was still in embryo, when even its authors perceived its outlines with difficulty, and, having exposed it, opened a furious attack on the laxity of the Mensheviks in matters of organization and concentrated the whole attention of the Party's practical workers on this question. For the very existence of the Party was at stake; it was a matter of life or death for the Party.

To establish an all-Russian political newspaper as a rallying centre of Party forces, to organize staunch Party cadres in the localities as "regular units" of the Party, to organize these cadres into one entity through the medium of the newspaper, and to weld them into an all-Russian militant party with sharply-defined limits, with a clear programme, firm tactics and a single will—such was the plan that Lenin developed in his famous books, What Is To Be Done?[3] and One Step Forward, Two Steps

3 See V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 5, pp. 319-494.

Back.[4] The merit of this plan lay in the fact that it fully conformed to Russian realities, and that it generalized in masterly fashion the organizational experience of the best of the practical workers. In the struggle for this plan, the majority of the Russian practical workers resolutely followed Lenin and were not deterred by a possible split. The victory of this plan laid the foundation for that close-knit and steeled Communist Party which has no equal in the world.

Our comrades (not only the Mensheviks!) often accused Lenin of an excessive inclination towards controversy and splits, of being relentless in his struggle against conciliators, and so on. At one time this was undoubtedly the case. But it will be easily understood that our Party could not have rid itself of internal weakness and diffuseness, that it could not have attained its characteristic vigour and strength if it had not expelled the non-proletarian, opportunist elements from its midst. In the epoch of bourgeois rule, a proletarian party can grow and gain strength only to the extent that it combats the opportunist, anti-revolutionary and anti-party elements in its own midst and within the working class. Lassalle was right when he said: "The party becomes strong by purging itself."[5]

The accusers usually cited the German party, in which "unity" at that time flourished. But, in the first place, not every kind of unity is a sign of strength, and secondly, one has only to glance at the late German party, rent into three parties,[6] to realize the utter falsity and fictitiousness of "unity" between Scheidemann and Noske, on the one hand, and Liebknecht and Luxemburg, on the other. And who knows whether it would not have been better for the German proletariat if the revolutionary elements of the German party had split away from its anti-revolutionary elements in time?... No, Lenin was a thousand times right in leading the Party along the path of uncompromising struggle against the anti-Party and anti-revolutionary elements. For it was only because of such a policy of organization that our Party was able to create that

4 See V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 7, pp. 185-392.

5 These words, which occur in a letter from Lassalle to Karl Marx dated June 24, 1852, were taken by V. I. Lenin as an epigraph to his *What Is To Be Done?* (see *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 5, p. 319).

6 The three parties resulting from the split of the old German Social-Democratic Party were: the Social-Democratic Party, the Independent Social-Democratic Party and the Communist Party of Germany.

internal unity and astonishing cohesion which enabled it to emerge unscathed from the July crisis during the Kerensky regime, to bear the brunt of the October uprising, to pass through the crisis of the Brest period unshaken, to organize the victory over the Entente, and, lastly, to acquire that unparalleled flexibility which permits it at any moment to re-form its ranks and to concentrate hundreds of thousands of its members on any big task without causing confusion in its midst.

II. Lenin as the Leader of the Russian Communist Party

But the merits of the Russian Communist Party in the field of organization are only one aspect of the matter. The Party could not have grown and become strong so quickly if the political content of its work, its programme and tactics had not conformed to Russian realities, if its slogans had not fired the masses of the workers and had not impelled the revolutionary movement forward. Let us pass to this aspect of the matter.

The Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution (1905) took place under conditions differing from those that prevailed during the revolutionary upheavals in the West, in France and Germany, for example. Whereas the revolution in the West took place under the conditions of the manufacturing period of capitalism and of an undeveloped class struggle, when the proletariat was weak and numerically small and did not have its own party to formulate its demands, while the bourgeoisie was sufficiently revolutionary to win the confidence of the workers and peasants and to lead them into the struggle against the aristocracy—in Russia, on the other hand, the revolution began (1905) under the conditions of the machine-industry period of capitalism and of a developed class struggle, when the Russian proletariat, relatively numerous and welded together by capitalism, had already fought a number of battles with the bourgeoisie, had its own party, which was more united than the bourgeois party, and its own class demands, while the Russian bourgeoisie, which, moreover, subsisting on government contracts, was sufficiently scared by the revolutionary temper of the proletariat to seek an alliance with the government and the landlords against the workers and peasants. The fact that the Russian revolution broke out as a result of the military reverses suffered on the fields of Manchuria only accelerated events without essentially changing the state of affairs.

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

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

And that vulgar medley of the tunes of the wretched liberals the Mensheviks passed off as the last word in "genuine" Marxism!...

The immense service Lenin rendered the Russian revolution was that he utterly exposed the futility of the Mensheviks' historical parallels and the whole danger of the Menshevik "scheme of revolution" which surrendered the cause of the workers to the tender mercies of the bourgeoisie. The revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, instead of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; boycott of the Bulygin Duma[7] and armed uprising, instead of participating in the Duma and carrying on organic work within it; the idea of a "Left bloc," when the Duma was after all convened, and the utilization of the Duma platform for the struggle outside the Duma, instead of a Cadet Ministry and the reactionary "cherishing" of the Duma; the fight against the Cadet Party as a counter-revolutionary force, instead of forming a

7 The Bulygin Duma—a consultative representative assembly which the tsarist government intended to convene in 1905. The law instituting the Duma and the regulations governing the elections to it were drafted by a commission of which Minister of the Interior Bulygin was the chairman, and were published simultaneously with the tsar's Manifesto of August 6, 1905. The Bolsheviks proclaimed an active boycott of the Bulygin Duma. "...The Bulygin Duma was never convened. It was swept away by the revolutionary storm before it was convened." (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 23, p. 239.)

"bloc" with it—such was the tactical plan which Lenin developed in his famous pamphlets, Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution[8] and The Victory of the Cadets and the Tasks of the Workers' Party.[9]

The merit of this plan lay in the fact that it bluntly and resolutely formulated the class demands of the proletariat in the epoch of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia, facilitated the transition to the socialist revolution, and contained in embryo the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The majority of the Russian practical workers resolutely and unswervingly followed Lenin in the struggle for this tactical plan. The victory of this plan laid the foundation for those revolutionary tactics thanks to which our Party is now shaking the foundations of world imperialism.

The subsequent development of events; the four years of imperialist war and the shattering of the whole economic life of the country; the February Revolution and the celebrated dual power; the Provisional Government, which was a hotbed of bourgeois counter-revolution, and the Petrograd Soviet of Deputies, which was the form of the incipient proletarian dictatorship; the October Revolution and the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly; the abolition of bourgeois parliamentarism and the proclamation of the Republic of Soviets; the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war and the offensive of world imperialism, together with the professed "Marxists," against the proletarian revolution; and, lastly, the pitiable position of the Mensheviks, who clung to the Constituent Assembly and who were thrown overboard by the proletariat and driven by the waves of revolution to the shores of capitalism—all this only confirmed the correctness of the principles of the revolutionary tactics formulated by Lenin in his Two Tactics. A party with such a heritage could sail boldly forward, without fear of submerged rocks.

In our time of proletarian revolution, when every Party slogan and every utterance of a leader is tested in action, the proletariat makes special demands of its leaders. History knows of proletarian leaders who were leaders in times of storm, practical leaders, self-sacrificing and cou-

8 See V. I . Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed, Vol. 9, pp. 1-119.

9 See V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ ed., Vol. 10, pp. 175-250.

rageous, but who were weak in theory. The names of such leaders are not soon forgotten by the masses. Such, for example, were Lassalle in Germany and Blanqui in France. But the movement as a whole cannot live on reminiscences alone: it must have a clear goal (a programme), and a firm line (tactics).

There is another type of leader—peacetime leaders, who are strong in theory, but weak in matters of organization and practical work. Such leaders are popular only among an upper layer of the proletariat, and then only up to a certain time. When the epoch of revolution sets in, when practical revolutionary slogans are demanded of the leaders, the theoreticians quit the stage and give way to new men. Such, for example, were Plekhanov in Russia and Kautsky in Germany.

To retain the post of leader of the proletarian revolution and of the proletarian party, one must combine strength in theory with experience in the practical organization of the proletarian movement. P. Axelrod, when he was a Marxist, wrote of Lenin that he "happily combines the experience of a good practical worker with a theoretical education and a broad political outlook" (see P. Axelrod's preface to Lenin's pamphlet: The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats[10]). What Mr. Axelrod, the ideologist of "civilized" capitalism, would say now about Lenin is not difficult to guess. But we who know Lenin well and can judge matters objectively have no doubt that Lenin has fully retained this old quality. It is here, incidentally, that one must seek the reason why it is Lenin, and no one else, who is today the leader of the strongest and most steeled proletarian party in the world.

Pravda, No. 86,
April 23, 1920
Signed: J. Stalin

10 V. I. Lenin wrote the pamphlet, *The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats*, at the end of 1897, while he was in exile. The first edition, with a preface by P. Axelrod, was published in Geneva in 1898 by the League of Russian Social-Democrats (see V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 299-326).

SPEECH DELIVERED AT A MEETING CALLED BY THE MOSCOW COMMITTEE, R.C.P. (B.) ON THE OCCASION OF V. I. LENIN'S FIFTIETH BIRTHDAY

April 23, 1920

After the speeches and reminiscences we have heard here, very little remains for me to say. I should like only to mention one feature of Comrade Lenin's of which nobody has yet spoken, namely, his modesty and his courage in acknowledging mistakes.

I recall two occasions when Lenin, that giant, admitted that he had been in the wrong.

The first episode relates to the decision on boycotting the Witte Duma, taken in Tammerfors, Finland, in December 1905, at the All-Russian Bolshevik Conference.[1] The question of boycotting the

1 The Tammerfors Conference—the first conference of the Bolsheviks, held December 12-17, 1905. It was at this conference that V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin met for the first time; until then they had maintained contact by correspondence or through comrades.

The agenda of the conference was as follows: 1) Reports from the local organizations; 2) Report on the current situation; 3) Organizational report of the C.C.; 4) Merging of the two sections of the R.S.D.L.P.; 5) Re-organization of the Party; 6) The agrarian question; 7) The State Duma.

The reports on the current situation and on the agrarian question were delivered by V. I. Lenin, who also spoke on the attitude towards the Witte Duma. J. V. Stalin reported on the activities of the Transcaucasian Bolshevik organization and spoke in support of Lenin's tactics of actively boycotting the Duma. The conference adopted a decision on the re-unification of the Party, which was virtually split into two separate parties, and approved V. I. Lenin's resolution on the agrarian question. J. V. Stalin and V. I. Lenin were members of the commission which drafted the resolution on the attitude towards the Duma. The resolution called upon the Party and the working class to boycott the Duma and recommended all the Party organizations to make wide use of the election meetings for the purpose of extending the revolutionary organization of the

Witte Duma had then to be decided. A group of seven, closely associated with Comrade Lenin, and on whom we provincial delegates used to bestow all kinds of epithets, had assured us that Ilyich was opposed to boycotting the Duma and in favour of taking part in the elections. This, as it turned out later, was actually so. But the debate opened, and the pro-boycotters from the provinces, from St. Petersburg, Moscow, Siberia and the Caucasus went into the attack, and what was our surprise when, after we had spoken, Lenin got up and declared that he had been in favour of taking part in the elections, but he saw now that he had been wrong and associated himself with the delegates from the provinces. We were astounded. It had the effect of an electric shock. We cheered him to the echo.

Here is another episode of a similar character. In September 1917, under Kerensky, at the time when the Democratic Conference had been convened and the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries were contriving a new institution, the Pre-parliament, which was to pave the way for a transition from the Soviets to a Constituent Assembly, at that moment we in the Central Committee in Petrograd decided not to disperse the Democratic Conference, and to go ahead strengthening the Soviets, to convene a Congress of Soviets, start an uprising and proclaim the Congress of Soviets the organ of state power. Ilyich, who at that time was living in hiding outside Petrograd, did not agree with the Central Committee and wrote that the scum (meaning the Democratic Conference) should be dispersed and arrested right away.

It seemed to us that the matter was not quite so simple, for we knew that a half, or at least a third, of the members of the Democratic Conference were delegates from the front, and that by arresting and dispersing the Conference we might only spoil matters and damage our relations with the front. We considered that all the bumps and pitfalls on our path were clearer to us, the practical workers. But Ilyich was a great man; he was not afraid of bumps and pitfalls, he did not fear danger, and said: "Rise and march straight to the goal!" We, the practical workers, on the other hand, believed that no good could come of acting in this way at that time, that the thing to do was to skirt around the obstacles in order

---

proletariat and for conducting agitation among all sections of the people in favour of an armed uprising.

to take the bull by the horns later. And despite all Ilyich's insistence, we did not listen to him and went on strengthening the Soviets, and to such effect as to end up with the Congress of Soviets of October 25 and the successful uprising. Ilyich was already in Petrograd by then. Smiling and glancing at us slyly, he said: "Yes, it seems you were right."

Again we were astounded.

Comrade Lenin was not afraid of acknowledging his mistakes.

It was this modesty and courage that particularly captivated us. (*Applause*.)

First published in the symposium,
The Fiftieth Birthday of
Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov-Lenin,
Moscow, 1920

THE ENTENTE'S NEW CAMPAIGN AGAINST RUSSIA

It is beyond all doubt that the campaign of the Polish gentry against workers' and peasants' Russia is in actual fact a campaign of the Entente. The point is not only that the League of Nations, which is led by the Entente and of which Poland is a member, has evidently approved Poland's campaign against Russia. The chief point is that without the Entente's support Poland could not have organized her attack on Russia, that France in the first place, and also Britain and America, are doing all they can to support Poland's offensive with arms, equipment, money and instructors. Disagreements within the Entente over the Polish question do not affect the matter, for they concern only the ways of supporting Poland, and not the support itself. Nor is the matter affected by Curzon's diplomatic correspondence with Comrade Chicherin,[1] or by the ostentatious anti-intervention articles in the British press, because all this hullabaloo has only one object, namely, to throw dust in the eyes of naive politicians and by talking about peace with Russia to cover up the foul work of the actual armed intervention organized by the Entente.

I. The General Situation

The Entente's present campaign is the third in succession.

The first campaign was launched in the spring of 1919. It was a combined campaign, because it envisaged a joint attack by Kolchak, Denikin, Poland, Yudenich and composite Anglo-Russian detachments in Turkestanand. Arkhangelsk, the main weight of the attack being in

1 The reference is to the diplomatic correspondence in connection with the Note of Lord Curzon, British Foreign Secretary, to the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the R.S.F.S.R. of April 11, 1920, offering the full capitulation of Wrangel and his army in the Crimea provided they were amnestied by the Soviet Government.

Kolchak's area.

At that period the Entente was solid and united and stood for open intervention: the weakness of the labour movement in the West, the number of Soviet Russia's enemies, and their complete confidence in victory over Russia, enabled the bosses of the Entente to pursue a brazen policy of undisguised intervention.

At that period Russia was in a critical state, because she was cut off from the grain areas (Siberia, the Ukraine, the Northern Caucasus) and fuel sources (the Donets Basin, Grozny, Baku) and was forced to fight on six fronts. The Entente saw this and gloated over its anticipated victory. The Times was already beating the drums.

Nevertheless, Russia passed through this crisis safely, and her most powerful enemy, Kolchak, was put out of action. The point is that Russia's rear, and hence also her army, proved to be more stable and flexible than the rear and armies of her adversaries.

The Entente's second campaign was launched in the autumn of 1919. It, too, was a combined campaign, because it envisaged a joint attack by Denikin, Poland and Yudenich (Kolchak had been written off the accounts). This time the weight of the attack was in the South, in Denikin's area.

At this period the Entente for the first time began to experience internal disagreements. For the first time it began to moderate its insolent tone, intimated its opposition to open intervention, proclaimed the permissibility of negotiations with Russia, and proceeded to withdraw its troops from the North. The growth of the revolutionary movement in the West and Kolchak's defeat had evidently made the former policy of open intervention unsafe for the Entente. It no longer dared to speak openly of undisguised intervention.

Despite the victory over Kolchak and the recovery of one of the grain areas (Siberia), Russia in this period was again in a critical state, because the main enemy, Denikin, stood at the gates of Tula, the chief source of supply of cartridges, rifles and machine guns for our army. Nevertheless, Russia emerged safe and sound from this crisis too. And for the same reason, namely, the greater stability and flexibility of our rear, and hence also of our army.

The Entente's third campaign is being launched in a quite new situation. To begin with, unlike the previous campaigns, this campaign cannot be called a combined one, for not only have the Entente's old allies (Kolchak, Denikin, Yudenich) dropped out, but no new ones (if there are any) have yet joined in, if we disregard the ludicrous Petlura and "his" ludicrous "army." Poland is so far facing Russia alone, without any serious fighting allies.

Further, the notorious blockade has been broken not only morally and practically, but also formally. The Entente is forced to reconcile itself to the necessity of diplomatic relations with Russia and to tolerate official representatives of Russia in the West. The mass revolutionary movement in the European countries, which is adopting the slogans of the Third International, and the new successes of the Soviet armies in the East are widening the division within the Entente, enhancing Russia's prestige in the neutral and border states, and rendering the Entente's policy of isolating Russia utopian. Estland, that "natural" ally of Poland, has been neutralized. Latvia and Lithuania, who yesterday were Poland's fighting allies, are today conducting peace negotiations with Russia. The same may be said of Finland.

Lastly, Russia's internal position at the opening of the Entente's third campaign must be regarded as having radically changed for the better. Russia has not only opened the road to the grain and fuel areas (Siberia, the Ukraine, the Northern Caucasus, the Donets Basin, Grozny, Baku), but has reduced the number of fronts from six to two, and is therefore in a position to mass troops in the West.

To what has been said must be added the very important fact that Poland is the attacking side, having rejected Russia's peace proposals, and Russia the defending side, which is an enormous and inestimable moral advantage for Russia.

All these circumstances create a new situation, new chances for a Russian victory which did not exist at the time of the earlier, the first and second, Entente campaigns against Russia.

That, chiefly, explains the gloomy and sceptical tone in which the Western imperialist press evaluates the successes of the Polish army.

II. Rear, Striking Area

No army in the world can be victorious (we are speaking of firm and enduring victory, of course) without a stable rear. The rear is of prime importance to the front, because it is from the rear, and the rear alone, that the front obtains not only all kinds of supplies, but also its man power—its fighting forces, sentiments and ideas. An unstable rear, and so much the more a hostile rear, is bound to turn the best and most united army into an unstable and crumbling mass. The weakness of Kolchak and Denikin was due to the fact that they had no rear of "their own," that they, imbued as they were with essentially-Russian dominant-nation aspirations, were obliged to a very large extent to build their front and to supply and replenish it from non-Russian elements who were hostile to these aspirations, and that they were obliged to operate in areas which were obviously alien to their armies. It was natural that armies which had no internal, national, and still less class cohesion, and which were surrounded by a hostile environment, should cave in at the first powerful blow of the Soviet armies.

In this respect, the rear of the Polish forces differs very substantially from that of Kolchak and Denikin—to the great advantage of Poland. Unlike the rear of Kolchak and Denikin, the rear of the Polish forces is homogeneous and nationally united. Hence its unity and staunchness. Its predominant sentiment—a "sense of motherland"—is communicated through numerous channels to the Polish Front, lending the units national cohesion and firmness. Hence the staunchness of the Polish troops. Poland's rear, of course, is not (and cannot be!) homogeneous in the class sense; but class conflicts have not yet reached such a pitch as to undermine the sense of national unity and to breed antagonisms in a front of heterogeneous class composition. If the Polish forces were operating in Poland's own territory, it would undoubtedly be difficult to fight against them.

But Poland is not content with her own territory and is pushing her armies forward, subjugating Lithuania and Byelorussia, and driving deeply into Russia and the Ukraine. This circumstance alters the situation fundamentally, to the great detriment of the stability of the Polish armies.

As the Polish armies advance beyond the borders of Poland and

penetrate deeper into the adjacent regions, they get farther and farther away from their national rear, weaken their communications with it, and find themselves in an alien, and for the most part hostile, national environment. Worse still, this hostility is aggravated by the fact that the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of the areas adjacent to Poland (Byelorussia, Lithuania, Russia, the Ukraine) consist of non-Polish peasants who are oppressed by Polish landlords, and that these peasants regard the offensive of the Polish troops as a war for the power of the Polish gentry, as a war against the oppressed non-Polish peasants. This, in fact, explains why the slogan of the Soviet army, "Down with the Polish gentry!" is meeting with so powerful a response among the majority of the inhabitants of these regions, why the peasants of these regions welcome the Soviet armies as their deliverers from landlord oppression, why, in expectation of the arrival of the Soviet armies, they rise in revolt at the first convenient opportunity and attack the Polish army in the rear. It is to this circumstance, too, that must be attributed the unparalleled enthusiasm of the Soviet armies, which is attested by all our military and political workers.

All this cannot but create an atmosphere of uncertainty and insecurity within the Polish armies, cannot but undermine their morale, their faith in the justice of their cause, their faith in victory, and cannot but convert the national cohesion of the Polish army from a favourable into an unfavourable factor.

And the further they advance (if they advance at all), the more strongly will these unfavourable aspects of the Polish campaign make themselves felt.

Can Poland, under such circumstances, develop a strong and powerful offensive, one promising enduring successes?

Will not the Polish troops, under these circumstances, find themselves in a situation similar to that in which the German troops, cut off from their rear, found themselves in the Ukraine in 1918?

This brings us to the question of the striking area. In war in general, and in civil war in particular, success, decisive victory, not infrequently depends upon a successful choice of the striking area, the area from which you intend to deliver and develop your main blow against the

enemy. One of Denikin's big mistakes was that he chose as the area of his main blow the Donets BasinKharkov-Voronezh-Kursk zone, an area which was patently unreliable for him, one that was hostile to him, and in which he could create neither a firm rear nor favourable conditions for the advance of his troops. The successes of the Soviet forces on the Denikin front were due, among other things, to the fact that the Soviet command took the timely precaution to transfer its main blow from the Tsaritsyn area (an unfavourable area) to the area of the Donets Basin (a highly favourable area), where the Soviet troops were greeted by the inhabitants with enthusiasm, and from which it was easiest of all to pierce Denikin's front, split it in two, and advance further, all the way to Rostov.

This factor, which is not infrequently lost sight of by the old military experts, is often of decisive importance in civil war.

It should be observed that in this respect, in respect of the area of her main blow, Poland is very badly off. The fact is that, for the reasons enumerated above, not one of the areas adjacent to Poland can be regarded as favourable to the Polish army, either for the delivery of the main blow or for the further development of this blow. Wherever the Polish forces advance, they will encounter the resistance of Ukrainian, Russian or Byelorussian peasants who are waiting for the Soviet armies to come and deliver them from the Polish landlords.

The position of the Soviet armies, on the other hand, is quite favourable in this respect: for them all areas will "do nicely," so to speak, for as the Soviet armies advance they do not fortify, but overthrow the power of the Polish gentry and deliver the peasants from bondage.

III. Prospects

So far, Poland is warring against Russia single-handed. But it would be naive to think that she is alone. What we have in mind is not only the all-round support which Poland is undoubtedly getting from the Entente, but also those fighting allies of Poland which in part have already been found by the Entente (the remnants of Denikin's army, for example), and partly those which will in all likelihood be found for the glory of European "civilization." It is not by chance that the Polish offensive began

at the time of the San Remo conference,[2] to which Russia's representatives were not admitted. Nor is it by chance that Rumania has dropped the question of peace negotiations with Russia... Moreover, it is quite likely that the Polish offensive, which at first glance seems to be a reckless adventure, is actually part of a broadly conceived plan for a combined campaign, which is being carried out little by little.

All the same, it should be said that if the Entente reckoned on conquering Russia when it organized this third campaign against her, it has miscalculated, for the chances of defeating Russia in 1920 are less, far less, than they were in 1919.

We have already discussed Russia's chances of victory, and have said that they are growing and will continue to grow. But this does not mean, of course, that victory is already in our pocket. The chances of victory we have spoken of can be of real value only if other conditions are equal, that is, on condition that we make as great an effort now as we did formerly, during Denikin's offensive, that our armies are supplied and replenished punctually and regularly, that our propagandists redouble their efforts to enlighten the Red Army men and the population around them, and that we clear our rear of scum and fortify it with all our strength and by every means.

Only if these conditions are fulfilled can victory be considered assured.

Pravda, Nos. 111 and 112,
May 25 and 26, 1920
Signed: J. Stalin

2 The conference of the Entente powers in San Remo, Italy, (April 19-26, 1920) discussed, among other questions, the fulfilment of the Versailles Peace Treaty by Germany and a draft peace treaty with Turkey.



THE SITUATION ON THE SOUTH-WESTERN FRONT
Ukrainian ROSTA Interview

The day before yesterday, Comrade J. V. Stalin, member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic, returned to Kharkov after having spent about three weeks at the front. It was while he was there that the Red forces began and gradually developed the offensive operations which opened with the celebrated breaching of the Polish Front by the Red cavalry.

Interviewed by a Ukrainian ROSTA correspondent, Comrade Stalin said the following:

The Break-through

When speaking of the operation of Comrade Budyonny's Cavalry Army on the Polish Front in the early part of June, many compare it—this breach of the enemy's front—with Mamontov's cavalry raid last year.

But such an analogy is quite incorrect.

Mamontov's operation was of an episodic, guerilla character, so to speak, and was not co-ordinated with the general offensive operations of Denikin's army.

The break-through of the Cavalry Army, on the other hand, is a link in the general chain of the Red Army's offensive operations.

Our cavalry raid began on June 5. On the morning of that day the Red cavalry, compressed into a tight fist, struck at the Polish Second Army, breached the enemy's front, raced through the Berdichev area, and on the morning of June 7 occupied Zhitomir.

The details of the capture of Zhitomir and of the trophies captured

have already been given in the press, and I shall say nothing about them. I shall only mention one characteristic thing. The Revolutionary Military Council of the Cavalry Army had reported to front headquarters: "The Polish army looks with utter disdain on our cavalry. We consider it our duty to show the Poles that our cavalry has to be respected." After the break-through, Comrade Budyonny wrote us: "The Polish gentry have learned to respect our cavalry; they are on the run, tumbling over one another, and leaving the road clear for us."

Results of the Break-through

The results of the break-through were:

The Polish Second Army, through which our Cavalry Army passed, was put out of action—over one thousand of its men were taken prisoner and about eight thousand cut down.

I have checked the latter figure from several sources and find it close to the truth, all the more that at first the Poles stubbornly refused to surrender and our cavalry literally had to hack their way through.

That was the first result.

Second result: the Polish Third Army (Kiev area) was cut off from its rear and was in danger of being surrounded, in consequence of which it began a general retreat in the Kiev-Korosten direction.

Third result: the Polish Sixth Army (KamenetsPodolsk area), left without support on its left flank and fearing to be pressed against the Dniester, began a general withdrawal.

Fourth result: as soon as the break-through was effected, we launched an impetuous general offensive along the whole front.

Fate of the Polish Army

As the fate of the Polish Third Army is still not clear to all, I shall dwell on this in greater detail.

Cut off from its base, and with its communications disrupted, the Polish Third Army was faced with the danger of being captured to a man. In view of this it began to burn its baggage trains, blow up its stores

and put its guns out of action.

After its first unsuccessful attempts to retire in good order, it was forced to take to flight (wholesale flight).

One third of its effectives (the Polish Third Army had about twenty thousand men in all) were taken prisoner or cut down. Another third, if not more, discarded their weapons and took to flight, dispersing through the marshes and forests. Only the remaining third, and even less, succeeded in making their way back to their own side through Korosten. It is beyond doubt that if the Poles had not succeeded in sending timely aid in the shape of fresh units through Shepetovka-Sarny, this part of the Polish Third Army would also have fallen prisoner or would have dispersed through the forests.

At any rate, it may be considered that the Polish Third Army no longer exists. Such remnants as managed to get back to their own side will need thorough overhauling.

To give an idea of how badly the Polish Third Army was smashed, I must tell you that the entire Zhitomir highway was strewn with half-burned baggage trains and all kinds of motor vehicles, the latter numbering about four thousand, according to the report of our chief of communications. We captured 70 guns, not less than 250 machine guns, and a vast quantity of rifles and cartridges, which have not yet been counted.

Such were our trophies.

Situation at the Front

The present situation at the front may be described as follows: the Polish Sixth Army is retreating, the Second is being withdrawn for re-organization, and the Third virtually does not exist and is being replaced by other Polish units taken from the Western Front or from the far rear.

The Red Army is advancing along the whole front and has crossed the line: Ovruch-Korosten-ZhitomirBerdichev-Kazatin-Kalinovka-Vinnitsa-Zhmerinka.

Conclusions

But it would be a mistake to think that the Poles on our front have been disposed of.

After all, we are contending not only against the Poles, but against the whole Entente, which has mobilized all the dark forces of Germany, Austria, Hungary and Rumania and is providing the Poles with supplies of every kind.

Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the Poles have reserves, which are already concentrated at Novograd-Volynsk, and their effect will undoubtedly be felt within the next few days.

It should also be borne in mind that there is as yet no mass demoralization in the Polish army. There is no doubt that more fighting is still to come, and fierce fighting at that.

Hence I consider the boastfulness and harmful self-conceit displayed by some of our comrades as out of place: some of them, not content with the successes at the front, are calling for a "march on Warsaw"; others, not content with defending our Republic against enemy attack, haughtily declare that they could be satisfied only with a "Red Soviet Warsaw."

I shall not demonstrate that this boastfulness and self-conceit are entirely at variance both with the policy of the Soviet Government and with the strength of the enemy forces at the front.

I must declare most categorically that we shall not be victorious unless we strain every effort in the rear and at the front. Without this, we cannot defeat our enemies from the West.

This is emphasized particularly by the offensive of Wrangel's troops, which has appeared like a "bolt from the blue" and has assumed menacing proportions.

The Crimean Front

There is not the least doubt that Wrangel's offensive was dictated by the Entente in order to ease the difficult position of the Poles. Only a naive politician could believe that Curzon's correspondence with Comrade

Chicherin could have any other purpose than to use talk of peace to cover up the preparations Wrangel and the Entente were making for an offensive from the Crimea.

Wrangel was not yet ready, and it was for that reason (and that reason alone!) that the "humane" Curzon begged Soviet Russia to have mercy on Wrangel's forces and spare their lives.

The Entente evidently calculated that at the moment when the Red Army overwhelmed the Poles and began to advance, Wrangel would appear in the rear of our armies and upset all Soviet Russia's plans.

Undoubtedly, Wrangel's offensive has considerably eased the position of the Poles, but there is scarcely reason to believe that Wrangel will succeed in breaking through to the rear of our Western armies.

At all events, the weight and strength of Wrangel's offensive will be apparent in the very near future.

Kommunist (Kharkov), No. 140,
June 24, 1920

TELEGRAM TO V. I. LENIN

Revishin, a front-line general, who was taken prisoner by our forces on the Crimean Front on June 10, has stated in my presence: a) Wrangel's army is getting its clothing, guns, rifles, tanks and sabres chiefly from the British, and also from the French; b) Wrangel is being aided from the sea by big British ships and small French ships; c) Wrangel is getting fuel (liquid) from Batum (this means that Baku must not supply fuel to Tiflis, which can sell it to Batum); d) General Erdeli, who was interned by Georgia and was to be turned over to us, was already in the Crimea in May (which means that Georgia is playing false and deceiving us).

General Revishin's testimony on British and French aid to Wrangel is being stenographed and a copy signed by him will be sent you as material for Chicherin.

Stalin
June 25, 1920
First published
in *Pravda*, No. 313,
November 14, 1935

THE SITUATION ON THE POLISH FRONT
Pravda Interview

Comrade Stalin, who recently returned from the South-Western Front, in an interview with our correspondent stated the following:

1. May-June

In the last two months, in May and in June, the situation at the front presented entirely different pictures.

May was a month of exceptional successes for the Polish army. On their right flank, the Poles were successfully advancing beyond the Kiev-Zhmerinka line and threatening Odessa. On their left flank, they were successfully stopping the offensive operations of our troops in the direction of Molodechno-Minsk. In the centre, having consolidated themselves in Mozyr and captured Rechitsa, they were threatening Gomel.

June, on the other hand, was a month of swift and drastic liquidation of the successes gained by the Polish army in May. The Poles' advance on the Ukraine was already stopped, for they were not only driven out of Kiev, but thrown back beyond the Rovno-ProskurovMoghilev line. Their advance on Gomel was also stopped since their forces were hurled back beyond Mozyr. As regards their left flank—the most stable, according to the Polish press—it must be said that the powerful drive towards Molodechno made by our troops in this area in the past few days leaves no doubt that here too the Poles will be flung back.

July reveals a picture of a decisive change at the front in favour of Russia, and of obvious superiority on the side of the Soviet armies.

2. The Zhitomir Break-through

The break-through effected by our cavalry in the Zhitomir area was un-

doubtedly the decisive factor in the radical change at the front.

Many compare it with Mamontov's break-through and raid and find them identical. But this is incorrect. Mamontov's break-through was of an episodic character and was not directly co-ordinated with Denikin's offensive operations. Comrade Budyonny's break-through, on the contrary, was an essential link in the continuous chain of our offensive operations, its aim being not only the disruption of the enemy's rear services, but also the direct performance of a definite strategic task.

The break-through began at dawn on June 5. On that day our cavalry units, compressed into a tight fist, with their baggage trains in the centre, breached the enemy's positions in the Popelnya-Kazatin area, raced through the Berdichev area, and on June 7 occupied Zhitomir. The resistance of the Poles was so desperate that our cavalry literally had to hack their way through, the result being that the Poles left on the field not less than eight thousand wounded and killed by shot or sabre, according to the reports of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Cavalry Army.

3. Results of the Break-through

Before the Zhitomir break-through the Poles, unlike Denikin, had protected the major points on their front by a belt of trenches and barbed-wire entanglements, and successfully combined mobile warfare with trench warfare. This had seriously hampered our advance. The Zhitomir break-through upset the Poles' calculations and reduced the value of combined warfare to a minimum.

That was the first positive result of the break-through.

Next, the break-through placed the enemy's rear services and communications in direct jeopardy, as a result of which:

a) the Polish Third Army (Kiev area), fearing-encirclement, began a swift retreat which later turned into a wholesale flight;

b) the Polish Second Army (Berdichev area), which sustained the main blow of the Cavalry Army, beat a hasty retreat;

c) the Polish Sixth Army (Zhmerinka area), being left without support on its left flank, began a regular withdrawal westward;

d) our armies launched an impetuous offensive along the whole front.

That was the second positive result of the Zhitomir break-through.

Lastly, the break-through knocked the arrogance out of the Poles, undermined their faith in their own strength, sapped their morale. Before the break-through the Polish units had looked upon our troops, and especially our cavalry, with utter disdain, had fought desperately and refused to surrender. Only after the break-through did the Poles begin to surrender in whole groups and desert en masse—the first symptom of demoralization in the Polish ranks. Comrade Budyonny, in fact, writes to the Revolutionary Military Council of the front: "The Polish gentry have learned to respect our cavalry."

4. The Danger from the South

Our successes on the anti-Polish Front are unquestionable. It is equally unquestionable that these successes will develop. But it would be unbecoming boastfulness to think that the Poles are as good as done with, that all that remains for us to do is to "march on Warsaw."

Such boastfulness, which saps the energy of our officials and breeds a harmful self-conceit, is out of place not only because Poland has reserves which she will undoubtedly send to the front, not only because Poland is not alone and is backed by the Entente, which supports her unreservedly against Russia, but also, and chiefly, because there has appeared in the rear of our armies a new ally of Poland—Wrangel, who is threatening to destroy from the rear the fruits of our victories over the Poles.

It is no use cherishing the hope that Wrangel will not be able to reach agreement with the Poles. He has already reached agreement and is working hand in glove with them.

Here is what Shulgin's Velikaya Rossiya, the Sevastopol newspaper which is the inspiration of the Wrangelites, says in one of its June issues:

"There is no doubt that we, by our offensive, are supporting the Poles, for we are diverting to ourselves part of the Bolshevik forces which were designated for use on the Polish Front. There is also no doubt that

the operations of the Poles are of substantial support to us. It does not matter whether we like the Poles or dislike them; we must guide ourselves solely by cold political calculation. Today an alliance with the Poles against the common enemy is to our advantage; as to tomorrow... well, we shall see."

Obviously, the Wrangel Front is an extension of the Polish Front, with the difference, however, that Wrangel is operating in the rear of our armies engaged against the Poles, that is, in the most dangerous place for us.

It is therefore ridiculous to talk of a "march on Warsaw," or in general of the lasting character of our successes so long as the Wrangel danger has not been eliminated. Yet Wrangel is gaining strength, and there is no evidence that we are adopting any special or effective measures against the growing danger from the South.

5. Remember Wrangel

As a result of our offensive operations against the Poles, our front is assuming the shape of an arc, with its concave side facing the West and its ends extending forward, the southern end lying in the Rovno area, and the northern in the Molodechno area. That is what is known as an enveloping position vis-à-vis the Polish troops, i.e., a position most dangerous to the latter.

Undoubtedly, this circumstance is taken into account by the Entente, which is trying its utmost to embroil Rumania in war with Russia, is feverishly seeking new allies for Poland, is doing everything it can to assist Wrangel, and is generally trying to save the Poles. It is quite possible that the Entente will succeed in finding new allies for Poland.

There is no reason to doubt that Russia will find the strength to repel these new enemies as well. But one thing must not be forgotten: so long as Wrangel is intact, so long as he is in a position to threaten our rear, our fronts will be unsteady and insecure, and our successes on the anti-Polish Front cannot be lasting. Only with the liquidation of Wrangel shall we be able to consider our victory over the Polish gentry secure. Therefore, the new slogan which the Party must now inscribe on its banners is: "Remember Wrangel!" "Death to Wrangel!"

Pravda, No. 151,
July 11, 1920

HOW THE RED ARMY IS GREETED
Statement to Krasnoarmeyets[1]

Comrade Stalin, member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic, states that he cannot refrain from remarking on the quite exceptional cordiality with which the Red Army on the Polish Front is welcomed by the local population.

"Such an attitude I have not had occasion to observe either in the East or in the South," Comrade Stalin says.

"Despite the poverty of the peasant masses in the West compared with the Volga area and the South, they were ready to share their last crust of bread with the Red Army men.

"The very onerous 'cartage' duty was performed without a murmur.

"The Red Army men were rendered every aid and assistance, and when at the close of May we were forced to begin a withdrawal the grief of the population was great.

"The population of the frontal zone had experienced all the misery of Polish occupation, and were therefore fully aware of what the incursion of the Polish gentry held in store for them.

"There is a whole group of units on our front the medical care of which has been entirely taken over by peasant men and women, who show the utmost concern and solicitude for our wounded Red Army men.

"As to the mood of the Byelorussian peasants on the other side of the front, we are informed that continuous revolts are breaking out there, and that guerilla detachments are active, disrupting the enemy's

1 *Krasnoarmeyets* (*Red Army Man*)—a daily newspaper published by the Political Department of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Sixteenth Army, Western Front, from March 20, 1919, to May 15, 1921.

rear, setting fire to stores, and wiping out landlords.

"It may be safely said that the same thing is occurring here as happened to Kolchak in Siberia.

"With the approach of our forces, everywhere the enemy's rear begins to blow up from within.

"What we are now witnessing in Byelorussia is a genuine peasant revolution against the Polish landlords."

Krasnoarmeyets, No. 337,
July 15, 1920

TO ALL PARTY ORGANISATIONS
Draft Letter of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.)[1]

We have information to the effect that around Wrangel have gathered a group of experienced and desperate cut-throat generals who will stop at nothing.

Wrangel's soldiers are splendidly enregimented, fight desperately and prefer suicide to surrender.

Technically, Wrangel's forces are better equipped than ours, the flow of tanks, armoured cars, aircraft, cartridges and clothing from the West is continuing to this day, despite Britain's assertion that it has been discontinued.

The weakness of our forces fighting against Wrangel lies in the fact that, firstly, they are diluted with prisoners of war, former Denikinites, who not infrequently desert to the enemy, and, secondly, they are not receiving volunteers or mobilized Communists, either in groups or singly, from the centre.

These forces must be purged of former prisoners of war and regularly supplied with large contingents of volunteers or mobilized Communists, so as to change their whole spirit and enable them to defeat the ferocious enemy.

The Crimea must be restored to Russia at all costs, otherwise the Ukraine and the Caucasus will always be menaced by Soviet Russia's enemies.

The Central Committee charges you with the duty of intensifying mass agitation on the lines of this circular letter and of immediately ar-

1 V. I. Lenin wrote on this draft letter the following minute, addressed to the Secretary of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.): "I am in favour of its *IMMEDIATE* circulation as something indisputable." The letter was circulated to the Party organizations by the Central Committee in the latter half of July 1920.

ranging for the regular dispatch of Communists to the Crimean Front, even at the expense of other fronts.

Written in July 1920
First published in 1945,
in *Lenin Miscellany*, XXXV

CREATION OF FIGHTING RESERVES OF THE REPUBLIC

1. Memorandum to the Political Burueau, C.C., R.C.P.(B.)

The behaviour of France and America in openly supporting the Poles and Wrangel, and the behaviour of Britain in tacitly sanctioning this support, on the one hand, and the successes of the Poles, the expected reinforcement of Wrangel's army with new forces, and the concentration of the Rumanian Eastern Army in the Dorokhoi area, on the other, are creating a serious international and military situation for the Republic. Measures must be taken without delay to provide the Re ith fresh bayonets (about 100,000) and fresh sabres (about 30,000), and with the corresponding military supplies.

The latest successes of the Poles have disclosed a fundamental defect of our armies, namely, the lack of effective fighting reserves. We must therefore put as the primary point of our current programme for enhancing the military might of the Republic the creation of powerful reserves capable of being thrown on to the front at any moment.

Accordingly, I propose the adoption of the following programme for the creation of fighting reserves of the Republic:

1) While continuing the normal replenishment of the divisions in the firing line that are fit for action, immediate steps should be taken to withdraw to the rear depleted and semi-depleted divisions (infantry) which have become unfit for action.

2) On the assumption that about 12-15 infantry divisions will be found to be in need of withdrawal, they should be concentrated in areas (they must be grain areas) from which they could be thrown without particular delay on to the Wrangel, Polish or Rumanian fronts, depending on circumstances (one third of the divisions withdrawn might be concentrated, say, in the Olviopol area, anoth-

er third in the Konotop-Bakhmach area, and the remaining third in the Ilovaiskaya-Volnovakha area).

3) These divisions should be replenished and supplied with a view to raising their strength to 7,000 or 8,000 bayonets each, and to having them fully ready for action by January 1, 1921.

4) Immediate steps should be taken to replenish our cavalry units on active service, with a view to assigning in the next few months (by January) 10,000 sabres to the First Cavalry Army, 8,000 to the Second Cavalry Army, and 6,000 to Gai's corps.

5) Immediate steps should be taken to form five cavalry brigades of 1,500 sabres each (one brigade consisting of Terek Cossacks, another of Caucasian highlanders, a third of Ural Cossacks, a fourth of Orenburg Cossacks, and a fifth of Siberian Cossacks). Formation of the brigades to be completed within two months.

6) Everything should be done to organize and develop an automobile industry, special attention being paid to the repair and manufacture of Austin and Fiat vehicles.

7) Every effort should be made to develop the production of armour plate, chiefly with a view to the armouring of motor vehicles.

8) Every effort should be made to develop aircraft production.

9) The supply programme should be enlarged in conformity with the above points.

J. Stalin
August 25, 1920
Moscow, The Kremlin

2. Statement to the Political Bureau, C.C., R.C.P.(B.)

Trotsky's reply on the subject of reserves is an evasion. His previous telegram, to which he refers in his reply, does not even hint at a plan for the creation of reserves, at the necessity for such a plan. When the divisions are to be withdrawn; to what areas; by what date they are to be brought up to strength; the training of replenishments and their cementing—all

these points (which are by no means details!) are avoided.

An important (unfavourable) role in the summer campaign was played by the remoteness of the reserves from the fronts (Urals, Siberia, North Caucasus): the reserves arrived late, with great delay, and for the most part failed in their purpose. Therefore, the areas of concentration of reserves must be well considered in advance as a very important factor.

An equally important role (also unfavourable) was played by the lack of training of the replenishments: semi-raw and uncemented, and suitable only in the onsweep of a general offensive, the replenishments usually failed to withstand serious enemy counteraction, abandoned practically all their matériel, and surrendered to the enemy by tens of thousands. Therefore, the period of training and bringing up to strength, as a very important factor, must also be well considered in advance.

An even more important role (also unfavourable) was played by the haphazard, impromptu character of our reserves: since we had no special reserve units, reserves were not infrequently patched together haphazardly and with extreme haste from all sorts of scrappy units, including even the VOKR,[1] which tended to undermine the staunchness of our armies.

In brief, systematic work must be begun (immediately!) to provide the Republic with effective reserves—otherwise we risk finding ourselves confronted with a new, "unexpected" ("like a bolt from the blue") military catastrophe.

Supply is not "the most important thing," as Trotsky mistakenly thinks. The history of the civil war shows that we coped with the problem of supply in spite of our poverty, yet half the "shirts" and "boots" issued to the soldiers found their way into the hands of the peasants. Why? Because the soldiers sold them (and will go on selling them!) to the peasants in exchange for milk, butter, meat, that is, in exchange for the things we are unable to give them. And in this (summer) campaign, too, we coped with the problem of supply, but suffered a reverse nevertheless (as far as I know, no one has yet ventured to accuse our supply men of

1 VOKR—Republican Forces of the Interior, which in 1919-20 guarded towns, industrial plants, railways, warehouses, etc., in the rear and in the front-line areas.

being responsible for our reverses on the Polish Front...). Evidently, there are factors more important than supply (regarding which, see above).

We must discard once and for all the harmful "doctrine" that the supply of the army must be entrusted to civilian departments, and all the rest to the Field Staff. The Central Committee must be acquainted with and control the entire work of the agencies of the war department, not excluding the preparation of fighting reserves and field operations, if it does not want to find itself confronting another catastrophe.

For this reason I insist:

1) That the war department should not evade the issue with talk about "soldiers' shirts," but should work out (proceed at once to work out) a concrete plan of the creation of fighting reserves of the Republic;

2) That this plan should be examined by the Central Committee (through the Council of Defence);

3) That the Central Committee should strengthen its control of the Field Staff by introducing the practice of periodical reports by the Commander-in-Chief or the Chief of Field Staff to the Council of Defence or to a special commission composed of members of the Council of Defence.

J. Stalin
August 30, 1920
Published for the first time



THE POLICY OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN RUSSIA

THREE YEARS OF REVOLUTION and civil war in Russia have shown that unless central Russia and her border regions support each other the victory of the revolution and the liberation of Russia from the clutches of imperialism will be impossible. Central Russia, that hearth of world revolution, cannot hold out long without the assistance of the border regions, which abound in raw materials, fuel and foodstuffs. The border regions of Russia in their turn would be inevitably doomed to imperialist bondage without the political, military and organizational support of more developed central Russia. If it is true to say that the more developed proletarian West cannot finish off the world bourgeoisie without the support of the peasant East, which is less developed but which abounds in raw materials and fuel, it is equally true to say that more developed central Russia cannot carry the revolution through to the end without the support of the border regions of Russia, which are less developed but which abound in essential resources.

The Entente undoubtedly took this circumstance into account from the very first days of the existence of the Soviet Government, when it (the Entente) pursued the plan of the economic encirclement of central Russia by cutting off the most important of her border regions. And the plan of the economic encirclement of Russia has remained the unchanging basis of all the Entente's campaigns against Russia, from 1918 to 1920, not excluding its present machinations in the Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Turkestan.

All the more important is it, therefore, to achieve a firm union between the centre and the border regions of Russia.

Hence the need to establish definite relations, definite ties between the centre and the border regions of Russia ensuring an intimate and undestructible union between them.

What must these relations be, what forms must they assume?

In other words, what is the policy of the Soviet Government on the national question in Russia?

The demand for the secession of the border regions from Russia as the form of the relations between the centre and the border regions must be rejected not only because it runs counter to the very formulation of the question of establishing a union between the centre and the border regions, but primarily because it runs fundamentally counter to the interests of the mass of the people in both the centre and the border regions. Apart from the fact that the secession of the border regions would undermine the revolutionary might of central Russia, which is stimulating the movement for emancipation in the West and the East, the seceded border regions themselves would inevitably fall into the bondage of international imperialism. One has only to glance at Georgia, Armenia, Poland, Finland, etc., which have seceded from Russia but which have retained only the semblance of independence, having in reality been converted into unconditional vassals of the Entente; one has only, lastly, to recall the recent case of the Ukraine and Azerbaijan, of which the former was plundered by German capital and the latter by the Entente, to realize the utterly counter-revolutionary nature of the demand for the secession of the border regions under present international conditions. When a life-and-death struggle is developing between proletarian Russia and the imperialist Entente, there are only two possible outcomes for the border regions:

Either they go along with Russia, and then the toiling masses of the border regions will be freed from imperialist oppression;

Or they go along with the Entente, and then the yoke of imperialism will be inevitable.

There is no third course.

The so-called independence of so-called independent Georgia, Armenia, Poland, Finland, etc., is only an illusion, and conceals the utter dependence of these apologies for states on one or another group of im-

perialists.

Of course, the border regions of Russia, the nations and races which inhabit these regions, possess, as all other nations do, the inalienable right to secede from Russia; and if any of these nations decided by a majority to secede from Russia, as was the case with Finland in 1917, Russia, presumably, would be obliged to take note of the fact and sanction the secession. But the question here is not about the rights of nations, which are unquestionable, but about the interests of the mass of the people both in the centre and in the border regions; it is a question of the character—which is determined by these interests—of the agitation which our Party must carry on if it does not wish to renounce its own principles and if it wishes to influence the will of the labouring masses of the nationalities in a definite direction. And the interests of the masses render the demand for the secession of the border regions at the present stage of the revolution a profoundly counter-revolutionary one.

Similarly, what is known as cultural-national autonomy must also be rejected as a form of union between the centre and the border regions of Russia. The experience of Austria-Hungary (the birthplace of cultural-national autonomy) during the last ten years has revealed the absolutely ephemeral and non-viable character of cultural-national autonomy as a form of alliance between the labouring masses of the nationalities of a multi-national state. Springer and Bauer, the authors of cultural-national autonomy, who are now confronted by the failure of their cunningly contrived national programme, are living corroborations of this. Finally, the champion of cultural-national autonomy in Russia, the once famous Bund, was itself recently obliged officially to acknowledge the superfluousness of cultural-national autonomy, publicly declaring that:

> The demand for cultural-national autonomy, which was put forward under the capitalist system, loses its meaning in the conditions of a socialist revolution (see The Twelfth Conference of the Bund, 1920, p. 21).

There remains regional autonomy for border regions that are distinguished by a specific manner of life and national composition, as the only expedient form of union between the centre and the border regions, an autonomy which is designed to connect the border regions of Russia with the centre by a federal tie. This is the Soviet form of au-

tonomy which was proclaimed by the Soviet Government from the very first days of its existence and which is now being put into effect in the border regions in the form of administrative communes and autonomous Soviet republics.

Soviet autonomy is not a rigid thing fixed once and for all time; it permits of the most varied forms and degrees of development. It passes from narrow, administrative autonomy (the Volga Germans, the Chuvashes, the Karelians) to a wider, political autonomy (the Bashkirs, the Volga Tatars, the Kirghiz); from wide political autonomy to a still wider form of it (the Ukraine, Turkestan); and, lastly, from the Ukrainian type of autonomy to the highest form of autonomy—to contractual relations (Azerbaijan). This flexibility of Soviet autonomy is one of its prime merits; for this flexibility enables it to embrace all the various types of border regions of Russia, which vary greatly in their levels of cultural and economic development. The three years of Soviet policy on the national question in Russia have shown that in applying Soviet autonomy in its diverse forms the Soviet Government is on the right path, for this policy alone has made it possible for it to open the road to the remotest corners of the border regions of Russia, to arouse to political activity the most backward and nationally diverse masses and to connect these masses with the centre by the most varied ties—a problem which no other government in the world has solved, or has even set itself (being afraid to do so!). The administrative redivision of Russia on the basis of Soviet autonomy has not yet been completed; the North Caucasians, the Kalmyks, the Cheremiss, the Votyaks, the Buryats and others are still awaiting a settlement of the question. But no matter what aspect the administrative map of the future Russia may assume, and no matter what shortcomings there may have been in this field—and some shortcomings there certainly were—it must be acknowledged that by undertaking an administrative redivision on the basis of regional autonomy Russia has made a very big stride towards rallying the border regions around the proletarian centre and bringing the government into closer contact with the broad masses of the border regions.

But the proclamation of this or that form of Soviet autonomy, the issuing of corresponding decrees and ordinances, and even the creation of governments in the border regions, in the shape of regional Councils

of People's Commissars of the autonomous republics, are still far from enough to consolidate the union between the border regions and the centre. To consolidate this union it is necessary, first of all, to put an end to the estrangement and isolation of the border regions, to their patriarchal and uncultured manner of life, and to their distrust of the centre, which still persist in the border regions as a heritage of the brutal policy of tsarism. Tsarism deliberately cultivated patriarchal and feudal oppression in the border regions in order to keep the masses in slavery and ignorance. Tsarism deliberately settled the best areas in the border regions with colonizing elements in order to force the masses of the native nationalities into the worst areas and to intensify national strife. Tsarism restricted, and at times simply suppressed, the native schools, theatres and educational institutions in order to keep the masses in ignorance. Tsarism frustrated all initiative of the best members of the native population. Lastly, tsarism suppressed all activity of the masses in the border regions. By all these means tsarism implanted among the mass of the native nationalities a profound distrust, at times passing into direct hostility, towards everything Russian. If the union between central Russia and the border regions is to be consolidated, this distrust must be removed and an atmosphere of mutual understanding and fraternal confidence created. But in order to remove this distrust we must first help the masses of the border regions to emancipate themselves from the survivals of feudal-patriarchal oppression; we must abolish—actually, and not only nominally—all the privileges of the colonizing elements; we must allow the masses to experience the material benefits of the revolution.

In brief, we must prove to the masses that central, proletarian Russia is defending their interests, and their interests alone; and this must be proved not only by repressive measures against the colonizers and bourgeois nationalists, measures that are often quite incomprehensible to the masses, but primarily by a consistent and carefully considered economic policy.

Everybody is acquainted with the liberals' demand for universal compulsory education. The Communists in the border regions cannot be more Right-wing than the liberals; they must put universal education into effect there if they want to end the ignorance of the people and if they want to create closer spiritual ties between the centre of Russia and

the border regions. But to do so, it is necessary to develop local national schools, national theatres and national educational institutions and to raise the cultural level of the masses of the border regions, for it need hardly be shown that ignorance is the most dangerous enemy of the Soviet regime. We do not know what success is attending our work in this field generally, but we are informed that in one of the most important border regions the local People's Commissariat of Education is spending on the native schools only ten per cent of its credits. If that is true, it must be admitted that in this field we have, unfortunately, not gone much further than the "old regime."

Soviet power is not power divorced from the people; on the contrary, it is the only power of its kind, having sprung from the Russian masses and being near and dear to them. This in fact explains the unparalleled strength and resilience which the Soviet regime usually displays at critical moments.

Soviet power must become just as near and dear to the masses of the border regions of Russia. But this requires that it should first of all become comprehensible to them. It is therefore necessary that all Soviet organs in the border regions—the courts, the administration, the economic bodies, the organs of direct authority (and the organs of the Party as well)—should as far as possible be recruited from the local people acquainted with the manner of life, habits, customs and language of the native population; that all the best people from the local masses should be drawn into these institutions; that the local labouring masses should participate in every sphere of administration of the country, including the formation of military units, in order that the masses should see that the Soviet power and its organs are the products of their own efforts, the embodiment of their aspirations. Only in this way can firm spiritual ties be established between the masses and the Soviet power, and only in this way can the Soviet power become comprehensible and dear to the labouring masses of the border regions.

Some comrades regard the autonomous republics in Russia and Soviet autonomy generally as a temporary, if necessary, evil which owing to certain circumstances had to be tolerated, but which must be combated with a view to its eventual abolishment. It need hardly be shown that this view is fundamentally false and that at any rate it is entirely foreign

to the policy of the Soviet Government on the national question. Soviet autonomy must not be regarded as an abstraction or an artificial thing; still less should it be considered an empty and declaratory promise. Soviet autonomy is the most real and concrete form of the union of the border regions with central Russia. Nobody will deny that the Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Kirghizia, Bashkiria, Tataria and the other border regions, if they desire the cultural and material prosperity of their masses, must have native schools, courts, administration and organs of authority, recruited principally from the local people. Furthermore, the real sovietization of these regions, their conversion into Soviet countries closely bound with central Russia in one integral state, is inconceivable without the widespread organization of local schools, without the creation of courts, administrative bodies, organs of authority, etc., staffed with people acquainted with the life and language of the population. But establishing schools, courts, administration and organs of authority functioning in the native language—this is precisely putting Soviet autonomy into practice; for Soviet autonomy is nothing but the sum total of all these institutions clothed in Ukrainian, Turkestan, Kirghiz, etc., forms.

How, after this, can one seriously say that Soviet autonomy is ephemeral, that it must be combated, and so on?

One thing or the other:

Either the Ukrainian, Azerbaijan, Kirghiz, Uzbek, Bashkir and other languages are an actual reality, and it is therefore absolutely essential to develop in these regions native schools, courts, administrative bodies and organs of authority recruited from the local people—in which case Soviet autonomy must be put into effect in these regions in its entirety, without reservations;

Or the Ukrainian, Azerbaijan and other languages are a pure fiction, and therefore schools and other institutions functioning in the native languages are unnecessary—in which case Soviet autonomy must be discarded as useless lumber.

The search for a third way is due either to ignorance of the subject or to deplorable folly.

One serious obstacle to the realization of Soviet autonomy is the

acute shortage in the border regions of intellectual forces of local origin, the shortage of instructors in every branch of Soviet and Party work without exception. This shortage cannot but hamper both educational and revolutionary constructive work in the border regions. But for that very reason it would be unwise and harmful to alienate the all too few groups of native intellectuals, who perhaps would like to serve the masses but are unable to do so, perhaps because, not being Communists, they believe themselves to be surrounded by an atmosphere of mistrust and are afraid of possible repressive measures. The policy of drawing such groups into Soviet work, the policy of recruiting them for industrial, agrarian, food-supply and other posts, with a view to their gradual sovietization, may be applied with success. For it can hardly be maintained that these intellectual groups are less reliable than, let us say, the counterrevolutionary military experts who, their counter-revolutionary spirit notwithstanding, were drawn into the work and subsequently became sovietized, occupying very important posts.

But the employment of the national groups of intellectuals will still be far from sufficient to satisfy the demand for instructors. We must simultaneously develop in the border regions a ramified system of courses of study and schools in every branch of administration in order to create cadres of instructors from the local people. For it is clear that without such cadres the organization of native schools, courts, administrative and other institutions functioning in the native languages will be rendered extremely difficult.

A no less serious obstacle to the realization of Soviet autonomy is the haste, often becoming gross tactlessness, displayed by certain comrades in the matter of sovietizing the border regions. When such comrades venture to take upon themselves the "heroic task" of introducing "pure communism" in regions which are a whole historical period behind central Russia, regions where the medieval order has not yet been wholly abolished, one may safely say that no good will come of such cavalry raids, of "communism" of this kind. We should like to remind these comrades of the point in our programme which says:

> The R.C.P. upholds the historical and class standpoint, giving consideration to the stage of historical development in which the given nation finds itself—whether it is on the way from medievalism to bourgeois democracy, or from bourgeois democracy to Soviet, or proletarian, democracy, etc.

And further:

> In any case, the proletariat of those nations which were oppressor nations must exercise particular caution and be particularly heedful of the survivals of national sentiment among the labouring masses of the oppressed or unequal nations (see Programme of the R.C.P.).

That means that if in Azerbaijan, for instance, the direct method of requisitioning superfluous dwelling space alienates from us the Azerbaijanian masses, who regard the home, the domestic hearth, as sacred and inviolable, it is obvious that the direct way of requisitioning superfluous dwelling space must be replaced by an indirect, roundabout way of achieving the same end. Or if, for instance, the Daghestan masses, who are profoundly imbued with religious prejudices, follow the Communists "on the basis of the Sharia," it is obvious that the direct way of combating religious prejudices in this country must be replaced by indirect and more cautious ways. And so on, and so forth.

In brief, cavalry raids with the object of "immediately communizing" the backward masses must be discarded in favour of a circumspect and carefully considered policy of gradually drawing these masses into the general stream of Soviet development.

Such in general are the practical conditions necessary for realizing Soviet autonomy, the introduction of which ensures closer spiritual ties and a firm revolutionary union between the centre and the border regions of Russia.

Soviet Russia is performing an experiment without parallel hitherto in the world in organizing the cooperation of a number of nations and races within a single proletarian state on a basis of mutual confidence, of voluntary and fraternal agreement. The three years of the revolution have shown that this experiment has every chance of succeeding. But this experiment can be certain of complete success only if our practical policy on the national question in the localities does not run counter to the demands of already proclaimed Soviet autonomy, in its varied forms and degrees, and if every practical measure we adopt in the localities helps to introduce the masses of the border regions to a higher, proletarian spiritual and material culture in forms conforming with the manner of life and national features of these masses.

In that lies the guarantee of the consolidation of the revolutionary

union between central Russia and the border regions of Russia, against which all the machinations of the Entente will be shattered.

Pravda, No. 226,
October 10, 1920
Signed: J. Stalin

SPEECH AT THE OPENING OF THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIAN CONFERENCE OF RESPONSIBLE PERSONNEL OF THE WORKERS' AND PEASANTS' INSPECTION

October 15, 1920

I DECLARE open the first all-Russian conference of officials of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection.

Comrades, before proceeding to the business of our conference, permit me to state the opinion of the People's Commissariat of Workers' and Peasants' Inspection on the question whether an Inspection is needed in a workers' and peasants' state, and, if it is, what its basic tasks should be.

Russia is so far the only country where the workers and peasants have seized power. The pre-condition for the seizure of power was the most profound revolution in the world, which was followed by the abolition of the old machinery of state power and the rise of a new one. The position in the old days was that the workers as a rule toiled for the masters, while the masters governed the country. This, in fact, explains why, before the revolution, all the experience in governing the country was concentrated in the ruling classes. But after the October Revolution, power was assumed by the workers and peasants, who had never governed before, who knew only how to work for others, and who had no adequate experience in governing the country.

That was the first circumstance which was the source of those shortcomings from which the administrative machinery of the Soviet country is now suffering.

Further, with the abolition of the old apparatus of state administration, bureaucracy was smashed, but the bureaucrats remained. They

disguised themselves as Soviet officials and installed themselves in our state apparatus, and, taking advantage of the inadequate experience of the workers and peasants, who had only just come to power, they started their old tricks for pilfering state property, introduced the old bourgeois habits and customs.

That was the second circumstance which was the basis of shortcomings in our state apparatus.

Lastly, the new power inherited from the old a completely disrupted economic apparatus. The disruption was aggravated by the civil war forced upon Russia by the Entente. This circumstance was still another of the conditions for the existence of defects and shortcomings in our government machinery.

These, comrades, are the basic conditions which have given rise to shortcomings in our state apparatus.

Clearly, so long as these conditions exist, so long as shortcomings in our state apparatus continue, we shall need an Inspection.

Of course, the working class is striving to acquire experience in governing the country; nevertheless, the experience of the representatives of the new class which has come to power is still inadequate.

Of course, the disguised bureaucrats who have wormed their way into our state apparatus are being curbed; but they have not yet been curbed sufficiently.

Of course, the economic disruption that we are faced with is diminishing thanks to the feverish activity of our government bodies; nevertheless, the disruption still persists.

And precisely for this reason, so long as these conditions continue and these shortcomings exist, we need a special state apparatus to study these shortcomings and correct them, and to assist our state bodies to become more perfect.

What, then, are the basic tasks of the Inspection?

There are two basic tasks.

The first is that the Inspection's officials must, as the result of, or in the course of, their work of inspection, help our comrades in authority

both in the centre and in the provinces to establish the most efficient forms of accountancy of state property, help to establish efficient forms of bookkeeping, help to perfect the machinery of supply, peacetime and wartime machinery, and the economic machinery.

That is the first basic task.

The second basic task is that the W.P.I. must in the course of its work train from the ranks of the workers and peasants instructors who will be capable of mastering the entire state apparatus. Comrades, a country is not governed by those who elect their delegates to parliament, under the bourgeois system, or to the Congresses of Soviets, under the Soviet system. No, a country is actually governed by those who have in fact mastered the executive apparatus of the state and direct it. If the working class really wants to master the state apparatus for governing the country, it must have experienced agents not only in the centre, not only in the places where questions are discussed and decided, but also in the places where the decisions are put into effect. Only then can it be said that the working class has really become master of the state. To achieve this, we must have adequate cadres of instructors in the work of governing the country. It is the basic task of the W.P.I. to rear and train such cadres by enlisting the co-operation of the broad strata of the workers and peasants in its work. The W.P.I. must be a school for such cadres from the ranks of the workers and peasants.

That is the second task of the W.P.I.

This determines the methods which the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection must practise in its work. In the old, pre-revolutionary days, the control was something extraneous to the government institutions; it was an external force which, when inspecting the institutions, sought to catch delinquents, criminals, and that was all. This is what I would call the police method, the method of catching criminals, of making sensational exposures for the press to raise a hue and cry over. This method must be discarded. It is not the method of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. Our Inspection must not regard the institutions they are inspecting as alien bodies; they must regard them as their own institutions, which have to be taught and perfected. The chief function is not to catch individual criminals, but first and foremost to study the institutions they are inspecting, to study them thoughtfully and seriously, to

study their defects and merits, and to help to perfect them. The worst and most undesirable thing would be if our inspectors were to incline towards police methods, were to start carping at the institution they are inspecting and to snap at its heels, if they were to skim the surface and overlook the fundamental shortcomings.

The W.P.I.'s method of work should be to disclose fundamental shortcomings. I know that this W.P.I. policy is very difficult, that it often provokes the displeasure of some officials of the inspected institutions. I know that often the most honest W.P.I. officials are pursued by the hatred of some arrant bureaucrats, as well as of some Communists who succumb to the influence of such bureaucrats. But that is something the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection should not be afraid of. Its fundamental commandment should always be: Do not spare individuals, whatever the position they occupy; spare only the public cause, only the public interest.

That is a very difficult and delicate task; it demands great restraint and great, irreproachable moral purity on the part of our officials. I have to say, to my regret, that in some of the actual inspections of institutions made here in Moscow, the control agents themselves proved to be unworthy of their calling. I must declare that towards such agents the Commissariat will be implacable. The Commissariat will demand that they be punished with the utmost severity, because they cast a stain on the honour of the Workers' and Peasants' inspectors. Since the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection has been entrusted with the lofty duty of correcting the shortcomings of our institutions, of helping their personnel to advance and perfect themselves, since it is the duty of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection to spare no one, but only the public interest, then, obviously, the personnel of the W.P.I. must themselves be pure, irreproachable and implacable in their justice. This is absolutely essential if they are to have not only the formal, but also the moral right to inspect others and to teach others.

Izvestia Raboche-Krestyanskoy
Inspektsii, No. 9-10,
November-December, 1920

AUTHOR'S PREFACE
To a Collection of Articles on the National Question Published in 1920

This pamphlet contains only three articles on the national question. The publishers evidently made this particular selection because these three articles reflect three very important periods in the solution of the national question within the ranks of our Party, and, evidently, the purpose of the pamphlet as a whole is to give a more or less complete picture of the policy of our Party on the national question.

The first article ("Marxism and the National Question," see the magazine *Prosveshcheniye*, 1913)[1] reflects the period of the discussion of the fundamental principles of the national question within Russian Social-Democracy at the time of the landlord-tsarist reaction, a year and a half before the outbreak of the imperialist war, at the time when the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia was gathering momentum. Two theories of nations, and, correspondingly, two national programmes contended with one another at that time: the Austrian, supported by the Bund and the Mensheviks, and the Russian, or the Bolshevik. The reader will find a description of both trends in the article. Subsequent developments, especially the imperialist war and the break-up of Austria-Hungary into separate national states, clearly demonstrated which side was right. Now, when Springer and Bauer are confronted by the failure of their national programme, it is scarcely to be doubted

1 *Marxism and the National Question* (see *Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 300-381) was written by J. V. Stalin in Vienna at the end of 1912 and the beginning of 1913, and was first published (signed K. Stalin) in *Prosveshcheniye*, Nos. 3-5, 1913, under the title "The National Question and Social-Democracy." *Prosveshcheniye* (*Enlightenment*)—a Bolshevik monthly magazine which was published in St. Petersburg from December 1911 to June 1914, when it was shut down by the tsarist government. One double number appeared in the autumn of 1917. The magazine was directed by V. I. Lenin. J. V. Stalin, when he was in St. Petersburg, took all active part in its publication.

that the "Austrian school" has been condemned by history. Even the Bund has had to admit that "the demand for cultural-national autonomy (i.e., the Austrian national programme—*J. St.*), which was put forward under the capitalist system, loses its meaning in the conditions of a socialist revolution" (see The Twelfth Conference of the Bund, 1920). The Bund does not even suspect that by this it has admitted (inadvertently) the fundamental unsoundness of the theoretical principles of the Austrian national programme, the fundamental unsoundness of the Austrian theory of the nation.

The second article ("The October Revolution and the National Question," see *Zhizn Natsionalnostei*, 1918)[2] reflects the period following the October Revolution, when the Soviet power, having defeated the counter-revolution in central Russia, came into conflict with the bourgeois-nationalist governments in the border regions, which were hotbeds of counter-revolution; when the Entente, alarmed by the growing influence of the Soviet power on its (the Entente's) colonies, openly began to support the bourgeois-nationalist governments with a view to strangling Soviet Russia; when in the course of the victorious struggle against the bourgeois-nationalist governments, we were confronted with the practical problem of what should be the concrete forms of regional Soviet autonomy, of the organization of autonomous Soviet republics in the border regions, of the extension of the influence of Soviet Russia to the oppressed countries of the East through the eastern border regions of Russia, and of the creation of a united revolutionary front of the West and the East against world imperialism. The article notes the inseparable connection between the national question and the question of power, and treats national policy as a part of the general question of the oppressed peoples and colonies, that is, the very thing against which as a rule the "Austrian school," the Mensheviks, the reformists and the Second International objected, and which was later confirmed by the whole course of developments.

---

2 *The October Revolution and the National Question* (see present volume, pp. 158-170) was published in the newspaper *Zhizn Natsionalnostei*, No. 1, November 9, 1918. *Zhizn Natsionalnostei* (*Life of the Nationalities*)—weekly organ of the People's Commissariat for the Affairs of Nationalities, published in Moscow from November 9, 1918, to February 16, 1922. From February 25, 1922, it appeared as a magazine under the same name and continued publication until January 1924.

The third article ("The Policy of the Soviet Government on the National Question in Russia," see *Zhizn Natsionalnostei*, October 1920)[3] relates to the present period of, still incompleted, administrative redivision of Russia on the basis of regional Soviet autonomy, the period of the organization of administrative communes and autonomous Soviet republics in the border regions as component parts of the R.S.F.S.R. The central theme of the article is the practical implementation of Soviet autonomy, that is, the ensuring of a revolutionary union between the centre and the border regions as a guarantee against imperialist attempts at intervention.

It may seem strange that the article categorically rejects the demand for the secession of the border regions from Russia as being a counter-revolutionary move. But there is really nothing strange in that. We are for the secession of India, Arabia, Egypt, Morocco and other colonies from the Entente, because secession in this case would mean the liberation of those oppressed countries from imperialism, a weakening of the positions of imperialism and a strengthening of the positions of the revolution. We are against the secession of the border regions from Russia, because secession in that case would mean imperialist bondage for the border regions, a weakening of the revolutionary might of Russia and a strengthening of the positions of imperialism. It is for this reason that the Entente, which fights against the secession of India, Egypt, Arabia and other colonies, at the same time fights for the secession of the border regions from Russia. It is for this reason that the Communists, who fight for the secession of the colonies from the Entente, at the same time cannot but fight against the secession of the border regions from Russia. Obviously, secession is a question which must be decided in conformity with the specific international conditions and in conformity with the interests of the revolution.

Certain passages which are only of historical interest might have been deleted from the first article, but because of its polemical character it had to be given in full and unaltered. The second and third articles are likewise reprinted without alteration.

October, 1920

3 See present volume.

J. Stalin, Collection of Articles,
State Publishing House, Tula, 1920

THE POLITICAL SITUATION OF THE REPUBLIC

Report Delivered at a Regional Conference of Communist Organisations of the Don and the Caucasus, held in Vladikavkaz, October 27, 1920

Comrades, before the October Revolution the conviction prevailed in certain West-European socialist circles that the socialist revolution might break out and be crowned with success first of all in capitalistically developed countries. Some conjectured that England would be such a country, others, Belgium, and so on. But practically all said that the socialist revolution could not begin in capitalistically underdeveloped countries, where the proletariat was numerically small and poorly organized, as, for instance, in Russia. The October Revolution has refuted this view, since the socialist revolution began precisely in a capitalistically underdeveloped country—Russia.

Further, some of those who took part in the October Revolution were convinced that the socialist revolution in Russia could be crowned with success, and that this success could be lasting, only if the revolution in Russia were directly followed by the outbreak of a more profound and serious revolutionary explosion in the West which would support the revolution in Russia and impel it forward, it being, moreover, taken for granted that such an explosion was bound to break out. That view has likewise been refuted by events, since socialist Russia, which did not receive direct revolutionary support from the Western proletariat and is surrounded by hostile states, has successfully continued to exist and develop for already three years.

It has turned out that the socialist revolution can not only begin in a capitalistically underdeveloped country, but can be crowned with

success, make progress and serve as an example for the capitalistically developed countries.

Hence, the question of the present situation of Russia which is down for discussion at this conference takes the following form: Can Russia, left more or less to its own devices, and, representing something in the nature of a socialist oasis surrounded by hostile capitalist states—can this Russia continue to hold on and to defeat and destroy its enemies as it has done hitherto?

To answer this question, it is first of all necessary to elucidate the conditions which guarantee, and which may continue in future to guarantee, the existence and progress of Soviet Russia. These conditions are of two kinds: constant conditions, which are independent of us, and variable conditions, which are dependent on human beings.

In the former category we must class, firstly, the fact that Russia is a vast and boundless land, within which it is possible to hold on for a long time by retreating, in the event of reverses, into the heart of the country in order to gather strength for a new offensive. If Russia were a small country, such as Hungary, where a powerful enemy assault would swiftly decide its fate, where manoeuvring is difficult and there is nowhere to retire to, if Russia were such a small country, it could hardly have held on for so long as a socialist land.

Then there is another condition of a constant character favouring the development of socialist Russia. It is that Russia is one of the few countries in the world which abound in every kind of fuel, raw material and food—that is to say, a country, which is independent of foreign lands for fuel, food, etc., a country that can get along in this respect without the outside world. It is beyond doubt that if Russia had depended for its existence on foreign grain and fuel, as Italy, for instance, does, it would have found itself in a critical situation on the very morrow of the revolution, for it would have been enough to blockade it, and it would have been left without grain or fuel. Yet the blockade of Russia undertaken by the Entente struck at the interests not only of Russia, but of the Entente itself, since it deprived the latter of Russian raw materials.

But in addition to constant conditions, there are also variable conditions which are just as necessary as the former for the existence and de-

velopment of Soviet Russia. What are these conditions? They are those which ensure Russia reserves. The point is that in the bitter war which has been going on between Russia and the Entente for three years, and which may go on for another three years—in such a war the question of fighting reserves is decisive.

What, then, are the Entente's reserves?

What are our reserves?

The Entente's reserves consist, firstly, of Wrangel's forces and the young armies of the young bourgeois states, which have not yet been infected with the "virus of class antagonisms" (Poland, Rumania, Armenia, Georgia, etc.). The Entente's weak point in this respect is that it has not a counter-revolutionary army of its own. Because of the revolutionary movement in the West, it is not in a position to hurl against Russia its own, that is, British, French and other, forces, and consequently has to use the armies of others, which it finances, but which it cannot order about entirely at its own discretion as if they were its own armies. The fact that these armies are operating on the instructions of the Entente by no means does away with the frictions that exist, and will continue to exist, between the Entente and the national interests of the countries whose armies the Entente is using. The peace signed with Poland in spite of the promptings of the Entente is one more confirmation of the existence of such frictions. Well, this fact cannot but undermine the inner strength of the Entente's fighting reserves.

The Entente's reserves consist, secondly, of the counter-revolutionary forces that are operating in the rear of our armies, organizing guerilla and other actions of every kind.

Lastly, there are also the Entente reserves that are operating in the colonies and semi-colonies subjugated by the Entente, their object being to stifle the revolutionary movement that is beginning to develop in these countries.

We say nothing of the Entente's reserves in Europe itself in the shape of all kinds of scorpions, up to and including the Second International, whose aim it is to stifle the socialist revolution in the West.

Russia's reserves consist, in the first place, of the Red Army, which is an army of workers and peasants. The Red Army differs from the armies

hired and bought by the Entente in that it is fighting for the liberty and independence of its own country, that its interests merge with the interests of the country for which it is shedding its blood, and with the interests of the government on whose instructions it is fighting. Therein lies the inexhaustible inherent strength of Soviet Russia's basic reserves.

Russia's reserves consist, secondly, in those revolutionary movements which are developing in the West and evolving into a socialist revolution. There is no doubt that had it not been for this revolutionary movement in the West, the Entente would have had its own counter-revolutionary armies and would have ventured the risk of direct armed intervention in Russia's affairs. Russia's reserves consist, lastly, in that growing ferment in the East and in the Entente's colonies and semi-colonies which is developing into an open revolutionary movement for the emancipation of the countries of the East from the imperialist yoke, thereby threatening to deprive the Entente of its sources of raw materials and fuel. It should be remembered that the colonies are the Achilles' heel of imperialism, a blow at which would place the Entente in a critical position. There is no doubt that the revolutionary movement in the East is surrounding the Entente with an atmosphere of uncertainty and disintegration.

Such are our reserves.

What has been the historical development of these factors?

In 1918, Soviet Russia consisted of inner Russia, which was cut off from its sources of raw materials, food and fuel (the Ukraine, the Caucasus, Siberia, Turkestan), had no army to speak of, and received no support from the West-European proletariat. At that time the Entente could talk of undertaking direct armed intervention in Russia's affairs, which it did. Now, two years later, Russia presents an entirely different picture. Siberia, the Ukraine, the Caucasus and Turkestan are already liberated. Yudenich, Kolchak and Denikin have been smashed. Some of the young bourgeois states (Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland) have been neutralized. The remnants of Denikin's army (Wrangel's army) are on the eve of destruction. The revolutionary movement in the countries of the West is forging ahead and strengthening its militant organ, the Third International, while the Entente no longer dares even to think of direct armed intervention in Russia's affairs. In the East, the rev-

olutionary movement against the Entente is growing and creating a core in the shape of revolutionary Turkey, and forming its militant organ in the shape of the Committee of Action and Propaganda.[1]

In brief, the Entente's reserves are melting away day by day, while Soviet Russia's reserves are being replenished.

It is clear that now, in 1920, the chances of Russia being defeated are incomparably less than they were two years ago. It is clear that if Russia withstood the Entente's assault two years ago, so much the more will she withstand it now, when her reserves in all fields of the struggle are multiplying.

Does this mean that the war with the Entente is coming to an end, that we may lay down our arms, disband our troops and begin peaceful labours?

No, it does not. The Entente may have reconciled itself, however grudgingly, to the peace we have concluded with the Poles, but, judging by all the signs, it does not intend to lay down its arms; it obviously intends to shift the theatre of hostilities to the South, to the Transcaucasian area, and it is quite possible that Georgia, being a kept woman of the Entente, will consider itself in duty bound to serve it.

Evidently, the belief is that the earth is too small for both the Entente and Russia, that one of them must perish if peace is to be established on earth. If that is how the question stands, if that is the way the Entente puts it—and it is the only way it does put it—obviously Russia cannot lay down its arms. On the contrary, we must bend every effort to set into motion all the forces of the country to parry the new blow. The Red Army, the protector of the liberty and independence of our country, must be strengthened and fortified, the socialist revolution in the West must be given every support, the countries of the East which are fighting the Entente for their liberation must be assisted with every means in our power—such are our immediate duties, and we must perform them unswervingly and with the utmost energy if we want to win.

And we certainly shall win if we perform these duties conscientious-

1 The Committee of Action and Propaganda, or the Council of Action and Propaganda of the Peoples of the East, was instituted at the First Congress of the Peoples of the East, held in Baku in September 1920. Its purpose was to organize propaganda, to support and unite the liberation movement of the East. It existed for about a year.

ly.

In conclusion, I should like to mention one condition without which the victory of the revolution in the West will be extremely difficult. I am referring to the building up of food stocks for the revolution in the West. The fact of the matter is that the Western countries (Germany, Italy, etc.) are completely dependent Up America, which supplies Europe with grain. In the event of a victory of the revolution in these countries, the proletariat would be confronted with a food crisis the very next day, should bourgeois America refuse to supply them with grain, which is quite likely. Russia has no food reserves to speak of, but it could nevertheless accumulate a certain stock; and in view of the possibility and likelihood of the food prospects just described, it would be well to give consideration at once to the question of creating a food reserve in Russia for our Western comrades. This question is not getting the attention it deserves from some of our comrades, but, as you see, it may be of vital importance to the course and outcome of the revolution in the West.

Kommunist (Vladikavkaz), No. 172,
October 30, 1920

THREE YEARS OF PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP

Report Delivered at a Celebration Meeting of the Baku Soviet November 6, 1920

Comrades, before beginning my report, I want to convey the greetings of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Russia to you, the Soviet of Workers' Deputies of Baku, the greetings of the Council of People's Commissars to the Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan and its head, Comrade Narimanov, and the ardent greetings of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic to the Eleventh Red Army, which liberated Azerbaijan and is staunchly upholding its liberty. (Applause.)

The basic question in the affairs of Russia during the three years of Soviet power has undoubtedly been the question of her international position. There was a time when Soviet Russia was ignored, disregarded, unrecognized. That was the first period—from the establishment of Soviet power in Russia to the defeat of German imperialism. That was the period when the Western imperialists—the two coalitions, the British and the German, being at each other's throats—disregarded Soviet Russia, had no time for her, so to speak.

The second period was that from the defeat of German imperialism and the beginning of the German revolution down to Denikin's broad offensive against Russia, when he was at the gates of Tula. The distinguishing feature of Russia's international position in that period was that the Entente—the Anglo-French-American coalition—having defeated Germany, directed all its available forces against Soviet Russia. That was the period when we were threatened with an alliance of fourteen states, which afterwards proved to be a myth.

The third period is the one we are in now, when we are not only noticed as a socialist power, not only recognized in fact, but also feared.

The First Period

Three years ago, on October 25 (or November 7, New Style), 1917, a handful of Bolshevik members of the Petrograd Soviet met and decided to surround Kerensky's palace, take prisoner his already demoralized troops, and transfer power to the Second Congress of Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies, which was then assembled.

At that time many looked upon us as cranks at the best, and as "agents of German imperialism" at the worst.

Internationally, this period could be called the period of the complete isolation of Soviet Russia.

Not only were the surrounding bourgeois states hostile to Russia; even our socialist "comrades" in the West looked upon us with distrust.

If Soviet Russia nevertheless survived as a state, it was only because the Western imperialists were then absorbed in a fierce struggle among themselves. Furthermore, they looked upon the Bolshevik experiment in Russia with scorn: they believed that the Bolsheviks would die a natural death.

Internally, this period may be described as the period of the destruction of the old order in Russia, of the destruction of the entire apparatus of the old bourgeois power.

We knew from theory that the proletariat cannot simply take over the old state machine and set it going. That theoretical precept, taught us by Marx, was fully confirmed in practice when we found ourselves in a regular phase of sabotage on the part of the tsarist officials, office employees and a certain section of the upper proletariat—a phase of complete disorganization of state power.

The first and most important apparatus of the bourgeois state, the old army and its generals, was thrown on to the scrap heap. That cost us very dear. It left us for a time without any army at all, and we had to sign the Brest peace. But there was no alternative; history offered us no other way of emancipating the proletariat.

Another and equally important apparatus of the bourgeoisie which was destroyed, thrown on to the scrap heap, was the bureaucracy, the apparatus of bourgeois administration.

In the sphere of economic administration of the country, the most notable thing was that the banks, the main nerve of the bourgeois economic organism, were taken out of the hands of the bourgeoisie. The banks were taken out of the hands of the bourgeoisie, and the latter was, so to speak, deprived of its soul. Then came the work of breaking up the old economic machinery and expropriating the bourgeoisie—depriving it of the mills and factories and turning them over to the working class. Lastly came the break-up of the old machinery of food supply and the attempt to build a new one capable of procuring food and distributing it among the population. Finally, there was the abolition of the Constituent Assembly. These, roughly, were the measures Soviet Russia had to take in this period in order to destroy the bourgeois state apparatus.

The Second Period

The second period began when the Anglo-FrenchAmerican coalition, having defeated German imperialism, set to work to destroy Soviet Russia.

Internationally, this period can be described as a period of open war between the forces of the Entente and the forces of Soviet Russia. If in the first period we were disregarded, were sneered at and scoffed at, in this period, on the contrary, all the dark forces stirred into action in order to put an end to the so-called "anarchy" in Russia, which was threatening the decomposition of the entire capitalist world.

Internally, this period must be described as a period of construction, when the destruction of the old apparatus of the bourgeois state was in the main completed and a new phase, a phase of construction had begun; when the mills and factories which had been taken away from the owners were set going; when real workers' control was instituted and the proletariat then passed from control to direct management, and when a new machinery of food supply was being built in place of the one which had been destroyed, a new machinery of railway administration in the centre and in the provinces in place of the destroyed one, and a new army

in place of the old army.

It must be confessed that in general the work of construction proceeded very haltingly in this period, because the greater part—nine-tenths—of our creative energy was devoted to the building of the Red Army, since in the mortal struggle against the forces of the Entente the very existence of Soviet Russia was at stake, and in that period its existence could be preserved only by a powerful Red Army. And it must be said that our efforts were not in vain, because already in that period the Red Army demonstrated the full scope of its might by vanquishing Yudenich and Kolchak.

As regards the international position of Russia, this second period may be said to have been one of the gradual elimination of Russia's isolation. Her first allies began to appear. The German revolution produced closely-welded cadres of workers, communist cadres, and laid the foundation of a new Communist Party in the shape of the Liebknecht group.

In France, a small group which nobody had paid any attention to before, the Loriot group, became an important group of the communist movement. In Italy, the communist trend, which had been weak at first, came to embrace practically the whole Italian Socialist Party, its majority.

In the East, the Red Army's successes started a ferment which, for instance in Turkey, developed into an outright war against the Entente and its allies.

The bourgeois states themselves in this period were no longer the solid body of hostility to Russia which they had been in the first period, to say nothing of the disagreements within the Entente itself over the question of recognizing Soviet Russia, which grew more acute as time went on. Voices began to be raised advocating negotiation and agreement with Russia. Estonia, Latvia and Finland were examples.

Lastly, "Hands off Russia!" had become a popular slogan among the British and French workers and made it impossible for the Entente to intervene directly in Russia's affairs by force of arms. The Entente had to stop sending British and French soldiers against Russia. It had to confine itself to using the armies of others against Russia, armies which it could not order about at its own discretion.

The Third Period

The third period is the one we are in now. It may be called a transition period. The distinguishing feature of the first part of this period was that, having defeated the main enemy, Denikin, and foreseeing the end of the war, Russia set about converting the state apparatus, which had been adapted to the purposes of war, to new tasks, the tasks of economic construction. Whereas, formerly, the cry had been: "Everything for the war!" "Everything for the Red Army!" "Everything for victory over the foreign enemy!"—now it became: "Everything for the strengthening of the economy!" However, this phase of the third period, which began after the defeat of Denikin and his ejection from the Ukraine, was interrupted by Poland's attack on Russia. The Entente's purpose in this was to prevent Soviet Russia from getting on its feet economically and becoming a great world power. The Entente feared this, and incited Poland against Russia.

The state apparatus, already adapted for economic construction, had to be reconstructed again; the Labour Armies which had been formed in the Ukraine, the Urals and the Don area had again to be put on a war footing in order to rally the fighting units around them and dispatch them against Poland. This period is ending with Poland already neutralized and no new external enemies are so far in sight. The only direct enemy is the remnants of Denikin's army, represented by Wrangel, who is now being smashed by our Comrade Budyonny.

Now there are grounds for assuming that, for a short period at least, Soviet Russia will receive a valuable respite in which to direct all the energies of its indefatigable forces, who brought the Red Army into being almost in one day, to the work of economic construction, and to put our factories, our agriculture and our food agencies on their feet.

Externally, internationally, the distinguishing feature of the third period is not only that our enemies have ceased to ignore Russia, nor only that they have begun to fight her—even brandishing the bogey of the mythical fourteen states with which Churchill threatened Russia—but that, having received a series of drubbings, they have even begun to fear Russia, realizing that she is growing into a great socialist people's power, which will not allow itself to be ill-used.

Internally, the distinguishing feature of this period is that, with the defeat of Wrangel, Russia is getting her hands free and is devoting all her energies to internal affairs. Indeed, it is already observable that our economic bodies are working much better, much more thoroughly, than they did in the second period. In the summer of 1918 the workers of Moscow received one-eighth of a pound of bread mixed with oilcake once in two days. That difficult and distressful period is now a thing of the past. The workers of Moscow, as well as of Petrograd, now receive a pound and a half of bread a day. That means that our food agencies have got properly going, have improved, have learned how to procure grain.

As to our policy towards internal enemies, it remains, and must remain, what it was in all the three periods, that is, a policy of crushing all the enemies of the proletariat. This policy cannot of course be called a policy of "universal freedom"—in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat there can be no universal freedom, that is, no freedom of speech, freedom of the press, etc., for our bourgeoisie. The sum and substance of our home policy is to grant maximum freedom to the proletarian sections of town and country, and to deny even minimum freedom to the remnants of the bourgeois class.

That is the essence of our policy, which rests upon the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Prospects

Of course, our constructive work in these three years has not been as effective as we would have liked. But allowances must be made for the difficult, the impossible conditions in which the work had to be done, conditions which could not be evaded and could not be gainsaid, but which had to be overcome.

Firstly, we had to build under fire. Imagine a mason who has to lay bricks with one hand and defend what he is building with the other.

Secondly, what we were building was not a bourgeois economy in which each pursues his own private interest and has no concern for the country as a whole and does not set himself the problem of the planned organization of the economy on a country-wide scale. No, it was a socialist society we were building. That means that we must take into account

the requirements of society as a whole, that the economy of the whole of Russia must be organized in a planned and conscious way. That is undoubtedly a task of incomparably greater complexity and difficulty.

That is why our constructive efforts could not yield the maximum results.

That being the state of affairs, our prospects are clear: we are on the threshold of the liquidation of our external enemies, on the threshold of the conversion of our entire state machinery from war purposes to economic purposes. Our foreign policy is one of peace; we are no believers in war. But if war is forced upon us—and there are signs that the Entente is trying to transfer the theatre of hostilities to the South, to Transcaucasia—if the Entente, which we have given a beating several times, forces war upon us again, then it goes without saying that we shall not allow the sword to slip from our hand, we shall not disband our armies. We shall continue as before to bend every effort to ensure that the Red Army flourishes and is ready for action, so that it may be able to defend Soviet Russia against its enemies as boldly and bravely as it has done until now.

Reviewing the past of the Soviet power, I cannot help recalling that evening three years ago, on October 25, 1917, when we, a small group of Bolsheviks headed by Comrade Lenin, who had at our disposal the Petrograd Soviet (it was then already Bolshevik), a small Red Guard, and a quite small and still not fully cemented Communist Party of 200,000-250,000 members—when we, this small group, deposed the representatives of the bourgeoisie and transferred power to the Second Congress of Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies.

Since then three years have elapsed.

And now we see that in this period Russia has steeled herself in the crucible of fire and storm and has become a great socialist world power.

Whereas at that time we had only the Petrograd Soviet, now, three years later, all the Soviets of Russia are rallied around us.

Instead of the Constituent Assembly, for which our adversaries were then preparing, we now have the AllRussian Central Executive Committee of Soviets, which sprang from the Petrograd Soviet.

Whereas at that time we had a small guard composed of Petrograd workers, who were able to cope with the military cadets who had raised revolt in Petrograd, but were unable to fight an external enemy because they were too weak, now we have a glorious Red Army many million strong, which is smashing the enemies of Soviet Russia, which has vanquished Kolchak and Denikin, and which is now, by the hand of the tried and tested leader of our cavalry, Comrade Budyonny, destroying the last remnants of Wrangel's army.

Whereas at that time, three years ago, we had a small and still not fully cemented Communist Party of some 200,000-250,000 members in all, now, three years later, after the fire and storms through which Soviet Russia has passed, we have a party of 700,000, a party forged out of steel; a party whose members can be re-marshalled at any moment and concentrated by hundreds of thousands on any party task; a party which, without fear of confusion in its ranks, is able at a wave of the hand of the Central Committee to re-form its ranks and march against the enemy.

Whereas at that time, three years ago, we had only small groups of sympathizers in the West—the groups of Loriot in France, of MacLean in Britain, of Liebknecht, who was murdered by the capitalist scoundrels, in Germany—now, three years later, a grand organization of the international revolutionary movement has sprung up—the Third, Communist International, which has won the adherence of the major European parties: the German, the French, the Italian. In the Communist International, which has shattered the Second International, we now have the main core of the international socialist movement.

And it is not by chance that the leader of the Second International, Herr Kautsky, has been thrown out of Germany by the revolution, and that he has been forced to seek asylum in backward Tiflis, with the Georgian social-innkeepers.[1]

Lastly, whereas three years ago we observed in the countries of the oppressed East nothing but indifference to the revolution, now the East

1 Vandervelde, MacDonald, Renaudel and other leaders of the Second International arrived in Georgia on September 14, 1920, under the guise of a "socialist delegation." Karl Kautsky, who was considered to be one of the leaders of the "delegation," arrived in Tiflis on September 30. He and the "delegation" were given a ceremonial welcome by the Mensheviks. After a stay of two weeks, the "delegation" returned to Western Europe, but Kautsky remained in Tiflis until December 1920.

has begun to stir, and we are witnessing a whole number of liberation movements there directed against the Entente, against imperialism. We have a revolutionary nucleus, a rallying centre for all the other colonies and semi-colonies, in the shape of the Kemal Government, a bourgeois revolutionary government but one which is waging an armed struggle against the Entente.

Whereas three years ago we did not even dare to dream that the East might stir into action, now we not only have a revolutionary nucleus in the East, in the shape of bourgeois revolutionary Turkey; we also possess a socialist organ of the East—the Committee of Action and Propaganda.

All these facts indicating how poor we were in the revolutionary sense three years ago and how rich we have become now; all these facts furnish us with grounds for affirming that Soviet Russia will live, that it will develop and defeat its enemies.

Undoubtedly, our path is not of the easiest; but, just as undoubtedly, we are not to be frightened by difficulties. Paraphrasing the well-known words of Luther,[2] Russia might say:

"Here I stand on the border line between the old, capitalist world and the new, socialist world. Here, on this border line, I unite the efforts of the proletarians of the West and of the peasants of the East in order to shatter the old world. May the god of history be my aid!"

Kommunist (Baku), Nos. 157 and 160,
November 7 and 11, 1920

2 From Luther's speech in his defence at the Diet of Worms (1521), where he was called upon by the Catholic Church to recant his teachings (see *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesammtausgabe*. Weimar, 1897, Band 7, S. 838).

CONGRESS OF THE PEOPLES OF DAGHESTAN[1]

November 13, 1920

1. Declaration on Soviet Autonomy for Daghestan

Comrades, up to very recently the Soviet Government of the Russian Socialist Federative Republic was preoccupied with war against external enemies both in the South and the West, against Poland and Wrangel, and had neither time nor opportunity to devote its energies to the problem which is agitating the Daghestan people.

Now that Wrangel's army has been smashed and its miserable remnants are fleeing to the Crimea, and now that peace has been concluded with Poland, the Soviet Government is in a position to take up the question of autonomy for the Daghestan people.

In Russia, in the past, power was in the hands of the tsars, the landlords, the factory owners and mill owners. The Russia of the past was a Russia of tsars and executioners. Russia lived by oppressing the peoples of the old Russian Empire. The Russian Government lived on the sap and strength of the peoples it oppressed, the Russian people among them.

That was a time when Russia was cursed by all the peoples. That time is now a thing of the past. It is dead and buried, and will never be resurrected.

From the ashes of this tyrannical Russia of the tsars, a new Russia has arisen—a Russia of the workers and peasants.

---

1 The Congress of the Peoples of Daghestan was held in Temir Khan-Shura, November 13, 1920, and was attended by about 300 delegates. After J. V. Stalin had proclaimed the autonomy of Daghestan a speech greeting the congress was delivered by G. K. Ordjonikidze. The congress passed a resolution affirming the unbreakable ties between the peoples of Daghestan and the labouring peoples of Soviet Russia.

A new life has begun for the peoples of Russia. A period of emancipation has come for these peoples who suffered under the yoke of the tsars and the plutocrats, the landlords and factory owners.

The new period ushered in by the October Revolution, when power passed into the hands of the workers and peasants, and became communist power, is not only marked by the liberation of the peoples of Russia. It has raised the question of the liberation of all peoples in general, including the peoples of the East who are suffering from the oppression of the Western imperialists.

Russia has become a lever of the liberation movement, setting in motion the peoples not only of our country, but of the whole world.

Soviet Russia is a torch which lights the path to liberation from the yoke of the oppressors for all the peoples of the world.

Now that it is able, thanks to the victory over its enemies, to occupy itself with problems of internal development, the Government of Russia considers it necessary to tell you that Daghestan must be autonomous, that it will enjoy the right of internal self-administration, while retaining its fraternal tie with the peoples of Russia.

Daghestan must be governed in accordance with its specific features, its manner of life and customs.

We are told that among the Daghestan peoples the Sharia is of great importance. We have also been informed that the enemies of Soviet power are spreading rumours that it has banned the Sharia.

I have been authorized by the Government of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic to state here that these rumours are false. The Government of Russia gives every people the full right to govern itself on the basis of its laws and customs.

The Soviet Government considers that the Sharia, as common law, is as fully authorized as that of any other of the peoples inhabiting Russia.

If the Daghestan people desire to preserve their laws and customs, they should be preserved.

At the same time, I consider it necessary to state that autonomy for Daghestan does not, and cannot, imply its secession from Soviet Rus-

sia. Autonomy does not mean independence. The bond between Russia and Daghestan must be preserved, for only then can Daghestan preserve its freedom. It is the definite purpose of the Soviet Government in granting Daghestan autonomy to single out from the local forces men who are honest and loyal and who love their people, and to entrust to them all the organs of administration in Daghestan, both economic and administrative. Only thus, only in this way, can close contact be established between Soviet power in Daghestan and the people. The Soviet Government has no other object than to raise Daghestan to a higher cultural level by enlisting the co-operation of local forces.

The Soviet Government knows that the worst enemy of the people is ignorance. It is therefore necessary to create the greatest possible number of schools and organs of administration functioning in the local languages.

The Soviet Government hopes in this way to extricate the peoples of Daghestan from the quagmire of ignorance into which they were plunged by the old Russia.

The Soviet Government considers it essential that the same autonomy as is now enjoyed by Turkestan and the Kirghiz and Tatar republics should be established in Daghestan.

The Soviet Government recommends that you, the representatives of the peoples of Daghestan, should instruct your Daghestan Revolutionary Committee to select representatives to be sent to Moscow to work out there, together with representatives of the highest Soviet authority, a plan of autonomy for Daghestan.

Recent events in southern Daghestan, where the traitor Gotsinsky is trying to suppress the liberty of Daghestan, acting as an agent of General Wrangel, that same Wrangel who, under Denikin, fought the insurrectionary highlanders of the Northern Caucasus and destroyed their villages—these events are eloquent.

I must point out that the people of Daghestan, as represented by their Red partisans, have demonstrated their loyalty to the Red flag in fighting against Gotsinsky in defence of their Soviet power.

If you drive out Gotsinsky, the enemy of the labouring people of Daghestan, you will be justifying the confidence placed in you by the

highest Soviet authority in granting autonomy to Daghestan.

The Soviet Government is the first government to grant Daghestan autonomy voluntarily.

We hope that the peoples of Daghestan will justify the confidence of the Soviet Government.

Long Live the Union of the Peoples of Daghestan With the Peoples of Russia!

Long Live the Soviet Autonomy of Daghestan!

2. Concluding Remarks

Comrades, bearing in mind that the last enemy of Soviet power has been routed, the political significance of the autonomy the Soviet Government is voluntarily granting Daghestan becomes obvious.

There is one fact to which attention should be directed. Whereas the tsarist government, and the bourgeois governments of the world in general, usually make concessions to the people and grant one or another reform only when they are forced to do so by stress of circumstances, the Soviet Government, on the contrary, is granting autonomy to Daghestan absolutely voluntarily, and when it is at the height of its success.

This means that the autonomy of Daghestan will become the secure and indestructible foundation of the life of the Daghestan Republic. For only that is secure which is granted voluntarily.

I should like in conclusion to stress the hope that in the future struggle against our common enemies the Daghestan peoples will justify the high confidence reposed in them by the Soviet Government.

Long Live Autonomous Soviet Daghestan!

Sovetsky Daghestan, No. 76,
November 17, 1920

CONGRESS OF THE PEOPLES OF THE TEREK REGION[1]

November 17, 1920

1. Report on Soviet Autonomy for the Terek Region

Comrades, this congress has been called in order to make known the will of the Soviet Government concerning the arrangement of the affairs of the Terek peoples and their relations with the Cossacks.

The first question is the attitude towards the Cossacks.

Experience has shown that endless trouble arises from the fact that Cossacks and highlanders are living together in one administrative unit.

Experience has shown that if mutual offence and bloodshed are to be avoided, the mass of the Cossacks must be separated from the mass of the highlanders.

Experience has shown that it would be to the advantage of both parties if they separated.

Accordingly, the Government has decided to separate the majority of the Cossacks into a special gubernia, and the bulk of the highlanders into an autonomous Highland Soviet Republic, with the River Terek as the boundary between them.

It has been the aim of the Soviet Government not to injure the interests of the Cossacks. It had no thought, comrade Cossacks, of taking your land away from you. It had only one thought, and that was to deliver you from the yoke of the tsarist generals and plutocrats. That is the

1 The Congress of the Peoples of the Terek region was held in Vladikavkaz, November 17, 1920. Over 500 delegates were present. G. K. Ordjonikidze and S. M. Kirov took part in the work of the congress. In a resolution adopted on the report of J. V. Stalin, the congress expressed confidence that "autonomy will still further strengthen the bonds of brotherhood between the labouring masses of the Terek region and Soviet Russia."

policy it has pursued from the first days of the revolution.

But the behaviour of the Cossacks has been dubious, to say the least. They looked askance at the Soviet Government and did not trust it. At one time they got mixed up with Bicherakhov, later they hobnobbed with Denikin, and then with Wrangel.

And recently, when peace had not yet been concluded with Poland and when Wrangel was advancing on the Donets Basin, at that moment a section of the Terek Cossacks treacherously—there is no other word for it—rose up against our armies in the rear.

I am referring to the recent revolt on the Sunzha line, the purpose of which was to cut off Baku from Moscow.

The Cossacks temporarily succeeded in this attempt.

At that moment the highlanders, to the shame of the Cossacks be it said, proved themselves worthier citizens of Russia.

The Soviet Government has been very patient, but patience has its limit. And so, because of the treachery of certain groups of Cossacks, stern measures had to be taken against them, the delinquent Cossack villages had to be cleared and settled with Chechens.

The highlanders understood this to mean that the Terek Cossacks could now be maltreated with impunity, that they could be robbed, their cattle stolen and their women dishonoured.

I must declare that if the highlanders think that, they are deeply mistaken. The highlanders must know that the Soviet Government protects all the citizens of Russia alike, irrespective of their nationality, regardless of whether they are Cossacks or highlanders. Bear in mind that if the highlanders do not desist from outrages, the Soviet Government will punish them with all the severity of revolutionary power.

The future of the Cossacks, both those who are constituted into a separate gubernia and those who remain within the Highland Autonomous Republic, will entirely depend upon their own behaviour. If the Cossacks do not desist from acts of treachery against workers' and peasants' Russia, I must say that the Government will again have to resort to repressive measures.

But if the Cossacks behave in future as honest citizens of Russia, I

declare here before the whole congress that not one hair of the head of any Cossack will be injured.

The second question is our attitude towards the highlanders of the Terek region.

Comrade highlanders, the old period in the history of Russia, when the tsars and tsarist generals trampled upon your rights and destroyed your liberties—that period of oppression and slavery has gone forever. Now, when power in Russia has passed into the hands of the workers and peasants, there must no more be any who are oppressed in Russia.

In granting you autonomy, Russia restores the liberties which were stolen from you by the bloodsucking tsars and the tyrannous tsarist generals. This means that your internal affairs should be arranged in accordance with your manner of life, your habits and customs—of course, within the framework of the general Constitution of Russia.

Each of the peoples—Chechens, Ingushes, Ossetians, Kabardinians, Balkarians, Karachais, and also the Cossacks who remain within the autonomous highland territory—should have its National Soviet to administer the affairs of the given people in accordance with its manner of life and specific features. There is no need to mention the inogorodnie, who were and remain loyal sons of Soviet Russia, and whose interests the Soviet Government will always staunchly defend.

If it is shown that the Sharia is necessary, then let the Sharia remain. The Soviet Government has no thought of declaring war on the Sharia.

If it is shown that the organs of the Extraordinary Commission and the Special Department are unable to adapt themselves to the manner of life and specific features of the population, then, clearly, appropriate changes must be made in this sphere as well.

The National Soviets should be headed by a Council of People's Commissars of the Highland Republic, elected by the latter's Congress of Soviets and directly linked with Moscow.

Does this mean that the highlanders will be severed from Russia, that Russia is abandoning them, that the Red Army will be withdrawn to Russia—as the highlanders are asking in alarm? No, it does not. Russia realizes that, left to their own resources, the small nationalities of the

Terek cannot uphold their liberty against the world sharks and their agents—the highland landlords who have fled to Georgia and from there are intriguing against the labouring highlanders. Autonomy means not separation, but union between the self-governing highland peoples and the peoples of Russia. It is on this union that the Soviet autonomy of the highlanders will rest.

Comrades, it was usually the case in the past that governments consented to grant some reform, to make some concession to peoples, only at a time of difficulty, when they had been weakened and needed the sympathy of their peoples. That was always the case with the governments of the tsars and bourgeois governments generally. In contrast to them, the Soviet Government acts differently. The Soviet Government is granting you autonomy not at a time of difficulty, but at a time of resounding victories on the battlefields, at a time of complete triumph over the last stronghold of imperialism, in the Crimea.

Experience shows that that which governments grant in critical moments is insecure and unreliable, because it can always be withdrawn when the critical moment passes. Reforms and liberties can be secure only if they are granted, not under the pressure of momentary, temporary necessity, but in full knowledge of their usefulness, and when the government is in the full flower of its might and strength. That is just how the Soviet Government is acting now in restoring you your liberties.

In doing this, the Soviet Government wants you to know that it has full confidence in you, comrade highlanders, that it has faith in your ability to govern yourselves.

Let us hope that you will justify this confidence of workers' and peasants' Russia.

Long Live the Union of the Peoples of the Terek Region With the Peoples of Russia!

2. Concluding Remarks

Comrades, I have received a number of written questions on the subject of autonomy. I must reply to them.

The first question concerns the territorial boundaries of the High-

land Soviet Republic. In general, the boundaries will be the Terek in the North, and, in the other directions, the borders of the territories of the peoples of the Terek region: Chechens, Ingushes, Kabardinians, Ossetians, Balkarians, Karachais, as well as the inogorodnie, and also the Cossack villages on this side of the Terek. This will constitute the territory of the Autonomous Highland Republic. As to the detailed demarcation of the boundaries, that should be determined by a commission composed of representatives of the Highland Republic and the adjacent gubernias.

Second question: what will be the capital of the Autonomous Highland Republic, and will the towns Grozny and Vladikavkaz come within the republic? Of course, they will. Any town may be chosen as the capital of the republic. I personally consider that it should be Vladikavkaz, since it is a centre connected with all the nationalities of the Terek region.

The third question concerns the limits of autonomy. I am asked what type of autonomy is being granted to the Highland Republic.

There are different kinds of autonomy: administrative, such as the Karelians, the Cheremiss, the Chuvashes and the Volga Germans enjoy, and political, such as is enjoyed by the Bashkirs, Kirghiz and Volga Tatars. The autonomy of the Highland Republic will be political and, of course, Soviet. It will be of the same type as the autonomy of Bashkiria, Kirghizia and Tataria. This means that the Highland Soviet Republic will be headed by a Central Executive Committee of Soviets, elected by the Congress of Soviets. The Central Executive Committee will appoint the Council of People's Commissars, which will be directly linked with Moscow. The republic will be financed out of the general treasury of the Federative Republic. The People's Commissariats in charge of economic and military affairs will be directly linked with the corresponding Commissariats in the centre. The other Commissariats—Justice, Agriculture, Internal Affairs, Education, etc.—will be subordinated to the Central Executive Committee of the Highland Soviet Republic, which will be linked with the All-Russian Central Executive Committee. Foreign trade and foreign affairs will be entirely under the jurisdiction of the central government.

Then there is a question as to when autonomy will come into force. In order to work out the detailed regulations, or, to use the formal word,

the "Constitution," of the Republic, representatives should be chosen, one from each nationality, who, together with representatives of the Government in Moscow, will draft a Constitution for the Autonomous Highland Republic.

It would be as well if you were to elect these representatives at this congress, one each from the Chechens, Ingushes, Ossetians, Kabardinians, Balkarians, Karachais, and from the Cossack villages forming part of the Autonomous Highland Republic—seven representatives in all.

I am asked about the procedure of electing the National Soviets. They should be elected in conformity with the Constitution, that is, only working people should have the right to elect the Soviets. They must be Soviets of the working people.

We in Russia believe that he who does not work, neither shall he eat. You must declare that he who does not work, neither shall he vote. That is the basis of Soviet autonomy. That is the difference between bourgeois and Soviet autonomy.

The next question is about the army.

We must unquestionably have a common army, because the Highland Republic, with its tiny army, could not protect its liberty, would be powerless against armies subsidized by the Entente.

Concluding my speech, I want to stress the fundamental thing that autonomy can give you, the highlanders.

The chief evil that has always afflicted the highlanders is their backwardness, their ignorance. Only elimination of this evil, only broad enlightenment of the masses can save the highlanders from extinction and introduce them to the benefits of a higher culture. Therefore the first thing the highlanders should do in their autonomous republic is to build schools and cultural and educational institutions.

The whole purpose of autonomy is to draw the highlanders into governing their country themselves. You have all too few local persons capable of administering the affairs of the people. That is why the agencies of the Food Committee, the Extraordinary Commission, the Special Department, the national economy, are staffed with Russians who are not familiar with your manner of life and language. It is essential that

your own people be drawn into all branches of the government of your country. The autonomy of which we are speaking here is to be understood to mean that all governing bodies should be staffed with your own people, who are familiar with your language and your manner of life.

That is the meaning of autonomy.

Autonomy should teach you to stand on your own feet—that is its aim.

The results of autonomy will not be felt all at once; your local forces cannot produce in one day people experienced in governing the country. But before two or three years have passed you will have acquired an aptitude for governing your country, and will be producing from your midst teachers, business executives, food officials, surveyors, military men, judges and Party and Soviet workers generally. And then you will find that you have learned the art of self-government.

Long live the autonomy of the highlands, which will teach you how to govern your country, and will help you to become as enlightened as the workers and peasants of Russia, who have learned not only how to govern their country, but also how to vanquish their sworn enemies!

Zhizn Natsionalnostei, Nos. 39 and 40,
December 8 and 15, 1920



THE SITUATION IN THE CAUCASUS
Pravda Interview

Comrade Stalin, who has just returned from an official mission in the South, in an interview with our correspondent on the situation in the Caucasus stated the following:

The Caucasus is of major significance to the revolution, not only because it is a source of raw materials, fuel and food, but also because it lies between Europe and Asia, in particular between Russia and Turkey, and because of its economically and strategically important roads (Batum-Baku, Batum-Tabriz, Batum-TabrizErzerum).

This is fully appreciated by the Entente, which now holds Constantinople, the key to the Black Sea, and would like to retain the direct road to the East through Transcaucasia.

The whole question is, who in the end is going to be established in the Caucasus and have the use of its oil and the supremely important roads into the heart of Asia—the revolution or the Entente?

The liberation of Azerbaijan has done much to weaken the position of the Entente in the Caucasus. The struggle of Turkey against the Entente has had the same effect. Nevertheless, the Entente has not lost hope and is continuing to weave its intrigues in the Caucasus.

The conversion of Tiflis into a base of counter-revolutionary activity; the formation of bourgeois governments of Azerbaijan, Daghestan and the highlanders of the Terek region, with the money, of course, of the Entente and with the assistance of bourgeois Georgia; the coquetting with the Kemalists and the advocacy of a federation of Caucasian peoples as a Turkish protectorate; the continuous shuffling of Ministers instigated by the Entente in Persia and the flooding of that country with sepoys—all this and much else of the same sort shows that the old wolves of the Entente are not dozing. The activities of the Entente agents in

this direction have undoubtedly been intensified to fever pitch since the defeat of Wrangel.

What are the chances of the Entente, and what are the chances of the revolution, in the Caucasus?

There is no doubt that in Daghestan and the Terek region, for instance, the chances of the Entente have shrunk to nil. The defeat of Wrangel and the proclamation of Soviet autonomy in Daghestan and the Terek region, coupled with the intense development of Soviet work in these regions, have strengthened the position of the Soviet Government in this area. It is no chance thing that people's congresses representing the millions of the Terek and Daghestan populations have solemnly vowed to fight for the Soviets in close alliance with the workers and peasants of Russia.

The fact that the Soviet Government proclaimed their autonomy not at a time of difficulty, but at a time when its armies had scored resounding victories, is duly appreciated by the highlanders as a sign of the Government's confidence in them. Highlanders have said to me in private conversation: "That which the government grants peoples in time of difficulty, under the pressure of momentary necessity, is insecure. Only those reforms and liberties are secure which are granted from above after the enemy has been vanquished, as the Soviet Government is doing now."

Just as slim are the chances of the Entente in Azerbaijan, which has secured its independence and has entered into a voluntary union with the peoples of Russia. It scarcely needs demonstrating that the rapacious paw the Entente is stretching out to Azerbaijan and the oil of Baku can only arouse the loathing of the Azerbaijan working people.

The chances of the Entente in Armenia and Georgia have likewise fallen considerably since the defeat of Wrangel. Dashnak Armenia undoubtedly fell a victim to Entente provocation; the Entente incited it against Turkey and then shamefully abandoned it to the tender mercies of the Turks. It is scarcely to be doubted that only one road of salvation remains open to Armenia: union with Soviet Russia. This fact will unquestionably be a lesson to all the peoples whose bourgeois governments still pay servile homage to the Entente—to Georgia in the first place.

That Georgia's economic and food situation is catastrophic is admitted even by its present rulers. The Georgia which became enmeshed in the toils of the Entente, and in consequence has lost both the oil of Baku and the grain of the Kuban, the Georgia which has become the main base of British and French imperialist operations, and has therefore entered into hostile relations with Soviet Russia—that Georgia is at its last gasp. Small wonder that, having been thrown out of Europe by the tide of revolution, Herr Kautsky, the putrefying leader of the moribund Second International, has found an asylum in this musty Georgia that is enmeshed in the net of the Entente, among the bankrupt Georgian socialinnkeepers. It is scarcely to be doubted that the Entente will abandon Georgia at a moment of difficulty, just as it abandoned Armenia.

In Persia, the position of the British as conquerors of that country is becoming more and more transparent. We know that the Persian Government, with its kaleidoscopic changes of composition, is only a screen for the British military attachés. We know that the so-called Persian army has ceased to exist, having been replaced by British sepoys. We know that this has stirred up a number of anti-British demonstrations in Teheran and Tabriz. It is scarcely to be doubted that this circumstance is not calculated to enhance the Entente's chances in Persia.

And lastly, Turkey. The period of the Treaty of Sèvres,[1] which was directed against Turkey in general and against the Kemalists in particular, is undoubtedly coming to an end. The struggle of the Kemalists against the Entente and the growing ferment that this is stimulating in Britain's colonies, on the one hand, and the defeat of Wrangel and the fall of Venizelos in Greece, on the other, have induced the Entente to adopt a much milder policy towards the Kemalists. The defeat of Armenia by the Kemalists, with the Entente remaining absolutely "neutral," the rumours of the contemplated restoration of Thrace and Smyrna to Turkey, the rumours of negotiations between the Kemalists and the Sultan who is an agent of the Entente, and of a contemplated withdrawal from Constantinople, and, lastly, the lull on Turkey's Western Front—all these are symptoms which indicate that the Entente is flirting furi-

1 The Treaty of Sèvres—the peace treaty dictated by the Entente to Turkey, who had been an ally of Germany in the First World War, and signed in Sèvres, near Paris, on August 10, 1920. The onerous terms of the agreement, concluded with the Constantinople Government, practically deprived Turkey of independence.

ously with the Kemalists, and that the Kemalists are probably executing a certain swing to the Right.

How the Entente's flirtation with the Kemalists will end, and how far the latter will go in their swing to the Right, it is difficult to say. But one thing is certain, and that is that the struggle for the emancipation of the colonies, begun several years ago, will intensify in spite of everything, that Russia, the acknowledged standard-bearer of this struggle, will support those who champion it with every available means, and that this struggle will lead to victory together with the Kemalists, if they do not betray the cause of the liberation of the oppressed peoples, or in spite of them, if they should land in the camp of the Entente.

Testimony to this is the revolution that is flaring up in the West and the growing might of Soviet Russia.

Pravda, No. 269,
November 30, 1920

LONG LIVE SOVIET ARMENIA!

Armenia, so long martyred and tormented, with its people condemned by the grace of the Entente and the Dashnaks to starvation, ruin and the lot of refugees—this Armenia, deceived by all its "friends," has now found salvation by proclaiming itself a Soviet land.

Neither the false assurances of Britain, the "ancient protector" of Armenian interests, nor Wilson's celebrated fourteen points,[1] nor yet the ostentatious promises of the League of Nations, with its "mandate" for the administration of Armenia, had saved (or could save!) the Armenians from massacre and physical extermination. Only the idea of Soviet power has brought Armenia peace and the possibility of national renovation.

Here are some of the factors that have led to the sovietization of Armenia. The fatal policy of the Dashnaks, those agents of the Entente, condemned the country to anarchy and poverty. The war instigated by the Dashnaks against Turkey reduced Armenia to the last extreme of misery. In the latter part of November, the northern provinces of Armenia, tormented by hunger and tyranny, rose in revolt and set up an Armenian Revolutionary Military Committee, headed by Comrade Kasyan. On November 30, a telegram of greetings, addressed to Comrade Lenin, was received from the Chairman of the Armenian Revolutionary Military Committee, announcing the birth of Soviet Armenia and the occupation of the town of Delijan by the Committee. On December 1, Soviet Azerbaijan voluntarily renounced its claim to the disputed provinces and ceded Zangezur, Nakhichevan and Nagorny Karabakh to Soviet Armenia. On December 1, the Revolutionary Committee received the congratulations of the Turkish command. On De-

1 Wilson's fourteen points—the peace programme advanced by U.S. President Wilson in January 1918. One of the points spoke of guaranteeing the independence and integrity of all states, large and small

cember 2, information was received from Comrade Ordjonikidze that the Dashnak government in Erivan had been driven out and that the Armenian troops were placing themselves under the orders of the Revolutionary Committee.

The capital of Armenia, Erivan, is now in the hands of the Armenian Soviet Government.

The age-old enmity between Armenia and the surrounding Moslem peoples has been dispelled at one stroke by the establishment of fraternal solidarity between the working people of Armenia, Turkey and Azerbaijan.

Let it be known to all concerned that the so-called Armenian "problem," over which the old wolves of imperialist diplomacy racked their brains in vain, only Soviet power has proved capable of solving.

Long Live Soviet Armenia!

Pravda, No. 273,
December 4, 1920
Signed: J. Stalin

BIOGRAPHICAL CHRONICLE

(October 1917 - 1920)

1917

October 25-26
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin direct the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

October 26
The Second Congress of Soviets elects J. V. Stalin a member of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee (A.R.C.E.C.) and appoints him People's Commissar for the Affairs of Nationalities.

Night of October 27
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin visit the headquarters of the Petrograd Military Area and together with military experts work out a plan of operations for routing the Kerensky-Krasnov forces.

October 28
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin sign the order of the Council of People's Commissars banning the publication of bourgeois newspapers.

October 31
At a meeting of the Revolutionary Military Committee, J. V. Stalin reports on the situation at the front.

November 2
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin sign the "Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia," drafted by J. V. Stalin.

November 3
J. V. Stalin speaks in the discussion at a conference of representatives of political parties, the Putilov workers and the Central Executive Committee of the All-Russian Railwaymen's Union (Vikzhel).

November 6
J. V. Stalin speaks at a meeting of the A.R.C.E.C. on the formation of an "All-Socialist Government."

November 9
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin sign an order dismissing General Dukhonin from the post of Supreme Commander.

November 11
J. V. Stalin addresses a Congress of the Finnish Social-Democratic Labour Party in Helsingfors.

November 16
At a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars, J. V. Stalin proposes the restitution of Ukrainian historic treasures to the Ukrainian people. He is appointed a member of a commission to draft a decree instituting revolutionary courts.

November 19
J. V. Stalin makes reports in the Council of People's Commissars: 1) On trade with Finland, and 2) On the Ukraine and the Rada.

November 20
J. V. Stalin submits to the Council of People's Commissars the draft of an appeal by the Soviet Government "To All the Toiling Moslems of Russia and the East." He makes a report to the Council of People's Commissars on the counter-revolutionary activities of the Constituent Assembly Electoral Commission.

November 22
J. V. Stalin speaks on the banning of counterrevolutionary newspapers at a meeting of the Revolutionary Military Committee.

November 27
At a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars, J. V. Stalin speaks on the implementation of the financial and economic policy of the socialist state.

Not Earlier than November 27
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin draw up a summarized programme of peace negotiations.

November 28
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin sign a "Decree for the Arrest of Leaders of the Civil War Against the Revolution," drafted by V. I. Lenin.

November 29
The Central Committee of the Party sets up a Bureau of the C.C., to which V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin and Y. M. Sverdlov are appointed.

December 1
J. V. Stalin discusses with the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the

All-Russian Moslem Council the restitution of the "Sacred Koran of Osman" to the Moslems.

December 2
At a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars, J. V. Stalin makes reports on the Ukraine and on organizing a Congress of Soviets of Byelorussia.

December 5
Pravda publishes a decree, signed by V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin and Y. M. Sverdlov, establishing a Supreme Council of National Economy.

J. V. Stalin signs an agreement with representatives of the Byelorussian Regional Committee on joint action for the consolidation of Soviet power in Byelorussia.

December 12
J. V. Stalin writes the article "Reply to Ukrainian Comrades in the Rear and at the Front."

December 1
At a meeting of the A.R.C.E.C., J. V. Stalin makes a report on relations with the Ukrainian Rada.

December 16
J. V. Stalin makes reports at a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars on the situation in Orenburg, the Urals, Turkestan and the Caucasus.

December 18
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin sign a decree recognizing the independence of Finland.

J. V. Stalin makes a report at a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars on the military situation in the Orenburg area.

December 19
At a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars, J. V. Stalin makes a report on the Ukrainian Central Rada.

December 21
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin attend a meeting of the All-Russian Collegium for Formation of a Red Army.

December 22
At a meeting of the A.R.C.E.C., J. V. Stalin makes a report on the question of the independence of Finland.

December 23
J. V. Stalin is appointed temporary Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars during V. I. Lenin's absence on leave.

December 24
J. V. Stalin presides at a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars and makes reports on the situation in the Don area, on the Congress of Toiling Cossacks, and on the preparations for an offensive of the revolutionary detachments against Orenburg.

December 27
A meeting of the Council of People's Commissars under the chairmanship of J. V. Stalin resolves to nationalize the Putilov Works and issues a decree for the confiscation of the Anatra aircraft works in Simferopol and other plants.

December 27 and 28
J. V. Stalin confers with Left-wing delegates of the Don Cossack Assembly and a representative of the 8th Cossack Division.

December 31
J. V. Stalin's article, "Turkish Armenia," is published in *Pravda*, No. 227.

The same issue of *Pravda* contains the Decree on "Turkish Armenia," drafted by J. V. Stalin and signed by V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin.

1918

January 8
The Council of People's Commissars appoints J. V. Stalin a member of a commission for working out measures in regard to the food policy of the Soviet Government.

January 10-18
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of the Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets.

January 11
At a meeting of the Central Committee of the Party, J. V. Stalin speaks in support of V. I. Lenin's proposal for the conclusion of peace with the Germans.

January 15
J. V. Stalin makes a report at a meeting of the Bolshevik group at the Third Congress of Soviets on a Federation of Soviet Republics.

At the Third Congress of Soviets, J. V. Stalin makes a report on the national question and replies to the discussion. The congress approves a resolution on federal institutions of the Russian Republic, moved by J. V. Stalin.

January 24
At a meeting of the Central Committee of the Party where the convening of the Seventh Party Congress is discussed, J. V. Stalin speaks in favour of revising the

Programme of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.).

On instructions of the C.C. of the Bolshevik Party, J. V. Stalin conducts a conference of members of the revolutionary wings of a number of socialist parties of Europe and America.

January 28
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin send a telegram to the Soviet peace delegation in Brest-Litovsk on the need for the immediate conclusion of peace with Germany.

February 21 (8)[1]
In connection with the offensive launched by the German army, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin issue a directive to the Petrograd city and district committees of the Bolshevik Party to organize resistance to the German invaders and to mobilize the bourgeoisie to dig trenches under the control of the workers. A similar directive is sent by J. V. Stalin to the Bolsheviks in Kiev.

February 23
At a meeting of the Central Committee of the Party, J. V. Stalin supports V. I. Lenin against Trotsky and Bukharin on the subject of the Brest peace.

February 29
In a communication by direct wire to the People's Secretariat of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, J. V. Stalin instructs it to send a peace delegation to Brest and outlines the tactics the delegation should pursue in its negotiations with the German imperialists.

Not earlier than March 2
In a conversation by direct wire with the Chairman of the Murmansk Soviet, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin insist on the adoption of urgent diplomatic measures to prevent the occupation of Murmansk by Britain and France.

March 6-8
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of the Seventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.).

March 8
The Seventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) elects J. V. Stalin a member of the Party Central Committee and appoints him to the commission for drafting a new Party programme.

Before March 10
J. V. Stalin is elected a delegate from the Petrograd Soviet to the Fourth Extraordinary All-Russian Congress of Soviets.

---

1 From February 21(8) on, the dates in the Biographical Chronicle are New Style.

March 10
J. V. Stalin removes to Moscow together with the Government.

March 14
J. V. Stalin's article, "The Ukrainian Knot," appears in Izvestia, No. 47.

In a letter to G. K. Ordjonikidze, Commissar Extraordinary in the Ukraine, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin demand the formation of a united fighting front of the Crimea and the Donets Basin with all Russia to resist the advance of the German forces of occupation.

March 14-16
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of the Fourth Extraordinary All-Russian Congress of Soviets.

March 16
The Fourth Extraordinary All-Russian Congress of Soviets elects J. V. Stalin to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

March 19
In a letter to S. Shaumyan and A. Djaparidze, J. V. Stalin urges the necessity of strengthening the military defences of Baku.

March 26 and 27
J. V. Stalin's article, "Transcaucasian Counter-revolutionaries Under a Socialist Mask," appears in *Pravda*, Nos. 55 and 56.

Night of March 30
J. V. Stalin speaks by direct wire with the Chairman of the Tashkent Soviet on the situation in Turkestan.

April 1
The Bolshevik group of the A.R.C.E.C. elects J. V. Stalin to the commission for drafting the first Constitution of the Russian Soviet Republic.

April 2
At a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars, J. V. Stalin recommends, in connection with the German advance on Kharkov, that peace negotiations be immediately started with the Ukrainian Central Rada.

April 3 and 4
An interview with J. V. Stalin on the organization of a Russian Federal Republic is published in *Pravda*, Nos. 62 and 63.

April 5
J. V. Stalin speaks at the first meeting of the commission set up by the A.R.C.E.C. for drafting the Constitution of the R.S.F.S.R.

April 9
Pravda, No. 67, publishes a message of J. V. Stalin to the Kazan, Ufa, Orenburg, Turkestan and other Soviets under the title "One Immediate Task."

April 12
J. V. Stalin makes a report in the Constitution Drafting Commission on the type of federation of the Russian Soviet Republic.

April 19
J. V. Stalin's draft on "General Provisions of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic" is discussed and approved by the Constitution Drafting Commission.

April 27
The Council of People's Commissars appoints J. V. Stalin plenipotentiary representative of the R.S.F.S.R. for the negotiation of a peace treaty with the Ukrainian Central Rada.

April 29
J. V. Stalin arrives with a delegation in Kursk.

Not Earlier than May 2
J. V. Stalin leaves Kursk for Moscow to report to the Council of People's Commissars.

May 5
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin send a wireless message to Voronezh, Rostov and Bryansk regarding the conclusion of a truce on the Ukrainian Front.

May 10-16
J. V. Stalin conducts a conference on the convening of a constituent congress of Soviets of the Tatar-Bashkir Soviet Republic and delivers speeches at the opening and closing of the conference.

May 23
J. V. Stalin's article, "The Situation in the Caucasus," is printed in *Pravda*, No. 100.

May 29
The Council of People's Commissars appoints J. V. Stalin General Director of Food Affairs in South Russia and vests him with extraordinary powers.

June 1
J. V. Stalin's article, "The Don and the North Caucasus (Machinations and the Facts)," is printed in *Pravda*, No. 108.

June 4
J. V. Stalin leaves Moscow for Tsaritsyn.

June 6
J. V. Stalin arrives in Tsaritsyn.

June 7
In a telegram to V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin informs him of the measures taken to get the transport system going, to establish revolutionary order in Tsaritsyn, and to dispatch grain to the centre.

June 13
J. V. Stalin wires V. I. Lenin informing him of the improvement in the transport system and of the plan for the procurement of grain and its dispatch to Moscow.

June 25
J. V. Stalin arrives in Kamyshin to restore the transport system and to organize the dispatch of food.

June 29
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin by direct wire from Tsaritsyn that a number of through trains with food have left for the North.

July 7
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin exchange telegrams on the revolt of the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries.

In a letter to V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin informs him of the military situation in the Tsaritsyn area and about Turkestan.

July 8
J. V. Stalin writes to S. Shaumyan in Baku on the home and foreign policies of the R.S.F.S.R. and Azerbaijan.

July 10
In a letter to V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin protests against the orders of Trotsky which were leading to the collapse of the Tsaritsyn Front and the loss of the North Caucasian region.

July 15
J. V. Stalin wires the People's Commissariat of Military Affairs urging the rendering of immediate aid to Soviet Turkestan.

July 17
After an inspection of the Tsaritsyn Front, J. V. Stalin wires V. I. Lenin reporting his findings.

July 18
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin by direct wire that between July 12 and 16 five train loads of food have been sent to Moscow.

July 19
A Military Council of the North Caucasian Military Area is set up, headed by J. V. Stalin.

July 20
In a telegram to S. Shaumyan, J. V. Stalin on behalf of the A.R.C.E.C. and the Council of People's Commissars, insists that the Baku Soviet pursue an independent foreign policy and vigorously combat agents of foreign capitalism.

July 24
J. V. Stalin discusses with V. I. Lenin by direct wire the food situation in Moscow and Petrograd.

August 4
In a letter to V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin informs him of the military and food situation in the South.

August 6
J. V. Stalin signs an order of the North Caucasian Military Council on the re-organization of all agencies engaged in supplying the front.

August 8
J. V. Stalin and K. E. Voroshilov, who are at Kotelnikovo Station, give orders to the commander of the southern sector of the Tsaritsyn Front for the transfer of forces in connection with the offensive of the Krasnov bands.

August 13
J. V. Stalin signs an order of the Military Council proclaiming a state of siege in the city and Gubernia of Tsaritsyn.

August 14
J. V. Stalin signs an order of the Military Council mobilizing the bourgeois of Tsaritsyn for the digging of trenches.

August 17
J. V. Stalin wires to Parkhomenko in Moscow informing him that the situation on the Tsaritsyn Front has improved.

August 19
J. V. Stalin and K. E. Voroshilov are at Sarepta in connection with the military operations at the front.

August 24
J. V. Stalin and K. E. Voroshilov sign the operations order for the offensive on the Tsaritsyn Front.

August 26
In connection with the need for armoured cars at the front, J. V. Stalin and K. E. Voroshilov sign an order for the re-organization of the Tsaritsyn ordnance works.

August 31
J. V. Stalin and K. E. Voroshilov send a telegram to Y. M. Sverdlov, Chairman of the A.R.C.E.C., in connection with the villainous attempt on the life of V. I. Lenin.

September 6
J. V. Stalin informs the Council of People's Commissars by wire of the success of the Soviet offensive in the Tsaritsyn area.

September 8
J. V. Stalin wires V. I. Lenin informing him that a counter-revolutionary revolt of the Gruzoles Regiment organized in Tsaritsyn by the Socialist-Revolutionaries has been suppressed.

September 10
At a meeting in Tsaritsyn, J. V. Stalin, on behalf of the Council of People's Commissars and the North Caucasian Military Council, congratulates the regiments which distinguished themselves in action at Tsaritsyn and presents them with banners inscribed: "For Military Valour."

September 12
J. V. Stalin leaves for Moscow to report to V. I. Lenin on the situation on the Southern Front.

September 15
V. I. Lenin, Y. M. Sverdlov and J. V. Stalin confer on questions concerning the Tsaritsyn Front.

September 17
J. V. Stalin is appointed Chairman of the newly formed Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front.

September 19
J. V. Stalin examines questions of the composition and activities of the Collegium of the People's Commissariat for the Affairs of Nationalities.

V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin wire congratulations to the revolutionary troops of

the Tsaritsyn Front.

September 21
Izvestia publishes an interview with J. V. Stalin on the situation on the Tsaritsyn Front.

September 22
J. V. Stalin returns to Tsaritsyn from Moscow.

September 28
J. V. Stalin presides at the first meeting of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front, where the question is discussed of dividing the military units of the front into four armies.

October 3
J. V. Stalin and K. E. Voroshilov send a telegram to V. I. Lenin demanding that the Central Committee discuss the activities of Trotsky which menace the Southern Front with collapse.

October 6
J. V. Stalin again leaves for Moscow.

October 8
By decision of the Council of People's Commissars J. V. Stalin is appointed a member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic.

October 11
J. V. Stalin returns to Tsaritsyn from Moscow.

J. V. Stalin informs Y. M. Sverdlov by direct wire of the situation on the Tsaritsyn Front.

October 16
A "Letter to the Poor Peasants of the Don," signed by J. V. Stalin and other members of the Military Council, is printed in the newspaper Soldat Revolutsii, No. 58.

October 18
J. V. Stalin wires V. I. Lenin informing him of the rout of Krasnov's armies at Tsaritsyn.

October 19
J. V. Stalin leaves Tsaritsyn for Moscow.

October 22
J. V. Stalin wires congratulations to the revolutionary regiments which routed the whiteguard forces at Tsaritsyn.

At the Second Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) J. V. Stalin is elected a member of its Central Committee.

October 29

J. V. Stalin addresses a plenary meeting of the Moscow Soviet on the situation on the Southern Front.

J. V. Stalin's article, "The Logic of Facts (In Reference to the 'Theses' of the Central Committee of the Mensheviks)," is printed in *Pravda*, No. 234.

November 6

J. V. Stalin's article, "The October Revolution (October 24 and 25, 1917, in Petrograd)," is printed in *Pravda*, No. 241.

November 6-9

J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of the Sixth Extraordinary All-Russian Congress of Soviets.

November 9

The Sixth Extraordinary All-Russian Congress of Soviets elects J. V. Stalin a member of the A.R.C.E.C.

November 11

On behalf of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.), J. V. Stalin greets the First Congress of Moslem Communists in Moscow.

November 13

The All-Russian Central Executive Committee elects J. V. Stalin a member of its Presidium.

November 17

J. V. Stalin's article, "Partition Wall," is printed in Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 2.

November 24

J. V. Stalin's article, "Don' t Forget the East," is printed in Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 3.

November 30

J. V. Stalin is appointed a member and Vice Chairman of the Council of Workers' and Peasants' Defence.

December 1

J. V. Stalin speaks in the discussion at the first meeting of the Council of Workers' and Peasants' Defence.

V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin are empowered by the Council of Defence to endorse the decisions of its commissions.

December 3
J. V. Stalin presides at a meeting of the Council of Defence commission on improving railway transport.

December 7
The Council of People's Commissars approves a decree drafted by J. V. Stalin recognizing the independence of the Estland Soviet Republic.

December 11
At a meeting of the Council of Defence, J. V. Stalin makes reports on improving railway transport, on political agitational work in, and the appointment of commissars to, divisions in process of formation, and on the quartering of military units.

December 22
J. V. Stalin's article, "Things Are Moving," is printed in Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 7.

December 25
J. V. Stalin discusses the state structure of Byelorussia with responsible officials of the Byelorussian National Commissariat.

J. V. Stalin gives instructions by direct wire to Myasnikov in Smolensk on the organization of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian C.P.(B.).

December 29
J. V. Stalin reports on the food situation in the war area at a meeting of the Council of Defence.

December 30
On V. I. Lenin's recommendation, the C.C. R.C.P.(B.) decides to send J. V. Stalin to the Eastern Front.

1919

January 1
The C.C., R.C.P.(B.) and the Council of Defence set up a Party commission of inquiry, consisting of J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky, to investigate the reasons for the surrender of Perm and to adopt measures for the restoration of Party and Soviet work in the area of the Third and Second Armies of the Eastern Front.

January 5
J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky arrive in Vyatka.

In a letter to V. I. Lenin written from Vyatka, J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky urge the sending of reinforcements to the Third Army.

Night of January 6
J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky leave for the headquarters of the Third Army in Glazov.

January 7
J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky instruct the Regional Party Committee in Vyatka to mobilize Communists for the front.

January 13
J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky send V. I. Lenin a brief preliminary report on the results of their investigation of the causes of the Perm disaster.

January 18
J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky leave Glazov for Vyatka.

January 19
J. V. Stalin addresses a joint meeting of Ural and Vyatka Party and Soviet organizations, convened by the Commission of the Central Committee of the Party and the Council of Defence, on the question of setting up a Vyatka Revolutionary Military Committee.

J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky hold a conference of representatives of the People's Commissariat of Railways, the military transportation division of the Third Army and other organizations on the subject of relieving congestion at the Vyatka railway junction.

J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky send V. I. Lenin a report on the measures adopted to strengthen the front and rear of the Third Army.

January 20
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin that the situation on the Eastern Front has improved.

January 21
J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky leave Vyatka for Third Army headquarters in Glazov.

January 25
J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky return to Vyatka from Glazov.

January 27
J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky leave Vyatka for Moscow.

January 31
On their return from the Eastern Front J. V. Stalin and F. E. Dzerzhinsky pres-

ent to V. I. Lenin the report of the Commission of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) and the Council of Defence.

February 9
J. V. Stalin's article, "The Government's Policy on the National Question," is printed in Izvestia, No. 30.

February 17
At a meeting of the Council of Defence, J. V. Stalin reports on the organization of through trains for transport of grain and coal.

February 22
J. V. Stalin's article, "Two Camps," appears in Izvestia, No. 41.

March 2
J. V. Stalin's article, "Our Tasks in the East," is printed in *Pravda*, No. 48.

March 2-6
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of the First Congress of the Communist International as a member of the delegation of the R.C.P.(B.).

March 8
At a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars J. V. Stalin makes a report on the draft decree on the re-organization of State Control.

March 9
J. V. Stalin's article, "Two Years," is printed in *Pravda*, No. 53, and in Zhizn Natsionalnostei, No. 8.

March 16
J. V. Stalin's article, "Imperialism's Reserves," is printed in Izvestia, No. 58.

March 18-23
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of the Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.).

March 19
The Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) elects J. V. Stalin to the commission for the final editing of the Party Programme.

March 21
J. V. Stalin addresses the Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) on the military question.

March 22
The Eighth Party Congress elects J. V. Stalin a member of the commission set up to draft the resolution on the military question.

March 23
The Eighth Party Congress elects J. V. Stalin a member of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.).

Izvestia publishes the "Agreement Between the Central Soviet Government and the Government of Bashkiria on an Autonomous Soviet Bashkir Republic," signed by V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin.

March 25
At a plenary meeting of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.), J. V. Stalin is appointed a member of the Political Bureau and of the Organizing Bureau of the Central Committee.

March 30
The All-Russian Central Executive Committee appoints J. V. Stalin People's Commissar of State Control.

April 3
At a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars, J. V. Stalin makes a report on a draft decree on the re-organization of State Control.

April 9
J. V. Stalin makes a report at a plenary meeting of the A.R.C.E.C. on the re-organization of State Control.

V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin and M. I. Kalinin sign the decree on State Control approved by the A.R.C.E.C.

April 13
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of a plenary meeting of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.).

April 21
By decision of the Council of Defence, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin are appointed members of a commission set up to investigate the accountancy of military property by the Extraordinary Commission for the Supply of the Red Army.

April 23
J. V. Stalin's article, "The Shooting of the Twenty-Six Baku Comrades by Agents of British Imperialism," is printed in Izvestia, No. 85.

April 30
J. V. Stalin signs an announcement "To All Citizens of the Soviet Republic" about the institution of a Central Bureau of Complaints and Applications of the People's Commissariat of State Control. The announcement is published in Izvestia, No. 97, May 8, 1919.

May 4
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of a plenary meeting of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.).

May 5
At a meeting of the Council of Defence, J. V. Stalin reports on the results of an inspection of Soviet institutions.

May 8
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin send a directive of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) to the Ukrainian Council of People's Commissars to increase military assistance to the Southern Front in connection with Denikin's threat to the Donbas.

May 17
In connection with Yudenich's offensive and the threat to Petrograd, the Central Committee of the Party and the Council of Defence send J. V. Stalin to the Petrograd Front.

May 19
On his arrival in Petrograd, J. V. Stalin confers with the Commander-in-Chief, the commander of the Western Front and the commander of the Seventh Army on the situation at the front.

J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin by direct wire of the situation at Petrograd and the measures adopted to strengthen the front.

May 20
J. V. Stalin leaves Petrograd for the headquarters of the Western Front in Staraya Russa.

May 21
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin and the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic by direct wire of the situation in the Gatchina sector of the front.

May 22
J. V. Stalin leaves Staraya Russa for the Gatchina area, which is directly menaced by the Whites.

May 25
J. V. Stalin goes to Kronstadt to acquaint himself with the state of the Baltic Fleet.

J. V. Stalin inspects the fortifications on the Karelian sector of the front.

May 28
J. V. Stalin returns to Petrograd after his tour of the front.

May 30
J. V. Stalin confers with the Commander-inChief, representatives of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic, and the commanders of the Western Front, the Seventh Army and the Baltic Fleet on measures for the defence of

the approaches to Petrograd.

Beginning of June
J. V. Stalin appeals to the troops defending Petrograd to combat deserters and traitors at the front.

June 8-9
J. V. Stalin visits the Narva sector of the Front.

June 10
The C.C., R.C.P.(B.) instructs J. V. Stalin to take measures to centralize the control of the Western Front.

June 13
In connection with the counter-revolutionary revolt in Forts Krasnaya Gorka and Seraya Loshad, J. V. Stalin orders vessels of the Baltic Fleet to take up stations in the outer roads and turn their guns on Fort Krasnaya Gorka, and also gives instructions for the formation of a Coastal Army Group in Oranienbaum for an assault on Krasnaya Gorka from the land.

June 14
J. V. Stalin arrives in Oranienbaum and confers with representatives of the naval and army commands and commanders and commissars of the Coastal Group units on the plan for the assault on Krasnaya Gorka.

June 15
J. V. Stalin leaves Oranienbaum for the battle area to direct the operations against Fort Krasnaya Gorka.

June 16
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin of the capture of Forts Krasnaya Gorka and Seraya Loshad by the Red Army.

J. V. Stalin attends a meeting of sailors of the Baltic Fleet and units of the Red Army in Fort Krasnaya Gorka.

June 22
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin that the Red Army on the Petrograd Front has passed to the offensive.

June 28
J. V. Stalin sends a message of congratulation to the 1st Rifle Division and crews of the Onega Flotilla and the Baltic Fleet on the capture of Vidlitsa, the military base of the Finnish whiteguards near the borders of Finland.

July 3
J. V. Stalin arrives in Moscow.

July 3-4
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of a plenary meeting of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.).

July 5
J. V. Stalin is appointed a member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Western Front.

July 8
Pravda publishes an interview with J. V. Stalin on the situation on the Petrograd Front.

July 9
J. V. Stalin arrives at the headquarters of the Western Front in Smolensk.

July 13
J. V. Stalin confers in Minsk with members of the Lithuanian-Byelorussian Government on the question of dissolving the Government and the Minsk Council of Defence and the inclusion of their members in the agencies of the front.

July 23
J. V. Stalin signs an instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Western Front to the Petrograd and Western Area Military Commissariats to organize nodal defence points.

August 5
J. V. Stalin signs an order of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Western Front for the establishment of a Petrograd fortified area.

J. V. Stalin signs an instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Western Front to the armies of the front, ordering them to rout the Whites at the approaches to Petrograd and capture Pskov.

August 11
In a letter to V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin informs him of the position on the Western Front.

August 13
J. V. Stalin requests information by direct wire from G. K. Ordjonikidze as to the situation in the area of operation of the Sixteenth Army of the Western Front.

August 26
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin of the capture of Pskov by the Red Army.

August
J. V. Stalin presides at a Special Conference of responsible political workers of

the Western Front on the subject of compiling "Instructions for Commissars of Regiments on Active Service."

September 2
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin that the Red Army has launched a counter-offensive at Dvinsk.

September 10
J. V. Stalin leaves Smolensk for Moscow.

September 15
J. V. Stalin returns to Smolensk.

September 25
J. V. Stalin leaves Smolensk for Moscow.

September 26
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of a plenary meeting of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.). The plenary meeting of the C.C. resolves to send J. V. Stalin to the Southern Front to organize the defeat of Denikin.

September 27
J. V. Stalin is appointed a member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front.

J. V. Stalin attends a meeting of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic, where, on his suggestion, it is decided to form a composite division for action on the Southern Front comprised of regiments of the Western Front, and also to institute a Southern Front Formations Board.

September 28
J. V. Stalin arrives in Smolensk.

September 30
J. V. Stalin leaves Smolensk for Moscow.

October 2
J. V. Stalin attends a meeting of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic where, on his suggestion, it is decided to replenish the Latvian Division, designated for service on the Southern Front.

October 3
J. V. Stalin arrives at Southern Front headquarters in the village of Sergievskoye.

October 9
J. V. Stalin signs an instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front ordering the formation of a shock force for action against Denikin's army at Orel.

October 11
J. V. Stalin leaves Sergievskoye for Serpukhov, to which the headquarters of the Southern Front have been transferred.

October 15
In a letter to V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin outlines a strategic plan for an offensive against Denikin from the Voronezh area in the direction of Rostov, through Kharkov and the Donbas.

October 17
J. V. Stalin signs an instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front to the Fourteenth Army, ordering the capture of Orel. Orel was taken by the Red Army on October 20.

October 20
J. V. Stalin signs an instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front to the armies of the Front, ordering the pursuit of Denikin's retreating armies, with the delivery of the main blow in the direction of Kursk.

October 25
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin of the rout near Voronezh of Shkuro's and Mamontov's Cavalry Corps by Budyonny's Cavalry Corps, and of the capture of Voronezh by the Red Army.

October 30
J. V. Stalin leaves Serpukhov for the battle area of the Southern front.

November 3
J. V. Stalin returns to Serpukhov after his visit to the front.

November 4
J. V. Stalin leaves for Moscow.

November 6
J. V. Stalin attends a meeting of the Political Bureau of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.), where a resolution on replenishments for the Southern Front is adopted on his motion.

November 9
J. V. Stalin returns to Southern Front headquarters in Serpukhov.

J. V. Stalin signs an instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front for pressing the offensive along the whole front and for routing the Kursk group of Denikin's forces.

November 11
On J. V. Stalin's proposal, the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern

Front resolves to form a Cavalry Army.

Early half of November
J. V. Stalin directs the compiling of instructions for the inspection of the organization of Soviet power in the liberated areas, and instructions to Revolutionary Committees in the area of the Southern Front.

November 16
J. V. Stalin leaves for Moscow.

November 17
J. V. Stalin attends a meeting of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic where the question of forming a Cavalry Army is discussed.

November 18
J. V. Stalin returns to Southern Front headquarters in Serpukhov.

November 19
J. V. Stalin signs an order of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front re-naming the First Cavalry Corps the Cavalry Army.

November 21
J. V. Stalin attends a preliminary conference in Moscow, presided over by V. I. Lenin, of delegates to the Second All-Russian Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East.

November 22
J. V. Stalin makes a speech at the opening of the Second All-Russian Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East.

November 27
The Presidium of the A.R.C.E.C. confers on J. V. Stalin the Order of the Red Banner for his services in the defence of Petrograd and selfless efforts on the Southern Front.

J. V. Stalin leaves Serpukhov for the battle area of the Southern Front.

November 29
J. V. Stalin arrives in Voronezh.

December 5
J. V. Stalin arrives at Kastornaya station. From there he proceeds to Stary Oskol.

December 6
J. V. Stalin arrives at the village of Veliko-Mikhailovka, near Novy Oskol, in the area of operation of the First Cavalry Army.

At a joint meeting of the Revolutionary Military Councils of the Southern

Front and the First Cavalry Army, J. V. Stalin outlines the latter's tasks in carrying out the plan for the defeat of Denikin.

December 6-7
J. V. Stalin familiarizes himself with the state of the units of the Cavalry Army and the course of military operations.

December 7
J. V. Stalin and S. M. Budyonny inspect the battlefield near Veliko-Mikhailovka.

December 8
J. V. Stalin arrives in Novy Oskol.

December 9
The Seventh All-Russian Congress of Soviets elects J. V. Stalin a member of the A.R.C.E.C.

December 10
J. V. Stalin arrives in Voronezh.

December 12
After his inspection of the front, J. V. Stalin returns to Southern Front headquarters in Serpukhov.

J. V. Stalin signs an instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front to the armies of the front for the capture of Kiev and the Donbas.

December 13
J. V. Stalin leaves Serpukhov for Moscow.

December 17
J. V. Stalin returns to Serpukhov from Moscow.

December 18
The newspaper Petrogradskaya *Pravda* publishes a message sent on behalf of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front by J. V. Stalin to the workers of Petrograd, thanking them for their assistance to the Southern Front.

December 26
J. V. Stalin writes his article, "The Military Situation in the South," which is published in *Pravda*, No. 293, December 28.

December 29
J. V. Stalin leaves Serpukhov for Moscow.

1920

January 3
J. V. Stalin arrives in Orel.

J. V. Stalin signs an instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front to the armies of the front for the capture of Rostov.

January 5
J. V. Stalin arrives at Southern Front headquarters in Kursk.

January 10
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin of the capture of Rostov by Budyonny's Cavalry.

J. V. Stalin signs an order of the day of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front congratulating the armies of the front on the defeat of Denikin's armies and the capture of the Donbas and Rostov.

January 11
J. V. Stalin leaves Kursk for the area of operations of the Fourteenth Army of the South-Western Front.[2]

January 13
J. V. Stalin signs an instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the South-Western Front to the armies of the front for the pursuit of Denikin's armies retreating to the Black Seaports.

January 14
J. V. Stalin returns to Kursk after his visit to the front.

January 15
J. V. Stalin leaves Kursk for Moscow.

January 20
At a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars, J. V. Stalin makes a report on the "Statute of the Ukrainian Labour Army Council." The C.P.C. endorses the "Statute" and appoints J. V. Stalin Chairman of the Ukrainian Labour Army Council.

February 2
J. V. Stalin arrives from Moscow at the headquarters of the South-Western Front in Kursk.

February 7
The A.R.C.E.C. appoints J. V. Stalin a member of a commission of the Presidium of the A.R.C.E.C. set up to work out problems concerning the federal

2 On January 10, 1920, the Southern Front was re-named the South-Western Front.

structure of the R.S.F.S.R.

February 10
J. V. Stalin arrives in Kharkov with the transfer to that city of the Revolutionary Military Council and headquarters of the SouthWestern Front.

February 12
J. V. Stalin conducts a preliminary conference of members of the Ukrainian Labour Army Council.

February 13
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin by direct wire of the measures adopted for the formation of the Ukrainian Labour Army.

February 16
J. V. Stalin presides at the first meeting of the Ukrainian Labour Army Council and reports on the constitution of the Council and its tasks.

February 20
J. V. Stalin signs decisions of the Ukrainian Labour Army Council on the militarization of the Donbas coal industry and on the supply of prime necessities to the workers.

March 7
In an order of the day to the Ukrainian Labour Army, J. V. Stalin calls on the men, commanders and commissars of the 42nd Division, which has been incorporated in the Ukrainian Labour Army, to win the battle for coal.

March 9
J. V. Stalin conducts a conference of members of the Ukrainian Labour Army Council, the Ukrainian Council of People's Commissars and other organizations on problems of food supply.

March 15
J. V. Stalin conducts an emergency meeting of the Ukrainian Labour Army Council in connection with V. I. Lenin's proposal on delimiting the boundaries of the Donets Gubernia.

March 17-23
J. V. Stalin directs the Fourth All-Ukrainian Conference of the Ukrainian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in Kharkov.

March 17
J. V. Stalin delivers a speech at the opening of the Fourth All-Ukrainian Conference of the Ukr.C.P.(B.).

March 19
J. V. Stalin makes a report on economic policy at the Fourth All-Ukrainian Conference of the Ukr.C.P.(B.).

March 20
J. V. Stalin replies to the discussion of his report on economic policy at the Fourth AllUkrainian Conference of the Ukr.C.P.(B.).

March 23
The Fourth All-Ukrainian Conference of the Ukr.C.P.(B.) elects J. V. Stalin a delegate to the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.).

J. V. Stalin delivers a speech at the closing of the conference.

J. V. Stalin leaves Kharkov for Moscow.

March 29-April 5
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.).

April 1
At the Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), J. V. Stalin is elected to a commission set up to draft the resolution on the question of the trade unions and their organization.

April 4
The Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) elects J. V. Stalin a member of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.).

April 5
At a plenary meeting of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.), J. V. Stalin is appointed a member of the Political Bureau and the Organizing Bureau of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.).

April 16
J. V. Stalin makes a communication on the state of the Donets coal industry at a meeting of the Council of Labour and Defence.

April 23
J. V. Stalin's article, "Lenin as the Organizer and Leader of the Russian Communist Party," appears in *Pravda*, No. 86.

J. V. Stalin delivers a speech at a meeting called by the Moscow Committee of the R.C.P.(B.) on the occasion of V. I. Lenin's fiftieth birthday.

April 29-May 2
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin participate in drawing up the theses of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) on the organization of agitational work in connection with the war with Poland.

May 4
The Council of People's Commissars appoints J. V. Stalin Chairman of a commission on the establishment of an Autonomous Tatar Sovie Republic.

May 10
The Council of Labour and Defence appoints J. V. Stalin Chairman of a commission on the supply of clothing to the armies of the Western Front.

May 14
J. V. Stalin makes a report on the supply of clothing to the armies of the Western Front at a meeting of the Council of Labour and Defence.

The Council of Labour and Defence appoints J. V. Stalin Chairman of a commission on the supply of cartridges, rifles and machine guns to the army and on measures for increasing the output of the small arms and ammunition factories.

May 17
J. V. Stalin conducts a meeting of the commission on the supply of cartridges, rifles and machine guns and on measures for increasing the output of the small arms and ammunition factories.

May 20
Izvestia publishes "Instructions Concerning the Procedure of Election of Workers and Peasants to, and Their Participation in, the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection," signed by J. V. Stalin as People's Commissar of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection.

May 21
At a meeting of the Council of Labour and Defence, J. V. Stalin reports on the results of the work of the commission on the supply of cartridges, rifles and machine guns to the army.

May 25 and 26
J. V. Stalin's article, "The Entente's New Campaign Against Russia," is published in *Pravda*, Nos. 111 and 112.

May 26
In connection with Poland's attack on the Soviet Republic, the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) sends J. V. Stalin to the South-Western Front.

May 27
J. V. Stalin arrives at the headquarters of the South Western Front in Kharkov.

May 29
J. V. Stalin wires V. I. Lenin informing him of the measures adopted to strengthen the Crimean sector of the South-Western Front.

J. V. Stalin leaves Kharkov for Kremenchug.

May 31

J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin of the situation on the South-Western Front.

J. V. Stalin signs an instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the South Western Front to the Command of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Armies on measures for the defence of Odessa.

Early June

J. V. Stalin confers with commanders of the First Cavalry Army in Kremenchug and discusses the situation at the front and the plan of operations of the Cavalry Army.

June 3

J. V. Stalin signs an instruction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the South-Western Front to the Commander of the First Cavalry Army to demolish the Kiev group of the Polish armies.

June 12

In a letter to V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin comments on V. I. Lenin's draft theses on the national and colonial question for the Second Congress of the Communist International.

J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin of the capture of Kiev by the Red Army.

June 20

J. V. Stalin returns to Kharkov from Kremenchug.

June 24

J. V. Stalin leaves for Sinelnikovo, in the Crimean sector of the South-Western Front.

The Kharkov newspaper Kommunist publishes an interview given by J. V. Stalin to a Ukrainian ROSTA correspondent on the situation on the South-Western Front.

July 3

J. V. Stalin returns to Kharkov from Sinelnikovo.

July 7

J. V. Stalin leaves for Moscow.

Prior to July 11

J. V. Stalin confers with the Commander-in-Chief, the Chief of the Field Staff and the Vice-Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic on the sending of reinforcements to the Crimean sector of the South-Western Front.

July 11
Pravda publishes an interview with J. V. Stalin on the situation on the Polish Front.

July 12
J. V. Stalin returns from Moscow to South-Western Front headquarters in Kharkov.

July 14
J. V. Stalin leaves for Volnovakha, in the Crimean sector of the front.

July 16
J. V. Stalin goes to Mariupol to acquaint himself with the state of the Azov fleet.

A plenary meeting of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) approves the measures proposed by J. V. Stalin for the defeat of Wrangel. V. I. Lenin informs J. V. Stalin of this.

Prior to July 19
J. V. Stalin drafts a letter of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) to Party organizations on the mobilization of Communists for the Crimean Front. On V. I. Lenin's proposal, the letter is circulated to the Party organizations.

July 19
J. V. Stalin arrives in Lozovaya from Volnovakha.

July 20
J. V. Stalin returns to Kharkov after his visit to the front.

July 31
J. V. Stalin leaves for Lozovaya.

August 2
V. I. Lenin informs J. V. Stalin of a decision of the Political Bureau of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) to establish an independent front against Wrangel. The Political Bureau instructs J. V. Stalin to set up a Revolutionary Military Council of this front and concentrate attention on this sector.

August 7
J. V. Stalin informs V. I. Lenin that the Red Army has forced the Dnieper and occupied Alyoshki, Kakhovka and other points on the left bank of the river.

August 9
J. V. Stalin arrives in Alexandrovsk from Lozovaya.

August 14
J. V. Stalin returns to Kharkov after his visit to the front.

August 17
J. V. Stalin leaves for Moscow.

August 19
V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin send instructions on measures for assisting the Crimean Front to the Central Committee of the Ukr.C.P.(B.), the Caucasian and Siberian Bureaus of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.), the Petrograd Committee of the R.C.P.(B.) and the Revolutionary Military Council of the Western Front.

August 25
In a memorandum to the Political Bureau of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.), J. V. Stalin submits a programme for the creation of fighting reserves of the Republic.

September 22-25
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of the Ninth All-Russian Conference of the R.C.P.(B.).

September 22
J. V. Stalin speaks in the discussion on the report of the Central Committee at the Ninth All-Russian Conference of the R.C.P.(B.).

October 10
J. V. Stalin's article, "The Policy of the Soviet Government on the National Question in Russia," is printed in *Pravda*, No. 226.

October 15
J. V. Stalin delivers a speech at the opening of the First All-Russian Conference of Responsible Personnel of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection.

October 16
On the instructions of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.), J. V. Stalin leaves for the North Caucasus and Azerbaijan.

October 18
J. V. Stalin arrives in Rostov-on-Don and acquaints himself with the state of Party work.

October 21
J. V. Stalin arrives in Vladikavkaz.

October 26
J. V. Stalin sends a report to the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) and V. I. Lenin on the situation in the Caucasus.

October 27-29
J. V. Stalin directs the work of a regional conference of Communist organizations of the Don and the Caucasus, held in Vladikavkaz.

October 27
At the regional conference of Communist organizations of the Don and the Caucasus, J. V. Stalin delivers a report on the "Political Situation of the Republic."

October 30
J. V. Stalin leaves Vladikavkaz for Baku.

November 4
J. V. Stalin attends a meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Azerbaijan Communist Party and members of the Caucasian Bureau of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.) on the negotiations with Georgia and the situation in Armenia.

November 6
J. V. Stalin delivers an address on "Three Years of Proletarian Dictatorship" at a celebration meeting of the Baku Soviet.

November 9
J. V. Stalin makes a report on the tasks of Party and Soviet work in Azerbaijan at a joint meeting of the C.C., Azerbaijan C.P.(B.), the Caucasian Bureau of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.), and Baku Party and Soviet organizations.

November 12
J. V. Stalin arrives in Temir-Khan-Shura.

November 13
J. V. Stalin makes a report at a meeting of Party functionaries on the tasks of Party and Soviet bodies in connection with the granting of autonomy to Daghestan.

J. V. Stalin makes a declaration on Soviet autonomy for Daghestan at a Congress of the Peoples of Daghestan.

November 16
J. V. Stalin arrives in Vladikavkaz.

November 17
J. V. Stalin makes a report at a Congress of the Peoples of the Terek region on "Soviet Autonomy for the Terek region."

J. V. Stalin receives a number of delegates to the Congress of the Peoples of the Terek region, members of the Cossack-peasant group.

November 20
J. V. Stalin leaves Vladikavkaz for Moscow.

November 30
Pravda publishes an interview with J. V. Stalin on the situation in the Caucasus.

December 4
J. V. Stalin's article, "Long Live Soviet Armenia!" is printed in *Pravda*, No. 273.

December 22-29
J. V. Stalin takes part in the work of the Eighth All-Russian Congress of Soviets.

December 29
The Eighth All-Russian Congress of Soviets elects J. V. Stalin a member of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

December 31
The A.R.C.E.C. elects J. V. Stalin a member of its Presidium.

The Collected Works of Josef Stalin: Volume 4 is an important chronicle of the revolutionary years from 1917 to 1920-a period marked by the consolidation of Soviet power, civil war, and the fierce struggle against imperialist intervention. *Volume 4* of the *Works* captures Stalin's critical contributions as both a theorist and a leader in the newly established socialist state, offering readers a window into the strategic and practical challenges faced by the Bolsheviks in the wake of the October Revolution.

From his speeches on the national question and the defense of Soviet federalism to his directives on military strategy during the civil war, Stalin's writings in this volume reveal a revolutionary mind committed to the survival and success of the new proletarian state. His incisive analyses of counter-revolutionary threats, his unwavering support for the Red Army, and his calls for unity among the oppressed nationalities of the former Russian Empire underscore his role in fortifying the Soviet Republic against both internal and external enemies.

For scholars, organizers, and revolutionaries alike, *Volume 4* offers not just historical documentation but a profound study of revolutionary praxis during times of upheaval and war. This critical republication by Iskra Books ensures that Stalin's foundational contributions remain accessible to new generations committed to understanding the theory and practice of socialist construction.

POLITICS / HISTORY
Cover Art by Ben Stahnke

For a free PDF of this and other books in our catalog, visit:
iskrabooks.org

ISBN 979-8-2957-7649-6