INSTITUTE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU

AGAINST TROTSKYISM

THE STRUGGLE OF LENIN AND THE CPSU AGAINST TROTSKYISM

A Collection of Documents

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
Moscow

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

The works of Lenin (in their entirety or extracts) and the decisions adopted at congresses and conferences of the Bolshevik Party and at plenary meetings of the CC offered in this volume show that Trotskyism is an anti-Marxist, opportunist trend, show its subversive activities against the Communist Party and expose its ties with the opportunist leaders of the Second International and with revisionist, anti-Soviet trends and groups in the workers' parties of different countries. The resolutions passed by local Party organisations underscore the CPSU's unity against Trotskyism.

The addenda include decisions adopted by the Communist International and resolutions of the Soviet trade unions against Trotskyism. The *Notes* facilitate the use of the material published in this book.

First printing 1972

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

FOREWORD

Trotskyism is Marxism-Leninism's most sinister enemy. As an opportunist doctrine of the petty bourgeoisie it was first encountered by Lenin and the Party at the Second Congress of the RSDLP, in the period of Bolshevism's emergence.

Since then, at various stages of history, the Communist Party has had to wage an unrelenting fight with the utterly opportunist ideology and adventurist practices of Trotskyism. On the international scene Trotskyism has been and still is combated by other Marxist-Leninist Parties side by side with the CPSU.

The documents in this volume trace the struggle that Lenin and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union waged against Trotskyism and give convincing evidence of the absolute superiority and the sweeping victory of the historical truth of Leninism over the false and venomous ideology and pernicious practices of Trotskyism.

This volume has five sections.

The first consists of documents of the pre-revolutionary period. The earliest of these documents characterise the struggle waged against Trotskyism by Lenin and his supporters at the Second Congress of the RSDLP (1903), at which Trotsky made it quite plain that he represented the conciliatory, reformist trend in the European Social-Democratic movement and was an adversary of Bolshevism.

At that Congress Lenin and his supporters emphatically rejected the views of the opportunists, Trotsky among them, about the special place occupied by the Bund, a Jewish petty-bourgeois nationalistic organisation, in the Party and their misinterpretation of the meaning of "dictatorship of the proletariat". Trotsky vigorously backed the wording of the first paragraph of the Party Rules as formulated by Martov, a wording which would have given unstable petty-bourgeois elements access to the Party. "Comrade Trotsky," Lenin said at the Congress, "completely misinterpreted the main idea of my book, *What Is To Be Done?*" (see p. 24). Trotsky insisted that every striker should have the right to call himself a Party member, to which Lenin replied: "It would be better if ten who do work should not call themselves Party members (real workers don't hunt after titles!) than that one who only talks should have the right and opportunity to be a Party member" (p. 26).

The Party's split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks occurred at the Second Congress.

The course of events strikingly brought to the fore the substance of the disagreements between the Leninists, on the one hand, and the Mensheviks and Trotskyites, on the other. Led by Lenin, the Bolsheviks organised a close-knit revolutionary Party, which prepared and directed the socialist revolution, while the Mensheviks and Trotskyites clung to their reformism.

After the Second Congress Trotsky attacked its decisions. In a letter to Y. D. Stasova, F. V. Lengnik and others on October 14, 1904, Lenin wrote: "A new pamphlet by Trotsky came out recently.... The pamphlet is a pack of brazen lies, a distortion of the facts.... The Second Congress was, in his words, a reactionary attempt to consolidate sectarian methods of organisation, etc. The pamphlet is a slap in the face both for the present Editorial Board of the CO and for all Party workers" (p. 26).

During the first Russian revolution, Lenin and the Bolsheviks had to fight Trotsky over issues concerning the Party's theory and tactics. In 1905 Trotsky sought to counter Lenin's theory of the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution with his own so-called theory of "permanent revolution", which questioned the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic

revolution and denied the revolutionary potentialities of the peasantry as an ally of the proletariat.

In the period of reaction that followed, Lenin and the Bolsheviks fought on two fronts under incredibly difficult conditions: against the liquidators and the otzovists. Despite the declaration that they were "above factions", Trotsky and his small band of supporters preached that it was imperative to reconcile the revolutionaries with the opportunists within the Party, giving the liberal-bourgeois argument that the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks did not represent two different political schools but were only two groups of Social-Democratic intellectuals fighting for influence over the "politically immature proletariat". In a series of articles and letters Lenin exposed this approach of Trotsky to fundamental differences and his conciliatory attitudes and lack of principles. He wrote that "Trotsky behaves like a despicable careerist and factionalist.... He pays lip-service to the Party and behaves worse than any other of the factionalists" (p. 37). Lenin regarded Trotsky and his group as the most harmful and dangerous of all the shades of Menshevism. "Trotsky and the 'Trotskyites and conciliators' like him are more pernicious than any liquidator; the convinced liquidators state their views bluntly, and it is easy for the workers to detect where they are wrong, whereas the Trotskys *deceive* the workers, *cover up* the evil, and make it impossible to expose the evil and to remedy it" (p. 72). Lenin denounced the odious role played by the Trotskyites and called Trotsky Judas.

Lenin scathingly criticised Trotsky's political platform during the First World War, calling it a variety of Kautskyism.* Trotsky, in effect, supported the theory of "ultra-imperialism" and repeated Kautsky's thesis that war paralysed the revolutionary potentialities of the proletariat and, therefore, before thinking of revolution the working class had to secure peace. He rejected the Bolshevik slogan calling for the defeat of one's own government in the imperialist war in favour of a chauvinistic slogan demanding "neither victory nor defeat".

* Karl Kautsky (1854-1938) was a leader of the German Social-Democratic movement and of the Second International. He began as a Marxist but subsequently lapsed into renegacy and preached Centrism (Kautskyism), the most dangerous brand of opportunism.—*Ed.*

While giving verbal recognition to the theory that capitalism developed unevenly, Trotsky propounded the thesis that capitalist development was evening out and, on that basis, tried to prove that the socialist revolution could not be accomplished and that socialism could not be established in one country taken separately.

Lenin's teaching that the socialist revolution could be carried out initially in a few or even in one capitalist country and that socialism could not triumph simultaneously in all the capitalist countries was directed, in particular, against the views that were being expounded by Trotsky, who held that national economies could not provide the foundation for the socialist revolution and that "it was quite hopeless to carry on a struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat in any country taken separately; the proletariat can establish its dictatorship only on the scale of the whole of Europe, i.e., in the form of a European United States" (*Nashe Slovo*, February 4, 1916). This was the same double-dyed opportunism resting on the "permanent revolution" theory.

The Trotskyites lost all vestige of influence in the working-class movement long before 1917. When Trotsky arrived in Petrograd in 1917 he had to affiliate himself with the so-called Mezhrayontsi, a Social-Democratic group that vacillated between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. In August 1917 the Mezhrayontsi declared they had no differences with the Bolsheviks and joined the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks). Trotsky and his supporters joined the Party with them. Upon joining the Bolsheviks many of the Mezhrayontsi broke with opportunism. But, as subsequent developments showed, for Trotsky and some of his supporters this was only a formality: they went on propounding their pernicious views, flouted discipline and undermined the Party's ideological and organisational unity.

At the most crucial moment of the development of the socialist revolution—the period of preparation and the actual accomplishing of the October armed uprising in Petrograd—Lenin and the Bolshevik Party found they had once more to come to grips with Trotsky's totally untenable, harmful and dangerous views. Trotsky insisted that the uprising should be postponed until the Second Congress of Soviets. In practice, this meant wrecking the uprising, because the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks could

put off the date for the congress, thus giving the Provisional Government the possibility of massing its forces by that date and suppressing the uprising. Had it been accepted, this piece of adventurism might have been fatal. Lenin opportunely exposed Trotsky's demagogic stand, which was calculated for effect, and proved that the Provisional Goverment had to be overthrown before the Congress of Soviets opened.

The second section covers the period from 1918 to 1922. The documents dating from this period trace the struggle that Lenin and the Bolshevik Party waged against Trotsky's pseudo-revolutionary line, which inflicted enormous damage on the then young Soviet Republic at the time the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty was signed, and against his adventurist extremes during the years of the Civil War and foreign intervention. Much of the material in this section is drawn from Lenin's works and from Party decisions exposing Trotsky's open opposition to the Party in 1920 and 1921, during the debate of the question of the trade unions and during the transition to the New Economic Policy, when the question of preserving and consolidating the alliance between the working class and the peasants was of particular importance

The fight for the Brest peace in 1918 was a fight to preserve the Soviet Republic and strengthen the new system. The Soviet Republic was opposing the imperialist war and pressing for world peace. This struggle won massive support from the working people of the whole world for the Russian revolution.

Documents show that on the question of the Brest Peace Treaty Trotsky maintained an anti-Leninist stand, criminally exposing the newly emerged Soviet Republic to mortal danger. As head of the Soviet delegation to the peace talks, he ignored the instructions of the Party Central Committee and the Soviet Government. At a crucial moment of the talks he declared that the Soviet Republic was unilaterally withdrawing from the war, announced that the Russian Army was being demobilised, and left Brest-Litovsk. This gave the German Command the pretext it desired for ending the armistice. "We can only be saved, in the true meaning of the word, by a European revolution," he said (Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the RCP(B), verbatim report, Russ.

ed., Moscow, 1962, p. 65). The German Army mounted an offensive and occupied considerable territory. As a result, much harsher peace terms were put forward by the German Government. On account of Trotsky's adventurism, Lenin wrote, Soviet Russia signed "a much more humiliating peace, and the blame for this rests upon those who refused to accept the former peace" (p. 139).

Though it was short-lived, the respite given by the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty was of immense significance. It allowed the Soviet Republic to withdraw from the world war and prepare to repulse the foreign intervention and the internal counter-revolution.

The Civil War of 1918-1920 ended in victory for the Soviet Republic. The country embarked on economic rejuvenation and started healing the terrible wounds inflicted by the imperialist intervention and the whiteguard counter-revolution. The Party switched from war communism to the New Economic Policy as charted by Lenin, who pointed out that the prime task in the obtaining situation was to restore industry. This, he said, could not be achieved without first securing an upsurge in agriculture and drawing the workers and their trade unions into active socialist construction. The way to resolve these problems was not through pressure and compulsion but through planned organisation, persuasion and the use of incentives.

At this critical period, Trotsky and other enemies of Leninism forced the Party to start a discussion on the question of the trade unions. At a time when every effort had to be directed towards the fight against famine and economic dislocation, the attainment of a rise of agricultural production and the restoration of industry, the Party's attention was diverted by this discussion. At a meeting of the RCP(B)* group at the Fifth All-Russia Trade Union Conference Trotsky insisted on "tightening up the screws" and "shaking up" the trade unions, on turning the trade unions forthwith into state agencies in order to replace persuasion by compulsion.

In a speech under the heading "The Trade Unions, the Current Situation and Trotsky's Mistakes", the article "The

* RCP(B)—Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)—the name by which the Party was known from 1918 onwards. In 1925 it was renamed the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks).—*Ed.*

Party Crisis", the pamphlet *Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin*, and other works included in this volume Lenin denounced the Trotskyites' anti-Marxist approach to the question of the role and tasks of the trade unions in socialist construction. He showed that Trotsky's line of turning the trade unions into part of the state machine would lead to their abolition and the undermining of the proletarian dictatorship. In effect, the issue in the trade union discussion forced on the Party by Trotsky was "the attitude to the peasants, who had risen against war communism, the attitude to the non-Party mass of workers, generally the Party's attitude to the masses at a time when the Civil War had ended" (p. 247).

In the discussion the opposition was overwhelmingly defeated in all the main Party organisations. The Party rallied round Lenin, supporting his platform and rejecting the line propounded by the Trotsky faction and other opposition groups.

The results of this discussion were summed up by the Tenth Party Congress (March 1921), whose decisions defined the role and tasks of the trade unions under the dictatorship of the proletariat. At this Congress Lenin again exposed the anti-Party substance of the policy pursued by the Trotskyites and other opposition groups. On his proposal the Congress passed a decision on Party unity, which firmly laid down that all factions were to be disbanded immediately and that Party organisations should henceforth prohibit all factional action. "Non-fulfilment of this decision of the Congress," it was stated, "shall be followed by unconditional and immediate expulsion from the Party" (p. 230).

The resolutions adopted by Party organs on the struggle against Trotskyism in 1923-1925 are to be found in the third section of this volume.

At a joint plenary meeting with representatives of ten of the largest Party organisations in October 1923, the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission discussed the situation in the Party and condemned Trotsky's anti-Party letter and the Statement of 46 concocted by the Trotskyites and other opposition groups: "The plenary meetings of the CC, the CCC and representatives of 10

Party organisations unequivocally condemn the Statement of 46 as a step in factional and divisive politics.... This Statement threatens to embroil the entire Party in an inner-Party struggle during the next few months and thereby weaken the Party at a most crucial moment to the destinies of the international revolution" (p. 236).

In a pamphlet entitled *The New Line*, Trotsky accused the Party leadership of degeneration and counterposed young people, particularly students, to veteran Bolsheviks. To flatter young people, he called them the "barometer of the Party".

The Thirteenth Conference of the RCP(B), held in January 1924, passed a resolution—"Results of the Discussion and the Petty-Bourgeois Deviation in the Party"—which sharply condemned the factional activities of Trotsky and his supporters and stated that "the present opposition is not only an attempt to revise Bolshevism, not only a flagrant departure from Leninism but patently a *petty-bourgeois deviation.* There is no doubt whatever that this opposition objectively mirrors the pressure of the petty-bourgeoisie on the position of the proletarian Party and its policy" (p. 241).

This resolution was endorsed by the Thirteenth Congress of the RCP(B).

In the autumn of 1924, after Lenin's death, Trotsky published an article in which he extolled his own role in the revolution, brought out his old idea of "permanent revolution" and again argued that hostile collisions were inevitable between the proletarian vanguard and the broad peasant masses.

At a plenary meeting on January 17-20, 1925 the Central Committee of the RCP(B) qualified Trotsky's unceasing attacks on Bolshevism as an attempt *to substitute Trotskyism for Leninism.* By decision of this plenary meeting Trotsky was removed from the office of Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council of the USSR. He was "warned in the most emphatic terms that membership of the Bolshevik Party demands real, not verbal, subordination to Party discipline and total and unconditional renunciation of any attacks on the ideals of Leninism" (p. 254).

A New Opposition led by Zinoviev and Kamenev attacked the Leninist line at the Fourteenth Party Congress, which

was convened at the close of December 1925. Only recently Zinoviev and Kamenev had been opposed to the Trotskyites, but then they themselves sank to the positions of Trotskyism.

After a crushing defeat at the Fourteenth Congress, the New Opposition openly embraced Trotskyism. An anti-Party opposition bloc, which was joined by the remnants of other opposition groups, smashed by the Party, now took shape.

The fourth section offers documents tracing the Party's struggle against Trotskyism in 1926 and 1927.

In the autumn of 1926 the leaders of the Trotskyite bloc made an open anti-Party sally, speaking at Party meetings at the Aviapribor Works in Moscow and the Putilov Works in Leningrad, where they demanded a discussion of their anti-Leninist platform. The Communist workers sharply denounced them and made them leave these meetings. This induced them to beat a retreat: they sent a statement to the Central Committee in which they hypocritically recanted their errors. Actually, they formed an illegal party of their own and held secret meetings, at which they discussed their factional platform and the tactics to be adopted against the Communist Party.

The Fifteenth All-Union Party Conference, held in October-November 1926, characterised the Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition as a Menshevik deviation in the Party and warned them that further evolution towards Menshevism would lead to their expulsion from the Party. The conference called on all Communists to adopt a determined stand against the opposition bloc.

The Seventh Extended Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive, held shortly afterwards, endorsed the Fifteenth Party Conference resolution on the opposition bloc and made it incumbent on Communist parties to put down the attempts of the Trotskyites to split the international communist movement.

The Trotskyites did not cease their anti-Party activities despite their defeat in the Party, the working class and the international communist movement. They took advantage of the difficulties at home and also the deterioration of the Soviet Union's international position to come forward with their so-called "platform of 83", in which they renewed

their slander against the Party. They claimed that the Party and the Soviet Government were out to abolish the monopoly of foreign trade and grant political rights to the kulaks. A huge edition of this "platform" was printed at an underground printshop and circulated among Party members and non-Party people.

An end had to be put to this anti-Party activity. Convened in October 1927, a joint plenary meeting of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission exposed the anti-Leninist essence of the opposition platform and expelled Trotsky and Zinoviev from the Central Committee for their factional activities against the Party and its unity. At this plenary meeting it was decided to submit all the materials on the divisive activities of the Trotsky opposition for consideration by the Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party.

During the Party discussion that preceded the Fifteenth Congress, 724,000 members voted in favour of the Central Committee's Leninist policy, while the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc received only 4,000 votes, i.e., half of one per cent of the participants in this discussion. This was a staggering defeat for the opposition.

It was now obvious that the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc had suffered political bankruptcy and was isolated from the Party masses. It, therefore, went over from factional activity within the Party to an anti-Soviet, counter-revolutionary struggle.

After their total defeat in the Party organisations, the opposition members tried to appeal to the non-Party masses in the hope of making them rise against the Communist Party and the Soviet power. They held their illegal conferences at private homes in Moscow and Leningrad, working out a plan of action for the coming demonstration on November 7. They decided to speak on that day, shout their slogans and display the portraits of their leaders. On November 4 the Trotskyites forced their way into the Higher Technical School in Moscow and held a factional meeting. In some towns they printed anti-Soviet leaflets illegally, scattering them at factories and pasting them on fences and posts.

On the 10th anniversary of the October Revolution they tried to organise anti-Soviet actions in Moscow and

Leningrad, but were swept off the streets by demonstrations of working people, who expressed their complete confidence in the Communist Party and the Soviet Government.

The November 7 actions of the opposition showed that it had become a counter-revolutionary force openly hostile to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Having flouted all the standards of Party life, the Trotskyites now began to violate state laws, demonstrating their anti-Soviet, anti-popular aspirations.

On November 14, 1927, in fulfilment of the will of the Party masses, the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission expelled Trotsky and Zinoviev from the Party; other members of their group were removed from the CC and the CCC.

The defeat of Trotskyism was completed by the Fifteenth Party Congress (December 1927). It found that the opposition had ideologically broken with Leninism, degenerated into a Menshevik group, taken the road of capitulation to the international and internal bourgeoisie and become a weapon against the proletarian dictatorship. It, therefore, endorsed the decision of the CC and CCC to expel Trotsky and Zinoviev, and expelled another 75 members of their group. It instructed Party organisations to purge their ranks of patently incorrigible Trotskyites and institute measures to influence the rank-and-file members of the opposition ideologically in order to persuade them to abandon Trotskyite views and go over to the positions of Leninism.

Party unity is dealt with in the fifth section, which consists of resolutions adopted by local Party organisations on the struggle against Trotskyism (1923-1927).

After the Fifteenth Congress many rank-and-file members of the opposition bloc realised their delusions, renounced Trotskyism and were re-established as Party members. However, spurred by his implacable enmity for Leninism, Trotsky did not down arms, with the result that in 1929 he was expelled from the Soviet Union. The Leninist Party thus finally smashed the Trotsky opposition ideologically and organisationally.

However, under various guises Trotskyite ideology continues to harm the liberation movement.

Present-day Trotskyism has many aspects. Following the example of Trotsky, its spiritual father, it is capable

of acquiring any hue and adapting itself to any revolutionary trend in order to blow it up from within.

The problem of the unity and cohesion of the anti-imperialist forces, above all, of the communist and working-class movement, received considerable attention at the 24th Congress of the CPSU, which was held in Moscow in March-April 1971. It was noted that recent years had witnessed an animation of Right and "Left" opportunism and violent attacks by various splinter groups on Marxism-Leninism as the ideological and theoretical guideline of the communist movement. Modern Trotskyism, it was pointed out, had actively aligned itself with these splinter groups, which the present Chinese leadership was setting up in various countries. Speaking from the congress rostrum the delegates and the numerous foreign guests stressed their determination to wage a tireless fight against all these attacks, including the assaults of the Trotskyites, and work to strengthen the unity and solidarity of the communist and working-class movement on the unshakable foundation of the Marxist-Leninist teaching.

At various stages Trotskyism united and headed different opportunist trends. This was made possible by Trotskyism's ability to use ultra-revolutionary verbiage to mask its opportunist concepts and thereby tempt and attract people with little experience of politics and no or inadequate knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory. Delusions of a Trotskyite hue sometimes disorient part of the revolutionary-minded youth, who, on account of their inexperience, are unable to find the road to genuinely revolutionary theory, to communist ideology.

Modern Trotskyism seeks to emasculate Marxism-Leninism of its revolutionary content, helps the agents of imperialism to fight the Marxist-Leninist teaching and resorts to ultra-revolutionary clamour in an effort to sow the poisonous seeds of adventurism among young people.

In the capitalist countries, the radical, democratic youth are looking for a way out of oppression and exploitation and seeking the means of fighting social injustice. By their own reformist practices most of the Socialist and Social-Democratic parties are increasingly demonstrating that they are spokesmen of the capitalist system. The finest and most politically conscious young people are adopting Marxism-

Leninism, which gives them a wider political horizon, indicates effective ways of fighting imperialism and shows them the prospects for the triumph of the socialist revolution.

There is no doubt that the temporary attraction that a section of the young people in the capitalist countries has for the modern Trotskyite slogans with their tub-thumping and pseudo-revolutionary veneer will pass. And there is no doubt that in the course of the revolutionary struggle led by the Communist and Workers' Parties, who are armed with the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, Trotskyite ideology with its opportunism and adventurism will be exposed again and again and swept away, as has repeatedly been the case in the past. The viability and invincibility of Marxism-Leninism are shown by the documents in this volume tracing the struggle the Communist Party and the working people of the Soviet Union waged against the petty-bourgeois anti-Leninist ideology and practice of Trotskyism.

The addenda include decisions of the Communist International and resolutions adopted by the trade unions against Trotskyism.

This volume was compiled by *B. S. Ulasov* and *I. P. Ganenko* under the direction of *A. A. Solovyov.*

Institute of Marxism-Leninism,
Central Committee of the CPSU

LENIN'S CRITICISM OF THE OPPORTUNIST VIEWS OF THE TROTSKYITES AND EXPOSURE OF THEIR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN 1903-1917

SECOND CONGRESS OF THE RSDLP[1]

July 17 (30)-August 10 (23), 1903*

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECHES ON THE DISCUSSION OF THE PARTY RULES

August 2(15)

1

Lenin delivers a brief speech in support of his formulation, emphasising in particular its stimulating effect: "Organise!"[2] It must not be imagined that Party organisations must consist solely of professional revolutionaries. We need the most diverse organisations of all types, ranks and shades, beginning with extremely limited and secret and ending with very broad, free *lose Organisationen.* Its endorsement by the Central Committee is an essential condition for a Party organisation.

2

I should like first of all to make two remarks on minor points. First, on the subject of Axelrod's kind proposal (I am not speaking ironically) to "strike a bargain". I would willingly respond to this appeal, for I by no means consider our difference so vital as to be a matter of life or death to the Party. We shall certainly not perish because of an unfortunate clause in the Rules! But since it has come to the point of choosing between *two* formulations, I simply cannot

* The double dates are necessary because the Julian calendar was used in Russia at the time. The switch to the new calendar (figures in parentheses) was made in February 1918.—*Ed.*

abandon my firm conviction that Martov's formulation is *worse* than the original draft and *may*, in certain circumstances, cause no little harm to the Party. The second remark concerns Comrade Brucker. It is only natural for Comrade Brucker, who wishes to apply the elective principle everywhere, to have accepted my formulation, the only one that defines at all exactly the concept of a Party *member*. I therefore fail to understand Comrade Martov's delight at Comrade Brucker's agreement with me. Is it possible that in actual fact Comrade Martov makes a point of *guiding* himself by the opposite of what Brucker says, without examining his motives and arguments?

To come to the main subject, I must say that Comrade Trotsky has completely misunderstood Comrade Plekhanov's fundamental idea, and his arguments have therefore evaded the gist of the matter. He has spoken of intellectuals and workers, of the class point of view and of the mass movement, but he has failed to notice a basic question, does my formulation narrow or expand the concept of a Party member? If he had asked himself that question, he would easily have seen that my formulation narrows this concept, while Martov's expands it, for (to use Martov's own correct expression) what distinguishes his concept is its "elasticity". And in the period of Party life that we are now passing through it is just this "elasticity" that undoubtedly opens the door to all elements of confusion, vacillation, and opportunism. To refute this simple and obvious conclusion it has to be proved that there are no such elements; but it has not even occurred to Comrade Trotsky to do that. Nor can that be proved, for everyone knows that such elements exist in plenty, and that they are to be found in the working class too. The need to safeguard the firmness of the Party's line and the purity of its principles has now become particularly urgent, for, with the restoration of its unity, the Party will recruit into its ranks a great many unstable elements, whose number will increase with the growth of the Party. Comrade Trotsky completely misinterpreted the main idea of my book, *What Is to Be Done?*, when he spoke about the Party not being a conspiratorial organisation (many others too raised this objection). He forgot that in my book I propose a number of various types of organisations, from the most secret and most exclusive to compara-

tively broad and "loose" (*lose*) organisations.* He forgot that the Party must be only the vanguard, the leader of the vast masses of the working class, the whole (or nearly the whole) of which works "under the control and direction" of the Party organisations, but the whole of which does not and should not belong to a "party". Now let us see what conclusions Comrade Trotsky arrives at in consequence of his fundamental mistake. He has told us here that if rank after rank of workers were arrested, and all the workers were to declare that they did not belong to the Party, our Party would be a strange one indeed! Is it not the other way round? Is it not Comrade Trotsky's argument that is strange? He regards as something sad that which a revolutionary with any experience at all would only rejoice at. If hundreds and thousands of workers who were arrested for taking part in strikes and demonstrations did not prove to be members of Party organisations, it would only show that we have good organisations, and that we are fulfilling our task of keeping a more or less limited circle of leaders secret and of drawing the broadest possible masses into the movement.

The root of the mistake made by those who stand for Martov's formulation is that they not only ignore one of the main evils of our Party life, but even sanctify it. The evil is that, at a time when political discontent is almost universal, when conditions require our work to be carried on in complete secrecy, and when most of our activities have to be confined to limited, secret circles and even to private meetings, it is extremely difficult, almost impossible in fact, for us to distinguish those who only talk from those who do the work. There is hardly another country in the world where the jumbling of these two categories is as common and as productive of such boundless confusion and harm as in Russia. We are suffering sorely from this evil not only among the intelligentsia, but also among the working class, and Comrade Martov's formulation sanctions it. This formulation necessarily tends to make Party members of *all and sundry*; Comrade Martov himself was forced to admit this, although with a reservation: "Yes, if you like," he said. But that is precisely what we do not like! And

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 459.—*Ed.*

that is precisely why we are so adamant in our opposition to Martov's formulation. It would be better if ten who do work should not call themselves Party members (real workers don't hunt after titles!) than that one who only talks should have the right and opportunity to be a Party member. That is a principle which seems to me irrefutable, and which compels me to fight against Martov.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 6, pp. 500-03

From THE LETTER TO Y. D. STASOVA, F. V. LENGNIK, AND OTHERS*

14/X. [1904]

A new pamphlet by Trotsky came out recently, under the editorship of *Iskra*, as was announced. This makes it the "Credo" as it were of the new *Iskra*.[3] The pamphlet is a pack of brazen lies, a distortion of the facts. And this is done under the editorship of the CO. The work of the *Iskra* group is vilified in every way, the Economists,[4] it is alleged, did far more, the *Iskra* group displayed no initiative, they gave no thought to the proletariat, were more concerned with the bourgeois intelligentsia, introduced a deadly bureaucracy everywhere—their work was reduced to carrying out the programme of the famous "Credo". The Second Congress was, in his words, a reactionary attempt to consolidate sectarian methods of organisation, etc. The pamphlet is a slap in the face both for the present Editorial Board of the CO and for all Party workers. Reading a pamphlet of this kind you can see clearly that the "Minority" has indulged in so much lying and falsehood that it will be incapable of producing anything viable, and one wants to fight, here there is something worth fighting for.

Kol's wife is well, she is in Yekaterinoslav.

Warm greetings to all of you.
Starik & Co.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 43, p. 129

* Written by Krupskaya on Lenin's instructions.—*Ed.*

From SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND THE PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT[5]

March 1905*

. . .Parvus managed at last to go forward, instead of moving backward like a crab. He refused to perform the Sisyphean labour[6] of endlessly correcting Martynov's and Martov's follies. He openly advocated (unfortunately, together with Trotsky) the idea of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship,** the idea that it was the duty of Social-Democrats to take part in the provisional revolutionary government after the overthrow of the autocracy. Parvus is profoundly right in saying that the Social-Democrats must not fear to take bold strides forward, to deal joint "blows" at the enemy, shoulder to shoulder with the revolutionary bourgeois democrats, on the definite understanding, however (very appropriately brought to mind), that the organisations are not to be merged, that we march separately but strike together, that we do not conceal the diversity of interests, that we watch our ally as we would our enemy, etc.

But for all our warm sympathy for these slogans of a revolutionary Social-Democrat who has turned away from the tail-enders,*** we could not help feeling jarred by certain false notes that Parvus struck. We mention these slight errors, not out of captiousness, but because from him to

---

* The date shows the time of writing or the first publication.—*Ed.*

** In the manuscript: "He openly advocated (unfortunately with the windbag Trotsky in a foreword to the latter's bombastic pamphlet *Before the Ninth of January*) the idea of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship. . .".—*Ed.*

*** A note in the manuscript says: "*Iskra* is modestly silent over the matter of Trotsky's pamphlet with Parvus's preface, published in the Party printshop. Of course, it is not in its interests to disentangle the muddle: Martynov pulls one way and Parvus pulls the other way, but we'll say nothing until Plekhanov pulls Martov out by his ears! And we call this 'Ideological leadership of the Party'! Incidentally, I'll mention a 'formalistic' curiosity. Our sages in the Council[7] have decreed the Party signature is only permissible on pamphlets published on instructions from Party organisations. It would be interesting to learn from these sages what organisation requested the publication of the pamphlet of Nadezhdin, Trotsky and others? Or were the people right who called the above-mentioned 'decree' a scurvy sectarian trick against Lenin's publishing house?"—*Ed.*

whom much is given, much is demanded. It would be most dangerous at present for Parvus to compromise his correct position by his own imprudence. Among the imprudent, to say the least, is the following sentence in his preface to Trotsky's pamphlet: "If we wish to keep the revolutionary proletariat apart from the other political currents, we must learn to stand ideologically at the head of the revolutionary movement" (this is correct), "to be more revolutionary than anyone else". This is incorrect. That is to say, it is incorrect, if the statement is taken in the general sense in which it is expressed by Parvus; it is incorrect from the point of view of the reader to whom this preface is something standing by itself, apart from Martynov and the new-Iskrists, whom Parvus does not mention. If we examine this statement dialectically, i.e., relatively, concretely, in all its aspects, and not after the manner of those literary jockeys, who, even many years after, snatch separate sentences from some single work and distort their meaning, it will become clear that Parvus directs the assertion expressly against tailism, *to which extent* he is right (compare particularly his subsequent words: "If we *lag behind* revolutionary development", etc.). But the reader cannot have in mind only tail-enders, since there are others besides tail-enders among the dangerous friends of the revolution in the camp of the revolutionaries—there are the "Socialists-Revolutionaries",[8] there are people like the Nadezhdins, who are swept along by the tide of events and are helpless in the face of revolutionary phrases; or those who are guided by instinct rather than by a revolutionary outlook (like Gapon). These Parvus forgot; he forgot them because his presentation, the development of his thoughts, was not free, but was hampered by the pleasant memory of the very Martynovism against which he seeks to warn the reader. Parvus's exposition is not sufficiently concrete because he does not consider the totality of the various revolutionary currents in Russia, which are inevitable in the epoch of democratic revolution and which naturally reflect the still unstratified classes of society in such an epoch. At such a time, revolutionary-democratic programmes are quite naturally veiled in vague, even reactionary, socialist ideas concealed behind revolutionary phrases (to wit, the Socialists-Revolutionaries and Nadezhdin, who, it seems, changed only his label when he went

over from the "revolutionary socialists" to the new *Iskra*). Under such circumstances we, the Social-Democrats, never can and never will advance the slogan "Be more revolutionary than anyone else". We shall not even try to keep up with the revolutionariness of a democrat who is detached from his class basis, who has a weakness for fine phrases and flaunts catchwords and cheap slogans (especially in agrarian matters). On the contrary, we will always be critical of such revolutionariness; we will expose the real meaning of words, the real content of idealised great events; and we will teach the need for a sober evaluation of the classes and shadings within the classes, even in the hottest situations of the revolution.

Equally incorrect, for the same reason, are Parvus's statements that "the revolutionary provisional government in Russia will be a government of working-class democracy", that "if the Social-Democrats are at the head of the revolutionary movement of the Russian proletariat, this government will be a Social-Democratic government", that the Social-Democratic provisional government "will be an integral government with a Social-Democratic majority". This is *impossible*, unless we speak of fortuitous, transient episodes, and not of a revolutionary dictatorship that will be at all durable and capable of leaving its mark in history. This is impossible, because only a revolutionary dictatorship supported by the vast majority of the people can be at all durable (not absolutely, of course, but relatively). The Russian proletariat, however, is at present a minority of the population in Russia. It can become the great, overwhelming majority only if it combines with the mass of semi-proletarians, semi-proprietors, i.e., with the mass of the petty-bourgeois urban and rural poor. Such a composition of the social basis of the possible and desirable revolutionary-democratic dictatorship will, of course, affect the composition of the revolutionary government and inevitably lead to the participation, or even predominance, within it of the most heterogeneous representatives of revolutionary democracy. It would be extremely harmful to entertain any illusions on this score. If that windbag Trotsky now writes (unfortunately, side by side with Parvus) that "a Father Gapon could appear only once", that "there is no room for a second Gapon", he does so simply because he is a windbag. If

there were no room in Russia for a second Gapon, there would be no room for a truly "great", consummated democratic revolution. To become great, to evoke 1789-93, not 1848-50, and to surpass those years, it must rouse the vast masses to active life, to heroic efforts, to "fundamental historic creativeness"; it must raise them out of frightful ignorance, unparalleled oppression, incredible backwardness, and abysmal dullness. The revolution is already raising them and will raise them completely; the government itself is facilitating the process by its desperate resistance. But, of course, there can be no question of a mature political consciousness, of a Social-Democratic consciousness of these masses or their numerous "native" popular leaders or even "muzhik" leaders. They cannot become Social-Democrats at once without first passing a number of revolutionary tests, not only because of their ignorance (revolution, we repeat, enlightens with marvellous speed), but because their class position is not proletarian, because the objective logic of historical development confronts them at the present time with the tasks, not of a socialist, but of a democratic revolution.

In this revolution, the revolutionary proletariat will participate with the utmost energy, sweeping aside the miserable tail-ism of some and the revolutionary phrases of others. It will bring class definiteness and consciousness into the dizzying whirlwind of events, and march on intrepidly and unswervingly, not fearing, but fervently desiring, the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship, fighting for the republic and for complete republican liberties, fighting for substantial economic reforms, in order to create for itself a truly large arena, an arena worthy of the twentieth century, in which to carry on the struggle for socialism.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 8, pp. 289-92

FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE RSDLP

April 30-May 19 (May 13-June 1), 1907[9]

From SPEECH ON THE REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE DUMA GROUP

May 8(21)

A few words about Trotsky. He spoke on behalf of the "Centre", and expressed the views of the Bund.[10] He fulminated against us for introducing our "unacceptable" resolution. He threatened an outright split, the withdrawal of the Duma group, which is supposedly offended by our resolution. I emphasise these words. I urge you to reread our resolution attentively.

Is it not monstrous to see something offensive in a calm acknowledgement of mistakes, unaccompanied by any sharply expressed censure, to speak of a split in connection with it? Does this not show the sickness in our Party, a fear of admitting mistakes, a fear of criticising the Duma group?

The very possibility that the question can be presented in this way shows that there is something non-partisan in our Party. This non-partisan something is the Duma group's relations with the Party. The Duma group must be more of a Party group, must have closer connections with the Party, must be more subordinate to all proletarian work. Then wailings about insults and threats of a split will disappear.

When Trotsky stated: "Your unacceptable resolution prevents your right ideas being put into effect", I called out to him: "Give us *your* resolution." Trotsky replied: "No, first withdraw yours."

A fine position indeed for the "Centre" to take, isn't it? Because of our (in Trotsky's opinion) mistake ("tactlessness"), he punishes the whole Party, depriving it of his "tactful" exposition of the very same principles. Why did you not get your resolution passed, we shall be asked in the localities. Because the Centre took umbrage at it, and in a huff refused to set forth its own principles! (*Applause from the Bolsheviks and part of the Centre.*) That is a position based not on principle, but on the Centre's lack of principle.

We came to the Congress with two tactical lines which have long been known to the Party. It would be stupid and unworthy of a workers' party to cover up differences of opinion and conceal them. We must compare the two points of view more clearly. We must express them in their application to all questions of our policy. We must sum up our Party experience clearly. Only in this way shall we be doing our duty and put an end to vacillation in the policy of the proletariat. (*Applause from the Bolsheviks and part of the Centre.*)

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 12, pp. 451-52

From THE AIM OF THE PROLETARIAN STRUGGLE IN OUR REVOLUTION

March (April) 1909

III

As for Trotsky, whom Comrade Martov has involved in the controversy of third parties which he has organised—a controversy involving everybody except the dissentient—we positively cannot go into a full examination of his views here. A separate article of considerable length would be needed for this. By just touching upon Trotsky's mistaken views, and quoting scraps of them, Comrade Martov only sows confusion in the mind of the reader, for scraps of quotations do not explain but confuse matters. Trotsky's major mistake is that he ignores the bourgeois character of the revolution and has no clear conception of the transition from this revolution to the socialist revolution. This major mistake leads to those mistakes on side issues which Comrade Martov *repeats* when he quotes a couple of them with sympathy and approval. Not to leave matters in the confused state to which Comrade Martov has reduced them by his exposition, we shall at least expose the fallacy of those arguments of Trotsky which have won the approval of Comrade Martov. A coalition of the proletariat and the peasantry "presupposes either that the peasantry will come

under the sway of one of the existing bourgeois parties, or that it will form a powerful independent party". This is obviously untrue both from the standpoint of general theory and from that of the experience of the Russian revolution. A "coalition" of classes *does not at all* presuppose *either* the existence of any particular powerful party, *or* parties in general. This is only confusing classes with parties. A "coalition" of the specified classes *does not in the least* imply *either* that one of the existing bourgeois parties will establish its sway over the peasantry *or* that the peasants should form a powerful independent party! Theoretically this is clear because, first, the peasants do not lend themselves very well to party organisation; and because, secondly, the formation of peasant parties is an extremely difficult and lengthy process in a bourgeois revolution, so that a "powerful independent" party may emerge only towards the end of the revolution. The experience of the Russian revolution shows that "coalitions" of the proletariat and the peasantry were formed *scores and hundreds of times*, in the most diverse forms, without any "powerful independent party" of the peasantry. Such a coalition was formed when there was "joint action", between, say, a Soviet of Workers' Deputies and a Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies, or a Railwaymen's Strike Committee, or Peasants' Deputies, etc. All these organisations were mainly *non-party*; nevertheless, every joint action between them undoubtedly represented a "coalition" of *classes*. In the course of this a peasant party took shape as an idea, in germ, coming into being in the form of the Peasant Union[11] of 1905, or the Trudovik group of 1906—and *as* such a party grew, developed and constituted itself, the coalition of *classes* assumed different forms, from the vague and unofficial to definite and official political agreements. After the dissolution of the First Duma, for example, the following *three* calls for insurrection were issued: (1) "To the Army and Navy", (2) "To all the Russian Peasants", (3) "To the Whole People". The first was signed by the Social-Democratic group in the Duma and the Committee of the Trudovik group. Was this "joint action" evidence of *a coalition of two classes*? Of course it was. To deny it means to engage in pettifoggery, or to narrow the broad scientific concept of a "coalition of classes" to a strictly juridical concept, almost that—I would say—of a notary.

Further, can it be denied that this joint *call* for insurrection, signed by the Duma deputies of the working class and peasantry, was accompanied by joint *actions* of representatives of both classes in the form of partial local insurrections? Can it be denied that a joint call for a general insurrection and joint participation in local and partial insurrections necessarily implies the joint formation of a provisional revolutionary government? To deny it would mean to engage in pettifoggery, to reduce the concept of "government" to something completely and formally constituted, to forget that the complete and formally constituted develop from the incomplete and unconstituted.

To proceed. The second call for insurrection was signed by the *Central Committee* (Menshevik!) of the RSDLP and also the Central Committee of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, the All-Russia Peasant Union, the All-Russia Railwaymen's[12] and the All-Russia Teachers' Unions,[13] as well as by the Committee of the Trudovik group and the Social-Democratic group in the Duma. The third call for insurrection bears the signatures of the Polish Socialist Party and the Bund, plus all the foregoing signatures except the three unions.

That was a fully constituted political coalition of parties and non-party organisations! That was "the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" *proclaimed* in the form of a threat to tsarism, in the form of a call to the whole people, but not yet realised! And today one will hardly find many Social-Democrats who would agree with the Menshevik *Sotsial-Demokrat*[14] of 1906, No. 6, which wrote of these appeals: "In this case our Party concluded with other revolutionary parties and groups not a political bloc, but a fighting agreement, which we have always considered expedient and necessary" (cf. *Proletary* No. 1, August 21, 1906 and No. 8, November 23, 1906*). A fighting agreement cannot be contraposed to a political bloc, for the latter concept embraces the former. A political bloc at various historical moments takes the form either of a "fighting agreement" in connection with insurrection, or of a parliamentary agreement for "joint action against the Black

* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, pp. 150-66, 307-19.—*Ed.*

Hundreds and Cadets", and so on. The idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry has found its practical expression throughout our revolution in a thousand forms, from the signing of the manifesto calling upon the people to pay no taxes and to withdraw their deposits from the savings-banks (December 1905), or the signing of calls to insurrection (July 1906), to voting in the Second and Third Dumas in 1907 and 1908.

Trotsky's second statement quoted by Comrade Martov is wrong too. It is not true that "the whole question is, who will determine the government's policy, who will constitute a homogeneous majority in it", and so forth. And it is particularly untrue when Comrade Martov uses it as an argument against the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. Trotsky himself, in the course of his argument, concedes that "representatives of the democratic population will take part" in the "workers' government", i.e., concedes that there will be a government consisting of representatives of the proletariat *and* the peasantry. On what terms the proletariat will take part in the government of the revolution is another question, and it is quite likely that on this question the Bolsheviks will disagree not only with Trotsky, but also with the Polish Social-Democrats. The question of the dictatorship of the revolutionary classes, however, cannot be reduced to a question of the "majority" in any particular revolutionary government, or of the terms on which the participation of the Social-Democrats in such a government is admissible.

Lastly, the most fallacious of Trotsky's opinions that Comrade Martov quotes and considers to be "just" is the third, viz.: "even if they [the peasantry]* do this ["support the regime of working-class democracy"] with no more political understanding than they usually support a bourgeois regime." The proletariat cannot count on the ignorance and prejudices of the peasantry as the powers that be under a bourgeois regime count and depend on them, nor can it assume that in time of revolution the peasantry will remain in their usual state of political ignorance and passivity. The history of the Russian revolution shows that the very first

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

wave of the upsurge at the end of 1905 at once stimulated the peasantry to form a political organisation (the All-Russia Peasant Union), which was undoubtedly the embryo of a distinct peasant party. Both in the First and Second Dumas—in spite of the fact that the counter-revolution had wiped out the first contingents of advanced peasants—the peasantry, now for the first time acting on a nation-wide scale in the all-Russia general elections, immediately laid the foundations of the Trudovik group, which was undoubtedly the embryo of a distinct peasant party. In these embryos and rudiments there was much that was unstable, vague and vacillating: that is beyond doubt. But if political groups like this could spring up at the beginning of the revolution, there cannot be the slightest doubt that a revolution carried to such a "conclusion", or rather, to such a high stage of development as a revolutionary dictatorship, will produce a more definitely constituted and stronger revolutionary peasant party. To think otherwise would be like supposing that some vital organs of an adult can retain the size, shape and development of infancy.

In any case, Comrade Martov's conclusion that the conference agreed with Trotsky, of all people, on the question of the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry in the struggle for power is an amazing contradiction of the facts, is an attempt to read into *a word* a meaning that was never discussed, not mentioned and not even thought of at the conference.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 15, pp. 370-74

TO G. Y. ZINOVIEV

[August 24, 1909]

Dear Gr.,

I have received No. 7-8 of *Sotsial-Demokrat*.[15] I object to Trotsky's *signature*; signatures must be omitted. (I have not yet read the articles.)

As regards *Proletary*, I think we should insert in it (1) an

article on the elections in St. Petersburg (in connection with the claptrap of *Rech* and Vodovozov, if *Rech* has not misreported him); (2) on the Swedish strike— a summing-up article is essential; (3) ditto on the Spanish events[16]; (4) on the Mensheviks, in connection with their (very vile) polemic with the Geneva (Georgien[17]) anti-liquidator; (5) in the supplement as a special sheet, an answer to the "Open Letter" of Maximov and Co.[18] A proper answer must be given to them so that these scoundrels do not mislead people by their lies.

After three weeks' holiday, I am beginning to come round. I think I could take No. 4 and 5 upon myself, if need be No. 1 as well, but I am still afraid to promise. Write me your opinion and the exact *deadlines*. What else is there for *Proletary*?

No. 2 and 3 can be made up from *Vorwärts*[19]; I shall send it to you, if you will undertake to write.

As regards *Pravda*,[20] have you read Trotsky's letter to Inok? If you have, I hope it has convinced you that Trotsky behaves like a despicable careerist and factionalist of the Ryazanov-and-Co. type. Either equality on the editorial board, *subordination* to the CC and no one's transfer to Paris except Trotsky's (the scoundrel, he wants to "fix up" the *whole* rascally crew of *Pravda* at our expense!)—or a break with this swindler and an exposure of him in the CO. He pays lip-service to the Party and behaves worse than any other of the factionalists.

All the best.

N. Lenin

P.S. I'm afraid we'll have to give Kamenev up as a bad job. An article on *The Social Movement* has been promised six weeks (or six months) ago?[21]

My address is: Mr. Wl. Oulianoff (Chez Madame Lecreux), *Bombon* (Seine-et-Marne).

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 34, pp. 399-400

From NOTES OF A PUBLICIST

March-May (June) 1910

II

The "UNITY CRISIS" IN OUR PARTY

1. Two Views on Unity

With touching unanimity the liquidators[22] and the otzovists[23] are abusing the Bolsheviks up hill and down dale (the liquidators attack Plekhanov as well). The Bolsheviks are to blame, the Bolshevik Centre is to blame, the " 'individualistic' tendencies of Lenin and Plekhanov" (p. 15 of the "Necessary Supplement"[24]) are to blame, as well as the "irresponsible group" of "former members of the Bolshevik Centre" (see the leaflet of the *Vperyod* group). In this respect the liquidators and the otzovists are entirely at one; their *bloc* against orthodox Bolshevism (a bloc which *more than once* characterised the struggle at the plenum, which I deal with separately below) is an indisputable fact; the representatives of two extreme tendencies, each of them equally expressing subordination to bourgeois ideas, each of them equally anti-Party, are entirely at one in their internal Party policy, in their struggle against the Bolsheviks and in proclaiming the Central Organ to be "Bolshevik". But the strongest abuse from Axelrod and Alexinsky only serves to screen their complete failure to understand the meaning and importance of Party unity. Trotsky's (the Viennese) resolution only differs outwardly from the "effusions" of Axelrod and Alexinsky. It is drafted very "cautiously" and lays claim to "above faction" fairness. But what is its meaning? The "Bolshevik leaders" are to blame for everything—this is the same "philosophy of history" as that of Axelrod and Alexinsky.

The very first paragraph of the Vienna resolution states: ... "the representatives of all factions and trends ... by their decision [at the plenum] consciously and deliberately assumed responsibility for carrying out the adopted resolutions *in the present conditions, in co-operation with the given persons, groups and institutions*". This refers to "conflicts in the Central Organ". Who is "responsible for carrying out the resolutions" of the plenum in the Central

Organ? Obviously the majority of the Central Organ, i.e., the Bolsheviks and the Poles; it is they who are responsible for carrying out the resolutions of the plenum—"in co-operation with the given persons", i.e., with the Golosists[25] and Vperyodists.[26]

What does the principal resolution of the plenum say in that part of it which deals with the most "vexed" problems of our Party, with questions which were most disputable before the plenum and which should have become least disputable after the plenum?

It says that *bourgeois influence over the proletariat manifests itself,* on the one hand, in rejecting the illegal Social-Democratic Party and belittling its role and importance, etc., and, on the other hand, in rejecting Social-Democratic work in the Duma as well as the utilisation of legal possibilities, the failure to grasp the importance of both the one and the other, etc.

Now what is the meaning of this resolution?

Does it mean that the Golosists should have sincerely and irrevocably put an end to rejecting the illegal Party and belittling it, etc., that they should have admitted this to be a deviation, that they should have got rid of it, and done positive work in a spirit hostile to this deviation; that the Vperyodists should have sincerely and irrevocably put an end to rejecting Duma work and legal possibilities, etc., that the majority of the Central Organ should in every way have enlisted the "co-operation" of the Golosists and Vperyodists *on condition* that they sincerely, consistently and irrevocably renounced the "deviations" described in detail in the resolution of the plenum?

Or does the resolution mean that the majority of the Central Organ is responsible for carrying out the resolutions (on the overcoming of liquidationist and otzovist deviations) "in co-operation with the *given*" Golosists, who *continue* as before and even more crudely to defend liquidationism, and with the given Vperyodists, who continue as before and even more crudely to assert the legitimacy of otzovism, ultimatumism, etc.?

This question needs only to be put for one to see how hollow are the eloquent phrases in Trotsky's resolution, to see how *in reality* they serve to defend the very position held by Axelrod and Co., and Alexinsky and Co.

In the very first words of his resolution Trotsky expressed the full spirit of the worst kind of conciliation, "conciliation" in inverted commas, of a sectarian and philistine conciliation, which deals with the "given persons" and not the given line of policy, the given spirit, the given ideological and political content of Party work.

It is in this that the enormous difference lies between real partyism, which consists in purging the Party of liquidationism and otzovism, and the "conciliation" of Trotsky and Co., which actually renders the most faithful service to the liquidators and otzovists, and is therefore an evil that is all the more dangerous to the Party the more cunningly, artfully and rhetorically it cloaks itself with professedly pro-Party, professedly anti-factional declamations.

In point of fact, what is it that we have been given as the task of the Party?

Is it "given persons, groups and institutions" that we have been "given" and that have to be "reconciled" irrespective of their policy, irrespective of the content of their work, irrespective of their attitude towards liquidationism and otzovism?

Or have we been given a Party line, an ideological and political direction and content of our entire work, the task of purging this work of liquidationism and otzovism—a task that must be carried out irrespective of "persons, groups and institutions", in spite of the opposition of "persons, institutions and groups" which disagree with that policy or do not carry it out?

Two views are possible on the meaning of and conditions for the achievement of any kind of Party unity. It is extremely important to grasp the difference between these views, for they become entangled and confused in the course of development of our "unity crisis" and it is impossible to orientate ourselves in this crisis unless we draw a sharp line between them.

One view on unity may place in the forefront the "reconciliation" of "given persons, groups and institutions". The identity of their views on Party work, on the policy of that work, is a secondary matter. One should try to keep silent about differences of opinion and not elucidate their causes, their significance, their objective conditions. The chief thing is to "reconcile" persons and groups. If they do not

agree on carrying out a common policy, that policy must be interpreted in such a way as to be acceptable to all. Live and let live. This is philistine "conciliation", which inevitably leads to sectarian diplomacy. To "stop up" the sources of disagreement, to keep silent about them, to "adjust" "conflicts" at all costs, to neutralise the conflicting trends—it is to this that the main attention of such "conciliation" is directed. In circumstances in which the illegal Party requires a base of operations abroad, this sectarian diplomacy opens the door to "persons, groups and institutions" that play the part of "honest brokers" in all kinds of attempts at "conciliation" and "neutralisation".

Here is what Martov, in *Golos* No. 19-20, relates of one such attempt at the plenum:

> "The Mensheviks, Pravdists and Bundists proposed a composition of the Central Organ which would ensure '*neutralisation*' of the two opposite trends in the Party ideology, and would not give a definite majority to either of them, thus *compelling* the Party organ to work out, in relation to each essential question, that *mean course* which could unite the majority of Party workers."

As is known, the proposal of the Mensheviks was not adopted. Trotsky, who put himself forward as candidate for the Central Organ in the capacity of *neutraliser*, was defeated. The candidature of a Bundist for the same post (the Mensheviks in their speeches proposed such a candidate) was not even put to the vote.

Such is the *actual* role of those "conciliators", in the bad sense of the word, who wrote the Vienna resolution and whose views are expressed in Yonov's article in No. 4 of *Otkliki Bunda*, which I have just received. The Mensheviks *did not venture* to propose a Central Organ with a majority of *their own* trend, although, as is seen from Martov's argument above quoted, they recognised the existence of *two opposite trends* in the Party. The Mensheviks did not even think of proposing a Central Organ with a majority of *their* trend. They did not even attempt to insist on a Central Organ with any definite trend at all (so obvious at the plenary session was the absence of any trend among the Mensheviks, who were only required, only expected, to make a sincere and consistent renunciation of liquidationism). The Mensheviks tried to secure "neutralisation" of the Central Organ and they proposed *as neutralisers* either a Bundist or Trotsky.

The Bundist or Trotsky was to play the part of a matchmaker who would undertake to "unite in wedlock" "given persons, groups and institutions", irrespective of whether one of the sides had renounced liquidationism or not.

This standpoint of a matchmaker constitutes the entire "ideological basis" of Trotsky's and Yonov's conciliation. When they complain and weep over the failure to achieve unity, it must be taken *cum grano salis*.* It must be taken to mean that the matchmaking failed. The "failure" of the hopes of unity cherished by Trotsky and Yonov, hopes of unity with "given persons, groups and institutions" irrespective of their attitude to liquidationism, signifies only the failure of the matchmakers, the falsity, the hopelessness, the wretchedness of the matchmaking point of view, but it does not at all signify the failure of Party unity.

There is another view on this unity, namely, that long ago a number of profound objective causes, independently of the particular composition of the "given persons, groups and institutions" (submitted to the plenum and at the plenum), began to bring about and are steadily continuing to bring about in the two old and principal Russian factions of Social-Democracy changes that create—sometimes undesired and even unperceived by some of the "given persons, groups and institutions"—ideological and organisational bases for unity. These objective conditions are rooted in the specific features of the present period of bourgeois development in Russia, the period of bourgeois counter-revolution and attempts by the autocracy to remodel itself on the pattern of a bourgeois monarchy. These objective conditions simultaneously give rise to inseparably interconnected changes in the character of the working-class movement, in the composition, type and features of the Social-Democratic vanguard, as well as changes in the ideological and political tasks of the Social-Democratic movement. Hence the bourgeois influence over the proletariat that gives rise to liquidationism (= semi-liberalism, which likes to consider itself part of Social-Democracy) and otzovism (=semi-anarchism, which likes to consider itself part of Social-Democracy) is not an accident, nor evil design, stupidity or error on the part of some individual, but the inevitable result of the action of these objective

* With a grain of salt.—*Ed.*

causes, and the superstructure of the entire labour movement in present-day Russia, which is inseparable from the "basis". The realisation of the danger, of the non-Social-Democratic nature and harmfulness to the labour movement of both these deviations brings about a rapprochement between the elements of various factions and paves the way to Party unity "despite all obstacles".

From this point of view the unification of the Party may proceed slowly, with difficulties, vacillations, waverings and relapses, but proceed it must. From this point of view the process of unification does not necessarily take place among "given persons, groups and institutions", but irrespective of given persons, subordinating them, rejecting those of them who do not understand or who do not want to understand the requirements of objective development, promoting and enlisting new persons not belonging to those "given", effecting changes, reshufflings and regroupings within the old factions, trends and divisions. From this point of view, unity is inseparable from its ideological foundation, it can grow only on the basis of an ideological rapprochement, it is connected with the appearance, development and growth of such deviations as liquidationism and otzovism, not by the accidental connection between particular polemical statements of this or that literary controversy, but by an internal, indissoluble link such as that which binds cause and effect.

2. "The Fight on Two Fronts" and the Overcoming of Deviations

Such are the two fundamentally different and radically divergent views on the nature and significance of our Party unity.

The question is, which of these views forms the basis of the plenum resolution? Whoever wishes to ponder over it will perceive that it is the second view that forms *the basis*, but in some passages the resolution clearly reveals traces of partial "amendments" in the spirit of the first view. However, these "amendments", while *worsening* the resolution, *in no way remove its basis*, its main content, which is thoroughly imbued with the second point of view.

In order to demonstrate that this is so, that the "amendments" in the spirit of sectarian diplomacy are really in the

nature of partial amendments, that they do not alter the essence of the matter and the principle underlying the resolution, I shall deal with certain points and certain passages in the resolution on the state of affairs in the Party, which have already been touched upon in the Party press. I shall start from the end.

After accusing the "leaders of the old factions" of doing everything to prevent unity being established, of behaving in the same way at the plenum too so that "every inch of ground had to be taken from them by storm", Yonov writes:

> "Comrade Lenin did not want 'to overcome the dangerous deviations' by means of 'broadening and deepening Social-Democratic activities'. He strove quite energetically to put the theory of the 'fight on two fronts' in the centre of all Party activities. He did not even think of abolishing 'the state of reinforced protection' within the Party" (p. 22, Art. 1).

This refers to § 4, clause "b", of the resolution on the situation in the Party. The draft of this resolution was submitted to the Central Committee by myself, and the clause in question was altered by the plenum itself after the commission had finished its work; it was altered on the motion of Trotsky, against whom I fought without success. In this clause I had, if not literally, the words "fight on two fronts", at all events, words to that effect. The words "overcoming by means of broadening and deepening" were inserted on the proposal of Trotsky. I am very glad that Comrade Yonov, by telling of my struggle against this proposal, gives me a convenient occasion for expressing my opinion on the meaning of the "amendment".

Nothing at the plenum aroused more furious—and often comical—indignation than the idea of a "fight on two fronts". The very mention of this infuriated both the Vperyodists and the Mensheviks. This indignation can be fully explained on historical grounds, for the Bolsheviks have *in fact* from August 1908 to January 1910 waged a struggle on two fronts, i.e., a struggle against the liquidators and against the otzovists. This indignation was comical because those who waxed angry at the Bolsheviks were thereby only proving their own guilt, showing they were still very touchy about condemnation of liquidationism and otzovism. A guilty conscience is never at ease.

Trotsky's proposal to substitute "overcoming by means of

broadening and deepening" for the fight on two fronts met with the ardent support of the Mensheviks and the Vperyodists.

And now Yonov and *Pravda* and the authors of the Vienna resolution and *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* are all rejoicing over that "victory". But the question arises: have they, by deleting from this clause the words about the fight on two fronts, eliminated from the resolution the recognition of the need for that fight? *Not at all*, for since "deviations", their "danger", and the necessity of "explaining" that danger, are recognised, and since it is also recognised that these deviations are a "manifestation of bourgeois influence over the proletariat"—all this *in effect* means that the fight on two fronts is recognised! In one passage an "unpleasant" term (unpleasant to one or other of their friends) was altered, but the basic idea was left intact! The result was only that one part of one clause was confused, watered down and marred by phrase-mongering.

Indeed, it is nothing but phrase-mongering and a futile evasion when the paragraph in question speaks of overcoming by means of broadening and deepening the work. There is no clear idea here at all. The work must certainly at all times be broadened and deepened; the entire *third* paragraph of the resolution deals with this in detail before it passes on to the specific "ideological and political tasks", which are not always or absolutely imperative but which result from the conditions of the particular period. Paragraph 4 is devoted only to these special tasks, and in the preamble to all of its three points it is directly stated that these ideological and political tasks "*have come to the fore* in their turn".

What is the result? It is nonsense, as if the task of broadening and deepening the work has *also* come to the fore in its turn! As if there *could* be a historical "turn" when *this* task was not present, as it is always!

And in what way is it possible to overcome deviations *by means of* broadening and deepening Social-Democratic work? In any broadening and deepening of our work the question of how it should be broadened and deepened inevitably rises; if liquidationism and otzovism are not accidents, but trends engendered by social conditions, then they can assert themselves in any broadening and deepening of

the work. It is possible to broaden and deepen the work in the spirit of liquidationism—this is being done, for instance, by *Nasha Zarya* and *Vozrozhdeniye*[27]; it is also possible to do so in the spirit of otzovism. On the other hand, the overcoming of deviations, "overcoming" in the real sense of the word, inevitably deflects certain forces, time and energy from the immediate broadening and deepening of correct Social-Democratic work. The same Yonov, for instance, writes on the same page of his article:

"The plenum is over. Its participants have gone their several ways. The Central Committee in organising its work has to overcome incredible difficulties, among which not the least is the conduct of the so-called [only "so-called", Comrade Yonov, not real, genuine ones?] liquidators whose existence Comrade Martov so persistently denied."

Here you have the material—little, but characteristic material—which makes it clear how empty Trotsky's and Yonov's phrases are. The overcoming of the liquidationist activities of Mikhail, Yuri and Co. diverted the forces and time of the Central Committee from the immediate broadening and deepening of really Social-Democratic work. Were it not for the conduct of Mikhail, Yuri and Co., were it not for liquidationism among those whom we mistakenly continue to regard as our comrades, the broadening and deepening of Social-Democratic work would have proceeded more successfully, for then internal strife would not have diverted the forces of the Party. Consequently, if we take the broadening and deepening of Social-Democratic work to mean the immediate furthering of agitation, propaganda and economic struggle, etc., in a really Social-Democratic spirit, then in regard to this work the overcoming of the deviations of Social-Democrats from Social-Democracy is a minus, a deduction, so to speak, from "positive activity", and therefore the phrase about overcoming deviations *by means of* broadening, etc., is meaningless.

In reality this phrase expresses a vague longing, a pious, innocent wish that there should be less internal strife among Social-Democrats! This phrase reflects nothing but this pious wish; it is a *sigh* of the so-called conciliators: Oh, if there were only less struggle against liquidationism and otzovism!

The political importance of such "sighing" is nil, less than nil. If there are people in the Party who profit by "persist-

ently denying" the existence of liquidators (and otzovists), they will take advantage of the "sigh" of the "conciliators" to cover up the evil. That is precisely what *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* does. Hence the champions of such well-meaning and hollow phrases in resolutions are only *so-called* "conciliators". In actual fact, they are the abettors of the liquidators and otzovists, in actual fact, they do not deepen Social-Democratic work but strengthen deviations from it; they strengthen the evil by temporarily concealing it and thereby making the cure more difficult.

In order to illustrate for Comrade Yonov the significance of this evil, I shall remind him of a passage in an article by Comrade Yonov in *Diskussionny Listok* No. 1. Comrade Yonov aptly compared liquidationism and otzovism to a *benignant ulcer* which "in the process of swelling draws all the noxious elements from the entire organism, thus contributing to recovery".

That's just it. The process of swelling, which draws the "noxious elements" out of the organism, leads to recovery. And that which hampers the purification of the organism from such elements is harmful to it. Let Comrade Yonov ponder over this helpful idea of Comrade Yonov.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, pp. 209-19

From THE HISTORICAL MEANING OF THE INNER-PARTY STRUGGLE IN RUSSIA[28]

September-November 1910

The subject indicated by the above title is dealt with in articles by Trotsky and Martov in Nos. 50 and 51 of *Neue Zeit*. Martov expounds Menshevik views. Trotsky follows in the wake of the Mensheviks, taking cover behind particularly sonorous phrases. Martov sums up the "Russian experience" by saying: "Blanquist and anarchist lack of culture triumphed over Marxist culture" (read: Bolshevism over Menshevism). "Russian Social-Democracy spoke too zealously *in Russian*", in contrast to the "*general European*" methods of tactics. Trotsky's "philosophy of history" is the same. The cause of the struggle is the "adaptation of the Marxist

intelligentsia to the class movement of the proletariat". "Sectarianism, intellectualist individualism, ideological fetishism" are placed in the forefront. "*The struggle for influence over the politically immature proletariat*"—that is the essence of the matter.

I

The theory that the struggle between Bolshevism and Menshevism is a struggle for influence over an immature proletariat is not a new one. We have been encountering it since 1905 (if not since 1903) in innumerable books, pamphlets, and articles in the *liberal* press. Martov and Trotsky are putting before the German comrades *liberal views* with a Marxist coating.

Of course, the Russian proletariat is politically far less mature than the proletariat of Western Europe. But of all classes of Russian society, it was the proletariat that displayed the *greatest* political maturity in 1905-07. The Russian liberal bourgeoisie, which behaved in just as vile, cowardly, stupid and treacherous a manner as the German bourgeoisie in 1848, hates the Russian proletariat *for the very reason* that in 1905 it proved *sufficiently mature politically* to wrest the *leadership* of the movement from this bourgeoisie and ruthlessly to expose the treachery of the liberals.

Trotsky declares: "It is an illusion" to imagine that Menshevism and Bolshevism "have struck deep roots in the depths of the proletariat." This is a specimen of the resonant but empty phrases of which our Trotsky is a master. The *roots* of the divergence between the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks lie, not in the "depth of the proletariat", but in the *economic content* of the Russian revolution. By ignoring this content, Martov and Trotsky have deprived themselves of the possibility of understanding the historical meaning of the inner-Party struggle in Russia. The crux of the matter is not whether the theoretical formulations of the differences have penetrated "deeply" into this or that stratum of the proletariat, but the fact that the economic conditions of the Revolution of 1905 *brought* the proletariat into hostile relations with the liberal bourgeoisie—not only over the question of improving the conditions of daily life of the workers, but also over the agrarian question, over all the political ques-

tions of the revolution, etc. To speak of the struggle of trends in the Russian revolution, distributing labels such as "sectarianism", "lack of culture", etc., and not to say a word about the fundamental economic interests of the proletariat, of the liberal bourgeoisie and of the democratic peasantry, means stooping to the level of cheap journalists....

In 1905-07 the contradiction existing between the liberal bourgeoisie and the peasantry became fully revealed. In the spring and autumn of 1905, as well as in the spring of 1906, *from one-third to one-half* of the uyezds of Central Russia were affected by peasant revolts. The peasants destroyed approximately 2,000 country houses of landlords (unfortunately this is not more than one-fifteenth of what should have been destroyed). The proletariat *alone* whole-heartedly supported this revolutionary struggle, directed it in every way, guided it, and united it by its mass strikes. The liberal bourgeoisie *never* helped this revolutionary struggle; they preferred to "pacify" the peasants and "reconcile" them with the landlords and the tsar. The same thing was then repeated in the parliamentary arena in the first two Dumas (1906 and 1907). *During the whole of that period* the liberals hindered the struggle of the peasants and betrayed them; and it was *only the workers' deputies* who directed and supported the peasants in *opposition to the liberals.* The *entire* history of the First and Second Dumas is full of the struggle of the liberals against the peasants and the Social-Democrats. The struggle between Bolshevism and Menshevism is *inseparably* bound up with that history, being a struggle over the question whether to support the liberals or to overthrow the hegemony of the liberals over the peasantry. Therefore, to attribute our splits to the influence of the intelligentsia, to the immaturity of the proletariat, etc., is a childishly naive repetition of liberal fairy-tales.

For the same reason Trotsky's argument that splits in the international Social-Democratic movement are caused by the "process of adaptation of the social-revolutionary class to the limited (narrow) conditions of parliamentarism", etc., while in the Russian Social-Democratic movement they are caused by the adaptation of the intelligentsia to the proletariat, is absolutely false. Trotsky writes: "While the real political content of this process of adaptation was limited (narrow) from the standpoint of the socialist, final aim, its

forms were unrestrained, and the ideological shadow cast by this process was great."

This truly "unrestrained" phrase-mongering is merely the "ideological shadow" of liberalism. Both Martov and Trotsky mix up different historical periods and compare Russia, which is going through her bourgeois revolution, with Europe, where these revolutions were completed long ago. In Europe the real political content of Social-Democratic work is to prepare the proletariat for the struggle for power against the bourgeoisie, which already holds full sway in the state. In Russia, the question is *still only one of creating* a modern bourgeois state, which will be similar either to a Junker monarchy (in the event of tsarism being victorious over democracy) or to a peasant bourgeois-democratic republic (in the event of democracy being victorious over tsarism). And the victory of democracy in present-day Russia is possible only if the peasant masses follow the lead of the revolutionary proletariat and not that of the treacherous liberals. History has not yet decided this question. The bourgeois revolutions are not yet completed in Russia and *within these bounds*, i.e., within the bounds of the struggle for the *form* of the bourgeois regime in Russia, "the real political content" of the work of Russian Social-Democrats is *less* "limited" than in countries where there is no struggle for the confiscation of the landed estates by the peasants, where the bourgeois revolutions were completed long ago.

It is easy to understand why the class interests of the bourgeois compel the liberals to try to persuade the workers that their role in the revolution is "limited", that the struggle of trends is caused by the intelligentsia, and not by profound economic contradictions, that the workers' party must be "*not* the leader in the struggle for emancipation, *but* a class party". This is the formula that the Golosist liquidators advanced quite recently (Levitsky in *Nasha Zarya*) and which the liberals have approved. They use the term "class party" in the Brentano-Sombart sense: concern yourself only with your own class and abandon "Blanquist dreams" of leading all the revolutionary elements of the people in a struggle against tsarism and treacherous liberalism.

II

Martov's arguments on the Russian revolution and Trotsky's arguments on the present state of Russian Social-Democracy definitely confirm the incorrectness of their fundamental views.

We shall start with the boycott. Martov calls the boycott "abstention from politics", the method of the "anarchists and syndicalists", and he refers *only* to 1906. Trotsky says that the "boycottist tendency runs through the whole history of Bolshevism—boycott of the trade unions, of the State Duma, of local self-government bodies, etc.", that it is the "result of sectarian fear of being swamped by the masses, the radicalism of irreconcilable abstention", etc. As regards boycotting the trade unions and the local self-government bodies, what Trotsky says is *absolutely untrue.* It is equally untrue to say that boycottism runs through the whole history of Bolshevism; Bolshevism as a tendency took definite shape in the spring and summer of 1905, *before* the question of the boycott first came up. *In August 1906,* in the official organ of the faction, Bolshevism declared that the historical conditions which made the boycott necessary had passed.*

Trotsky distorts Bolshevism, because he has never been able to form any definite views on the role of the proletariat in the Russian bourgeois revolution.

But far worse is the distortion of the history of this revolution. If we are to speak of the boycott we must start from the beginning, not from the end. The first (and only) victory in the revolution was wrested by the mass movement, which *proceeded under the slogan of the boycott.* It is only to the advantage of the liberals to forget this.

The law of August 6 (19), 1905 created the Bulygin Duma[29] as a consultative body. The liberals, even the most radical of them, decided to participate in this Duma. The Social-Democrats, by an enormous majority (against the Mensheviks), decided to boycott it and to call upon the masses for a direct onslaught on tsarism, for a mass strike and an uprising. Hence, the question of the boycott was not a question within Social-Democracy alone. It was a question

---

* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. 11, pp. 141-49.—*Ed.*

of the struggle of *liberalism against the proletariat.* The entire liberal press of that time showed that the liberals feared the development of the revolution and directed all their efforts towards reaching an "agreement" with tsarism. . . .

IV

The development of the factions in Russian Social-Democracy since the revolution is also to be explained not by the "adaptation of the intelligentsia to the proletariat", but by the changes in the relations between the classes. The Revolution of 1905-07 accentuated, brought out into the open and placed on the order of the day the antagonism between the peasants and the liberal bourgeoisie over the question of the *form* of a bourgeois regime in Russia. The politically mature proletariat could not but take a most energetic part in this struggle, and its attitude to the various classes of the new society was reflected in the struggle between Bolshevism and Menshevism.

The three years 1908-10 are marked by the victory of the counter-revolution, by the restoration of the autocracy and by the Third Duma, the Duma of the Black Hundreds[30] and Octobrists.[31] The struggle between the bourgeois classes over the form of the new regime has ceased to be in the forefront. The proletariat is now confronted with the *elementary* task of preserving its proletarian party, which is hostile both to the reaction and to counter-revolutionary liberalism. This task is not an easy one, because it is the proletariat that suffers all the brunt of economic and political persecution, and all the hatred of the liberals because the leadership of the masses in the revolution has been wrested from them by the Social-Democrats.

The crisis in the Social-Democratic Party is very grave. The organisations are shattered. A large number of veteran leaders (especially among the intellectuals) have been arrested. A new type of Social-Democratic worker, who is taking the affairs of the Party in hand, has already appeared, but he has to overcome extraordinary difficulties. Under such conditions the Social-Democratic Party is losing many of its "fellow-travellers". It is natural that petty-bourgeois "fellow-travellers" should have joined the socialists during the bourgeois revolution. Now they are falling away from

Marxism and from Social-Democracy. This process is observed in both factions: among the Bolsheviks in the shape of the "otzovist" tendency, which arose in the spring of 1908, suffered defeat immediately at the Moscow Conference, and after a long struggle was rejected by the official centre of the faction and formed a *separate faction* abroad—the *Uperyod* faction. The specific character of the period of disintegration was expressed in the fact that this faction united those Machists who introduced into their *platform* the struggle against Marxism (under the guise of defence of "proletarian philosophy") and the "ultimatumists", those shamefaced otzovists, as well as various types of "days-of-freedom Social-Democrats", who were carried away by "spectacular" slogans, which they learned by rote, but who *failed to understand* the fundamentals of Marxism.

Among the Mensheviks the same process of the falling away of petty-bourgeois "fellow-travellers" was expressed in the liquidationist tendency, now fully formulated in Mr. Potresov's magazine *Nasha Zarya*, in *Vozrozhdeniye* and *Zhizn*,[32] in the stand taken by "the Sixteen" and "the trio" (Mikhail, Roman, Yuri), while *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata*, published abroad, acted as a *servant* of the Russian liquidators in fact and a diplomatic disguise for them before the Party membership.

Failing to understand the historical and economic significance of this disintegration in the era of counter-revolution, of this *falling away of non-Social-Democratic* elements from the Social-Democratic Labour Party, Trotsky tells the German readers that *both* factions are "falling *to pieces*", that the Party is "falling *to pieces*", that the Party is "*demoralised*".

It is not true. And this untruth expresses, first, Trotsky's utter lack of theoretical understanding. Trotsky has absolutely failed to understand why the plenum described *both* liquidationism *and* otzovism as a "manifestation of bourgeois influence on the proletariat". Just think: is the severance from the Party of trends which have been condemned by the Party, and which express *bourgeois* influence on the proletariat, an indication of the Party's disintegration, of its demoralisation, or is it an indication of its becoming stronger and purer?

Secondly, in practice, this untruth expresses the "policy" of *advertisement* pursued by Trotsky's faction. That Trotsky's venture is an attempt to create a faction is now obvious to all, since Trotsky has removed the Central Committee's representative from *Pravda.* In advertising his faction Trotsky does not hesitate to tell the Germans that the Party is falling *to pieces*, that *both* factions are falling to pieces and that he, Trotsky, alone, is saving the situation. Actually, we all see now—and the latest resolution adopted by the Trotskyites (in the name of the Vienna Club, on November 26, 1910) proves this quite conclusively—that Trotsky enjoys the *confidence exclusively* of the liquidators and the Vperyodists.

The extent of Trotsky's shamelessness in belittling the Party and exalting himself before the Germans is shown, for instance, by the following. Trotsky writes that the "working masses" in Russia consider that the "Social-Democratic Party stands *outside* [Trotsky's italics] their circle" and he talks of "Social-Democrats without Social-Democracy".

How could one expect Mr. Potresov and his friends to refrain from bestowing kisses on Trotsky for such statements?

But these statements are refuted not only by the *entire* history of the revolution, but even by the results of the elections to the Third Duma from the workers' curia.

Trotsky writes that "owing to their former ideological and organisational structure, the Menshevik and Bolshevik factions proved altogether incapable" of working in legal organisations; work was carried on by "individual groups of Social-Democrats, but all this took place outside the factions, outside their organisational influence". "Even the most important legal organisation, in which the Mensheviks predominate, works completely outside the control of the Menshevik faction." That is what Trotsky writes. But the facts are as follows. From the very beginning of the existence of the Social-Democratic group in the Third Duma, the Bolshevik faction, through its representatives authorised by the Central Committee of the Party, has all the time assisted, aided, advised, and supervised the work of the Social-Democrats in the Duma. The same is done by the editorial board of the Central Organ of the Party, which consists of rep-

resentatives of the factions (which were dissolved as factions in January 1910).

When Trotsky gives the German comrades a detailed account of the stupidity of "otzovism" and describes this trend as a "crystallisation" of the boycottism characteristic of Bolshevism as a whole, and then mentions in a few words that Bolshevism "did not allow itself to be overpowered" by otzovism, but "attacked it resolutely or rather in an unbridled fashion"—the German reader certainly gets no idea how much subtle perfidy there is in such an exposition. Trotsky's Jesuitical "reservation" consists in omitting a small, very small "detail". He "forgot" to mention that at an official meeting of its representatives held as far back as the spring of 1909, the Bolshevik faction repudiated and expelled the otzovists. But it is just this "detail" that is inconvenient for Trotsky, who wants to talk of the "*falling to pieces*" of the Bolshevik faction (and then of the Party as well) and not of the *falling away* of the non-Social-Democratic elements!

We now regard Martov as one of the leaders of liquidationism, one who is the more dangerous the more "cleverly" he defends the liquidators by quasi-Marxist phrases. But Martov openly expounds views which have put their stamp on whole tendencies in the mass labour movement of 1903-10. Trotsky, on the other hand, represents only his own personal vacillations and nothing more. In 1903 he was a Menshevik; he abandoned Menshevism in 1904, returned to the Mensheviks in 1905 and merely flaunted ultra-revolutionary phrases; in 1906 he left them again; at the end of 1906 he advocated electoral agreements with the Cadets (i.e., he was in fact once more with the Mensheviks); and in the spring of 1907, at the London Congress, he said that he differed from Rosa Luxemburg on "individual shades of ideas rather than on political tendencies". One day Trotsky plagiarises from the ideological stock-in-trade of one faction, the next day he plagiarises from that of another, and therefore declares himself to be standing *above* both factions. In theory Trotsky is on *no* point in agreement with either the liquidators or the otzovists, but *in actual practice he is in entire* agreement with both the Golosists and the Vperyodists.

Therefore, when Trotsky tells the German comrades that he represents the "general Party tendency", I am obliged to declare that Trotsky represents only *his own* faction and

enjoys a certain amount of confidence *exclusively* among the otzovists and the liquidators. The following facts prove the correctness of my statement. In January 1910, the Central Committee of our Party established close ties with Trotsky's newspaper *Pravda* and appointed a representative of the Central Committee to sit on the editorial board. In September 1910, the Central Organ of the Party announced a *rupture* between the representative of the Central Committee and Trotsky owing to Trotsky's anti-Party policy. In Copenhagen, Plekhanov, as the representative of the pro-Party Mensheviks and delegate of the editorial board of the Central Organ, together with the present writer, as the representative of the Bolsheviks, and a Polish comrade,[33] entered an emphatic protest against the way Trotsky represents our Party affairs in the German press.

Let the readers now judge for themselves whether Trotsky represents a "general Party", or a "general *anti*-Party" trend in Russian Social-Democracy.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, pp. 374-75, 378-81, 387-92

LETTER TO THE RUSSIAN COLLEGIUM OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RSDLP[34]

[December 1910]

Recent events in the life of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party abroad clearly show that the "unity crisis" of the Party is coming to a head. I, therefore, consider it my duty, solely by way of information, to let you know the significance of recent happenings, the dénouement that may be expected (according to this course of events) and the position adopted by orthodox Bolsheviks.

In *Golos* No. 23, Martov in his article "Where Have We Landed?" gibes at the Plenary Meeting, at the fact that the Russian Collegium of the Central Committee has not met once during the year, and that nothing has been done to carry out the decisions. He, of course, "forgets" to add that it is precisely the liquidator group of Potresovs that has sabotaged the work of the Russian Central Committee; we

know of the non-recognition of the Central Committee by Mikhail, Roman, and Yuri, and their statement that its very existence is harmful. The CC in Russia has been wrecked. Martov rejoices at this. It stands to reason that the *Uperyod* group also rejoices, and this is reflected in the *Uperyod* symposium, No. 1. In his glee, Martov has blurted out his views prematurely. He screams with delight that "legality will finish them" (the Bolsheviks or the "Polish-Bolshevik bloc"). By this he means that *thanks to the obstruction* of the Central Committee's work by the liquidators, there is no way out of the present situation that would be *legal* from the Party point of view. Obviously, nothing pleases the liquidators more than a hopeless situation for the Party.

But Martov was in too much of a hurry. The Bolsheviks still have at their disposal an arch-legal means of emerging from this situation as foreseen by the Plenary Meeting and published in its name in No. 11 of the Central Organ. This is the demand for the return of the funds, because the *Golos* and *Uperyod* groups obviously have not abided by the terms agreed on—to eliminate factions and to struggle against the liquidators and the otzovists. It was precisely on these *conditions*, clearly agreed to, that the Bolsheviks handed over their property to the Central Committee.

Then, on the 5th December, 1910 (New Style), the Bolsheviks, having signed the conditions at the Plenary Meeting, applied for the return of the funds. According to legal procedure this demand must *lead to the convening of a plenary meeting*. The decision of the Plenary Meeting states that "should it prove impossible" (literally!) for a plenary meeting to take place within three months from the date of the application, then a commission of five members of the CC—three from the national, non-Russian, parties, one Bolshevik and one Menshevik—is to be set up.

Immediately, the *Golos* supporters revealed themselves in their true colours. The *Golos* supporter Igor, a member of the Central Committee Bureau Abroad, conscious of the policy of the Russian liquidators, handed in a statement that he was against holding a plenary meeting, but was in favour of a commission. The violation of legality by the *Golos* group is thus apparent, since a plenary meeting may be convened before the conclusion of the three-month period. Once such

a request has been made it is not even permissible to raise the question of a commission.

The liquidator Igor, true servant of the Party traitors, Messrs. Potresov and Co., calculates quite simply that the plenary meeting is a sovereign body and consequently its session would open the door to a solution of the whole Party crisis. A commission, however, is not a sovereign body and has no rights apart from the investigation into the claim put forward in the application. (Three Germans are now considering this claim.) Hence, having obstructed the Russian Central Committee, the liquidators (and their lackeys abroad, the *Golos* group) are now trying to prevent anything in the nature of a Central Committee from working. We shall yet see whether this attempt succeeds. The Poles in the Central Committee Bureau Abroad[35] are voting for the plenary meeting. It now all depends on the Letts and the Bund members,[36] from whom so far no reply has been received. Our representative in the Bureau Abroad[37] has submitted and distributed a firm protest against Igor. (Copies of Igor's statement and this protest are attached herewith.)

It has become clear that the struggle for the plenary meeting is a struggle for a legal way out, a struggle for the Party. The fight of the *Golos* group against the plenary meeting is a fight against a way out of the Party crisis, is a fight against legality.

Plekhanov and his friends, whom we kept informed of every step, are in complete agreement with us on the necessity for a plenary meeting. They, too, are in favour of it; the draft of our joint statement on this matter is now being considered, and in the near future we shall either come forward with a statement together with Plekhanov's group, or we shall publish an article on the question in the Central Organ.

Further, on the 26th November (N.S.), 1910, Trotsky carried through a resolution in the so-called Vienna Party Club (a circle of Trotskyites, exiles, who are pawns in the hands of Trotsky) which he published as a separate leaflet. I append this leaflet.

In this resolution, open war is declared on *Rabochaya Gazeta,* the organ of the Bolsheviks and Plekhanov's group. The arguments are not new. The statement that there are now "no essential grounds" for a struggle against the *Golos*

and *Uperyod* groups is the height of absurdity and hypocrisy. Everybody knows that the *Golos* and *Uperyod* people had no intention of dispersing their factions and that the former in reality support the liquidators, Potresov and Co., that the *Uperyod* group organised the factional school abroad (using funds of well-known origin), where they teach Machism, where they teach that otzovism is a "legal shade of opinion" (taken literally from their platform), etc., etc.

Trotsky's call for "friendly" collaboration by the Party with the *Golos* and *Uperyod* groups is disgusting hypocrisy and phrase-mongering. Everybody is aware that for the whole year since the Plenary Meeting the *Golos* and *Uperyod* groups have worked in a "friendly" manner against the Party (and were secretly supported by Trotsky). Actually, it is only the Bolsheviks and Plekhanov's group who have for a whole year carried out friendly Party work in the Central Organ, in *Rabochaya Gazeta,* and at Copenhagen,[38] as well as in the Russian legal press.

Trotsky's attacks on the bloc of Bolsheviks and Plekhanov's group are not new; what is new is the outcome of his resolution: the Vienna Club (read: "Trotsky") has organised a "general Party fund for the purpose of preparing and convening a conference of the RSDLP".

This indeed is new. It is a direct step towards a split. It is a clear violation of Party legality and the start of an adventure in which Trotsky will come to grief. This is obviously a split. Trotsky's action, his "fund", is supported only by the *Golos* and *Uperyod* groups. There can be no question of participation by the Bolsheviks and Plekhanov's group. That the liquidators (of *Golos*) in Zurich have already supported Trotsky is comprehensible. It is quite possible and probable that "certain" *Uperyod* "funds" will be made available to Trotsky. You will appreciate that this will only stress the adventurist character of his undertaking.

It is clear that this undertaking violates Party legality, since not a word is said about the Central Committee, which alone can call the conference. In addition, Trotsky, having ousted the CC representative on *Pravda* in August 1910, himself lost all trace of legality, converting *Pravda* from an organ supported by the representative of the CC into a purely factional organ.

Thus, the whole matter has taken on definite shape, the

situation has clarified itself. The *Uperyod* group collected "certain funds" for struggle against the Party, for support of the "legal shade of opinion" (otzovism). Trotsky in the last number of *Pravda* (and in his lecture in Zurich) goes all out to flirt with *Uperyod*. The liquidators in Russia sabotaged the work of the Russian Central Committee. The liquidators abroad want to prevent a plenary meeting abroad—in other words, sabotage anything like a Central Committee. Taking advantage of this "violation of legality", Trotsky seeks an organisational split, creating "his own" fund for "his own" conference.

The roles have been assigned. The *Golos* group defend Potresov and Co., as a "legal shade of opinion", the *Uperyod* group defend otzovism, as a "legal shade of opinion". Trotsky seeks to defend both camps in a "popular fashion", and to call his conference (possibly on funds supplied by *Uperyod*). The Triple Alliance (Potresov + Trotsky + Maximov) against the Dual Alliance (Bolsheviks + Plekhanov's group). The deployment of forces has been completed and battle joined.

You will understand why I call Trotsky's move an adventure; it is an adventure in every respect.

It is an adventure in the ideological sense. Trotsky groups all the enemies of Marxism, he unites Potresov and Maximov, who detest the "Lenin-Plekhanov" bloc, as they like to call it. Trotsky unites all to whom ideological decay is dear, all who are not concerned with the defence of Marxism; all philistines who do not understand the reasons for the struggle and who do not wish to learn, think, and discover the ideological roots of the divergence of views. At this time of confusion, disintegration, and wavering it is easy for Trotsky to become the "hero of the hour" and gather all the shabby elements around himself. The more openly this attempt is made, the more spectacular will be the defeat.

It is an adventure in the party-political sense. At present everything goes to show that the real unity of the Social-Democratic Party is possible only on the basis of a sincere and unswerving repudiation of liquidationism and otzovism. It is clear that Potresov (together with *Golos*) and the *Uperyod* group have renounced neither the one nor the other. Trotsky unites them, basely deceiving himself, deceiving the Party, and deceiving the proletariat. In reality,

Trotsky will achieve nothing more than the strengthening of Potresov's and Maximov's anti-Party groups. The collapse of this adventure is inevitable.

Finally, it is an organisational adventure. A conference held with Trotsky's "funds", without the Central Committee, is a split. Let the initiative remain with Trotsky. Let his be the responsibility.

Three slogans bring out the essence of the present situation within the Party:

1. Strengthen and help the unification and rallying of Plekhanov's supporters and the Bolsheviks for the defence of Marxism, for a rebuff to ideological confusion, and for the battle against liquidationism and otzovism.

2. Struggle for a plenary meeting—for a legal solution to the Party crisis.

3. Struggle against the splitting tactics and the unprincipled adventurism of Trotsky in banding Potresov and Maximov against Social-Democracy.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, pp. 17-22

From THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN THE PARTY

December 1910

The question of the crisis in our Party has again been given priority by the Social-Democratic press abroad, leading to stronger rumours, perplexity and vacillation among wide Party circles. It is, therefore, essential for the Central Organ of the Party to clarify this question in its entirety. Martov's article in *Golos*, No. 23, and Trotsky's statement of November 26, 1910 in the form of a "resolution" of the "Vienna Club", published as a separate leaflet, present the question to the reader in a manner which completely distorts the essence of the matter.

Martov's article and Trotsky's resolution conceal definite practical *actions*—actions *directed against the Party*. Martov's article is simply the literary expression of *a campaign launched by the Golos group to sabotage the Central Committee* of our Party. Trotsky's resolution, which calls upon organisations in the localities to prepare for a "general Party

conference" independent of, and against, the Central Committee, expresses the very aim of the *Golos* group—*to destroy the central bodies so detested by the liquidators, and with them, the Party as an organisation.* It is not enough to lay bare the anti-Party activities of *Golos* and Trotsky; they must be *fought.* Comrades to whom the Party and its revival are dear must come out most resolutely against all those who, guided by purely factional and narrow circle considerations and interests, are striving to destroy the *Party*....

Trotsky's statement, though *outwardly* entirely unconnected with Martov's jeering at the adversities of the Party, and with the attempts of the *Golos* supporters to sabotage the Central Committee, is actually connected with the one and the other by inseverable ties, by the ties of "interest". There are many Party members who still fail to see this connection. The Vienna resolution of November 26, 1910, will undoubtedly help them understand the essence of the matter.

The resolution consists of three parts: (1) a declaration of war against *Rabochaya Gazeta* (a call to "*rebuff it resolutely*" as one of the "new factional group undertakings", using Trotsky's expression); (2) polemics against the line of the Bolshevik-Plekhanov "bloc"; (3) a declaration that the "meeting of the Vienna Club [i.e., Trotsky and his circle] resolves: to organise a general Party fund for the purpose of preparing and convening a conference of the RSDLP".

We shall not dwell on the first part at all. Trotsky is quite right in saying that *Rabochaya Gazeta* is a "private undertaking", and that "*it is not authorised to speak in the name of the Party as a whole*".

Only Trotsky should not have forgotten to mention that he and his *Pravda* are not authorised to speak in the name of the Party *either.* In saying that the Plenary Meeting recognised the work of *Pravda* as useful, he should not have forgotten to mention that it appointed a *representative of the Central Committee* to the Editorial Board of *Pravda.* When Trotsky, in referring to the meeting's decisions on *Pravda,* fails to mention this fact, all one can say about it is that *he is deceiving the workers.* And this deception on the part of Trotsky is all the more malicious, since in *August* 1910 Trotsky *removed* the representative of the Central Committee from *Pravda.* Since that incident, since

Pravda has severed its relations with the Central Committee, Trotsky's paper is nothing but a "private undertaking", and one, moreover, that has failed to carry out the obligations it assumed. Until the Central Committee meets again, the *only* judge of *Pravda*'s attitude to the Central Committee is the Central Committee *representative* appointed by the Plenary Meeting who has *declared that Trotsky behaved in a manner hostile to the Party.*

That is what emerges from the question, so opportunely raised by Trotsky, as to who is "authorised to speak in the name of the Party as a whole".

Nor is that all. Inasmuch as (and so long as) the legalist independent liquidators obstruct the Central Committee in Russia, and inasmuch as (and so long as) the *Golos* group obstruct the Central Committee abroad, the *sole* body authorised "to speak in the name of the Party as a whole" is the *Central Organ.*

Therefore, we declare, *in the name of the Party as a whole,* that Trotsky is pursuing an anti-Party policy; that, by failing to make the least mention of the Central Committee in his resolution (as if he had already come to an understanding with *Golos* that the work of the Central Committee would be sabotaged), and by announcing in the name of *one group abroad* the "*organisation of a fund* for the purpose of convening a conference of the RSDLP", he is *contravening* Party *legality* and is embarking on the path of *adventurism* and a *split.* If the efforts of the liquidators to sabotage the work of the Central Committee meet with success, we, as the sole body authorised to speak in the name of the Party as a whole, will immediately declare that we take no part *whatever* in Trotsky's "fund" or in his venture, and that we shall recognise as a *general Party* conference only one convened *by the Central Organ,* not one convened by Trotsky's circle.*

But so long as events have not brought about the final wrecking of the Central Committee, there is still hope for a way out that is entirely *legal* from the Party point of view.

While calling upon Party members to fight resolutely for this solution based on Party legality, we shall try to

* That a general Party conference, one convened by the Central Committee of the Party, is really *needed* and should be called *as soon as possible*—of that there can be no question.

investigate "the fundamental principles" of the differences which the *Golos* group and Trotsky are in a hurry to carry to the point of a split—the former, by obstructing the work of the Central Committee, and the latter, by ignoring it and "organising a fund" for the purpose of convening a "conference of the RSDLP" (no joke!) by Trotsky's circle.

Trotsky writes in his resolution that at present "there is no basis for the struggle on principle" being waged by the "Leninists and Plekhanóvites" (in thus substituting *personalities* for the *trends* of Bolshevism and pro-Party Menshevism, Trotsky aims at disparagement, but succeeds only in expressing his own lack of understanding).

It is to investigate these fundamental principles that the Central Organ calls upon Social-Democrats throughout Russia—examine this very interesting question while the "uninteresting" struggle over the convocation of the plenary meeting is still going on.

We quote in full the reasons given by Trotsky for his statement that the struggle of the Central Organ is not justified by any basic difference of principle.

> "The conviction has taken firm root among *all* [Trotsky's italics] Party trends, that it is necessary to restore the illegal organisation, to combine legal with illegal work, and to pursue consistent Social-Democratic tactics. These fundamental directives were *unanimously* adopted by the last Plenary Meeting.
>
> "The difficulty now, a year after the meeting, is not the proclamation of these truths, but *their application in practice.* The way to achieve this is by harmonious work carried on jointly by all sections of the Party—the '*Golos*', 'Plekhanov', 'Leninist', and '*Úperyod*' groups, and the non-factionalists. The Party has already spiritually outgrown the period of its infancy, and it is time that all its members felt and acted as *revolutionary Social-Democrats,* as patriots of their Party and not as members of factions. This co-operation must take place within the framework of the Party as a whole, not around factional bodies."

That is an example of how fine words are worn into shreds by phrase-mongering intended to disguise a monstrous untruth, a monstrous deception both of those who revel in phrase-mongering and of the whole Party.

It is a plain and crying *untruth* that *all* Party trends are convinced of the need to revive the illegal organisation. Each issue of *Golos* shows that its writers regard the Potresov group as *a Party trend,* and that not only do they "regard" it as such but that they *systematically* take part

in its "work". Is it not ridiculous, is it not disgraceful today, a year after the Plenary Meeting, to play at hide and seek, to deceive oneself and deceive the workers, to indulge in verbal tricks, when it is a question, not of empty phrases, but of "*application in practice*"?

Yes or no? Does Trotsky regard the Potresov group, who were specifically mentioned in the Central Organ, as a "Party trend" or not? This is precisely a question of the "application in practice" of the decisions of the Plenary Meeting, and *it is now a year* since it was posed by the Central Organ clearly, bluntly, and unambiguously, so that there could be no evasions!

Trotsky is trying again and again to evade the question by passing it over in silence or by phrase-mongering; for he is concerned to keep the readers and the Party *ignorant of the truth*, namely, that Mr. Potresov's group, the group of sixteen, etc., are absolutely independent of the Party, represent expressly distinct factions, are not only doing nothing to revive the illegal organisation, but are obstructing its revival, and are *not* pursuing *any* Social-Democratic tactics. Trotsky is concerned with keeping the Party ignorant of the truth, namely, that the *Golos* group represent a faction abroad, similarly separated from the Party, and that they actually render service to the liquidators in Russia.

And what about the *Uperyod* group? Trotsky knows perfectly well that ever *since* the Plenary Meeting they have been strengthening and developing their separate faction, disposing of funds independently of the Party, and maintaining a separate factional school in which they teach, not "consistent Social-Democratic tactics", but that "*otzovism* is a legal shade of opinion"; in which they teach otzovist views on the role of the Third Duma, views expressed in the factional platform of *Uperyod*.

Trotsky maintains silence on this undeniable truth, because the truth is detrimental to the *real* aims of his policy. The real aims, however, are becoming clearer and more obvious even to the least far-sighted Party members. They are: *an anti-Party bloc of the Potresovs with the Uperyod group*—a bloc which Trotsky supports and is organising. The adoption of Trotsky's resolutions (like the "Vienna" one) by the *Golos* group, *Pravda*'s flirtation with the *Uperyod* group, *Pravda*'s allegations that only members of the

Uperyod group and Trotsky's group are active in the localities in Russia, the publicity given by *Pravda* to the *Uperyod* factional school, Trotsky's direct assistance to this school, these are all facts which cannot long remain concealed. Murder will out.

The substance of Trotsky's policy is "harmonious work" carried on by *Pravda* together with the factions of the Potresovs and *Uperyod*. The various roles in this bloc have been clearly cast: Mr. Potresov and Co. are continuing their legalistic work, independently of the Party, work of destroying the Social-Democratic Party; the *Golos* group represent the foreign branch of this faction; and Trotsky has assumed the role of attorney, assuring the naïve public that "consistent Social-Democratic tactics" has taken "firm root among *all* Party trends". The *Uperyod* group also enjoy the services of this attorney, who pleads their right to maintain a factional school and resorts to hypocritical and formal phrases in order to gloss over their policy. Naturally, this bloc will support Trotsky's "fund" and the anti-Party conference which he is convening, for here the Potresovs and the *Uperyod* group are getting what they want, namely, freedom for their factions, blessings of the conference for those factions, a cover for their activity, and an attorney to defend that activity before the workers.

Therefore, it is from the standpoint of "fundamental principles" that we must regard this bloc as *adventurism* in the most literal meaning of the term. Trotsky *does not dare* to say that he sees in Potresov and in the otzovists real Marxists, real champions of loyalty to the principles of Social-Democracy. The essence of the position of an adventurer is that he must forever resort to evasions. For it is obvious and known to everyone that the Potresovs and the otzovists *all* have their *own* line (an anti-Social-Democratic line) and that they are *pursuing* it, while the diplomats of *Golos* and *Uperyod* only serve as a screen for them.

The most profound reason why this bloc is *doomed* to failure—no matter how great its success among the philistines and no matter how large the "funds" Trotsky may succeed in collecting with the assistance of *Uperyod* and Potresov's "sources"—is that it is an *unprincipled* bloc. The theory of Marxism, "*the fundamental principles*" of our entire world outlook and of our entire Party programme and tac-

tics, is now in the forefront of all Party life not by mere chance, but because it is inevitable. It was no mere chance that since the failure of the revolution, *all* classes of society, the widest sections of the popular *masses*, have displayed a fresh interest in the very fundamentals of the world outlook, including the questions of religion and philosophy, and the *principles* of our Marxist doctrine *as a whole*; that was inevitable. It is no mere chance that the masses, whom the revolution drew into the sharp struggle over questions of tactics, have subsequently, in the period characterised by the absence of open struggle, shown a desire for *general theoretical* knowledge; that was inevitable. We must again explain *the fundamentals of Marxism* to these masses; the defence of Marxist theory is again on the order of the day. When Trotsky declares that the rapprochement between the pro-Party Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks is "devoid of political content" and "unstable", he is thereby merely revealing the depths of his own ignorance, he is thereby demonstrating his own complete emptiness. For it is precisely the fundamental principles of Marxism that have triumphed as a result of the struggle waged by the Bolsheviks against the non-Social-Democratic ideas of *Uperyod*, and as a result of the struggle waged by the pro-Party Mensheviks against the Potresovs and *Golos*. It was precisely this rapprochement on the question of *the fundamental principles* of Marxism that constituted *the real basis* for really harmonious work between the pro-Party Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks during the whole year following the Plenary Meeting. This is a fact—not words, nor promises, nor "well-meaning resolutions". And no matter what differences divided the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks in the past, and will divide them in future (only adventurers are capable of attracting the crowd with *promises* that the differences would disappear, or that they would be "liquidated" by this or that resolution)—this fact cannot be expunged from history. Only the internal development of the principal factions *themselves*, only *their own* ideological evolution, can provide the guarantee that the factions will really be abolished as a result of their drawing closer together, as a result of their being tested in joint work. This began after the Plenary Meeting. We have *so far not* seen harmonious work between Potresov and the *Uperyod* group and Trotsky; all we have seen is group diplomacy,

juggling with words, solidarity in evasions. But the Party has seen the pro-Party Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks work in harmony for a whole year, and anyone who is capable of valuing *Marxism*, anyone who holds dear the "fundamental principles" of Social-Democracy, will not doubt for a moment that nine-tenths of the workers belonging to *both* groups will be fully in favour of *this* rapprochement.

It is precisely from the standpoint of "fundamental principles" that Trotsky's bloc with Potresov and the *Uperyod* group is adventurism. And it is equally so from the standpoint of the *Party's political* tasks. These tasks were indeed pointed out by the Plenary Meeting *unanimously*, but that does not mean that they can be reduced to that banal phrase —combining legal with illegal work (for the Cadets also "combine" the legal *Rech* with the illegal Central Committee of their party)—which Trotsky deliberately uses in order to please the Potresovs and the *Uperyod* group, who do not object to hollow phrases and platitudes.

"The historical circumstances in which the Social-Democratic movement finds itself in the period of bourgeois counter-revolution," the resolution of the Plenary Meeting states, "inevitably beget—as a manifestation of bourgeois influence upon the proletariat—on the one hand, the repudiation of the illegal Social-Democratic Party, the belittling of its role and importance, attempts to curtail the programmatical and tactical tasks and slogans of revolutionary Social-Democracy, etc.; and, on the other hand, repudiation of Social-Democratic work in the Duma and of the utilisation of opportunities for legal work, failure to appreciate the importance of the one and the other, inability to adapt revolutionary Social-Democratic tactics to the peculiar historical conditions of the present moment, etc."

After a *year's experience*, no one can evade a direct answer to the question as to the *real* meaning of these points. Nor must it be forgotten that at the meeting *all* the representatives of the non-Russian nationalities (joined at the time by Trotsky, who is in the habit of joining *any* group that happens to be in the majority at the moment) declared in a written statement that "*in point of fact* it would be desirable to describe the trend mentioned in the resolution as liquidationism, against which it is essential to fight".

The experience of the year since the Plenary Meeting has shown in practice that it is precisely Potresov groups and the *Uperyod* faction that *are the embodiment* of this bourgeois influence upon the proletariat. The *evasion* of this obvious

fact is what we call adventurism, for so far nobody has dared to say openly that the line of Potresov and his supporters is *not* liquidationism, or that recognition of otzovism as "a legal shade of opinion" *conforms* to the line of the Party. The year that followed the meeting has not been wasted on us. We have enriched our experience. We have seen the *practical* manifestation of the tendencies noted at the time. We have seen *factions* arise that embody those tendencies. And *words* about the "harmonious work" of these *anti-Party* factions in an allegedly "Party" spirit can no longer deceive any large sections of the workers.

Thirdly and lastly, Trotsky's policy is adventurism in the *organisational* sense; for, as we have already pointed out, it violates Party legality; by organising a conference in the name of one group abroad (or of a bloc of *two* anti-Party factions—the *Golos* and *Uperyod* factions), it is directly making for a split. Since we are authorised to speak in the name of the whole Party, it is our duty to uphold Party legality to the end. But we by no means want the Party membership to see only the form of "legality" and to overlook the *essence* of the matter. On the contrary, we draw the *main* attention of Social-Democrats to the *essence* of the matter, which consists in the *bloc* formed by the *Golos* and *Uperyod* groups—a bloc which stands for full freedom for Potresov and his like to engage in liquidationist activity and for the otzovists to destroy the Party.

We call upon all Social-Democrats to fight resolutely for Party legality, to fight the anti-Party bloc, for the sake of the fundamental principles of Marxism, and in order to purge Social-Democracy of the taint of liberalism and anarchism.

P.S. The publication of the above article in a special edition (decided on by the vote of a majority of the Editorial Board—two representatives of the Bolshevik trend and one representative of the Polish organisation) has led to a protest (published as a separate leaflet) on the part of the two other members of the Editorial Board who belong to the *Golos* trend. The authors of the leaflet do not deal with the contents of the article, *The State of Affairs in the Party*, on their merits, but accuse the majority of the Editorial Board (1) of

violating their formal rights as co-editors, and (2) of committing an act of "police informing". Since the dispute is not conducted on the plane of principles and tactics but along the lines of an organisational squabble and personal attacks, we consider that the most proper procedure is to refer it entirely to the Central Committee. We believe that, even before the Central Committee comes to a decision on this question, all *Party* comrades will be able to form a proper opinion of the "polemical" methods of the two members of the Editorial Board—Martov and Dan.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 17, pp. 29-38

JUDAS* TROTSKY'S BLUSH OF SHAME

January 1911

At the Plenary Meeting Judas Trotsky made a big show of fighting liquidationism and otzovism. He vowed and swore that he was true to the Party. He was given a subsidy.

After the meeting the Central Committee grew weaker, the *Uperyod* group grew stronger and acquired funds. The liquidators strengthened their position and in *Nasha Zarya* spat in the face of the illegal Party, before Stolypin's** very eyes.

Judas expelled the representative of the Central Committee from *Pravda* and began to write liquidationist articles in *Vorwärts*. In defiance of the direct decision of the School Commission[39] appointed by the Plenary Meeting to the effect that no Party lecturer may go to the *Uperyod* factional school, Judas Trotsky did go and discussed a plan for a conference with the *Uperyod* group. This plan has now been published by the *Uperyod* group in a leaflet.

And it is this Judas who beats his breast and loudly pro-

---

* Name of the central figure in M. Y. Saltykov-Shchedrin's novel *The Messrs. Golovlyovs*. A bigot who conceals his treachery beneath a flood of hypocritical phrases.—*Ed.*

** P. A. Stolypin—Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister for the Interior of Russia in 1906-11. His name is associated with a period of the most brutal political reaction.—*Ed.*

fesses his loyalty to the Party, claiming that he did not grovel before the *Uperyod* group and the liquidators.

Such is Judas Trotsky's blush of shame.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 17, p. 45

From THE CAMP OF THE STOLYPIN "LABOUR" PARTY

(Dedicated to Our "Conciliators" and Advocates of "Agreement")

September 1911

Comrade K.'s letter[40] deserves the profound attention of all to whom our Party is dear. A better exposure of *Golos* policy (and of *Golos* diplomacy), a better refutation of the views and hopes of our "conciliators" and advocates of "agreement" it is hard to imagine.

Is the case cited by Comrade K. an exception? No, it is *typical* of the advocates of a Stolypin labour party, for we know very well that a *number* of writers in *Nasha Zarya, Dyelo Zhizni*, etc., have *already* been systematically preaching *these very* liquidationist ideas *for many a year.* These liquidators do not often meet worker members of the Party; the Party very rarely receives such exact information of their disgraceful utterances as that for which we have to thank Comrade K.; but, *always and everywhere*, the preaching of the *group* of independent legalists is conducted precisely in this spirit. It is impossible to doubt this when periodicals of the *Nasha Zarya* and *Dyelo Zhizni* type exist. It is to the advantage of only the most cowardly and most despicable defenders of the liquidators to keep silent about this.

Compare this fact with the methods employed by people like Trotsky, who shout about "agreement" and about their hostility to the liquidators. We know these methods only too well; these people shout at the top of their voices that they are "neither Bolsheviks nor Mensheviks, but revolutionary Social-Democrats"; they zealously vow and swear that they are foes of liquidationism and staunch defenders of the illegal RSDLP; they *vociferously abuse those who expose the liquidators, the Potresovs*; they say that the anti-liquidators

are "exaggerating" the issue; but *do not say a word* against the definite liquidators Potresov, Martov, Levitsky, Dan, Larin, and so on.

The real purpose of such methods is obvious. They use *phrase-mongering* to shield the *real* liquidators and do everything to *hamper* the work of the anti-liquidators. This was exactly the policy pursued by *Rabocheye Dyelo*,[41] so notorious in the history of the RSDLP for its unprincipled character; it vowed and swore, "We are not Economists, not at all, we are wholly in favour of political struggle"; but in reality it provided a *screen* for *Rabochaya Mysl*[42] and the Economists, directing its whole struggle against those who exposed and refuted the Economists.

Hence it is clear that Trotsky and the "Trotskyites and conciliators" like him are more pernicious than any liquidator; the convinced liquidators state their views bluntly, and it is easy for the workers to detect where they are wrong, whereas the Trotskys *deceive* the workers, *cover up* the evil, and make it impossible to expose the evil and to remedy it. Whoever supports Trotsky's puny group supports a policy of lying and of deceiving the workers, a policy of shielding the liquidators. Full freedom of action for Potresov and Co. in Russia, and the shielding of their deeds by "revolutionary" phrase-mongering abroad—there you have the essence of the policy of "Trotskyism".

Hence it is clear, furthermore, that any "agreement" with the *Golos* group that evades the question of the liquidators' centre in Russia, that is, the leading lights of *Nasha Zarya* and *Dyelo Zhizni*, would be nothing but a continuation of this deception of the workers, this covering up of the evil. Since the Plenary Meeting of January 1910 the *Golos* supporters have made it abundantly clear that they are capable of "subscribing" to any resolution, not allowing any resolution "to hamper the freedom" of their liquidationist activities one iota. Abroad they subscribe to resolutions saying that any disparagement of the importance of the illegal Party is evidence of bourgeois influence among the proletariat, while in Russia they assist the Potresovs, Larins, and Levitskys, who, far from taking part in illegal work, scoff at it and try to destroy the illegal Party.

At present Trotsky, together with Bundists like Mr. Lieber (an extreme liquidator, who publicly defended Mr. Potresov

in his lectures and who now, in order to hush up the fact, is stirring up squabbles and conflicts), together with Letts like Schwartz, and so on, is concocting just such an "agreement" with the *Golos* group. Let nobody be deceived on this score: their agreement will be an agreement to shield the liquidators.

P.S. These lines were already set up when reports appeared in the press of an "agreement" between the *Golos* group and Trotsky, the Bundist and the Lett liquidator. Our words have been fully borne out: this is an agreement *to shield* the liquidators in Russia, an agreement between the servants of the Potresovs.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 17, pp. 242-44

From TROTSKY'S DIPLOMACY AND A CERTAIN PARTY PLATFORM

December 1911

Trotsky's *Pravda* No. 22, which appeared recently after a long interval in which no issue was published, vividly illustrates the decay of the petty groups abroad that attempted to base their existence on their diplomatic game with the non-Social-Democratic trends of liquidationism and otzovism.

The publication appeared on November 29, New Style, nearly a month after the announcement issued by the Russian Organising Commission.[43] *Trotsky makes no mention of this whatsoever.*

As far as Trotsky is concerned, the Russian Organising Commission does not exist. Trotsky calls himself a Party man on the strength of the fact that to him the Russian Party centre, formed by the overwhelming majority of the Social-Democratic organisations in Russia, means nothing. Or perhaps it is the other way round, comrades? Perhaps Trotsky, with his small group abroad, is just nothing so far as the Social-Democratic organisations in Russia are concerned?

Trotsky uses the boldest type for his assertions—it's a wonder he never tires of making solemn vows—that his paper is "not a factional but a Party organ". You need only

pay some little attention to the contents of No. 22 to see at once the obvious mechanics of the game with the *non*-Party *Uperyod* and liquidator factions.

Take the report from St. Petersburg, signed S.V., which advertises the *Uperyod* group. S.V. reproaches Trotsky for not having published the resolution of the St. Petersburg *Uperyod* group against the petition campaign, sent to him long ago. Trotsky, accused by the *Uperyod* group of "narrow factionalism" (what black ingratitude!), twists and turns, pleading lack of funds and the fact that his paper does not appear often enough. The game is too obvious: We will do you a good turn, and you do the same for us—we (Trotsky) will keep silent about the fight of the Party people against the otzovists and, again, we (Trotsky) will help advertise *Uperyod*, and you (S.V.) give in to the liquidators on the question of the "petition campaign". Diplomatic defence of both non-Party factions—isn't that the sign of a true Party spirit?

Or take the florid editorial grandly entitled "Onward!". "Class-conscious workers!" we read in that editorial. "At the present moment there is no more important [sic!] and comprehensive slogan [the poor fellow has let his tongue run away with him] than freedom of association, assembly, and strikes." "The Social-Democrats," we read further, "call upon the proletariat to fight for a republic. But if the fight for a republic is not to be merely the bare [!!] slogan of a select few, it is necessary that you class-conscious workers should teach the masses to realise from experience the need for freedom of association and to fight for this most vital class demand."

This revolutionary phraseology merely serves to disguise and justify the falsity of liquidationism, and thereby to befuddle the minds of the workers. Why is the slogan calling for a republic the *bare* slogan of a *select few* when the existence of a republic means that it would be impossible to disperse the Duma, means freedom of association and of the press, means freeing the peasants from violence and plunder by the Markovs, Romanovs, and Purishkeviches? Is it not clear that it is just the opposite—that it is the slogan of "freedom of association" as a "comprehensive" slogan, used *independently* of the slogan of a republic, that is "bare" and senseless?

It is absurd to demand "freedom of association" from the tsarist monarchy, without explaining to the masses that such freedom cannot be expected from tsarism and that to obtain it there must be a republic. The introduction of bills into the Duma on freedom of association, and questions and speeches on such subjects, ought to serve us Social-Democrats as an occasion and material for our agitation in favour of a republic.

The "class-conscious workers should teach the masses to realise from experience the need for freedom of association". This is the old song of old Russian opportunism, the opportunism long ago preached to death by the Economists. The *experience* of the masses is that the ministers are closing down their unions, that the governors and police officers are daily perpetrating deeds of violence against them—this is real *experience of the masses.* But extolling the slogan of "freedom of association" as opposed to a republic is merely phrase-mongering by an opportunist intellectual who is alien to the masses. It is the phrase-mongering of an intellectual who imagines that the "experience" of a "petition" (with 1,300 signatures)[44] or a pigeon-holed bill is something that educates the "masses". Actually, it is not paper experience, but something different, the experience of life that educates them; what enlightens them is the agitation of the class-conscious workers for a republic—which is the sole comprehensive slogan from the standpoint of political democracy.

Trotsky knows perfectly well that liquidators writing in legal publications *combine* this very slogan of "freedom of association" with the slogan "down with the underground party, down with the struggle for a republic". Trotsky's particular task is to conceal liquidationism by throwing dust in the eyes of the workers.

It is impossible to argue with Trotsky on the merits of the issue, because Trotsky holds no views whatever. We can and should argue with confirmed liquidators and otzovists; but it is no use arguing with a man whose game is to hide the errors of both these trends; in his case the thing to do is to expose him as a diplomat of the smallest calibre.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, pp. 360-62

TO THE BUREAU OF THE CC OF THE RSDLP IN RUSSIA*

April 16, 1912

Dear Friends,

For God's sake give us more contacts. Contacts, contacts, contacts, that's what we haven't got. Without this everything is unstable. Remember that two have already left the scene, there are no replacements for them. Without contacts everything will fall to pieces after one or two further arrests. You must without fail set up regional committees (or simply groups of trusted *agents*), *linked up* with us, for every region. Without this everything is shaky. As regards publication, you should press on with reprinting the *entire* resolution about the elections,[45] to make it *everywhere* available *in full* and among the masses.

As regards the money, it is time to stop being naïve about the Germans. Trotsky is now in full command there, and carrying on a *furious* struggle. You must send us a mandate to take the matter to the courts, otherwise we shall get nothing. We have already sent the May Day leaflet everywhere. I advise you to publish the appeal to the peasants about the elections as a leaflet (from *Rabochaya Gazeta*: the peasantry and the elections).** Make sure of republishing the long article from *Rabochaya Gazeta*. This is an essential supplement to the platform, in which a very important paragraph about socialism has been omitted. Write! Contacts, contacts. Greetings.

P.S. *Vorwärts* is printing the most brazen lies, as, for example, that all Russia has already declared in favour of the Bundist-Lettish conference. It's Trotsky and Co. who are writing, and the Germans believe them. Altogether, Trotsky is boss in *Vorwärts*. The foreign department is controlled by Hilferding, Trotsky's friend.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, pp. 34-35

---

* This letter was sent via the Kiev Committee of the RSDLP.—*Ed.*

** See "The Peasantry and the Elections to the Fourth Duma" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, pp. 529-31).—*Ed.*

From THE LIQUIDATORS AGAINST THE PARTY

April (May) 1912

Trotsky was entrusted with singing all the virtues of the Organising Committee[46] and of the forthcoming liquidationist conference; nor could they have assigned the job to anyone fitter than the "professional uniter". And he did sing ... in every variety of type his Vienna printer could find: "The supporters of *Vperyod* and *Golos*, pro-Party Bolsheviks, pro-Party Mensheviks, so-called liquidators and non-factionalists—in Russia and abroad—are firmly supporting the work..." of the Organising Committee (*Pravda* No. 24).

The poor fellow—again he told a lie, and again he miscalculated. The bloc under the hegemony of the liquidators, which was being prepared in opposition to the Conference of 1912[47] with so much fuss, is now bursting at the seams and the reason is that the liquidators have shown their hand too openly. The Poles refused to take part in the Organising Committee. Plekhanov, through correspondence with a representative of the Committee, established several interesting details, to wit: (1) that what is planned is a "constituent" conference, i.e., not a conference of the RSDLP, but of some new party; (2) that it is being convened on "anarchical" lines; (3) that the "conference is being convened by the liquidators". After these circumstances had been revealed by Comrade Plekhanov, there was nothing surprising to us in the fact that the so-called Bolshevik (?!) conciliators plucked up courage and resolved to convict Trotsky of—having told a lie by listing them among the supporters of the Organising Committee. "This Organising Committee, as it is now constituted, with its obvious tendency to impose upon the whole Party its own attitude to the liquidators, and with the principles of organisational anarchy which it has made the basis for increasing its membership, does not provide the least guarantee that a really general Party conference will be convened." That is how our emboldened "pro-Party" people comment on the Organising Committee today. We do not know where the most Leftist of our Left—the *Vperyod* group, who at one time hastened to signify its sympathy with the Organising Committee—stand today. Nor is this of any

importance. The important thing is that the liquidationist character of the conference to be held by the Organising Committee has been established by Plekhanov with irrefutable clarity, and that the statesmanlike minds of the "conciliators" had to bow to this fact. Who remains, then? The open liquidators and Trotsky.

The basis of this bloc is obvious: the liquidators enjoy full freedom to pursue their line in *Zhivoye Dyelo* and *Nasha Zarya* "as before", while Trotsky, operating abroad, screens them with r-r-revolutionary phrases, which cost him nothing and do not bind them in any way.

There is one little lesson to be drawn from this affair by those abroad who are sighing for unity, and who recently hatched the sheet *Za Partiyu*[48] in Paris. To build up a party, it is not enough to be able to shout "unity"; it is also necessary to have a *political* programme, a programme of political action. The bloc comprising the liquidators, Trotsky, the *Uperyod* group, the Poles, the pro-Party Bolsheviks (?), the Paris Mensheviks, and so on and so forth, was foredoomed to ignominious failure, because it was based on an unprincipled approach, on hypocrisy and hollow phrases. As for those who sigh, it would not be amiss if they finally made up their minds on that extremely complicated and difficult question: With whom do they want to have unity? If it is with the liquidators, why not say so without mincing? But if they are against unity with the liquidators, then what sort of unity are they sighing for?

The January Conference and the bodies it elected are the only thing that actually unites all the RSDLP functionaries in Russia today. Apart from the Conference there is only the promise of the Bundists and Trotsky to convene the liquidationist conference of the Organising Committee, and the "conciliators" who are experiencing their liquidationist hangover.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 18, pp. 22-24

From THE LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF *PRAVDA*[49]

[July 19, 1912]

I advise you to reply to Trotsky through the post: "To Trotsky (Vienna). We shall not reply to disruptive and slanderous letters." Trotsky's dirty campaign against *Pravda* is one mass of lies and slander. The well-known Marxist and follower of Plekhanov, Rothstein (London), has written to us that he received Trotsky's slanders and replied to him: I cannot complain of the Petersburg *Pravda* in any way. But this intriguer and liquidator goes on lying, right and left.

Yours faithfully,
V. Ulyanov

P.S. It would be still better to reply in this way to Trotsky through the post: "*To Trotsky* (Vienna). You are wasting your time sending us disruptive and slanderous letters. They will not be replied to."[50]

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, pp. 40-41

THE QUESTION OF UNITY

February (March) 1913

The letter which Shagov, the Kostroma workers' deputy, wrote to *Pravda* (No. 22/226) indicated very clearly the terms on which the workers think Social-Democratic unity feasible. Letters from a number of other deputies for the worker curia (*Pravda* Nos. 21-28) confirmed this view. The workers themselves must bring about unity "from below". The liquidators should not fight the underground but should form part of it.

It is amazing that after the question has been posed so clearly and squarely we come across Trotsky's old, pompous but perfectly meaningless phrases in *Luch*[51] No. 27 (113). Not a word *on the substance* of the matter! Not the slightest attempt to cite *precise facts* and analyse them thoroughly! Not a hint of the *real terms* of unity! Empty exclamations,

high-flown words, and haughty sallies against opponents whom the author does not name, and impressively important assurances—that is Trotsky's total stock-in-trade.

That won't do, gentlemen. You speak "to the workers" *as though they were children*, now trying to scare them with terrible words ("the shackles of the circle method", "monstrous polemics", "the feudal, serf-owning period of our Party history"), now "coaxing" them, as one coaxes small children, without either convincing them or explaining matters to them.

The workers will not be intimidated or coaxed. They *themselves* will compare *Luch* and *Pravda*; they will read, for example, the leading article in *Luch* No. 101 ("The Mass of the Workers and the Underground"), and simply shrug off Trotsky's verbiage.

"In practice the question of the underground, alleged to be one of principle, is decided by all Social-Democratic groups absolutely alike . . ." Trotsky wrote in italics. The St. Petersburg workers know from experience that that is not so. Workers in any corner of Russia, as soon as they read the *Luch* leading article mentioned above, will see that Trotsky is departing from the truth.

"It is ridiculous and absurd to affirm," we read in his article, "that there is an irreconcilable contradiction between the political tendencies of *Luch* and *Pravda*." Believe us, my dear author, that neither the word "absurd" nor the word "ridiculous" can frighten the workers, who will ask you to speak to them *as to adults on the substance of the matter*: just expound those tendencies and prove that the leading article in *Luch* No. 101 can be "reconciled" with Social-Democracy!

You cannot satisfy the workers with mere phrases, no matter how "conciliatory" or honeyed.

"Our historic factions, Bolshevism and Menshevism, are purely intellectualist formations in origin," wrote Trotsky.

This is the repetition of a liberal tale. In fact, however, the whole of Russian reality confronted the workers with the issue of the attitude to the liberals and the peasantry. Even if there had been no intelligentsia, the workers *could not* have evaded the issue of whether they should *follow* the liberals or lead the peasantry *against* the liberals.

It is *to the advantage* of the liberals to pretend that this fundamental basis of the differences was introduced by "intellectuals". But Trotsky merely disgraces himself by echoing a liberal tale.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 18, pp. 553-54

THE BREAK-UP OF THE "AUGUST" BLOC[52]

March 1914

All who are interested in the working-class movement and Marxism in Russia know that a bloc of the liquidators, Trotsky, the Letts, the Bundists and the Caucasians was formed in August 1912.

The formation of this bloc was announced with tremendous ballyhoo in the newspaper *Luch*, which was founded in St. Petersburg—not with workers' money—just when the elections were being held, in order to sabotage the will of the majority of the organised workers. It went into raptures over the bloc's "large membership", over the alliance of "Marxists of different trends", over "unity" and non factionalism, and it raged against the "splitters", the supporters of the January 1912 Conference.

The question of "unity" was thus presented to thinking workers in a new and practical light. The facts were to show who was right: those who praised the "unity" platform and tactics of the August bloc members, or those who said that this was a false signboard, a new disguise for the old, bankrupt liquidators.

Exactly *eighteen months* passed. A tremendous period considering the upsurge of 1912-13. And then, in February 1914, a new journal—this time eminently "unifying" and eminently and truly "non-factional"—bearing the title *Borba*, was founded by Trotsky, that "*genuine*" adherent of the August platform.

Both the contents of *Borba*'s issue No. 1 and what the liquidators wrote about that journal before it appeared at once revealed to the attentive observer that the August bloc *had broken* up and that frantic efforts were being made to conceal this and hoodwink the workers. But this fraud will also be exposed very soon.

Before the appearance of *Borba*, the editors of *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta*[53] published a scathing comment stating: "The real physiognomy of this journal, which has of late been spoken of quite a lot in Marxist circles, is still unclear to us."

Think of that, reader: since August 1912 Trotsky has been considered a leader of the August unity bloc; but the whole of 1913 shows him to have been dissociated from *Luch* and the Luchists. In 1914, this selfsame Trotsky establishes *his own* journal, while continuing fictitiously on the staff of *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta* and *Nasha Zarya*. "*There is a good deal of talk in circles*" about a secret "memorandum"—which the liquidators are keeping dark—written by Trotsky *against* the Luchists, Messrs. F.D., L.M., and similar "strangers".

And yet the truthful, non-factional and unifying Editorial Board of *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta* writes: "Its physiognomy is still unclear to us."

It is not yet clear to them that the August bloc has fallen apart!

No, Messrs. F.D., L.M., and other Luchists, it is perfectly "clear" to you, and you are simply deceiving the workers.

The August bloc—as we said at the time, in August 1912—turned out to be a mere screen for the liquidators. *That bloc has fallen asunder. Even* its friends in Russia have not been able to stick together. The famous uniters even failed to unite themselves and we got *two* "August" trends, the Luchist trend (*Nasha Zarya* and *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta*) and the Trotskyist trend (*Borba*). Both are waving scraps of the "general and united" August banner which they have torn up, and both are shouting themselves hoarse with cries of "unity".

What is *Borba*'s trend? Trotsky wrote a verbose article in *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta* No. 11, explaining this, but the editors of that liquidator newspaper very pointedly replied that its "physiognomy is still unclear".

The liquidators do have their *own* physiognomy, a liberal, not a Marxist one. Anyone familiar with the writings of F.D., L.S., L.M., Yezhov, Potresov and Co. is familiar with this physiognomy.

Trotsky, however, has never had any "physiognomy" at all; the only thing he does have is a habit of changing sides,

of skipping from the liberals to the Marxists and back again, of mouthing scraps of catchwords and bombastic parrot phrases.

In *Borba* you will not find a *single* live word on any controversial issue.

This is incredible, but it is a fact.

The question of the "underground"? *Not a word.*

Does Trotsky share the views of Axelrod, Zasulich, F.D., L. S. (*Luch* No. 101) and so forth? *Not a murmur.*

The slogan of fighting for an open party? *Not a single word.*

The liberal utterances of the Yezhovs and other Luchists on strikes? The annulment of the programme on the national question? *Not a murmur.*

The utterances of L. Sedov and other Luchists *against two* of the "pillars"[54]? *Not a murmur.* Trotsky assures us that he is in favour of combining immediate demands with ultimate aims, but there is not a word as to his attitude towards the *liquidator* method of effecting this "combination".

Actually, under cover of high-sounding, empty, and obscure phrases that confuse the non-class-conscious workers, Trotsky is defending the liquidators by passing over in silence the question of the "underground", by asserting that there is no liberal labour policy in Russia, and the like.

Trotsky delivers long lectures to the seven Duma deputies, headed by Chkheidze, instructing them how to repudiate the "underground" and the Party in a *more subtle manner.* These amusing lectures clearly point to the *further break-up* of the Seven. Buryanov has left them. They were unable to see eye to eye in their reply to Plekhanov. They are now oscillating between Dan and Trotsky, while Chkheidze is evidently exercising his diplomatic talents in an effort to paper over the new cracks.

And these near-Party people, who are unable to unite on their *own* "August" platform, try to deceive the workers with their shouts about "unity". Vain efforts.

Unity means recognising the "old" and combating those who repudiate it. Unity means rallying the majority of the workers in Russia about decisions which have long been known, and which condemn liquidationism. Unity means that members of the Duma must work in harmony with

the will of the majority of the workers, which the six workers' deputies[55] are doing.

But the liquidators and Trotsky, the Seven and Trotsky, who tore up their own August bloc, who flouted all the decisions of the Party and dissociated themselves from the "underground" as well as from the organised workers, are the worst splitters. Fortunately, the workers have already realised this, and all class-conscious workers are creating their own *real* unity *against* the liquidator disrupters of unity.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 20, pp. 158-61

DISRUPTION OF UNITY UNDER COVER OF OUTCRIES FOR UNITY

May (June) 1914

The questions of the present-day working-class movement are in many respects vexed questions, particularly for representatives of that movement's recent past (i.e., of the stage which historically has just drawn to a close). This applies primarily to the questions of so-called factionalism, splits, and so forth. One often hears intellectuals in the working-class movement making nervous, feverish and almost hysterical appeals not to raise these vexed questions. Those who have experienced the long years of struggle between the various trends among Marxists since 1900-1901, for example, may naturally think it superfluous to repeat many of the arguments on the subject of these vexed questions.

But there are not many people left today who took part in the fourteen-year-old conflict among Marxists (not to speak of the eighteen- or nineteen-year-old conflict, counting from the moment the first symptoms of Economism appeared). The vast majority of the workers who now make up the ranks of the Marxists either do not remember the old conflict, or have never heard of it. To the overwhelming majority (as, incidentally, was shown by the opinion poll held by our journal[56]), these vexed questions are a matter of exceptionally great interest. We therefore intend to deal with these questions, which have been raised *as it were*

anew (and for the younger generation of the workers they are really new) by Trotsky's "non-factional, workers' journal", *Borba*.

I. "FACTIONALISM"

Trotsky calls his new journal "non-factional". He puts this word in the top line in his advertisements; this word is stressed by him in every key, in the editorial articles of *Borba* itself, as well as in the liquidationist *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta*, which carried an article on *Borba* by Trotsky before the latter began publication.

What is this "non-factionalism"?

Trotsky's "workers' journal" is Trotsky's journal *for* workers, as there is not a trace in it of either workers' initiative, or any connection with working-class organisations. Desiring to write in a popular style, Trotsky, in his journal for workers, explains for the benefit of his readers the meaning of such foreign words as "territory", "factor", and so forth.

Very good. But why not also explain to the workers the meaning of the word "non-factionalism"? Is that word *more* intelligible than the words "territory" and "factor"?

No, that is not the reason. The reason is that the label "non-factionalism" is used by the worst representatives of the worst remnants of factionalism to *mislead* the younger generation of workers. It is worth while devoting a little time to explaining this.

Group-division was the main distinguishing feature of the Social-Democratic Party during a definite historical period. Which period? From 1903 to 1911.

To explain the nature of this group-division more clearly we must recall the concrete conditions that existed in, say, 1906-1907. At that time the Party was united, there was no split, but group-division existed, i.e., in the united Party there were *practically two* groups, two virtually separate organisations. The local workers' organisations were united, but on every important issue the two groups devised two sets of tactics. The advocates of the respective tactics disputed among themselves in the united workers' organisations (as was the case, for example, during the discussion of the slogan: a Duma, or Cadet, Ministry in 1906, or during the elections of delegates to the London Congress in 1907), and

questions were decided *by a majority vote.* One group was defeated at the Stockholm Unity Congress (1906), the other was defeated at the London Unity Congress (1907).[57]

These are commonly known facts in the history of organised Marxism in Russia.

It is sufficient to recall these commonly known facts to realise what glaring falsehoods Trotsky is spreading.

For over two years, since 1912, there has been *no* factionalism among the organised Marxists in Russia, no disputes over tactics in *united* organisations, at united *conferences* and congresses. There is a *complete* break between the Party, which in January 1912 formally announced that the liquidators *do not* belong to it, and the liquidators. Trotsky often calls this state of affairs a "split", and we shall deal with this appellation separately later on. But it remains an undoubted fact that the term "factionalism" *deviates from the truth.*

As we have said, this term is a repetition, an uncritical, unreasonable, senseless repetition of *what was true yesterday*, i.e., in the period that has already passed. When Trotsky talks to us about the "chaos of factional strife" (see No. 1, pp. 5, 6, and many others) we realise at once *which* period of the past his words echo.

Consider the present state of affairs from the viewpoint of the young Russian workers who now constitute nine-tenths of the organised Marxists in Russia. They see *three* mass expressions of the different views or trends in the working-class movement: the Pravdists, gathered around a newspaper with a circulation of 40,000; the liquidators (15,000 circulation) and the Left Narodniks (10,000 circulation). The circulation figures tell the reader about the *mass* character of a given tenet.

The question arises: what has "chaos" got to do with it? Everybody knows that Trotsky is fond of high-sounding and empty phrases. But the catchword "chaos" is *not only* phrase-mongering; it signifies *also* the transplanting, or rather, a vain attempt to transplant to Russian soil, in the present period, the relations that existed *abroad* in a *bygone* period. That is the whole point.

There is no "chaos" whatever in the struggle between the Marxists and the Narodniks. That, we hope, not *even* Trotsky will dare to deny. The struggle between the Marxists

and the Narodniks has been going on for over thirty years, ever since Marxism came into being. The cause of this struggle is the radical divergence of interests and viewpoints of two different classes, the proletariat and the peasantry. If there is any "chaos" anywhere, it is only in the heads of cranks who fail to understand this.

What, then, remains? "Chaos" in the struggle between the Marxists and the liquidators? That, too, is wrong, for a struggle against a *trend*, which the entire Party recognised as a trend and condemned as far back as 1908, cannot be called chaos. And everybody who has the least concern for the history of Marxism in Russia knows that liquidationism is most closely and inseverably connected, even as regards its leaders and supporters, with Menshevism (1903-1908) and Economism (1894-1903). Consequently, here, too, we have a history extending over nearly twenty years. To regard the history of one's own Party as "chaos" reveals an unpardonable empty-headedness.

Now let us examine the present situation *from the point of view* of Paris or Vienna. At once the whole picture changes. *Besides* the Pravdists and liquidators, we see *no less than five Russian* groups claiming membership of one and the same Social-Democratic Party: Trotsky's group, two *Uperyod* groups, the "pro-Party Bolsheviks" and the "pro-Party Mensheviks".[58] All Marxists in Paris and in Vienna (for the purpose of illustration I take two of the largest centres) are perfectly well aware of this.

Here Trotsky is right in a certain sense; this is indeed group-division, chaos indeed!

Groups within the Party, i.e., nominal unity (all *claim* to belong to one Party) and actual disunity (for, in fact, all the groups are independent of one another and enter into negotiations and agreements with each other as sovereign powers).

"Chaos", i.e., the absence of (1) objective and verifiable proof that these groups are linked with the working-class movement in Russia and (2) absence of any data to enable us to judge the actual ideological and political physiognomy of these groups. Take a period of two full years—1912 and 1913. As everybody knows, this was a period of the revival and upswing of the working-class movement, when every trend or tendency of a more or less *mass* character (and in

politics this mass character alone counts) *could not but* exercise some influence on the Fourth Duma elections, the strike movement, the legal newspapers, the trade unions, the insurance campaign, and so on. Throughout those two years, not one of these five groups abroad asserted itself in the slightest degree *in any* of the activities of the mass working-class movement in Russia just enumerated!

That is a fact that anybody can easily verify.

And that fact proves that we were right in calling Trotsky a representative of the "worst remnants of factionalism".

Although he claims to be non-factional, Trotsky is known to everybody who is in the least familiar with the working-class movement in Russia as the representative of "Trotsky's *faction*". Here we have group-division, for we see two essential symptoms of it: (1) nominal recognition of unity and (2) group segregation in fact. Here there are remnants of group-division, for there is no evidence whatever of any real connection with the mass working-class movement in Russia.

And lastly, it is the worst form of group-division, for there is *no* ideological and political definiteness. It cannot be denied that this definiteness is characteristic of both the Pravdists (even our determined opponent L. Martov admits that we stand "solid and disciplined" around universally known formal decisions on all questions) and the liquidators (they, or at all events the most prominent of them, have very definite features, namely, liberal, not Marxist).

It cannot be denied that some of the groups which, like Trotsky's, really exist exclusively from the Vienna-Paris, but by no means from the Russian, point of view, possess a degree of definiteness. For example, the *Machist* theories of the Machist *Uperyod* group are definite; the emphatic repudiation of these theories and defence of Marxism, in addition to the theoretical condemnation of liquidationism, by the "pro-Party Mensheviks", are definite.

Trotsky, however, possesses no ideological and political definiteness, for his patent for "non-factionalism", as we shall soon see in greater detail, is merely a patent to *flit* freely to and fro, from one group to another.

To sum up:

(1) Trotsky does not explain, nor does he understand, the historical significance of the *ideological* disagreements among the various Marxist trends and groups, although these dis-

agreements run throughout the twenty years' history of Social-Democracy and concern the fundamental questions of the present day (as we shall show later on);

(2) Trotsky fails to understand that the main specific features of *group-division* are nominal recognition of unity and actual disunity;

(3) Under cover of "non-factionalism" Trotsky is championing the interests of a group abroad which particularly lacks definite principles and has no basis in the working-class movement in Russia.

All that glitters is not gold. There is much glitter and sound in Trotsky's phrases, but they are meaningless.

II. THE SPLIT

"Although there is no group-division, i.e., nominal recognition of unity, but actual disunity, among you, Pravdists, there is something worse, namely, splitting tactics", we are told. This is exactly what Trotsky says. Unable to think out his ideas or to get his arguments to hang together, he rants against group-division at one moment, and at the next shouts: "Splitting tactics are winning one suicidal victory after another" (No. 1, p. 6).

This statement can have only one meaning: "The *Pravdists* are winning one victory after another" (this is an objective, verifiable fact, established by a study of the mass working-class movement in Russia during, say, 1912 and 1913), *but I, Trotsky*, denounce the Pravdists (1) as splitters, and (2) as suicidal politicians.

Let us examine this.

First of all we must express our thanks to Trotsky. Not long ago (from August 1912 to February 1914) he was at one with F. Dan, who, as is well known, threatened to "*kill*" anti-liquidationism, and called upon others to do so. At present Trotsky does not threaten to "kill" our trend (and our Party—don't be angry, Citizen Trotsky, this is true!), he only prophesies that it will kill *itself*!

This is much milder, isn't it? It is almost "non-factional", isn't it?

But joking apart (although joking is the only way of retorting mildly to Trotsky's insufferable phrase-mongering).

"Suicide" is a mere empty phrase, mere "Trotskyism".

Splitting tactics are a grave political accusation. This accusation is repeated against us in a thousand different keys by the liquidators and by all the groups enumerated above, who, from the point of view of Paris and Vienna, actually exist.

And all of them repeat this grave political accusation in an amazingly frivolous way. Look at Trotsky. He admitted that "splitting tactics are winning (read: the Pravdists are winning) one suicidal victory after another". To this he adds:

"*Numerous advanced workers, in a state of utter political bewilderment, themselves often become active agents of a split*" (*No. 1, p. 6*).

Are not these words a glaring example of irresponsibility on this question?

You accuse us of being splitters when all that we see in front of us in the arena of the working-class movement in Russia is liquidationism. So you think that our attitude towards liquidationism is wrong? Indeed, *all* the groups abroad that we enumerated above, no matter how much they may differ from each other, are agreed that our attitude towards liquidationism is wrong, that it is the attitude of "splitters". This, too, reveals the similarity (and fairly close political kinship) between *all* these groups and the liquidators.

If our attitude towards liquidationism is wrong in theory, in principle, then Trotsky should say so *straightforwardly*, and state *definitely*, without equivocation, why he thinks it is wrong. But Trotsky has been evading this extremely important point *for years*.

If our attitude towards liquidationism has been proved wrong in practice, by the experience of the movement, then this experience should be analysed; but Trotsky fails to do this either. "Numerous advanced workers," he admits, "become *active agents* of a split" (read: active agents of the Pravdist line, tactics and system of organisation).

What is the cause of the deplorable fact, which, as Trotsky admits, is confirmed by experience, that the *advanced* workers, the *numerous* advanced workers at that, stand for *Pravda*?

It is the "utter political bewilderment" of these advanced workers, answers Trotsky.

Needless to say, this explanation is highly flattering to Trotsky, to all five groups abroad, and to the liquidators. Trotsky is very fond of using, with the learned air of the expert, pompous and high-sounding phrases to explain historical phenomena in a way that is flattering to Trotsky. Since "numerous advanced workers" become "active agents" of a political and Party line which does not conform to Trotsky's line, Trotsky settles the question unhesitatingly, out of hand: these advanced workers are "in a state of utter political bewilderment", whereas he, Trotsky, is evidently "in a state" of political firmness and clarity, and keeps to the right line!... And this very same Trotsky, beating his breast, fulminates against factionalism, parochialism, and the efforts of intellectuals to impose their will on the workers!

Reading things like these, one cannot help asking oneself: is it from a lunatic asylum that such voices come?

The Party put the question of liquidationism, and of condemning it, before the "advanced workers" as far back as 1908, while the question of "splitting" away from a very definite group of liquidators (namely, the *Nasha Zarya* group), i.e., of building up the Party only *without* this group and in opposition to it—this question was raised in January 1912, over two years ago. The overwhelming majority of the advanced workers declared *in favour of* supporting the "January (1912) line". Trotsky himself admits this fact when he talks about "victories" and about "numerous advanced workers". But Trotsky wriggles out of this simply by *hurling abuse* at these advanced workers and calling them "splitters" and "politically bewildered"!

From these facts sane people will draw a different conclusion. Where the *majority* of the class-conscious workers have rallied around precise and definite decisions, there we shall find *unity* of opinion and action, there we shall find the Party spirit, and the Party.

Where we see liquidators who have been "removed from office" by the workers, or half a dozen groups outside Russia, who for two years have produced *no* proof that they are connected with the mass working-class movement in Russia, there, indeed, we shall find bewilderment and *splitting tactics*. In now trying to persuade the workers *not to carry out the decisions* of that "united whole", which the *Pravda*

Marxists recognise, Trotsky is *trying* to disrupt the movement and cause a split.

These efforts are futile, but we must expose the arrogantly conceited leaders of intellectualist groups, who, while causing splits themselves, are shouting about others causing splits; who, after sustaining *utter defeat* at the hands of the "advanced workers" for the past two years or more, are with incredible insolence *flouting* the decisions and the will of these advanced workers and saying that *they* are "politically bewildered". These are entirely the methods of Nozdryov,* or of "Judas" Golovlyov.

In reply to these repeated outcries about a split and in fulfilment of my duty as a publicist, I will not tire of repeating *precise*, unrefuted and irrefutable figures. In the Second Duma, 47 per cent of the deputies elected by the worker curia were Bolsheviks, in the Third Duma 50 per cent were Bolsheviks, and in the Fourth Duma 67 per cent.

There you have the majority of the "advanced workers", there you have the Party; there you have unity of opinion and action of the majority of the class-conscious workers.

To this the liquidators say (see Bulkin, L. M., in *Nasha Zarya* No. 3) that we base our arguments on the Stolypin curias. This is a foolish and unscrupulous argument. The Germans measure their successes by the results of elections conducted under the Bismarckian electoral law, which excludes women. Only people bereft of their senses would reproach the German Marxists for measuring their successes under the *existing* electoral law, without in the least justifying its reactionary restrictions.

And we, too, without justifying curias, or the curia system, measured our successes under the *existing* electoral law. There were curias in all three (Second, Third and Fourth) Duma elections; and *within* the worker curia, *within* the ranks of Social-Democracy, there was a *complete* swing against the liquidators. Those who do not wish to deceive themselves and others must admit this objective fact, namely, the victory of *working-class unity over* the liquidators.

The other argument is just as "clever": "Mensheviks and liquidators voted for (or took part in the election of) such-and-such a Bolshevik". Splendid! But does not the same

* Nozdryov, a character in *Dead Souls*, a novel by the great Russian writer Nikolai Gogol. An impudent and brazen-faced liar.—*Ed.*

thing apply to the 53 per cent *non*-Bolshevik deputies returned to the Second Duma, and to the 50 per cent returned to the Third Duma, and to the 33 per cent returned to the Fourth Duma?

If, instead of the figures on the deputies elected, we could obtain the figures on the electors, or workers' delegates, etc., we would gladly quote them. But these more detailed figures are *not* available, and consequently the "disputants" are simply throwing dust in people's eyes.

But what about the figures of the workers' groups that assisted the newspapers of the different trends? During *two* years (1912 and 1913), 2,801 groups assisted *Pravda*, and 750 assisted *Luch*.* These figures are verifiable and nobody has attempted to disprove them.

Where is the *unity of action and will of the majority* of the "advanced workers", and where is the *flouting* of the will of the majority?

Trotsky's "non-factionalism" is, actually, splitting tactics, in that it shamelessly flouts the will of the majority of the workers.

III. THE BREAK-UP OF THE AUGUST BLOC

But there is still another method, and a very important one, of verifying the correctness and truthfulness of Trotsky's accusations about splitting tactics.

You consider that it is the "Leninists" who are splitters? Very well, let us assume that you are right.

But if you are, why have not all the other sections and groups proved that unity is possible with the liquidators *without* the "Leninists", and *against* the "splitters"?... If we are splitters, why have not you, uniters, united among yourselves, and with the liquidators? Had you done that you would have proved to the workers *by deeds* that unity is possible and beneficial....

Let us go over the chronology of events.

In January 1912, the "Leninist" "splitters" declared that they were a Party *without* and *against* the liquidators.

In March 1912, *all* the groups and "factions": liquidators,

* A preliminary calculation made up to April 1, 1914, showed 4,000 groups for *Pravda* (commencing with January 1, 1912) and 1,000 for the liquidators and all their allies taken together.

Trotskyites, Vperyodists, "pro-Party Bolsheviks" and "pro-Party Mensheviks", in their Russian newssheets and in the columns of the German Social-Democratic newspaper *Vorwärts, united* against these "splitters". All of them unanimously, in chorus, in unison and in one voice vilified us and called us "usurpers", "mystifiers", and other no less affectionate and tender names.

Very well, gentlemen! But what could have been easier for you than to unite *against* the "usurpers" and to set the "advanced workers" an example of unity? Do you mean to say that if the advanced workers had seen, on the one hand, the unity of all against the usurpers, the unity of liquidators and *non*-liquidators, and on the other, *isolated* "usurpers", "splitters", and so forth, they would not have supported the former?

If disagreements are only invented, or exaggerated, and so forth, by the "Leninists", and if unity between the liquidators, Plekhanovites, Vperyodists, Trotskyites, and so forth, is really *possible*, why have you not proved this during the past two years by *your own* example?

In August 1912, a conference of "uniters" was convened. *Disunity* started at once: the Plekhanovites refused to attend at all; the Vperyodists attended, but walked out after protesting and exposing the fictitious character of the whole business.

The liquidators, the Letts, the Trotskyites (Trotsky and Semkovsky), the Caucasians, and the Seven "united". But did they? We stated at the time that they did not, that this was merely a screen to cover up liquidationism. Have the events disproved our statement?

Exactly eighteen months later, in February 1914, we found:

1. That the Seven was breaking up. Buryanov had left them.

2. That in the remaining new "Six", Chkheidze and Tulyakov, or somebody else, could not see eye to eye on the reply to be made to Plekhanov. They stated in the press that they would reply to him, *but they could not.*

3. That Trotsky, who for many months had practically vanished from the columns of *Luch,* had *broken away*, and had started "his own" journal, *Borba.* By calling this journal "non-factional", Trotsky clearly (clearly to those who are

at all familiar with the subject) intimates that in his, Trotsky's, opinion, *Nasha Zarya* and *Luch had proved to be* "factional", i.e., poor uniters.

If you are a uniter, my dear Trotsky, if you say that it is possible to unite with the liquidators, if you and they stand by the "fundamental ideas formulated in August 1912" (*Borba* No. 1, p. 6, Editorial Note), why *did not you yourself* unite with the liquidators in *Nasha Zarya* and *Luch*?

When, before Trotsky's journal appeared, *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta* published some scathing comment stating that the physiognomy of this journal was "unclear" and that there had been "quite a good deal of talk in Marxist circles" about this journal, *Put Pravdy* (No. 37)* was naturally obliged to expose this falsehood. It said: "There has been talk in Marxist circles" about a secret memorandum written by Trotsky *against* the *Luch* group; Trotsky's physiognomy and his breakaway from the August bloc were perfectly "clear".

4. An, the well-known leader of the Caucasian liquidators, who had attacked L. Sedov (for which he was given a public wigging by F. Dan and Co.), now appeared in *Borba*. It remains "unclear" whether the Caucasians now desire to go with Trotsky or with Dan.

5. The Lettish Marxists, who were the only real organisation in the "August bloc", had *formally* withdrawn from it, stating (in 1914) in the resolution of their last congress that:

> "*the attempt on the part of the conciliators to unite at all costs with the liquidators (the August Conference of 1912) proved fruitless, and the uniters themselves became ideologically and politically dependent upon the liquidators.*"

This statement was made, after eighteen months' experience, by an organisation which had itself been *neutral* and had *not* desired to establish connection with *either* of the two centres. This decision of *neutrals* should carry all the more weight with Trotsky!

Enough, is it not?

Those who accused us of being splitters, of being unwilling or unable to get on with the liquidators, were *themselves* unable to get on with them. The August bloc proved to be a fiction and broke up.

---

* See pp. 81-84.—*Ed.*

By concealing this break-up from his readers, Trotsky is deceiving them.

The experience of our opponents has proved that we are right, has proved that the liquidators cannot be co-operated with.

IV. A CONCILIATOR'S ADVICE TO THE "SEVEN"

The editorial article in issue No. 1 of *Borba* entitled "The Split in the Duma Group" contains advice from a conciliator to the Seven pro-liquidator (or inclining towards liquidationism) members of the Duma. The gist of this advice is contained in the following words:

> "first of all consult the Six whenever it is necessary to reach an agreement with other groups..." (p. 29).

This is the wise counsel which, among other things, is evidently the cause of Trotsky's disagreement with the liquidators of *Luch*. This is the opinion the Pravdists have held ever since the outbreak of the conflict between the two groups in the Duma, ever since the resolution of the Summer (1913) Conference was adopted. The Russian Social-Democratic Labour group in the Duma has reiterated in the *press*, even after the split, that it continues to adhere to this position, in spite of the repeated refusals of the Seven.

From the very outset, since the time the resolution of the Summer Conference was adopted, we have been, and still are, of the opinion that *agreements* on questions concerning activities *in the Duma* are desirable and possible; if such agreements have been repeatedly arrived at with the petty-bourgeois peasant democrats (Trudoviks), they are all the more possible and necessary with the petty-bourgeois, liberal labour politicians.

We must not exaggerate disagreements, but we must face the facts: the Seven are men leaning towards liquidationism, who yesterday entirely followed the lead of Dan, and whose eyes today are travelling longingly from Dan to Trotsky and back again. The liquidators are a group of legalists who have broken away from the Party and are pursuing a liberal labour policy. Since they repudiate the "underground", there can be no question of unity with them in matters concerning Party organisation and the working-

class movement. Whoever thinks differently is badly mistaken and fails to take into account the profound nature of the changes that have taken place since 1908.

But *agreements* on certain questions with this group, which stands outside or on the fringe of the Party, are, of course, permissible: we must *always* compel this group, too, like the Trudoviks, to choose between the workers' (Pravdist) policy and the liberal policy. For example, on the question of fighting for freedom of the press the liquidators clearly revealed vacillation between the liberal formulation of the question, which repudiated, or overlooked, the illegal press, and the opposite policy, that of the workers.

Within the scope of a *Duma* policy in which the most important *extra-Duma* issues are not directly raised, agreements with the seven liberal-labour deputies are possible and desirable. On this point Trotsky has shifted his ground *from* that of the liquidators *to* that of the Party Summer (1913) Conference.

It should not be forgotten, however, that to a group standing outside the Party, agreement means something entirely different from what Party people usually understand by the term. By "agreement" in the Duma, non-Party people mean "*drawing up a* tactical resolution, or line". To Party people agreement is an attempt to *enlist* others in the work of carrying out the Party line.

For example, the Trudoviks have no party. By agreement they understand "freedom", so to speak, of "drawing up" a line, today with the Cadets, tomorrow with the Social-Democrats. We, however, understand something entirely different by agreement with the Trudoviks. We have Party decisions on all the important questions of tactics, and we shall never depart from these decisions; by agreement with the Trudoviks we mean *winning* them over to our side, *convincing* them that we are right, and *not rejecting* joint action against the Black Hundreds and against the liberals.

How far Trotsky has forgotten (not for nothing has he associated with the liquidators) this elementary difference between the Party and non-Party point of view on agreements, is shown by the following argument of his:

"The representatives of the International must bring together the two sections of our divided parliamentary group and jointly with them ascertain the points of agreement and points of disagreement.... A

detailed tactical resolution formulating the principles of parliamentary tactics may be drawn up..." (No. 1, pp. 29-30).

Here you have a characteristic and typical example of the liquidationist presentation of the question! Trotsky's journal forgets about the Party; such a trifle is hardly worth remembering!

When different parties in Europe (Trotsky is fond of inappropriately talking about Europeanism) come to an agreement or unite, what they do is this: their respective representatives meet and first of all ascertain the points of disagreement (precisely what the International proposed in relation to Russia, without including in the resolution Kautsky's ill-considered statement that "the old Party no longer exists"[59]). Having ascertained the points of disagreement, the representatives decide *what decisions* (resolutions, conditions, etc.) on questions of tactics, organisation, etc., *should be submitted to the congresses of the two parties.* If they succeed in drafting unanimous decisions, the congresses decide whether to adopt them or not. If *differing* proposals are made, they too are submitted for final decision to the congresses of the two parties.

What appeals to the liquidators and Trotsky is only the *European* models of opportunism, but certainly not the models of European partisanship.

"A detailed tactical resolution" will be drawn up by the members of the Duma! This example should serve the Russian "advanced workers", with whom Trotsky has good reason to be so displeased, as a striking illustration of the lengths to which the groups in Vienna and Paris—who persuaded even Kautsky that there was "no Party" in Russia—go in their ludicrous project-mongering. But if it is sometimes possible to fool foreigners on this score, the Russian "advanced workers" (at the risk of provoking the terrible Trotsky to another outburst of displeasure) will laugh in the faces of these project-mongers.

"Detailed tactical resolutions", they will tell them, "are drawn up among us (we do not know how it is done among you non-Party people) by Party congresses and conferences, for example, those of 1907, 1908, 1910, 1912 and 1913. We shall gladly acquaint uninformed foreigners, as well as forgetful Russians, with our Party decisions, and still more gladly ask the representatives of the Seven, or the

August bloc members, or Left-wingers or anybody else, to acquaint us with the resolutions of their congresses or conferences and to bring up at their next congress the definite question of the attitude they should adopt towards our resolutions, or towards the resolution of the neutral Lettish Congress of 1914, etc."

This is what the "advanced workers" of Russia will say to the various project-mongers, and this *has already been said* in the Marxist press, for example, by the organised Marxists of St. Petersburg. Trotsky chooses to ignore these published terms for the liquidators? So much the worse for Trotsky. It is our duty to warn our readers how ridiculous that "unity" (the August type of "unity"?) project-mongering is which refuses to reckon with the will of the majority of the class-conscious workers of Russia.

V. TROTSKY'S LIQUIDATIONIST VIEWS

As to the substance of his own views, Trotsky contrived to say as little as possible in his new journal. *Put Pravdy* (No. 37) has already commented on the fact that Trotsky has not said a word either on the question of the "underground" or on the slogan of working for a legal party, etc.* That, among other things, is why we say that when attempts are made to form a separate organisation which is to have *no* ideological and political physiognomy, it is *the worst* form of factionalism.

Although Trotsky has refrained from openly expounding his views, quite a number of passages in his journal show what kind of ideas he has been trying to smuggle in.

In the very first editorial article in the first issue of his journal, we read the following:

> "The pre-revolutionary Social-Democratic Party in our country was a *workers'* party only in ideas and aims. Actually, it was an organisation of the Marxist intelligentsia, which led the awakening working class" (5).

This is the old liberal and liquidationist tune, which is really the prelude to the *repudiation of the Party.* It is based on a distortion of the historical facts. The strikes of

---

* See pp. 81-84.—*Ed.*

1895-96 had already given rise to a *mass* working-class movement, which both in ideas and organisation was linked with the Social-Democratic movement. And in these strikes, in this economic and non-economic agitation, the "intelligentsia *led* the working class"!?

Or take the following exact statistics of political offences in the period 1901-03 compared with the preceding period.

Occupations of Participants in the Emancipation Movement Prosecuted for Political Offences (per cent)

Period	Agriculture	Industry and commerce	Liberal professions and students	No definite occupation, and no occupation
1884-90	7.1	15.1	53.3	19.9
1901-03	9.0	46.1	28.7	8.0

We see that in the eighties, when there was as yet *no* Social-Democratic Party in Russia, and when the movement was "Narodnik", the intelligentsia predominated, accounting for over half the participants.

But the picture underwent a complete change in 1901-03, when a Social-Democratic Party already existed, and when the old *Iskra* was conducting its work. The intelligentsia were now a *minority* among the participants of the movement; the *workers* ("industry and commerce") were far more numerous than the intelligentsia, and the workers and peasants together constituted more than half the total.

It was precisely in the conflict of trends within the Marxist movement that the petty-bourgeois intellectualist *wing* of the Social-Democracy made itself felt, beginning with Economism (1895-1903) and continuing with Menshevism (1903-1908) and liquidationism (1908-1914). Trotsky repeats the liquidationist slander against the Party and is afraid to mention the history of the twenty years' conflict of trends within the Party.

Here is another example.

"In its attitude towards parliamentarism, Russian Social-Democracy passed through the same three stages ... [as in other countries] ... first 'boycottism' ... then the acceptance in principle of parliamentary tactics, but ... [that magnificent "but", the "but" which Shchedrin translated

as: The ears never grow higher than the forehead, never!*] ... for purely agitational purposes ... and lastly, the presentation from the Duma rostrum ... of current demands..." (No. 1, p. 34).

This, too, is a liquidationist distortion of history. The distinction between the second and third stages was invented in order to smuggle in a defence of reformism and opportunism. Boycottism as a stage in "the attitude of Social-Democracy towards parliamentarism" never existed *either* in Europe (where anarchism has existed and continues to exist) *or* in Russia, where the boycott of the Bulygin Duma, for example, applied *only* to a definite institution, was *never* linked with "parliamentarism", and was engendered by the peculiar nature of the struggle between liberalism and Marxism for the continuation of the onslaught. Trotsky does not breathe a word about the way this struggle affected the conflict between the two trends in Marxism!

When dealing with history, one must explain concrete questions and the class roots of the different trends; anybody who wants to make a Marxist study of the struggle of classes and trends over the question of participation in the Bulygin Duma, will see therein the roots of the liberal labour policy. But Trotsky "deals with" history only in order to *evade* concrete questions and to *invent* a justification, or a semblance of justification, for the present-day opportunists!

"Actually, all trends," he writes, "employ the same methods of struggle and organisation." "The outcries about the liberal danger in our working-class movement are simply a crude and sectarian travesty of reality" (No. 1, pp. 5 and 35).

This is a very clear and very vehement defence of the liquidators. But we will take the liberty of quoting at least one small fact, one of the very latest. Trotsky merely slings words about; we should like the workers themselves to ponder over the facts.

It is a fact that *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta* for March 13 wrote the following:

"*Instead of emphasising the definite and concrete task that confronts the working class, viz., to compel the Duma to throw out the bill [on the*

* Meaning the impossible.—*Ed.*

press], a vague formula is proposed of fighting for the 'uncurtailed slogans', and at the same time the illegal press is widely advertised, which can only lead to the relaxation of the workers' struggle for their legal press."

This is a clear, precise and documentary defence of the liquidationist policy and a criticism of the *Pravda* policy. Well, will any literate person say that both trends employ "the same methods of struggle and organisation" on this question? Will any literate person say that the liquidators are *not* pursuing a *liberal*-labour policy on this question, that the liberal menace to the working-class movement is purely imaginary?

The reason why Trotsky avoids facts and concrete references is because they relentlessly refute all his angry outcries and pompous phrases. It is very easy, of course, to strike an attitude and say: "a crude and sectarian travesty". Or to add a still more stinging and pompous catch-phrase, such as "emancipation from conservative factionalism".

But is this not very cheap? Is not this weapon borrowed from the arsenal of the period when Trotsky posed in all his splendour before audiences of high-school boys?

Nevertheless, the "advanced workers", with whom Trotsky is so angry, would like to be told plainly and clearly: Do you or do you not approve of the "method of struggle and organisation" that is definitely expressed in the above-quoted appraisal of a definite political campaign? If you do, then you are pursuing a liberal-labour policy, betraying Marxism and the Party; to talk of "peace" or of "unity" with *such* a policy, with groups which pursue *such* a policy, means deceiving yourself and others.

If not, then say so plainly. Phrases will not astonish, satisfy or intimidate the present-day workers.

Incidentally, the policy advocated by the liquidators in the above-quoted passage is a foolish one even from the liberal point of view, for the passage of a bill in the Duma depends on "Zemstvo-Octobrists" of the type of Bennigsen, who has already shown his hand in the committee.

* * *

The old participants in the Marxist movement in Russia know Trotsky very well, and there is no need to discuss

him for their benefit. But the younger generation of workers do not know him, and it is therefore necessary to discuss him, for he is typical of all the five groups abroad, which, in fact, are also vacillating between the liquidators and the Party.

In the days of the old *Iskra* (1901-03), these waverers, who flitted from the Economists to the Iskrists and back again, were dubbed "Tushino turncoats" (the name given in the Troublous Times in Rus to fighting men who went over from one camp to another).

When we speak of liquidationism we speak of a definite ideological trend, which grew up in the course of many years, stems from Menshevism and Economism in the twenty years' history of Marxism, and is connected with the policy and ideology of a definite class—the liberal bourgeoisie.

The only ground the "Tushino turncoats" have for claiming that they stand above groups is that they "borrow" their ideas from one group one day and from another the next day. Trotsky was an ardent Iskrist in 1901-03, and Ryazanov described his role at the Congress of 1903 as "Lenin's cudgel". At the end of 1903, Trotsky was an ardent Menshevik, i.e., he deserted from the Iskrists to the Economists. He said that "there is a gulf between the old *Iskra* and the new". In 1904-05, he deserted the Mensheviks and occupied a vacillating position, now co-operating with Martynov (the Economist), now proclaiming his absurdly Left "permanent revolution" theory. In 1906-07, he approached the Bolsheviks, and in the spring of 1907 he declared that he was in agreement with Rosa Luxemburg.

In the period of disintegration, after long "non-factional" vacillation, he again went to the Right, and in August 1912, he entered into a bloc with the liquidators. He has now deserted them again, although *in substance* he reiterates their shoddy ideas.

Such types are characteristic of the flotsam of past historical formations, of the time when the mass working-class movement in Russia was still dormant, and when every group had "ample room" in which to pose as a trend, group or faction, in short, as a "power", negotiating amalgamation with others.

The younger generation of workers should know exactly whom they are dealing with, when individuals come before them with incredibly pretentious claims, unwilling absolutely to reckon with *either* the Party decisions, which since 1908 have defined and established our attitude towards liquidationism, *or* with the experience of the present-day working-class movement in Russia, which has actually brought about the *unity* of the majority on the basis of full recognition of the aforesaid decisions.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 20, pp. 327-47

From THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION

February-May 1914

9. THE 1903 PROGRAMME AND ITS LIQUIDATORS

The reader will see that at the Second Congress of the Party, which adopted the Programme, it was unanimously understood that self-determination meant "only" the right to secession. Even the Bundists grasped this truth at the time, and it is only in our own deplorable times of continued counter-revolution and all sorts of "apostasy" that we can find people who, bold in their ignorance, declare that the programme is "vague". But before devoting time to these sorry would-be Social-Democrats, let us first finish with the attitude of the Poles to the Programme.

They came to the Second Congress (1903) declaring that unity was necessary and imperative. But they left the Congress after their "reverses" in the Programme Commission, and their *last word* was a written statement, printed in the Minutes of the Congress, containing the above-mentioned proposal to *substitute* cultural-national autonomy for self-determination.

In 1906 the Polish Marxists joined the Party; *neither* upon joining *nor* afterwards (at the Congress of 1907, the conferences of 1907 and 1908, or the plenum of 1910) *did*

they introduce a single proposal to amend § 9 of the Russian programme!

That is a fact.

And, despite all utterances and assurances, this fact definitely proves that Rosa Luxemburg's friends regarded the question as having been settled by the debate at the Programme Commission of the Second Congress, as well as by the decision of that Congress, and that they tacitly acknowledged their mistake and corrected it by joining the Party in 1906, after they had left the Congress in 1903, without a single attempt to raise the question of amending § 9 of the programme through *Party* channels.

Rosa Luxemburg's article appeared over her signature in 1908—of course, it never entered anyone's head to deny Party publicists the right to criticise the programme—and, *since* the writing of this article, *not a single* official body of the Polish Marxists has raised the question of revising § 9.

Trotsky was therefore rendering a great disservice to certain admirers of Rosa Luxemburg when he wrote, on behalf of the editors of *Borba* in issue No. 2 of that publication (March 1914):

"The Polish Marxists consider that 'the right to national self-determination' is entirely devoid of political content and should be deleted from the programme" (p. 25).

The obliging Trotsky is more dangerous than an enemy! Trotsky could produce *no* proof, except "private conversations" (i.e., simply gossip, on which Trotsky always subsists), for classifying "Polish Marxists" in general as supporters of every article by Rosa Luxemburg. Trotsky presented the "Polish Marxists" as people devoid of honour and conscience, incapable of respecting even their own convictions and the programme of their Party. How obliging Trotsky is!

When, in 1903, the representatives of the Polish Marxists walked out of the Second Congress *over* the right to self-determination, Trotsky could have said *at the time* that they regarded this right as devoid of content and subject to deletion from the programme.

But after that the Polish Marxists *joined* the Party whose

programme this was, and they have never introduced a motion to amend it.*

Why did Trotsky withhold these facts from the readers of his journal? Only because it pays him to speculate on fomenting differences between the Polish and the Russian opponents of liquidationism and to deceive the Russian workers on the question of the programme.

Trotsky has never yet held a firm opinion on any important question of Marxism. He always contrives to worm his way into the cracks of any given difference of opinion, and desert one side for the other. At the present moment he is in the company of the Bundists and the liquidators. And these gentlemen do not stand on ceremony where the Party is concerned.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 20, pp. 446-48

From SOCIALISM AND WAR

(The Attitude of the RSDLP Towards the War)[60]

July-August 1915

CHAPTER I

THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM AND THE WAR OF 1914-1915

"Kautskyism"

Kautsky, the leading authority in the Second International, is a most typical and striking example of how a verbal recognition of Marxism has led in practice to its conversion into "Struvism" or into "Brentanoism".[61] Another example is Plekhanov. By means of patent sophistry, Marxism is

* We are informed that the Polish Marxists attended the Summer Conference of the Russian Marxists in 1913 with *only* a consultative voice and did not vote at all on the right to self-determination (secession), declaring their opposition to this right in general. Of course, they had a perfect right to act the way they did, and, as hitherto, to agitate in Poland against secession. But this is not quite what Trotsky said; for the Polish Marxists did not demand the "deletion" of § 9 "from the programme".

stripped of its revolutionary living spirit; *everything* is recognised in Marxism *except* the revolutionary methods of struggle, the propaganda and preparation of those methods, and the education of the masses in this direction. Kautsky "reconciles" in an unprincipled way the fundamental idea of social-chauvinism, recognition of defence of the fatherland in the present war, with a diplomatic sham concession to the Lefts—his abstention from voting for war credits, his verbal claim to be in the opposition, etc. Kautsky, who in 1909 wrote a book on the approaching epoch of revolutions and on the connection between war and revolution, Kautsky, who in 1912 signed the Basle Manifesto on taking revolutionary advantage of the impending war, is outdoing himself in justifying and embellishing social-chauvinism and, like Plekhanov, joins the bourgeoisie in ridiculing any thought of revolution and all steps towards the immediate revolutionary struggle.

The working class cannot play its world-revolutionary role unless it wages a ruthless struggle against this backsliding, spinelessness, subservience to opportunism, and unparalleled vulgarisation of the theories of Marxism. Kautskyism is not fortuitous; it is the social product of the contradictions within the Second International, a blend of loyalty to Marxism in word, and subordination to opportunism in deed.

This fundamental falseness of "Kautskyism" manifests itself in different ways in different countries. In Holland, Roland-Holst, while rejecting the idea of defending the fatherland, defends unity with the opportunists' party. In Russia, Trotsky, while rejecting this idea, also defends unity with the opportunist and chauvinist *Nasha Zarya* group. In Rumania, Rakovsky, while declaring war on opportunism as being responsible for the collapse of the International, is at the same time ready to recognise the legitimacy of the idea of defending the fatherland. All this is a manifestation of the evil which the Dutch Marxists (Gorter and Pannekoek) have called "passive radicalism", and which amounts to replacing revolutionary Marxism with eclecticism in theory, and servility to or impotence towards opportunism, in practice. . . .

CHAPTER IV

THE HISTORY OF THE SPLIT, AND THE PRESENT STATE OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY IN RUSSIA

The Present State of Affairs in the Ranks of the Russian Social-Democrats

As we have already said, our January 1912 Conference has not been recognised by the liquidators, or by a number of groups abroad (those of Plekhanov, Alexinsky, Trotsky, and others), or by the so-called "national" (i.e., non-Great Russian) Social-Democrats. Among the numberless epithets hurled against us, "usurpers" and "splitters" have been most frequently repeated. We have replied by quoting precise and objectively verifiable figures showing that our Party has united four-fifths of the class-conscious workers in Russia. This is no small figure, considering the difficulties of underground activities in a period of counter-revolution.

If "unity" were possible in Russia on the basis of Social-Democratic tactics, without expelling the *Nasha Zarya* group, why have our numerous opponents not achieved it *even among themselves*? Three and a half years have elapsed since January 1912, and all this time our opponents, much as they have desired to do so, have failed to form a Social-Democratic party in opposition to us. This fact is our Party's best defence.

The entire history of the Social-Democratic groups that are fighting against our Party has been a history of collapse and disintegration. In March 1912, all of them, without exception, "united" in reviling us. But already in August 1912, when the so-called August bloc was formed against us, disintegration set in among them. Some of the groups defected from them. They were unable to form a party and a Central Committee; what they set up was only an Organising Committee "for the purpose of restoring unity". Actually, this OC proved an ineffective cover for the liquidationist group in Russia. Throughout the tremendous upswing of the working-class movement in Russia and the mass strikes of 1912-14, the only group in the entire August bloc to conduct work among the masses was the *Nasha Zarya*

group, whose strength lay in its links with the liberals. Early in 1914, the Lettish Social-Democrats officially withdrew from the August bloc (the Polish Social-Democrats did not join it), while Trotsky, one of the leaders of the bloc, left it unofficially, again forming his own separate group. At the Brussels Conference of July 1914, at which the Executive Committee of the International Socialist Bureau, Kautsky and Vandervelde participated, the so-called Brussels bloc was formed against us, which the Letts did not join, and from which the Polish opposition Social-Democrats forthwith withdrew. On the outbreak of war, this bloc collapsed. *Nasha Zarya*, Plekhanov, Alexinsky and An, leader of the Caucasian Social-Democrats, became open social-chauvinists, who came out for the desirability of Germany's defeat. The OC and the Bund defended the social-chauvinists and the principles of social-chauvinism. Although it voted against the war credits (in Russia, even the bourgeois democrats, the Trudoviks, voted against them), the Chkheidze Duma group remained *Nasha Zarya*'s faithful ally. Plekhanov, Alexinsky and Co., our extreme social-chauvinists, were quite pleased with the Chkheidze group. In Paris, the newspaper *Nashe Slovo* (the former *Golos*) was launched, with the participation mainly of Martov and Trotsky, who wanted to combine a platonic defence of internationalism with an absolute demand for unity with *Nasha Zarya*, the OC or the Chkheidze group. After 250 issues, this newspaper was itself compelled to admit its disintegration: one section of the editorial board gravitated towards our Party, Martov remained faithful to the OC which publicly censured *Nashe Slovo* for its "anarchism" (just as the opportunists in Germany, David and Co., *Internationale Korrespondenz*[62] and Legien and Co. have accused Comrade Liebknecht of anarchism); Trotsky announced his rupture with the OC, but wanted to stand with the Chkheidze group. Here are the programme and the tactics of the Chkheidze group, as formulated by one of its leaders. In No. 5, 1915, of *Sovremenny Mir*,[63] journal of the Plekhanov and Alexinsky trend, Chkhenkeli wrote:

"To say that German Social-Democracy was in a position to prevent its country from going to war and failed to do so would mean either secretly wishing that it should not only have breathed its last at the bur-

*ricades, but also have the fatherland breathe its last, or looking at nearby things through an anarchist's telescope."**

These few lines express the sum and substance of social-chauvinism: both the justification, in principle, of the idea of "defence of the fatherland" in the present war, and mockery—with the permission of the military censors—of the preachment of and preparation for revolution. It is not at all a question of whether the German Social-Democrats were or were not in a position to prevent war, or whether, in general, revolutionaries can guarantee the success of a revolution. The question is: shall socialists behave like socialists or really breathe their last in the embrace of the imperialist bourgeoisie?

Our Party's Tasks

Social-Democracy in Russia arose before the bourgeois-democratic revolution (1905) in our country, and gained strength during the revolution and counter-revolution. The backwardness of Russia explains the extraordinary multiplicity of trends and shades of petty-bourgeois opportunism in our country; whereas the influence of Marxism in Europe and the stability of the legally existing Social-Democratic parties before the war converted our exemplary liberals into near-admirers of "reasonable", "European" (non-revolutionary), "legal" "Marxist" theory and Social-Democracy. The working class of Russia could not build up its party otherwise than in a resolute thirty-year struggle against all the varieties of opportunism. The experience of the world war, which has brought about the shameful collapse of European opportunism and has strengthened the alliance between our national-liberals and social-chauvinist liquidationism, has still further fortified our conviction that our Party must follow the same consistently revolutionary road.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 21, pp. 311-12, 335-38

---

* *Sovremenny Mir* No. 5, 1915, p. 148. Trotsky recently announced that he deemed it his task to enhance the prestige of the Chkheidze group in the International. No doubt Chkhenkeli will with equal energy enhance Trotsky's prestige in the International. . . .

From THE LETTER TO ALEXANDRA KOLLONTAI

[Not earlier than August 4, 1915]

Dear A. M.,

We were very glad about the statement by the Norwegians and your efforts with the Swedes.[64] It would be devilishly important to have a joint international statement by the *Left* Marxists! (A statement of principle is the main thing, and so far the only thing possible.)

Roland-Holst, like Rakovsky (have you seen his French pamphlet?), like Trotsky, in my opinion, are *all* the most harmful "Kautskyites", in the sense that all of them in various forms are for unity with the opportunists, all in various forms *embellish* opportunism, all of them (in various ways) preach eclecticism instead of revolutionary Marxism.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, p. 200

From THE LETTER TO HENRIETTE ROLAND-HOLST

8/III.1916

(5) What are our differences with Trotsky? This must probably interest you. In brief—he is a Kautskyite, that is, he stands for unity with the Kautskyites in the International and with Chkheidze's parliamentary group in Russia. We are absolutely against such unity. Chkheidze with his phrases (that he is for Zimmerwald: see his recent speech, *Vorwärts* 5/III) *cloaks* the fact that he shares the views of the *Organising Committee* and of the people *taking part in the war committees.** Trotsky at present is against the Organising Committee (Axelrod and Martov) but for unity with the Chkheidze Duma group!!

We are definitely against.

With best regards to you, Comrade Pannekoek and the other Dutch comrades!

Yours,

N. Lenin

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 43, pp. 515-16

* Meaning the war industries committees.[65]—*Ed.*

From THE DISCUSSION ON SELF-DETERMINATION SUMMED UP

July 1916

11. CONCLUSION

Contrary to the erroneous assertions of the Polish Social-Democrats, the demand for the self-determination of nations has played no less a role in our Party agitation than, for example, the arming of the people, the separation of the church from the state, the election of civil servants by the people and other points the philistines have called "utopian". On the contrary, the strengthening of the national movements after 1905 naturally prompted more vigorous agitation by our Party, including a number of articles in 1912-13, and the resolution of our Party in 1913 giving a precise "anti-Kautskian" definition (i.e., one that does not tolerate purely verbal "recognition") of the *content* of the point.*

It will not do to overlook a fact which was revealed at that early date: opportunists of various nationalities, the Ukrainian Yurkevich, the Bundist Liebman, Semkovsky, the Russian myrmidon of Potresov and Co., all spoke *in favour* of Rosa Luxemburg's arguments *against* self-determination! What for Rosa Luxemburg, the Polish Social-Democrat, had been merely an incorrect theoretical generalisation of the *specific* conditions of the movement in Poland, became *objective* opportunist support for Great-Russian imperialism when actually applied to more extensive circumstances, to conditions obtaining in a big state instead of a small one, when applied on an international scale instead of the narrow Polish scale. The history of *trends* in political thought (as distinct from the views of individuals) has proved the correctness of our programme.

Outspoken social-imperialists, such as Lensch, still rail both against self-determination and the renunciation of annexations. As for the Kautskyites, they hypocritically recognise self-determination—Trotsky and Martov are going the same way here in Russia. *Both of them*, like Kautsky, say they favour self-determination. What happens in prac-

* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 427-29.—*Ed.*

tice? Take Trotsky's articles "The Nation and the Economy" in *Nashe Slovo*, and you will find his usual eclecticism: on the one hand, the economy unites nations and, on the other, national oppression divides them. The conclusion? The conclusion is that the prevailing hypocrisy remains unexposed, agitation is dull and does not touch upon what is most important, basic, significant and closely connected with practice—one's attitude to the nation that is oppressed by "one's own" nation. Martov and other secretaries abroad simply preferred to forget—a profitable lapse of memory!—the struggle of their colleague and fellow-member Semkovsky against self-determination. In the legal press of the Gvozdyovites (*Nash Golos*[66]) Martov spoke *in favour* of self-determination, pointing out the indisputable truth that during the imperialist war it does not *yet* imply participation, etc., but evading the main thing—he also evades it in the illegal, free press!—which is that *even in peace time* Russia set a world record for the oppression of nations with an imperialism that is much more crude, medieval, economically backward and militarily bureaucratic. The Russian Social-Democrat who "recognises" the self-determination of nations more or less as it is recognised by Messrs. Plekhanov, Potresov and Co., that is, without bothering to fight for the freedom of secession for nations oppressed by tsarism, is *in fact* an imperialist and a lackey of tsarism.

No matter what the subjective "good" intentions of Trotsky and Martov may be, their evasiveness objectively supports Russian social-imperialism. The epoch of imperialism has turned all the "great" powers into the oppressors of a number of nations, and the development of imperialism will inevitably lead to a more definite division of trends in this question in international Social-Democracy as well.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 22, pp. 358-60

From THE LETTER TO ALEXANDRA KOLLONTAI

February 17, 1917

Dear A.M.,

We had your letter today, and were very glad to get it. For a long time we did not know that you were in America,

and had no letters from you except one, telling us that you were leaving America.

I wrote to you on January 7-8 (the day the letter was forwarded from Stockholm—all the letters direct from here to America are intercepted by the French!), but evidently this letter (with an article for *Novy Mir*) did not reach you while you were still in New York.

Pleasant as it was to learn from you of the victory of N. Iv. and Pavlov in *Novy Mir* (I get this newspaper devilishly irregularly; it must be the fault of the post and not the dispatch department of the paper itself), it was just as sad to read about the bloc between Trotsky and the Right for the struggle against N. Iv. What a swine this Trotsky is—Left phrases, and a bloc with the Right against the Zimmerwald Left!![67] He ought to be exposed (by you) if only in a brief letter to *Sotsial-Demokrat*!

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 35, p. 285

From THE LETTER TO INESSA ARMAND

[February 19, 1917]

Dear Friend,

The other day we had a gratifying letter from Moscow (we shall soon send you a copy, although the text is uninteresting). They write that the mood of the masses is a good one, that chauvinism is clearly declining and that probably our day will come. The organisation, they say, is suffering from the fact that the adults are at the front, while in the factories there are young people and women. But the fighting spirit, they say, is not any the less. They send us the copy of a leaflet (a good one) issued by the Moscow Bureau of the Central Committee.[68] We shall print it in the next issue of the Central Organ.

Richard is himself again! It's difficult for people to live, and for our Party in particular. But still they do live.

There is also a letter from Kollontai, who (let this be *entre nous* for the time being) has returned to Norway from America. N. Iv. and Pavlov (the Lett who was in Brussels: Pavel Vasilyevich) had *won Novy Mir*, she says (I get this

paper very irregularly), but ... Trotsky arrived, and this scoundrel at once ganged up with the *Right* wing of *Novy Mir* against the Left Zimmerwaldists!! That's it!! That's Trotsky for you!! Always true to himself = twists, swindles, poses as a Left, *helps* the Right, so long as he can....

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, p. 288

From THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT IN OUR REVOLUTION

(Draft Platform for the Proletarian Party)

April-May (June), 1917

THE SITUATION WITHIN THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

16. The international obligations of the working class of Russia are precisely now coming to the forefront with particular force.

Only lazy people do not swear by internationalism these days. Even the chauvinist defencists, even Plekhanov and Potresov, even Kerensky, call themselves internationalists. It becomes the duty of the proletarian party all the more urgently, therefore, to clearly, precisely and definitely counterpose internationalism in deed to internationalism in word.

Mere appeals to the workers of all countries, empty assurances of devotion to internationalism, direct or indirect attempts to fix a "sequence" of action by the revolutionary proletariat in the various belligerent countries, laborious efforts to conclude "agreements" between the socialists of the belligerent countries *on the question* of the revolutionary struggle, all the fuss over the summoning of socialist congresses *for the purpose* of a peace campaign, etc., etc.—no matter how sincere the authors of such ideas, attempts, and plans may be—amount, as far as their *objective* significance is concerned, to mere phrase-mongering, and *at best* are innocent and pious wishes, fit only to conceal the *deception* of the people by the chauvinists. The *French* social-chauvinists, who are the most adroit and accomplished in methods of parliamentary hocus-pocus, have long since broken the record

for ranting and resonant pacifist and internationalist phrases *coupled with* the incredibly brazen betrayal of socialism and the International, the acceptance of posts in governments which conduct the imperialist war, the voting of credits *or loans* (as Chkheidze, Skobelev, Tsereteli and Steklov have been doing recently in Russia), opposition to the revolutionary struggle in *their own country,* etc., etc.

Good people often forget the brutal and savage setting of the imperialist world war. This setting does not tolerate phrases, and mocks at innocent and pious wishes.

There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism, and that is—working whole-heartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in *one's own* country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy, and material aid) *this struggle*, this, *and only this*, line, in every *country* without exception.

Everything else is deception and Manilovism.*

During the two odd years of the war the international socialist and working-class movement in *every* country has evolved three trends. Whoever ignores *reality* and refuses to recognise the existence of these three trends, to analyse them, to fight consistently for the trend that is really internationalist, is doomed to impotence, helplessness and errors.

The three trends are:

(1) The social-chauvinists, i.e., socialists in word and chauvinists in deed, people who recognise "defence of the fatherland" in an imperialist war (and above all in the present imperialist war).

These people are our *class* enemies. They have gone over to the bourgeoisie.

They are the majority of the official leaders of the official Social-Democratic parties in *all* countries—Plekhanov and Co. in Russia, the Scheidemanns in Germany, Renaudel, Guesde and Sembat in France, Bissolati and Co., in Italy, Hyndman, the Fabians and the Labourites (the leaders of the "Labour Party") in Britain, Branting and Co. in Sweden, Troelstra and his party in Holland, Stauning and his party in Denmark, Victor Berger and the other "defenders of the fatherland" in America, and so forth.

---

* *Manilovism*—meaning idle chatter and spineless dreaming. Derived from Manilov, a character in Nikolai Gogol's *Dead Souls.—Ed.*

(2) The second trend, known as the "Centre", consists of people who vacillate between the social-chauvinists and the true internationalists.

The "Centre" all vow and declare that they are Marxists and internationalists, that they are for peace, for bringing every kind of "pressure" to bear upon the governments, for "demanding" in every way that their own government should "ascertain the will of the people for peace", that they are for all sorts of peace campaigns, for peace without annexations, etc., etc.—*and for peace with the social-chauvinists.* The "Centre" is for "unity", the Centre is opposed to a split.

The "Centre" is a realm of honeyed petty-bourgeois phrases, of internationalism in word and cowardly opportunism and fawning on the social-chauvinists in deed.

The crux of the matter is that the "Centre" is not convinced of the necessity for a revolution against one's own government; it does not preach revolution; it does not carry on a whole-hearted revolutionary struggle; and in order to evade such a struggle it resorts to the tritest ultra-"Marxist"-sounding *excuses.*

The social-chauvinists are our *class enemies*, they are *bourgeois* within the working-class movement. They represent a stratum, or groups, or sections of the working class which *objectively* have been bribed by the bourgeoisie (by better wages, positions of honour, etc.), and which help *their own* bourgeoisie to plunder and oppress small and weak peoples and to fight *for* the division of the capitalist spoils.

The "Centre" consists of routine-worshippers, eroded by the canker of legality, corrupted by the parliamentary atmosphere, etc., bureaucrats accustomed to snug positions and cushy jobs. Historically and economically speaking, they are not a *separate* stratum but represent only a *transition* from a past phase of the working-class movement—the phase between 1871 and 1914, which gave much that is valuable to the proletariat, particularly in the indispensable art of slow, sustained and systematic organisational work on a large and very large scale—to *a new phase* that became *objectively* essential with the outbreak of the first imperialist world war, which inaugurated *the era of social revolution.*

The chief leader and spokesman of the "Centre" is Karl

Kautsky, the most outstanding authority in the Second International (1889-1914), since August 1914 a model of utter bankruptcy as a Marxist, the embodiment of unheard-of spinelessness, and the most wretched vacillations and betrayals. This "Centrist" trend includes Kautsky, Haase, Ledebour and the so-called workers' or labour group in the Reichstag; in France it includes Longuet, Pressemane and the so-called minoritaires[69] (Mensheviks) in general; in Britain, Philip Snowden, Ramsay MacDonald and many other leaders of the Independent Labour Party,[70] and some leaders of the British Socialist Party[71]; Morris Hillquit and many others in the United States; Turati, Trèves, Modigliani and others in Italy; Robert Grimm and others in Switzerland; Victor Adler and Co. in Austria; the party of the Organising Committee, Axelrod, Martov, Chkheidze, Tsereteli and others in Russia, and so forth.

Naturally, at times individuals unconsciously drift from the social-chauvinist to the "Centrist" position, and vice versa. Every Marxist knows that classes are distinct, even though individuals may move freely from one class to another; similarly, *trends* in political life are distinct in spite of the fact that individuals may change freely from one trend to another, and in spite of all attempts and efforts to *amalgamate* trends.

(3) The third trend, that of the true internationalists, is best represented by the "Zimmerwald Left". (We reprint as a supplement its manifesto of September 1915, to enable the reader to learn of the inception of this trend at first hand.)

Its distinctive feature is its complete break with both social-chauvinism and "Centrism", and its gallant revolutionary struggle against *its own* imperialist government and *its own* imperialist bourgeoisie. Its principle is: "Our chief enemy is at home". It wages a ruthless struggle against honeyed social-pacifist phrases (a social-pacifist is a socialist in word and a bourgeois pacifist in deed; bourgeois pacifists dream of an everlasting peace *without* the overthrow of the yoke and domination of capital) and against all *subterfuges* employed to deny the possibility, or the appropriateness, or the timeliness of a proletarian revolutionary struggle and of a proletarian socialist revolution *in connection* with the present war.

The most outstanding representative of this trend in Germany is the Spartacus group or the *Internationale* group, to which Karl Liebknecht belongs. Karl Liebknecht is a most celebrated representative of this trend and of the *new*, and genuine, proletarian International.

Karl Liebknecht called upon the workers and soldiers of Germany to *turn their guns* against *their own* government. Karl Liebknecht did that openly from the rostrum of parliament (the Reichstag). He then went to a demonstration in Potsdamer Platz, one of the largest public squares in Berlin, with illegally printed leaflets proclaiming the slogan "Down with the Government". He was arrested and sentenced to *hard labour*. He is now serving his term in a German convict prison, like *hundreds*, if not thousands, of other *true* German socialists who have been imprisoned for their anti-war activities.

Karl Liebknecht in his speeches and letters mercilessly attacked not only *his own* Plekhanovs and Potresovs (Scheidemanns, Legiens, Davids and Co.), *but also his own Centrists*, his own Chkheidzes and Tseretelis (Kautsky, Haase, Ledebour and Co.).

Karl Liebknecht and his friend Otto Rühle, two out of one hundred and ten deputies, violated discipline, destroyed the "unity" with the "Centre" and the chauvinists, and *went against all of them*. Liebknecht *alone* represents socialism, the proletarian cause, the proletarian revolution. *All* the rest of German Social-Democracy, to quote the apt words of Rosa Luxemburg (also a member and one of the leaders of the Spartacus group), is a "*stinking corpse*".

Another group of true internationalists in Germany is that of the Bremen paper *Arbeiterpolitik*.

Closest to the internationalists in deed are: in France, Loriot and his friends (Bourderon and Merrheim have slid down to social-pacifism), as well as the Frenchman Henri Guilbeaux, who publishes in Geneva the journal *Demain*[72]; in Britain, the newspaper *The Trade-Unionist*,[73] and *some* of the members of the British Socialist Party and of the Independent Labour Party (for instance, Russel Williams, who openly called for a break with the leaders who have *betrayed* socialism), the Scottish socialist schoolteacher *MacLean*, who was sentenced to *hard labour* by the bourgeois government of Britain for his revolutionary fight

against the war, and hundreds of British socialists who are in jail for the same offence. They, and they alone, are internationalists *in deed*. In the United States, the Socialist Labour Party[74] and those within the opportunist Socialist Party[75] who in January 1917 began publication of the paper, *The Internationalist*[76]; in Holland, the Party of the "Tribunists" which publishes the paper *De Tribune* (Pannekoek, Herman Gorter, Wijnkoop, and Henriette Roland-Holst, who, although Centrist at Zimmerwald, has now joined our ranks)[77]; in Sweden, the Party of the Young, or the Left,[78] led by Lindhagen, Ture Nerman, Carleson, Ström and Z. Höglund, who at Zimmerwald was personally active in the organisation of the "Zimmerwald Left", and who is now in prison for his revolutionary fight against the war; in Denmark, Trier and his friends who have left the now purely *bourgeois* "Social-Democratic" Party of Denmark, headed by the *Minister* Stauning; in Bulgaria, the "Tesnyaki"[79]; in Italy, the nearest are Constantino Lazzari, secretary of the party, and Serrati, editor of the central organ, *Avanti!*; in Poland, Radek, Hanecki and other leaders of the Social-Democrats united under the "Regional Executive", and Rosa Luxemburg, Tyszka and other leaders of the Social-Democrats united under the "Chief Executive"[80]; in Switzerland, those of the Left who drew up the argument for the "referendum" (January 1917) in order to fight the social-chauvinists and the "Centre" in *their own* country and who at the Zurich Cantonal Socialist Convention, held at Töss on February 11, 1917, moved a consistently revolutionary resolution against the war; in Austria, the young Left-wing friends of Friedrich Adler, who acted partly through the Karl Marx Club in Vienna, now closed by the arch-reactionary Austrian Government, which is ruining Adler's life for his heroic though ill-considered shooting at the minister, and so on.

It is not a question of shades of opinion, which certainly exist even among the Lefts. It is a question of *trend*. The thing is that it is not easy to be an internationalist in deed during a terrible imperialist war. Such people are few; but it is on such people *alone* that the future of socialism depends; they *alone* are *the leaders of the people*, and not their corrupters.

The distinction between the reformists and the revolution-

aries, among the Social-Democrats, and socialists generally, was objectively bound to undergo a change under the conditions of the imperialist war. Those who confine themselves to "demanding" that the bourgeois governments should conclude peace or "ascertain the will of the peoples for peace", etc., are *actually* slipping into reforms. For, objectively, the *problem of the war* can be solved only in a *revolutionary way.*

There is no possibility of this war ending in a democratic, non-coercive peace or of the people being relieved of the burden of *billions* paid in interest to the capitalists, who have made fortunes out of the war, except through a revolution of the proletariat.

The most varied reforms can and must be demanded of the bourgeois governments, but one cannot, without sinking to Manilovism and reformism, demand that people and classes entangled by the thousands of threads of imperialist capital should *tear* those threads. And unless they are torn, all talk of a war against war is idle and deceitful prattle.

The "Kautskyites", the "Centre", are revolutionaries in word and reformists in deed, they are internationalists in word and accomplices of the social-chauvinists in deed.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,*
Vol. 24, pp. 74-80

LENIN AT THE MEZHRAYONTSI CONFERENCE[81]

May 1917

(Extract)

II

Amalgamation is desirable without delay.

It will be proposed to the C[entral] C[ommittee] of the RSDLP to include forthwith a Mezhrayontsi representative on the board of each of the two newspapers (the present *Pravda*, which is to be turned into an all-Russ[ia] *popular* newspaper, and the CO, which is to be organised in the immediate future).

It will be suggested that the C[entral] C[ommittee] set up a special organising committee to convene a Party congress

(in one and a half months). The inter-regional con[ference] will get the right to have two delegates included in that committee. If the M[enshe]viks, supporters of Martov, break with the "defencists", the inclusion of their delegates in that committee is both desirable and necessary.

Freedom of discussion of outstanding issues is ensured by the publication of discussion leaflets in [*Pravda*] *Priboi* and by the free discussion in the journal *Prosveshcheniye* (*Kommunist*), which is being revived.

The draft has been read by N. Lenin on his own behalf and on behalf of several members of the CC (May 10, 1917).*

III

Trotsky: (who took the floor out of turn immediately after me. . . .)

I agree with the resolution as a whole—but only *insofar* as Russian B[olshev]ism has *become international.*

The Bolsheviks have been debolshevised—and I cannot call myself a B[olsh]e[vi]k.

Their resolution can (and must) be used as the basis for the *qualification.*

But we cannot be asked to recognise B[olshev]ism.

The Bureau—(C[entral] C[ommittee] + ...) is acceptable.

Participation in the newspaper—this proposal is "less convincing".

"From that angle it will not stand." Agreement of individual writers:

"from a different angle, from the angle of setting up your own newspaper". . . .

Co-operation (from both sides) is very desirable. . . .

(Discus[sion] organs are unessential). . . .

The old factional name is undesirable. . . .

They want the *nationals* to be also included in the "Org[ani]s[ing] Bureau".

Lenin Miscellany IV,
Russ. ed., pp. 302-03

---

* This postscript, as the entire document, was written by Lenin in his own hand.—*Ed.*

SIXTH CONGRESS OF THE RSDLP(B)

Petrograd, July 26-August 3 (August 8-16), 1917[81]

RESOLUTION "ON PARTY UNITY"*

The split between the social-patriots and the revolutionary internationalists in Russia—a split that has taken place on a world scale, too—is steadily growing wider. Having begun with defencism, the Mensheviks have ended with the most despicable alliance with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, inspiring and sanctioning the persecution of internationalist organisations, the workers' press, etc., etc. Having turned into menials of the Russian and allied imperialism, they have finally gone over to the camp of the proletariat's enemies.

Under these circumstances revolutionary Social-Democracy's prime task is to show the treacherous policy of the imperialist Mensheviks in its true light to the broadest sections of the proletarian masses, and completely isolate them from all elements of the working class who are in any way revolutionary. Any attempt to secure a reconciliation between imperialist and revolutionary-internationalist elements of socialism through a "unity congress", with the object of setting up a single Social-Democratic party (plan of the *Novaya Zhizn* group of intellectuals who have no base to stand on), would, therefore, be a heavy blow to the interests of the proletariat. On the basis of its recognition of the need for a total and irrevocable split with the imperialist Mensheviks, the Congress declares that it is categorically opposed to such attempts. In opposition to the dangerous slogan of the unity of all, Social-Democracy advances the class revolutionary slogan of unity of all internationalists who have in fact broken with the imperialist Mensheviks. The Congress believes that such unity is necessary and inevitable and calls on all Social-Democratic revolutionary elements to rupture

---

* Forwarded to the CC for editing and printed only with stylistic corrections. Adopted at the morning sitting on August 3. (Note by the editors of the first printing of the minutes of the Sixth Congress.)

forthwith their organisational ties with the defencists and unite round the RSDLP.

The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 1, p. 501

From THE CRISIS HAS MATURED[83]

V

Yes, the leaders of the Central Executive Committee* are pursuing the correct tactics of defending the bourgeoisie and the landowners. And there is not the slightest doubt that if the Bolsheviks allowed themselves to be caught in the trap of constitutional illusions, "faith" in the Congress of Soviets and in the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, "waiting" for the Congress of Soviets, and so forth—these Bolsheviks would most certainly be *miserable traitors* to the proletarian cause.

They would be traitors to the cause, for by their conduct they would be betraying the German revolutionary workers who have started a revolt in the navy. To "wait" for the Congress of Soviets and so forth under such circumstances would be a *betrayal of internationalism,* a betrayal of the cause of the world socialist revolution.

For internationalism consists of *deeds* and not phrases, not expressions of solidarity, not resolutions.

The Bolsheviks would be traitors to the *peasants,* for to tolerate the suppression of the peasant revolt by a government which *even Dyelo Naroda* compares with the Stolypin government would be to *ruin* the whole revolution, to ruin it for good. An outcry is raised about anarchy and about the increasing indifference of the people, but what else can the people be but indifferent to the elections, when the peasants have been *driven to revolt* while the so-called "revolutionary

* Meaning the Central Executive Committee elected in June (July) 1917 at the First Congress of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Most of the members of this CEC were Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. It existed until the Second Congress of Soviets, which was held in October (November) 1917.—*Ed.*

democrats" are patiently tolerating its suppression by military force!

The Bolsheviks would be traitors to democracy and to freedom, for to tolerate the suppression of the peasant revolt at such a moment would *mean* allowing the elections to the Constituent Assembly to be fixed *in exactly the same* way as the Democratic Conference[84] and the "Pre-parliament" were fixed, only even worse and more crudely.

The crisis has matured. The whole future of the Russian revolution is at stake. The honour of the Bolshevik Party is in question. The whole future of the international workers' revolution for socialism is at stake.

The crisis has matured. . . .

September 29, 1917

Everything to this point may be published, but what follows is *to be distributed* among the members of the *Central Committee, the Petrograd Committee, the Moscow Committee, and the Soviets.*

VI

What, then, is to be done? We must *aussprechen was ist,* "state the facts", admit the truth that there is a tendency, or an opinion, in our Central Committee and among the leaders of our Party which favours *waiting* for the Congress of Soviets, and is *opposed* to taking power immediately, is *opposed* to an immediate insurrection. That tendency, or opinion, must be *overcome.*[85]

Otherwise, the Bolsheviks will cover themselves with eternal *shame* and *destroy themselves* as a party.

For to miss such a moment and to "wait" for the Congress of Soviets would be *utter idiocy,* or *sheer treachery.*

It would be sheer treachery to the German workers. Surely we should not wait until their revolution *begins.* In that case even the Lieberdans would be in favour of "supporting" it. But it *cannot* begin as long as Kerensky, Kishkin and Co. are in power.

It would be sheer treachery to the peasants. To allow the peasant revolt to be suppressed when we control the Soviets of both *capitals* would be to *lose,* and *justly lose,*

every ounce of the peasants' confidence. In the eyes of the peasants we would be putting ourselves on a level with the Lieberdans and other scoundrels.

To "wait" for the Congress of Soviets would be utter idiocy, for it would mean losing *weeks* at a time when weeks and even days decide *everything*. It would mean faint-heartedly *renouncing* power, for on November 1-2 it will have become impossible to take power (both politically and technically, since the Cossacks would be mobilised for the day of the insurrection so foolishly "appointed"*).

To "wait" for the Congress of Soviets is idiocy, for the Congress will **give nothing**, *and can give nothing*!

"Moral" importance? Strange indeed, to talk of the "importance" of resolutions and conversations with the Lieberdans when we know that the Soviets *support* the peasants and that the peasant revolt is *being suppressed*! We would be reducing the *Soviets* to the status of wretched debating parlours. First defeat Kerensky, then call the Congress.

The Bolsheviks are now *guaranteed* the success of the insurrection: (1) we can** (if we do not "wait" for the Soviet Congress) launch a *surprise* attack from three points—from Petrograd, from Moscow and from the Baltic fleet; (2) we have slogans that guarantee us support—down with the government that is suppressing the revolt of the peasants against the landowners! (3) we have a majority *in the country*; (4) the disorganisation among the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries is complete; (5) we are technically in a position to take power in Moscow (where the start might even be made, so as to catch the enemy unawares); (6) we have *thousands* of armed workers and soldiers in Petrograd who could *at once* seize the Winter Palace, the General Staff building, the telephone exchange and the large printing presses. Nothing will be able to drive us out, while agitational work in the *army* will be such as to make it *impossible* to combat this government of peace, of land for the peasants, and so forth.

* To "convene" the Congress of Soviets for October 20 in order to decide upon "taking power"—how does that differ from foolishly "appointing" an insurrection? It is possible to take power now, whereas on October 20-29 you will not be given a chance to.

** What has the Party done to *study* the disposition of the troops, etc.? What has it done to conduct the insurrection as an "art"? Mere talk in the Central Executive Committee, and so on!

If we were to attack at once, suddenly, from three points, Petrograd, Moscow and the Baltic fleet, the chances are a hundred to one that we would succeed with smaller sacrifices than on July 3-5, because *the troops will not advance* against a government of peace. Even though Kerensky *already* has "loyal" cavalry, etc., in Petrograd, if we were to attack from two sides, he would be compelled to *surrender* since *we* enjoy the sympathy of the army. If with such chances as we have at present we do not take power, then all talk of transferring the power to the Soviets becomes *a lie*.

To refrain from taking power now, to "wait", to indulge in talk in the Central Executive Committee, to confine ourselves to "fighting for the organ" (of the Soviet), "fighting for the Congress", is *to doom the revolution to failure*.

In view of the fact that the Central Committee has *even left unanswered* the persistent demands I have been making for such a policy ever since the beginning of the Democratic Conference, in view of the fact that the Central Organ is *deleting* from my articles all references to such glaring errors on the part of the Bolsheviks as the shameful decision to participate in the Pre-parliament, the admission of Mensheviks to the Presidium of the Soviet, etc.—I am compelled to regard this as a "subtle" hint at the unwillingness of the Central Committee even to consider this question, a subtle hint that I should keep my mouth shut, and as a proposal for me to retire.

I am compelled to *tender my resignation from the Central Committee,* which I hereby do, reserving for myself freedom to campaign among the *rank and file* of the Party and at the Party Congress.

For it is my profound conviction that if we "wait" for the Congress of Soviets and let the present moment pass, we shall *ruin* the revolution.

September 29 *N. Lenin*

P.S. There are a number of facts which serve to prove that *even* the Cossack troops will not go against a government of peace! And how many are there? Where are they? And will not the entire army dispatch units *for our support*?

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. 26, pp. 81-85

THE STRUGGLE LENIN AND THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY WAGED AGAINST TROTSKYISM IN 1918-1922

SPEECHES ON WAR AND PEACE AT A MEETING OF THE CC OF THE RSDLP(B) JANUARY 11 (24), 1918[86]

Minutes

1

Comrade Lenin speaks first and points out that at the meeting on January 8 (21) three standpoints were brought out on this question, and asks whether the question should be discussed point by point on the theses he put forward, or whether a general discussion should be opened. The second alternative is adopted, and Comrade Lenin has the floor.

He begins by setting forth the three standpoints brought out at the previous meeting: (1) signing a separate annexationist peace, (2) waging a revolutionary war, and (3) proclaiming the war ended, demobilising the army, but not signing a peace treaty. At the previous meeting, the first standpoint received 15 votes, the second 32 and the third 16.

Comrade Lenin points out that the Bolsheviks have never renounced defence, but this defence and protection of the fatherland must have a definite, concrete context, which exists at the present time, namely, defence of the Socialist Republic against an extremely strong international imperialism. The question is only one of how we should defend our fatherland, the Socialist Republic. The army is excessively fatigued by the war; the horses are in such a state that in the event of an offensive we shall not be able to move the artillery; the Germans are holding such favourable positions

on the islands in the Baltic that if they start an offensive they could take Revel and Petrograd with their bare hands. By continuing the war in such conditions, we shall greatly strengthen German imperialism, peace will have to be concluded just the same, but then the peace will be still worse because it is not we who will be concluding it. The peace we are now forced to conclude is undoubtedly an ignominious one, but if war begins, our government will be swept away and peace will be concluded by a different government. At present, we are relying not only on the proletariat but also on the poor peasantry, which will abandon us if the war continues. Drawing out the war is in the interest of French, British and American imperialism, and proof of this, for example, is the offer made at Krylenko's headquarters by the Americans to pay 100 rubles for every Russian soldier. Those who take the standpoint of revolutionary war stress that we shall then be engaged in a civil war with German imperialism, and shall thereby awaken revolution in Germany. But Germany, after all, is still only pregnant with revolution, whereas we have already given birth to a quite healthy infant, the Socialist Republic, which we may kill if we start the war. We are in possession of a circular letter of the German Social-Democrats, there is information about the attitude to us of two trends in the Centre, of which one considers that we have been bought, and that the current events in Brest are a farce, with the actors playing out their parts. This section is attacking us for the armistice. The other section of the Kautskyites says that the personal honesty of the leaders of the Bolsheviks is beyond all doubt, but that the Bolsheviks' behaviour is a psychological riddle.[87] We don't know the opinion of the Left-wing Social-Democrats. The British workers are supporting our efforts for peace. Of course, the peace we conclude will be an ignominious one, but we need a breathing space in order to carry out social reforms (take transport alone); we need to consolidate ourselves, and this takes time. We need to complete the crushing of the bourgeoisie, but for this we need to have both our hands free. Once we have done this, we shall free both our hands, and then we should be able to carry on a revolutionary war against international imperialism. The echelons of the revolutionary volunteer army which have now been formed are the officers of our future army.

What Comrade Trotsky is proposing—an end to the war, refusal to sign a peace treaty and demobilisation of the army—is an international political demonstration. The only thing we achieve by withdrawing our troops is handing over the Estonian Socialist Republic to the Germans. It is said that by concluding peace we are giving a free hand to the Japanese and Americans, who will immediately occupy Vladivostok. By the time they have even reached Irkutsk, we shall have been able to strengthen our Socialist Republic. By signing a peace treaty we, of course, betray self-determined Poland, but we retain the Estonian Socialist Republic and win a chance to consolidate our gains. Of course, we make a turn to the right, which leads through a very dirty stable, but we must do it. If the Germans start an offensive, we shall be forced to sign any peace treaty, and then, of course, it will be worse. An indemnity of three thousand million is not too high a price for saving the Socialist Republic. By signing peace now, we give the broad masses a visual demonstration that the imperialists (of Germany, Britain and France), having taken Riga and Baghdad, are continuing to fight, whereas we are developing, the Socialist Republic is developing.

2

Comrade Lenin points out that he is not in agreement on some points with his supporters Stalin and Zinoviev.[88] Of course, there is a mass movement in the West, but the revolution there has not yet begun. But if we were to alter our tactics because of that, we should be traitors to international socialism. He does not agree with Zinoviev that the conclusion of peace will for a time weaken the movement in the West. If we believe that the German movement can develop immediately, in the event of an interruption of the peace negotiations, then we must sacrifice ourselves, for the German revolution will have a force much greater than ours. But the whole point is that the movement there has not yet begun, but over here it already has a newborn and loudly shouting infant, and unless we now say clearly that we agree to peace, we shall perish. It is important for us to hold out until the general socialist revolution gets under way, but this we can only achieve by concluding peace.

3

Comrade Lenin motions a vote on the proposition that we drag out the signing of a peace treaty in every possible way.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, pp. 467-70

TELEGRAM TO GENERAL HEADQUARTERS OF THE SUPREME COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF*

[January 29 (February 11), 1918]

Use all methods available to you to cancel today's telegram on peace and general demobilisation of the armies on all fronts. By order of Lenin.[89]

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 44, p. 60

TELEGRAM TO GENERAL HEADQUARTERS OF THE SUPREME COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF**

[January 30 (February 12), 1918]

Notify all army commissars and Bonch-Bruyevich that all telegrams signed by Trotsky and Krylenko on demobilisation of the army are to be held up. We cannot give you the peace terms, since peace really has not yet been concluded. Please hold up all telegrams reporting peace until you receive special permission.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 44, p. 61

---

* Communicated by direct line by Lenin's secretary.—*Ed.*

** Communicated by direct line. The text of this telegram is repeated in a telegram to the Naval General Staff at the Central Committee of the Baltic Fleet.—*Ed.*

SPEECHES AT THE EVENING SITTING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RSDLP(B) ON FEBRUARY 18, 1918[90]

Minutes

1

Comrade Lenin. This is a basic question. Uritsky's proposal is amazing. The Central Committee voted against a revolutionary war, but we have neither war nor peace, and are being drawn into a revolutionary war. War is no joke. We are losing railway cars, and our transport is breaking down. We cannot wait any longer because the situation has fully crystallised. The people will not understand this: since there is a war on, there should have been no demobilisation; the Germans will now take everything. This thing has gone so far that continued sitting on the fence will inevitably ruin the revolution. Ioffe wrote from Brest that there was no sign of a revolution in Germany; if that is so the Germans will find their advance very rewarding. We cannot afford to wait, which would mean consigning the Russian revolution to the scrap-heap. If the Germans said that they wanted to overthrow Bolshevik power, we would naturally have to fight; no more procrastination is permissible. It is now no longer a matter of the past but of the present. If we apply to the Germans, all we have is a piece of paper. You can't call that a policy. The only thing we can do is offer the Germans a resumption of the talks. There is no halfway house in this. If it is to be revolutionary war it must be declared, and the demobilisation stopped, but we can't go on in this manner. While we engage in paper work, they take warehouses and railway cars, leaving us to perish. The issue now is that while playing with war we have been surrendering the revolution to the Germans.

History will say that you have surrendered the revolution. We could have concluded a peace which held no threat to the revolution. We have nothing, we have not even got the time to blow up anything as we retreat. We have done our best to help the revolution in Finland, but now we can do no more. This is not the time for an exchange of notes, and this temporising must stop. It is too late to put out feelers,

because it is quite clear now that the Germans can launch an offensive. We cannot argue against the advocates of a revolutionary war, but we can and must argue against the temporisers. An offer of peace must be made to the Germans.

2

Comrade Lenin. Bukharin failed to notice how he went over to the position of a revolutionary war. The peasants do not want war and will not fight. Can we now tell the peasants to fight a revolutionary war? But if that is what we want we should not have demobilised the army. It is a utopia to want a permanent peasant war. A revolutionary war must not be a mere phrase. If we are not ready, we must conclude peace. Since we have demobilised the army it is ridiculous to talk of a permanent war. There is no comparison at all with a civil war. The muzhik will not have a revolutionary war, and will overthrow anyone who openly calls for one. The revolution in Germany has not yet started, and we know that over here, too, our revolution did not win out all at once. It has been said here that they would take Lifland and Estland; but we can give them up for the sake of the revolution. If they should want us to withdraw our troops from Finland, well and good—let them take revolutionary Finland. The revolution will not be lost if we give up Finland, Lifland and Estland. The prospects with which Comrade Ioffe tried to scare us yesterday do not at all spell ruin to the revolution.

I propose a declaration that we are willing to conclude the peace the Germans offered us yesterday; should they add to this non-interference in the affairs of the Ukraine, Finland, Lifland and Estland, we should unquestionably accept all that as well. Our soldiers are in a poor state; the Germans want grain, they will take it and go back, making it impossible for Soviet power to continue in existence. To say that the demobilisation has been stopped is to be overthrown.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, pp. 522-24

From THE REVOLUTIONARY PHRASE[91]

February, 1918

When I said at a Party meeting that the revolutionary phrase about a revolutionary war might ruin our revolution, I was reproached for the sharpness of my polemics. There are, however, moments, when a question must be raised sharply and things given their proper names, the danger being that otherwise irreparable harm may be done to the Party and the revolution.

Revolutionary phrase-making, more often than not, is a disease from which revolutionary parties suffer at times when they constitute, directly or indirectly, a combination, alliance or intermingling of proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements, and when the course of revolutionary events is marked by big, rapid zigzags. By revolutionary phrase-making we mean the repetition of revolutionary slogans irrespective of objective circumstances at a given turn in events, in the given state of affairs obtaining at the time. The slogans are superb, alluring, intoxicating, but there are no grounds for them; such is the nature of the revolutionary phrase....

6

...We are accepting an unfavourable treaty and a separate peace knowing that *today* we are not yet ready for a revolutionary war, that we have to bide our time (as we did when we tolerated Kerensky's bondage, tolerated the bondage of our own bourgeoisie from July to October), we must wait until we are stronger. Therefore, *if there is a chance* of obtaining the most unfavourable separate peace, we *absolutely must accept* it in the interests of the socialist revolution, which is *still* weak (since the maturing revolution in Germany has not *yet* come to our help, to the help of the Russians). Only if a separate peace is *absolutely* impossible shall we have to fight immediately—*not because it will be correct tactics, but because we shall have no choice.* If it proves impossible there will be no occasion for a dispute over tactics. There will be nothing but the inevitability of the most furious resistance. But as long as we have a choice we must choose a separate peace and an extremely unfavourable treaty, because that will still be a hundred times better than the position of Belgium.[92]

Month by month we are growing stronger, although we are today still weak. Month by month the international socialist revolution is maturing in Europe, although it is not yet fully mature. Therefore ... therefore, "revolutionaries" (God save us from them) argue that we must accept battle when German imperialism is *obviously* stronger than we are but is *weakening* month by month (because of the slow but certain maturing of the revolution in Germany).

The "revolutionaries" of sentiment argue magnificently, they argue superbly!

7

The last argument, the most specious and most widespread, is that "this obscene peace is a disgrace, it is betrayal of Latvia, Poland, Courland and Lithuania".

Is it any wonder that the Russian *bourgeoisie* (and their hangers-on, the *Novy Luch*,[93] *Dyelo Naroda* and *Novaya Zhizn*[94] gang) are the most zealous in elaborating this allegedly internationalist argument?

No, it is no wonder, for this argument is a trap into which the bourgeoisie are deliberately dragging the Russian Bolsheviks, and into which some of them are falling unwittingly, because of their love of phrases.

Let us examine the argument from the standpoint of theory: which should be put first, the right of nations to self-determination, or socialism?

Socialism should.

Is it permissible, because of a contravention of the right of nations to self-determination, to allow the Soviet Socialist Republic to be devoured, to expose it to the blows of imperialism at a time when imperialism is obviously stronger and the Soviet Republic obviously weaker?

No, it is not permissible—that is *bourgeois* and not socialist politics.

Further, would peace on the condition that Poland, Lithuania and Courland are returned "to us" be *less* disgraceful, be any less an annexationist peace?

From the point of view of the Russian bourgeois, *it would.*

From the point of view of the socialist-internationalist, *it would not.*

Because if German imperialism set Poland free (which

at one time some *bourgeois* in Germany desired), it would squeeze Serbia, Belgium, etc., *all the more.*

When the Russian bourgeoisie wail against the "obscene" peace, they are correctly expressing their class interests.

But when some Bolsheviks (suffering from the phrase disease) repeat that argument, it is simply very sad.

Examine the *facts* relating to the behaviour of the Anglo-French bourgeoisie. They are doing everything they can to drag us into the war against Germany now, they are offering us millions of blessings, boots, potatoes, shells, locomotives (on credit . . . that is not "enslavement", don't fear that! It is "only" credit!). They want us to fight against Germany *now.*

It is obvious why they should want this; they want it because, in the first place, we should engage part of the German forces. And secondly, because Soviet power might collapse most easily from an untimely armed clash with German imperialism.

The Anglo-French bourgeoisie are setting a trap for us: please be kind enough to go and fight *now*, our gain will be magnificent. The Germans will plunder you, will "do well" in the East, will agree to cheaper terms in the West, and furthermore, Soviet power will be swept away. . . . Please do fight, dear Bolshevik "allies", we shall help you.

And the "Left" (God save us from them) Bolsheviks are walking into the trap by reciting the most revolutionary phrases. . . .

Oh yes, one of the manifestations of the traces of the petty-bourgeois spirit is surrender to revolutionary phrases. This is an old story that is perennially new. . . .

8

In the summer of 1907 our Party also experienced an attack of the revolutionary phrase that was, in some respects, analogous.

St. Petersburg and Moscow, nearly all the Bolsheviks were in favour of boycotting the Third Duma; they were guided by "sentiment" instead of an objective analysis and walked into a trap.

The disease has recurred.

The times are more difficult. The issue is a million times

more important. To fall ill at such a time is to risk ruining the revolution.

We must fight against the revolutionary phrase, we have to fight it, we absolutely must fight it, so that at some future time people will not say of us the bitter truth that "a revolutionary phrase about revolutionary war ruined the revolution".

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 19, 26-29

From SPEECHES AT THE MEETING OF THE CC OF THE RSDLP(B) FEBRUARY 24, 1918

Minutes

7

L. D. Trotsky's statement about his resigning the post of People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs was discussed.

Lenin pointed out that this was unacceptable, that a change of policy was a crisis. That a questionnaire on policy had been distributed in the provinces,[95] and that to polemise a little was not at all harmful.

He made a practical proposal: the Central Committee would ask Comrade Trotsky to postpone his statement until the next meeting of the CC, until Tuesday. (Amendment—until the return of the delegation from Brest.)...

9

L. D. Trotsky declared that since his statement had not been accepted he would be compelled to give up appearing in official institutions.

Lenin moved that it should be voted: the Central Committee, having heard Comrade Trotsky's statement, while fully agreeing to Comrade Trotsky's absence during decisions on foreign affairs in the Council of People's Commissars, requests Comrade Trotsky not to keep aloof from other decisions.

Adopted.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 55

EXTRAORDINARY SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE RCP(B)

March 6-8, 1918[99]

POLITICAL REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MARCH 7

(Extract)

Here one must know how to retreat. We cannot hide the incredibly bitter, deplorable reality from ourselves with empty phrases; we must say: God grant that we retreat in what is half-way good order. We cannot retreat in good order, but God grant that our retreat is half-way good order, that we gain a little time in which the sick part of our organism can be resolved at least to some extent. On the whole the organism is sound, it will overcome its sickness. But you cannot expect it to overcome it all at once, instantaneously; you cannot stop an army in flight. When I said to one of our young friends, a would-be Left, "Comrade, go to the front, see what is going on in the army", he took offence at this proposal. He said, "They want to banish us so as to prevent our agitating here for the great principles of a revolutionary war". In making this proposal I really had no intention whatever of banishing factional enemies; I merely suggested that they go and see for themselves that the army had begun to run away in an unprecedented manner. We knew that even before this, even before this we could not close our eyes to the fact that the disintegration of the army had gone on to such an unheard-of extent that our guns were being sold to the Germans for a song. We knew this, just as we know that the army cannot be held back, and the argument that the Germans would not attack was a great gamble. If the European revolution is late in coming, gravest defeats await us because we have no army, because we lack organisation, because, at the moment, these are two problems we cannot solve. If you are unable to adapt yourself, if you are not inclined to crawl on your belly in the mud, you are not a revolutionary but a chatterbox; and I propose this, not because I like it, but because we have no other road, because history has not been kind enough

to bring the revolution to maturity everywhere simultaneously.

The way things are turning out is that the civil war has begun as an attempt at a clash with imperialism, and this has shown that imperialism is rotten to the core, and that proletarian elements are rising in every army. Yes, we shall see the international world revolution, but for the time being it is a very good fairy-tale, a very beautiful fairy-tale—I quite understand children liking beautiful fairy-tales. But I ask, is it proper for a serious revolutionary to believe in fairy-tales? There is an element of reality in every fairy-tale. If you told children fairy-tales in which the cock and the cat did not converse in human language they would not be interested. In the same way, if you tell the people that civil war will break out in Germany and also guarantee that instead of a clash with imperialism we shall have a field revolution on a world-wide scale,[97] the people will say you are deceiving them. In doing this you will be overcoming the difficulties with which history has confronted us only in your own minds, by your own wishes. It will be a good thing if the German proletariat is able to take action. But have you measured it, have you discovered an instrument that will show that the German revolution will break out on such-and-such a day? No, you do not know that, and neither do we. You are staking everything on this card. If the revolution breaks out, everything is saved. Of course! But if it does not turn out as we desire, if it does not achieve victory tomorrow—what then? Then the masses will say to you, you acted like gamblers—you staked everything on a fortunate turn of events that did not take place, you proved to be unequal to the situation that actually arose instead of the world revolution, which will inevitably come, but which has not yet reached maturity.

A period has set in of severe defeats, inflicted by imperialism, which is armed to the teeth, upon a country which has demobilised its army, which had to demobilise. What I predicted has come to pass to a word; instead of the Brest peace we have a much more humiliating peace, and the blame for this rests upon those who refused to accept the former peace. We knew that through the fault of the army we were concluding peace with imperialism. We sat at the table

beside Hoffmann and not Liebknecht—and in doing so we assisted the German revolution. But now you are assisting German imperialism, because you have surrendered wealth valued at millions in guns and shells; and anybody who had seen the state—the painfully incredible state—of the army could have predicted this. Everyone of integrity who came from the front said that had the Germans made the slightest attack we should have perished inevitably and absolutely. We should have fallen prey to the enemy within a few days.

Having been taught this lesson, we shall overcome our split, our crisis, however severe the disease may be, because an immeasurably more reliable ally will come to our assistance—the world revolution. When the ratification of this Peace of Tilsit,[98] this unbelievable peace, more humiliating and predatory than the Brest peace, is spoken of, I say: certainly, yes. We must do this because we look at things from the point of view of the masses. Any attempt to apply the tactics used internally in one country between October and November—the triumphant period of the revolution—to apply them with the aid of our imagination to the progress of events in the world revolution, is doomed to failure. When it is said that the respite is a fantasy, when a newspaper called *Kommunist*[99]—from the word "Commune", I suppose—when this paper fills column after column with attempts to refute the respite theory, I say that I have lived through quite a lot of factional conflicts and splits and so I have a great deal of experience; and I must say that it is clear to me that this disease will not be cured by the old method of factional Party splits because events will cure it more quickly. Life is marching forward very quickly. In this respect it is magnificently efficient. History is driving its locomotive so fast that before the editors of *Kommunist* bring out their next issue the majority of the workers in Petrograd will have begun to be disappointed in its ideas, because events are proving that the respite is a fact. We are now signing a peace treaty, we have a respite, we are taking advantage of it the better to defend our fatherland—because had we been at war we should have had an army fleeing in panic which would have had to be stopped, and which our comrades cannot and could not stop, because war is more powerful than sermons, more powerful than ten

thousand arguments. Since they did not understand the objective situation they could not hold back the army, and cannot do so. This sick army infected the whole organism, and another unparalleled defeat was inflicted upon us. German imperialism struck another blow at the revolution, a severe blow, because we allowed ourselves to face the blows of imperialism without machine-guns. Meanwhile, we shall take advantage of this breathing-space to persuade the people to unite and fight, to say to the Russian workers and peasants: "Organise self-discipline, strict discipline, otherwise you will have to remain lying under the German jackboot as you are lying now, as you will inevitably have to lie until the people learn to fight and to create an army capable, not of running away, but of bearing untold suffering". It is inevitable, because the German revolution has not yet begun, and we cannot guarantee that it will come tomorrow.

That is why the respite theory, which is totally rejected in the flood of articles in *Kommunist*, is advanced by reality. Everyone can see that the respite is a fact, that all are taking advantage of it. We expected that we would lose Petrograd in a few days when the advancing German troops were only a few days' march away, and when our best sailors and the Putilov workers, notwithstanding all their great enthusiasm, remained alone, when incredible chaos and panic broke out, which compelled our troops to flee all the way to Gatchina, and when we had cases of positions being recaptured that had never been lost—by a telegraph operator, arriving at the station, taking his place at the key and wiring, "No Germans in sight. We have occupied the station". A few hours later I would receive a telephone communication from the Commissariat of Railways informing me, "We have occupied the next station. We are approaching Yamburg. No Germans in sight. Telegraph operator at his post". That is the kind of thing we had. This is the real history of the eleven days' war.[100] It was described to us by sailors and Putilov workers, who ought to be brought to the Congress of Soviets. Let them tell the truth. It is a frightfully bitter, disappointing, painful and humiliating truth, but it is a hundred times more useful, it can be understood by the Russian people.

One may dream about the field revolution on a world-

wide scale, for it will come. Everything will come in due time; but for the time being, set to work to establish self-discipline, subordination before all else, so that we can have exemplary order, so that the workers for at least one hour in twenty-four may train to fight. This is a little more difficult than relating beautiful fairy-tales. This is what you can do today; in this way you will help the German revolution, the world revolution. We do not know how many days the respite will last, but we have got it. We must demobilise the army as quickly as possible, because it is a sick organ; meanwhile, we will assist the Finnish revolution.[101]

Yes, of course, we are violating the treaty; we have violated it thirty or forty times. Only children can fail to understand that in an epoch like the present, when a long painful period of emancipation is setting in, which has only just created and raised the Soviet power three stages in its development—only children can fail to understand that in this case there must be a long, circumspect struggle. The shameful peace treaty is rousing protest, but when comrades from *Kommunist* talk about war they appeal to sentiment and forget that the people are clenching their fists with rage, are "seeing red". What do they say? "A class-conscious revolutionary will never live through this, will never submit to such a disgrace." Their newspaper bears the title *Kommunist*, but it should bear the title *Szlachcic** because it looks at things from the point of view of the *szlachcic* who, dying in a beautiful pose, sword in hand, said: "Peace is disgraceful, war is honourable". They argue from the point of view of the *szlachcic*; I argue from the point of view of the peasant.

If I accept peace when the army is in flight, and must be in flight if it is not to lose thousands of men, I accept it in order to prevent things from getting worse. Is the treaty really shameful? Why, every sober-minded peasant and worker will say I am right, because they understand that peace is a means of gathering forces. History knows—I have referred to it more than once—the case of the liberation of the Germans from Napoleon after the Peace of Tilsit. I deliberately called the peace a Peace of Tilsit although we did not undertake to do what had been stipulated in that treaty,

* *Szlachcic*—a Polish nobleman.—*Ed.*

we did not undertake to provide troops to assist the victor to conquer other nations—things like that have happened in history, and will happen to us if we continue to place our hopes in the field revolution on a world-wide scale. Take care that history does not impose upon you this form of military slavery as well. And before the socialist revolution is victorious in all countries the Soviet Republic may be reduced to slavery. At Tilsit, Napoleon compelled the Germans to accept incredibly disgraceful peace terms. That peace had to be signed several times. The Hoffmann of those days—Napoleon—time and again caught the Germans violating the peace treaty, and the present Hoffmann will catch us at it. Only we shall take care that he does not catch us soon.

The last war has been a bitter, painful, but serious lesson for the Russian people. It has taught them to organise, to become disciplined, to obey, to establish a discipline that will be exemplary. Learn discipline from the Germans; for, if we do not, we, as a people, are doomed, we shall live in eternal slavery.

This way, and no other, has been the way of history. History tells us that peace is a respite for war, war is a means of obtaining a somewhat better or somewhat worse peace. At Brest the relation of forces corresponded to a peace imposed upon the one who has been defeated, but it was not a humiliating peace. The relation of forces at Pskov corresponded to a disgraceful, more humiliating peace; and in Petrograd and Moscow, at the next stage, a peace four times more humiliating will be dictated to us. We do not say that the Soviet power is only a form, as our young Moscow friends[102] have said, we do not say that the content can be sacrificed for this or that revolutionary principle. We do say, let the Russian people understand that they must become disciplined and organised, and then they will be able to withstand all the Tilsit peace treaties. The whole history of wars of liberation shows that when these wars involved large masses liberation came quickly. We say, since history marches forward in this way, we shall have to abandon peace for war, and this may happen within the next few days. Everyone must be prepared. I have not the slightest shadow of doubt that the Germans are preparing near Narva, if it is true that it has not been taken, as all

the newspapers say; if not in Narva, then near Narva, if not in Pskov, then near Pskov, the Germans are grouping their regular army, making ready their railways, to capture Petrograd at the next jump. And this beast can jump very well. He has proved that. He will jump again. There is not a shadow of doubt about that. That is why we must be prepared, we must not brag, but must be able to take advantage of even a single day of respite, because we can take advantage of even one day's respite to evacuate Petrograd, the capture of which will cause unprecedented suffering to hundreds of thousands of our proletarians. I say again that I am ready to sign, and that I consider it my duty to sign, a treaty twenty times, a hundred times more humiliating, in order to gain at least a few days in which to evacuate Petrograd, because by that I will alleviate the sufferings of the workers, who otherwise may fall under the yoke of the Germans; by that I facilitate the removal from Petrograd of all the materials, gunpowder, etc., which we need; because I am a defencist, because I stand for the preparation of an army, even in the most remote rear, where our present, demobilised, sick army is being nursed back to health.

We do not know how long the respite will last—we will try to take advantage of the situation. Perhaps the respite will last longer, perhaps it will last only a few days. Anything may happen, no one knows, or can know, because all the major powers are tied down, restricted, compelled to fight on several fronts. Hoffmann's behaviour is determined first by the need to smash the Soviet Republic; secondly, by the fact that he has to wage war on a number of fronts, and thirdly, by the fact that the revolution in Germany is maturing, is growing, and Hoffmann knows this. He cannot, as some assert, take Petrograd and Moscow this very minute. But he may do so tomorrow, that is quite possible. I repeat that at a moment when the army is obviously sick, when we are taking advantage of every opportunity, come what may, to get at least one day's respite, we say that every serious revolutionary who is linked with the masses and who knows what war is, what the masses are, must discipline the masses, must heal them, must try to arouse them for a new war—every such revolutionary will admit that we are right, will admit that any disgraceful peace is

proper, because it is in the interests of the proletarian revolution and the regeneration of Russia, because it will help to get rid of the sick organ. As every sensible man understands, by signing this peace treaty we do not put a stop to our workers' revolution; everyone understands that by concluding peace with the Germans we do not stop rendering military aid; we are sending arms to the Finns, but not military units, which turn out to be unfit.

Perhaps we will accept war; perhaps tomorrow we will surrender even Moscow and then go over to the offensive; we will move our army against the enemy's army if the necessary turn in the mood of the people takes place. This turn is developing and perhaps much time is required, but it will come, when the great mass of the people will not say what they are saying now. I am compelled to accept the harshest peace terms because I cannot say to myself that this time has arrived. When the time of regeneration arrives everyone will realise it, will see that the Russian is no fool; he sees, he will understand that for the time being we must refrain, that this slogan must be carried through—and this is the main task of our Party Congress and of the Congress of Soviets.

We must learn to work in a new way. That is immensely more difficult, but it is by no means hopeless. It will not break Soviet power if we do not break it ourselves by utterly senseless adventurism. The time will come when the people will say, we will not permit ourselves to be tortured any longer. But this will take place only if we do not agree to this adventure but prove able to work under harsh conditions and under the unprecedentedly humiliating treaty we signed the other day, because a war, or a peace treaty, cannot solve such a historical crisis. Because of their monarchic organisation the German people were fettered in 1807, when after several humiliating peace treaties, which were transformed into respites to be followed by new humiliations and new infringements, they signed the Peace of Tilsit. The Soviet organisation of the people makes our task easier.

We should have but one slogan—to learn the art of warfare properly and put the railways in order. To wage a socialist revolutionary war without railways would be rank treachery. We must establish order and we must muster all

the energy and all the strength that will produce the best that is in the revolution.

Grasp even an hour's respite if it is given you in order to maintain contact with the remote rear and create there new armies. Abandon illusions for which real events have punished you and will punish you more severely in the future. An epoch of most grievous defeats is ahead of us, it is with us now, we must be able to reckon with it, we must be prepared for persistent work in conditions of illegality, in conditions of downright slavery to the Germans; it is no use painting it in bright colours, it is a real Peace of Tilsit. If we are able to act in this way, then, in spite of defeats, we shall be able to say with absolute certainty—victory will be ours. (*Applause.*)

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 101-09

REPLY TO THE DEBATE ON THE POLITICAL REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MARCH 8

Comrades, let me begin with some relatively minor remarks, let me begin from the end. At the end of his speech Comrade Bukharin went so far as to compare us to Petlyura. If he thinks that is so, how can he remain with us in the same party? Isn't it just empty talk? If things were really as he said, we should not, of course, be members of the same party. The fact that we are together shows that we are ninety per cent in agreement with Bukharin. It is true he added a few revolutionary phrases about our wanting to betray the Ukraine. I am sure it is not worth while talking about such obvious nonsense. I shall return to Comrade Ryazanov, and here I want to say that in the same way as an exception that occurs once in ten years proves the rule, so has Comrade Ryazanov chanced to say a serious word. (*Applause.*) He said that Lenin was surrendering space to gain time. That is almost philosophical reasoning. This time it happened that we heard from Comrade Ryazanov a serious phrase—true it is only a phrase—which fully expresses the case; to gain time I want to surrender space to the

actual victor. That and that alone is the whole point at issue. All else is mere talk—the need for a revolutionary war, rousing the peasantry, etc. When Comrade Bukharin pictures things as though there could not be two opinions as to whether war is possible and says—"ask any soldier" (I wrote down his actual words)—since he puts the question this way and wants to ask any soldier, I'll answer him. "Any soldier" turned out to be a French officer that I had a talk with.[103] That French officer looked at me, with anger in his eyes, of course—had I not sold Russia to the Germans?—and said: "I am a royalist, I am also a champion of the monarchy in France, a champion of the defeat of Germany, so don't think I support Soviet power—who would, if he was a royalist?—but I favour your signing the Brest Treaty because it's necessary". That's "asking any soldier" for you. Any soldier would say what I have said—we had to sign the Brest Treaty. If it now emerges from Bukharin's speech that our differences have greatly diminished, it is only because his supporters have concealed the chief point on which we differ.

Now that Bukharin is thundering against us for having demoralised the masses, he is perfectly correct, except that it is himself and not us that he is attacking. Who caused this mess in the Central Committee?—You, Comrade Bukharin. (*Laughter*). No matter how much you shout "No", the truth will out; we are here in our own comradely family, we are at our own Congress, we have nothing to hide, the truth must be told. And the truth is that there were three trends in the Central Committee. On February 17 Lomov and Bukharin did not vote. I have asked for the record of the voting to be reproduced and copies made so that every Party member who wishes to do so can go into the secretariat and see how people voted—the historic voting of January 21, which shows that they wavered and we did not, not in the least; we said, "Let us accept the Brest peace—you'll get nothing better—so as to prepare for a revolutionary war". Now we have gained five days in which to evacuate Petrograd. Now the manifesto signed by Krylenko and Podvoisky[104] has been published; they were not among the Lefts, and Bukharin insulted them by saying that Krylenko had been "dragged in", as though we had invented what Krylenko reported. We agree in full with what they

said; that is how matters stand, for it was these army men who gave proof of what I had said; and you dismiss the matter by saying the Germans won't attack. How can this situation be compared with October, when equipment was not what mattered? If you want to take facts into consideration, then consider this one—that the disagreement arose over the statement that we cannot start a war that is obviously to our disadvantage. When Comrade Bukharin began his concluding speech with the thunderous question "Is war possible in the near future?" he greatly surprised me. I answer without hesitation—yes, it is possible, but today we must accept peace. There is no contradiction in this.

After these brief remarks I shall give detailed answers to previous speakers. As far as Radek is concerned I must make an exception. But there was another speech, that of Comrade Uritsky. What was there in that speech apart from Canossa,[105] "treachery", "retreated", "adapted"? What is all this about? Haven't you borrowed your criticism from a Left Socialist-Revolutionary newspaper? Comrade Bubnov read us a statement submitted to the Central Committee by those of its members who consider themselves very Left-wing and who gave us a striking example of a demonstration before the eyes of the whole world—"the behaviour of the Central Committee strikes a blow at the international proletariat". Is that anything but an empty phrase? "Demonstrate weakness before the eyes of the whole world!" How are we demonstrating? By proposing peace? Because our army has run away? Have we not proved that to begin war with Germany at this moment, and not to accept the Brest peace, would mean showing the world that our army is sick and does not want to give battle? Bubnov's statement was quite empty when he asserted that the wavering was entirely of our making—it was due to our army's being sick. Sooner or later, there had to be a respite. If we had had the correct strategy we should have had a month's breathing-space, but since your strategy was incorrect we have only five days—even that is good. The history of war shows that even days are sometimes enough to halt a panic-stricken army. Anyone who does not accept, does not conclude this devilish peace now, is a man of empty phrases and not a strategist. That is the pity of it. When Central Committee members write to me about "demonstrations of

weakness", "treachery", they are writing the most damaging, empty, childish phrases. We demonstrated our weakness by attempting to fight at a time when the demonstration should not have been made, when an offensive against us was inevitable. As for the peasants of Pskov, we shall bring them to the Congress of Soviets to relate how the Germans treat people, so that they can change the mood of the soldier in panic-stricken flight and he will begin to recover from his panic and say, "This is certainly not the war the Bolsheviks promised to put an end to, this is a new war the Germans are waging against Soviet power". Then recovery will come. But you raise a question that cannot be answered. Nobody knows how long the respite will last.

Now I must say something about Comrade Trotsky's position. There are two aspects to his activities; when he began the negotiations at Brest and made splendid use of them for agitation, we all agreed with Comrade Trotsky. He has quoted part of a conversation with me, but I must add that it was agreed between us that we would hold out until the Germans presented an ultimatum, and then we would give way. The Germans deceived us—they stole five days out of seven from us.[106] Trotsky's tactics were correct as long as they were aimed at delaying matters; they became incorrect when it was announced that the state of war had been terminated but peace had not been concluded. I proposed quite definitely that peace be concluded. We could not have got anything better than the Brest peace. It is now clear to everybody that we would have had a month's respite and that we would not have lost anything. Since history has swept that away it is not worth recalling, but it is funny to hear Bukharin say, "Events will show that we were right". I was right because I wrote about it back in 1915—"We must prepare to wage war, it is inevitable, it is coming, it will come".* But we had to accept peace and not try vain blustering. And because war is coming, it was all the more necessary to accept peace, and now we are at least making easier the evacuation of Petrograd—we have made it easier. That is a fact. And when Comrade Trotsky makes fresh demands, "Promise not to conclude peace with Vinnichenko", I say that under no circumstances will I take that

* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 404.—*Ed.*

obligation upon myself.[107] If the Congress accepts this obligation, neither I, nor those who agree with me, will accept responsibility for it. It would mean tying our hands again with a formal decision instead of following a clear line of manoeuvre—retreat when possible, and at times attack. In war you must never tie yourself down with formal decisions. It is ridiculous not to know the history of war, not to know that a treaty is a means of gathering strength—I have already mentioned Prussian history. There are some people who are just like children, they think that if we have signed a treaty we have sold ourselves to Satan and have gone to hell. That is simply ridiculous when it is quite obvious from the history of war that the conclusion of a treaty after defeat is a means of gathering strength. There have been cases in history of one war following immediately after another, we have all forgotten that, we see that the old war is turning into....* If you like, you can bind yourselves for ever with formal decisions and then hand over all the responsible posts to the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries.[108] We shall not accept responsibility for it. There is not the least desire for a split here. I am sure that events will teach you—March 12 is not far away, and you will obtain plenty of material.[109]

Comrade Trotsky says that it will be treachery in the full sense of the word. I maintain that that is an absolutely wrong point of view.** To demonstrate this concretely, I will give you an example: two men are walking together and are attacked by ten men, one fights and the other runs away—that is treachery; but suppose we have two armies of a hundred thousand each and there are five armies against them; one army is surrounded by two hundred thousand, and the other must go to its aid; knowing that the other three hundred thousand of the enemy are ambushed to trap it, should the second army go to the aid of the first? It should not. That is not treachery, that is not cowardice; a simple increase in numbers has changed all concepts, any soldier knows this; it is no longer a personal concept. By

---

* Several words are missing in the verbatim report.—*Ed.*

** In the secretary's notes the text beginning with the words "...a means of gathering strength..." is put down as follows: "...for gathering strength. History knows of hundreds of all sorts of treaties. Then give the posts to Trotsky and others...."—*Ed.*

acting in this way I preserve my army; let the other army be captured, I shall be able to renew mine, I have allies, I shall wait till the allies arrive. That is the only way to argue; when military arguments are mixed up with others, you get nothing but empty phrases. That is not the way to conduct politics.

We have done everything that could be done. By signing the treaty we have saved Petrograd, even if only for a few days. (The secretaries and stenographers should not think of putting that on record.) The treaty requires us to withdraw our troops from Finland, troops that are clearly no good, but we are not forbidden to take arms into Finland. If Petrograd had fallen a few days ago, the city would have been in a panic and we should not have been able to take anything away; but in those five days we have helped our Finnish comrades—how much I shall not say, they know it themselves.

The statement that we have betrayed Finland is just a childish phrase. We helped the Finns precisely by retreating before the Germans in good time. Russia will never perish just because Petrograd falls, Comrade Bukharin is a thousand times right in that, but if we manoeuvre in Bukharin's way we may ruin a good revolution. (*Laughter.*)

We have not betrayed either Finland or the Ukraine. No class-conscious worker would accuse us of this. We are helping as best we can. We have not taken one good man away from our army and shall not do so. You say that Hoffmann will catch us—of course he may, I do not doubt it, but how many days it will take him, he does not know and nobody knows. Furthermore, your arguments about his catching us are arguments about the political alignment of forces, of which I shall speak later.

Now that I have explained why I am absolutely unable to accept Trotsky's proposal—you cannot conduct politics in that way—I must say that Radek has given us an example of how far the comrades at our Congress have departed from empty phrases such as Uritsky still sticks to. I certainly cannot accuse him of empty phrases in that speech. He said, "There is not a shadow of treachery, not a shadow of disgrace, because it is clear that you retreated in the face of overpowering military force." That is an appraisal that destroys Trotsky's position. When Radek said, "We must

grit our teeth and prepare our forces," he was right—I agree with that in full—don't bluster, grit your teeth and make preparations.

Grit your teeth, don't bluster and muster your forces. The revolutionary war will come, there is no disagreement on this; the difference of opinion is on the Peace of Tilsit—should we conclude it or not? The worst of it is that we have a sick army, and the Central Committee, therefore, must have a firm line and not differences of opinion or the middle line that Comrade Bukharin also supported. I am not painting the respite in bright colours; nobody knows how long it will last and I don't know. The efforts that are being made to force me to say how long it will last are ridiculous. As long as we hold the main lines we are helping the Ukraine and Finland. We are taking advantage of the respite, manoeuvring and retreating.

The German worker cannot now be told that the Russians are being awkward, for it is now clear that German and Japanese imperialism is attacking—it will be clear to everybody; apart from a desire to strangle the Bolsheviks, the Germans also want to do some strangling in the West, everything is all mixed up, and in this war we shall have to and must be able to manoeuvre.

With regard to Comrade Bukharin's speech, I must say that when he runs short of arguments he puts forward something in the Uritsky manner and says, "The treaty disgraces us". Here no arguments are needed; if we have been disgraced we should collect our papers and run, but, although we have been "disgraced" I do not think our position has been shaken. Comrade Bukharin attempted to analyse the class basis of our position, but instead of doing so told us an anecdote about a deceased Moscow economist. When you discovered some connection between our tactics and food speculation—this was really ridiculous—you forgot that the attitude of the class as a whole, the class, and not the food speculators, shows that the Russian bourgeoisie and their hangers-on—the *Dyelo Naroda* and *Novaya Zhizn* writers—are bending all their efforts to goad us on to war. You do not stress that class fact. To declare war on Germany at the moment would be to fall for the provocation of the Russian bourgeoisie. That is not new because it is the surest—I do not say absolutely certain, because nothing is

absolutely certain—the surest way of getting rid of us today. When Comrade Bukharin said that events were on their side, that in the long run we would recognise revolutionary war, he was celebrating an easy victory since we prophesied the inevitability of a revolutionary war in 1915. Our differences were on the following—would the Germans attack or not; that we should have declared the state of war terminated; that in the interests of revolutionary war we should have to retreat, surrendering territory to gain time. Strategy and politics prescribe the most disgusting peace treaty imaginable. Our differences will all disappear once we recognise these tactics.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 110-17

SPEECHES AGAINST TROTSKY'S AMENDMENTS TO THE RESOLUTION ON WAR AND PEACE MARCH 8[110]

1

Comrades, in my speech I have already said that neither I nor those who support me consider it possible to accept this amendment. We must in no way bind our hands in any strategic manoeuvre. Everything depends on the relationship of forces and the time of the attack against us by these or those imperialist countries, the time when the rehabilitation of our army, which is undoubtedly beginning, reaches the point when we shall be in a position and obliged not merely to refrain from concluding peace but to declare war. Instead of the amendments which Comrade Trotsky proposes, I am ready to accept the following:

First, to say—and this I shall certainly uphold—that the present resolution is not to be published in the press but that a communication should be made only about the ratification of the treaty.

Secondly, in the forms of publication and in the content the Central Committee shall have the right to introduce changes in connection with a possible offensive by the Japanese.

Thirdly, to say that the Congress will empower the CC

of the Party both to break all the peace treaties and to declare war on any imperialist power or the whole world when the CC of the Party considers that the appropriate moment for this has come.

We must give the CC full power to break the treaties at any moment but this does not in any way imply that we shall break them just now, in the situation that exists today. At the present time we must not bind our hands in any way. The words that Comrade Trotsky proposes to introduce will gain the votes of those who are against ratification in general, votes for a middle course which will create afresh a situation in which not a single worker, not a single soldier, will understand anything in our resolution.

At the present time we shall endorse the necessity of ratifying the treaty and we shall empower the Central Committee to declare war at any moment, because an attack against us is being prepared, perhaps from three sides; Britain or France wants to take Archangel from us—it is quite possible they will, but in any case we ought not to hamper our central institution in any way, whether in regard to breaking the peace treaty or in regard to declaring war. We are giving financial aid to the Ukrainians, we are helping them in so far as we can. In any case we must not bind ourselves to not signing any peace treaty. In an epoch of growing wars, coming one after the other, new combinations grow up. The peace treaty is entirely a matter of vital manoeuvring—either we stand by this condition of manoeuvring or we formally bind our hands in advance in such a way that it will be impossible to move: neither making peace nor waging war will be possible.

2

It seems to me that I have said: no, I cannot accept this. This amendment makes a hint, it expresses what Comrade Trotsky wants to say. There should be no hints in the resolution.

The first point says that we accept ratification of the treaty, considering it essential to utilise every, even the smallest, possibility of a breathing-space before imperialism attacks the Soviet Socialist Republic. In speaking of a breathing-space, we do not forget that an attack on our

Republic is still going on. There you have my opinion, which I stressed in my reply to the debate.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 120-21

TO THE CC, RCP

Comrade Trotsky is mistaken: here there are neither whims, nor mischief, nor caprice, nor confusion, nor desperation, nor any "element" of these pleasant qualities (which Trotsky castigates with such terrible irony).[111] What there is, is what Trotsky ignores, namely, that the majority of the CC is convinced that General Headquarters is a "den", that *all is not well* at Headquarters, and *in seeking a serious improvement*, in seeking ways for a *radical change* it has taken a definite *step*. That is all.

Moscow, 17/VI, 1919 *Lenin*

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 44, p. 255

TELEGRAM TO L. D. TROTSKY, L. P. SEREBRYAKOV, M. M. LASHEVICH[112]

Trotsky
Serebryakov
Lashevich

[September 6, 1919]

The Politbureau of the CC, after discussing the telegram from Trotsky, Serebryakov and Lashevich, endorsed the reply of the Commander-in-Chief and expresses surprise at attempts to revise the adopted basic strategic plan.

On behalf of the Politbureau of the CC,

Lenin

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 44, p. 281

THE TRADE UNIONS, THE PRESENT SITUATION AND TROTSKY'S MISTAKES[113]

Speech Delivered at a Joint Meeting of Communist Delegates to the Eighth Congress of Soviets, Communist Members of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and Communist Members of the Moscow City Council of Trade Unions December 30, 1920

Comrades, I must first of all apologise for departing from the rules of procedure, for anyone wishing to take part in the debate should have heard the report, the second report and the speeches. I am so unwell, unfortunately, that I have been unable to do this. But I was able yesterday to read the principal printed documents and to prepare my remarks. This departure from the rules will naturally cause you some inconvenience; not having heard the other speeches, I may go over old ground and leave out what should be dealt with. But I had no choice.

My principal material is Comrade Trotsky's pamphlet, *The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions.* When I compare it with the theses he submitted to the Central Committee, and go over it very carefully, I am amazed at the number of theoretical mistakes and glaring blunders it contains. How could anyone starting a big Party discussion on this question produce such a sorry excuse for a carefully thought-out statement? Let me go over the main points which, I think, contain the original fundamental theoretical errors.

Trade unions are not just historically necessary; they are historically inevitable as an organisation of the industrial proletariat, and, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, embrace nearly the whole of it. This is basic, but Comrade Trotsky keeps forgetting it; he neither appreciates it nor makes it his point of departure, all this while dealing with "The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions", a subject of infinite compass.

It follows from what I have said that the trade unions have an extremely important part to play at every step of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But what is their part?

I find that it is a most unusual one, as soon as I delve into this question, which is one of the most fundamental theoretically. On the one hand, the trade unions, which take in all industrial workers, are an organisation of the ruling, dominant, governing class, which has now set up a dictatorship and is exercising coercion through the state. But it is not a state organisation; nor is it one designed for coercion, but for education. It is an organisation designed to draw in and to train; it is, in fact, a school: a school of administration, a school of economic management, a school of communism. It is a very unusual type of school, because there are no teachers or pupils; this is an extremely unusual combination of what has necessarily come down to us from capitalism, and what comes from the ranks of the advanced revolutionary detachments, which you might call the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat. To talk about the role of the trade unions without taking these truths into account is to fall straight into a number of errors.

Within the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the trade unions stand, if I may say so, between the Party and the government. In the transition to socialism the dictatorship of the proletariat is inevitable, but it is not exercised by an organisation which takes in all industrial workers. Why not? The answer is given in the theses of the Second Congress of the Communist International on the role of political parties in general. I will not go into this here. What happens is that the Party, shall we say, absorbs the vanguard of the proletariat, and this vanguard exercises the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship cannot be exercised or the functions of government performed without a foundation such as the trade unions. These functions, however, have to be performed through the medium of special institutions which are also of a new type, namely, the Soviets. What are the practical conclusions to be drawn from this peculiar situation? They are, on the one hand, that the trade unions are a *link* between the vanguard and the masses, and by their daily work bring conviction to the masses, the masses of the class which alone is capable of taking us from capitalism to communism. On the other hand, the trade unions are a "reservoir" of the state power. This is what the trade unions are in the period of transition from capitalism to communism. In general, this transition cannot

be achieved without the leadership of that class which is the only class capitalism has trained for large-scale production and which alone is divorced from the interests of the petty proprietor. But the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be exercised through an organisation embracing the whole of that class, because in all capitalist countries (and not only over here, in one of the most backward) the proletariat is still so divided, so degraded, and so corrupted in parts (by imperialism in some countries) that an organisation taking in the whole proletariat cannot directly exercise proletarian dictatorship. It can be exercised only by a vanguard that has absorbed the revolutionary energy of the class. The whole is like an arrangement of cogwheels. Such is the basic mechanism of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and of the essentials of transition from capitalism to communism. From this alone it is evident that there is something fundamentally wrong in principle when Comrade Trotsky points, in his first thesis, to "ideological confusion", and speaks of a crisis as existing specifically and particularly in the trade unions. If we are to speak of a crisis, we can do so only after analysing the political situation. It is Trotsky who is in "ideological confusion", because in this key question of the trade unions' role, from the standpoint of transition from capitalism to communism, he has lost sight of the fact that we have here a complex arrangement of cogwheels which cannot be a simple one; for the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be exercised by a mass proletarian organisation. It cannot work without a number of "transmission belts" running from the vanguard to the mass of the advanced class, and from the latter to the mass of the working people. In Russia, this mass is a peasant one. There is no such mass anywhere else, but even in the most advanced countries there is a non-proletarian, or a not entirely proletarian, mass. That is in itself enough to produce ideological confusion. But it's no use Trotsky's pinning it on others.

When I consider the role of the trade unions in production, I find that Trotsky's basic mistake lies in his always dealing with it "in principle", as a matter of "general principle". All his theses are based on "general principle", an approach which is in itself fundamentally wrong, quite apart from the fact that the Ninth Party Congress said enough and more than enough about the trade unions' role in pro-

duction,[114] and quite apart from the fact that in his own theses Trotsky quotes the perfectly clear statements of Lozovsky and Tomsky, who were to be his "whipping boys" and an excuse for an exercise in polemics. It turns out that there is, after all, no clash of principle, and the choice of Tomsky and Lozovsky, who wrote what Trotsky himself quotes, was an unfortunate one indeed. However hard we may look, we shall not find here any serious divergence of principle. In general, Comrade Trotsky's great mistake, his mistake of principle, lies in the fact that by raising the question of "principle" at this time he is dragging back the Party and the Soviet power. We have, thank heaven, gone over from principles to practical business. We chatted about principles—rather more than we should have—at the Smolny. Today, three years later, we have decrees on all points of the production problem, and on many of its components; but such is the sad fate of our decrees: they are signed, and then we ourselves forget about them and fail to carry them out. Meanwhile, arguments about principles and differences of principle are invented. I shall later on quote a decree dealing with the trade unions' role in production,* a decree all of us, including myself, I confess, have forgotten.

The actual differences, apart from those I have listed, really have nothing to do with general principles. I have had to enumerate my "differences" with Comrade Trotsky because, with such a broad theme as "The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions", he has, I am quite sure, made a number of mistakes bearing on the very essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But, this apart, one may well ask, why is it that we cannot work together, as we so badly need to do? It is because of our different *approach* to the mass, the different way of winning it over and *keeping in touch* with it. That is the whole point. And this makes the trade union a very peculiar institution, which is set up under capitalism, which inevitably exists in the transition period from capitalism to communism, and whose future is a question mark. The time when the trade unions are actually called into question is a long way off: it will be up to our grandchildren to discuss that. What matters now is how to ap-

* See p. 177.—*Ed.*

proach the mass, to establish contact with it and win it over, and how to get the intricate transmission system working (how to run the dictatorship of the proletariat). Note that when I speak of the intricate transmission system I do not mean the machinery of the Soviets. What it may have in the way of intricacy of a transmission system comes under a special head. I have only been considering, in principle and in the abstract, class relations in capitalist society, which consists of a proletariat, a non-proletarian mass of working people, a petty bourgeoisie and a bourgeoisie. This alone yields an extremely complicated transmission system owing to what has been created by capitalism, quite apart from any red-tape in the Soviet administrative machinery. And that is the main point to be considered in analysing the difficulties of the trade unions' "task". Let me say this again: the actual differences do not lie where Comrade Trotsky sees them but in the question of how to approach the mass, win it over, and keep in touch with it. I must say that had we made a detailed, even if small-scale, study of our own experience and practices, we should have managed to avoid the hundreds of quite unnecessary "differences" and errors of principle in which Comrade Trotsky's pamphlet abounds. Some of his theses, for instance, polemicise against "Soviet trade-unionism". As if we hadn't enough trouble already, a new bogey has been invented. Who do you think it is? Comrade Ryazanov, of all people. I have known him for twenty odd years. You have known him less than that, but equally as well by his work. You are very well aware that assessing slogans is not one of his virtues, which he undoubtedly has. Shall we then produce theses to show that "Soviet trade-unionism" is just something that Comrade Ryazanov happened to say with little relevance? Is that being serious? If it is, we shall end up with having "Soviet trade-unionism", "Soviet anti-peace-signing", and what not. A Soviet "ism" could be invented on every single point. (*Ryazanov*: "Soviet anti-Brestism.") Exactly, "Soviet anti-Brestism".

While betraying this lack of thoughtfulness, Comrade Trotsky falls into error himself. He seems to say that in a workers' state it is not the business of the trade unions to stand up for the material and spiritual interests of the working class. That is a mistake. Comrade Trotsky speaks of a

"workers' state". May I say that this is an abstraction. It was natural for us to write about a workers' state in 1917; but it is now a patent error to say: "Since this is a workers' state without any bourgeoisie, against whom then is the working class to be protected, and for what purpose?" The whole point is that it is not quite a workers' state. That is where Comrade Trotsky makes one of his main mistakes. We have got down from general principles to practical discussion and decrees, and here we are being dragged back and prevented from tackling the business at hand. This will not do. For one thing, ours is not actually a workers' state but a workers' and peasants' state. And a lot depends on that (*Bukharin*: "What kind of state? A workers' and peasants' state?") Comrade Bukharin back there may well shout "What kind of state? A workers' and peasants' state?" I shall not stop to answer him. Anyone who has a mind to should recall the recent Congress of Soviets, and that will be answer enough.

But that is not all. Our Party Programme—a document which the author of the *ABC of Communism* knows very well—shows that ours is a workers' state *with a bureaucratic twist to it*. We have had to mark it with this dismal, shall I say, tag. There you have the reality of the transition. Well, is it right to say that in a state that has taken this shape in practice the trade unions have nothing to protect, or that we can do without them in protecting the material and spiritual interests of the massively organised proletariat? No, this reasoning is theoretically quite wrong. It takes us into the sphere of abstraction or an ideal we shall achieve in 15 or 20 years' time, and I am not so sure that we shall have achieved it even by then. What we actually have before us is a reality of which we have a good deal of knowledge, provided, that is, we keep our heads, and do not let ourselves be carried away by intellectualist talk or abstract reasoning, or by what may appear to be "theory" but is in fact error and misapprehension of the peculiarities of transition. We now have such a state under which the massively organised proletariat has to protect itself, while we, for our part, must use these workers' organisations to protect the workers from their state, and to get them to protect our state. Both forms of protection are achieved through the peculiar interweaving of our state

measures and our agreeing or "coalescing" with our trade unions.

I shall have more to say about this coalescing later on. But the word itself shows that it is a mistake to conjure up an enemy in the shape of "Soviet trade-unionism", for "coalescing" implies the existence of *distinct* things that *have yet to be* coalesced; "coalescing" implies the need to be able to use measures of the state power to protect the material and spiritual interests of the massively organised proletariat *from* that very same state power. When the coalescing has produced *coalescence* and *integration,* we shall meet in congress for a business-like discussion of actual experience, instead of "disagreements" on principle or theoretical reasoning in the abstract. There is an equally lame attempt to find differences of principle with Comrades Tomsky and Lozovsky, whom Comrade Trotsky treats as trade union "bureaucrats"—I shall later on say which side in this controversy tends to be bureaucratic. We all know that while Comrade Ryazanov may love a slogan, and must have one which is all but an expression of principle, it is not one of Comrade Tomsky's many vices. I think, therefore, that it would be going a bit too far to challenge Comrade Tomsky to a battle of principles on this score (as Comrade Trotsky has done). I am positively astonished at this. One would have thought that we had grown up since the days when we all sinned a great deal in the way of factional, theoretical and various other disagreements—although we naturally did some good as well. It is time we stopped inventing and blowing up differences of principle and got down to practical work. I never knew that Tomsky was eminently a theoretician or that he claimed to be one; it may be one of his failings, but that is something else again. Tomsky, who has been working very smoothly with the trade union movement, must in his position provide a reflection of this complex transition—whether he should do so consciously or unconsciously is quite another matter and I am not saying that he has always done it consciously—so that if something is hurting the mass, and they do not know what it is, and he does not know what it is (*applause, laughter*) but raises a howl, I say that is not a failing but should be put down to his credit. I am quite sure that Tomsky had many partial theoretical mistakes. And if we all

sat down to a table and started thoughtfully writing resolutions or theses, we should correct them all; we might not even bother to do that because production work is more interesting than the rectifying of minute theoretical disagreements.

I come now to "industrial democracy", shall I say, for Bukharin's benefit. We all know that everyone has his weak points, that even big men have little weak spots, and this also goes for Bukharin. He seems to be incapable of resisting any little word with a flourish to it. He seemed to derive an almost sensuous pleasure from writing the resolution on industrial democracy at the Central Committee Plenum on December 7. But the closer I look at this "industrial democracy", the more clearly I see that it is half-baked and theoretically false. It is nothing but a hodgepodge. With this as an example, let me say once again, at a Party meeting at least: "Comrade N. I. Bukharin, the Republic, theory and you yourself will benefit from less verbal extravagance." (*Applause.*) Industry is indispensable. Democracy is a category proper only to the political sphere. There can be no objection to the use of this word in speeches or articles. An article takes up and clearly expresses one relationship and no more. But it is quite strange to hear you trying to turn this into a thesis, and to see you wanting to coin it into a slogan, uniting the "ayes" and the "nays"; it is strange to hear you say, like Trotsky, that the Party will have "to choose between two trends". I shall deal separately with whether the Party must do any "choosing" and who is to blame for putting the Party in this position of having to "choose". Things being what they are, we say: "At any rate, see that you choose fewer slogans, like 'industrial democracy', which contain nothing but confusion and are theoretically wrong." Both Trotsky and Bukharin failed to think out this term theoretically and ended up in confusion. "Industrial democracy" suggests things well beyond the circle of ideas with which they were carried away. They wanted to lay greater emphasis and focus attention on industry. It is one thing to emphasise something in an article or speech; it is quite another to frame it into a thesis and ask the Party to choose, and so I say: cast your vote against it, because it is confusion. Industry is indispensable, democracy is not. Industrial democracy breeds some utterly false ideas. The

idea of one-man management was advocated only a little while ago. We must not make a mess of things and confuse people: how do you expect them to know when you want democracy, when one-man management, and when dictatorship. But on no account must we renounce dictatorship either—I hear Bukharin behind me growling: "Quite right". (*Laughter. Applause.*)

But to go on. Since September we have been talking about switching from the principle of priority to that of equalisation, and we have said as much in the resolution of the all-Party conference, which was approved by the Central Committee.[115] The question is not an easy one, because we find that we have to combine equalisation with priority, which are incompatible. But after all we do have some knowledge of Marxism and have learned how and when opposites can and must be combined; and what is most important is that in the three and a half years of our revolution we have actually combined opposites again and again.

The question obviously requires thoughtfulness and circumspection. After all, we did discuss these questions of principle at those deplorable plenary meetings of the Central Committee*—which yielded the groups of seven and eight and Comrade Bukharin's celebrated "buffer group"[117]— and we did establish that there was no easy transition from the priority principle to that of equalisation. We shall have to put in a bit of effort to implement the decision of the September Conference. After all, these opposite terms can be combined either into a cacophony or a symphony. Priority implies preference for one industry out of a group of vital industries because of its greater urgency. What does such preference entail? How great can it be? This is a difficult question, and I must say that it will take more than zeal to solve it; it may even take more than a heroic effort on the part of a man who is possibly endowed with many excellent qualities and who will do wonders on the right job; this is a very peculiar matter and calls for the correct approach. And so if we are to raise this question of priority and equalisation we must first of all give it some careful

* The reference is to the November and December plenary meetings of the Central Committee in 1920. For the text of their resolutions see *Pravda* No. 255 of November 13, and No. 281 of December 14, and also *Izvestia of the CC, RCP*[116] No. 26 of December 20.

thought, but that is just what we fail to find in Comrade Trotsky's work; the further he goes in revising his original theses, the more mistakes he makes. Here is what we find in his latest theses:

"The equalisation line should be pursued in the sphere of *consumption*, that is, the conditions of the working people's existence as individuals. In the sphere of *production*, the principle of priority will long remain decisive for us..." (thesis 41, p. 31 of Trotsky's pamphlet).

This is a real theoretical muddle. It is all wrong. Priority is preference, but it is nothing without preference in consumption. If all the preference I get is a couple of ounces of bread a day I am not likely to be very happy. The preference part of priority implies preference in consumption as well. Otherwise, priority is a pipe dream, a fleeting cloud, and we are, after all, materialists. The workers are also materialists; if you say shock work, they say, let's have the bread, and the clothes, and the beef. That is the view we now take, and have always taken, in discussing these questions time without number with reference to various concrete matters in the Council of Defence, when one would say: "I'm doing shock work", and would clamour for boots, and another: "I get the boots, otherwise your shock workers won't hold out, and all your priority will fizzle out."

We find, therefore, that in the theses the approach to equalisation and priority is basically wrong. What is more, it is a retreat from what has actually been achieved and tested in practice. We can't have that; it will lead to no good.

Then there is the question of "coalescing". The best thing to do about "coalescing" right now is to keep quiet. Speech is silver, but silence is golden. Why so? It is because we have got down to coalescing in practice; there is not a single large gubernia economic council, no major department of the Supreme Economic Council, the People's Commissariat for Communications, etc., where something is not being coalesced *in practice.* But are the results all they should be? Ay, there's the rub. Look at the way coalescence has *actually* been carried out, and what it has produced. There are countless decrees introducing coalescence in the various institutions. But we have yet to make a business-like study of our own practical experience; we have yet to go into the actual results of all this; we have yet to discover what

a certain type of coalescence has produced in a particular industry, what happened when member X of the gubernia trade union council held post Y in the gubernia economic council, how many months he was at it, etc. What we have not failed to do is to invent a disagreement on coalescence as a principle, and make a mistake in the process, but then we have always been quick at that sort of thing; but we were not up to the mark when it came to analysing and verifying our own experience. When we have congresses of Soviets with committees not only on the application of the better farming law in the various agricultural areas but also on coalescence and its results in the Saratov Gubernia flour-milling industry, the Petrograd metal industry, the Donbas coal industry, etc., and when these committees, having mustered the facts, declare: "We have made a study of so and so", then I shall say: "Now we have got down to business, we have finally grown up." But could anything be more erroneous and deplorable than the fact that we are being presented with "theses" splitting hairs over the principle of coalescence, after we have been at it for three years? We have taken the path of coalescence, and I am sure it was the right thing to do, but we have not yet made an adequate study of the results of our experience. That is why keeping quiet is the only common sense tactics on the question of coalescence.

A study must be made of practical experience. I have signed decrees and resolutions containing instructions on practical coalescence, and no theory is half so important as practice. That is why when I hear: "Let's discuss 'coalescence' ", I say: "Let's analyse what we have done." There is no doubt that we have made many mistakes. It may well be that a great part of our decrees need amending. I accept that, for I am not in the least enamoured of decrees. But in that case let us have some practical proposals as to what actually has to be altered. That would be a business-like approach. That would not be a waste of time. That would not lead to bureaucratic projecteering. But I find that that is exactly what's wrong with Trotsky's "Practical Conclusions", Part VI of this pamphlet. He says that from one-third to one-half of the members of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and the Presidium of the Supreme Economic Council should serve on both bodies, and from

one-half to two-thirds, on the collegiums, etc. Why so? No special reason, just "rule of thumb". It is true, of course, that rule of thumb is frequently used to lay down similar proportions in our decrees, but then why is it inevitable in decrees? I hold no brief for all decrees as such and have no intention of making them appear better than they actually are. Quite often rule of thumb is used in them to fix such purely arbitrary proportions as one-half or one-third of the total number of members, etc. When a decree says that, it means: try doing it this way, and later on we shall assess the results of your "try out". We shall later sort out the results. After sorting them out, we shall move on. We are working on coalescence and we expect to improve it because we are becoming more efficient and practical-minded.

But I seem to have lapsed into "production propaganda". That can't be helped. It is a question that needs dealing with in any discussion of the role of the trade unions in production.

My next question will therefore be that of production propaganda. This again is a practical matter and we approach it accordingly. Government agencies have already been set up to conduct production propaganda. I can't tell whether they are good or bad; they have to be tested and there's no need for any "theses" on this subject at all.

If we take a general view of the part trade unions have to play in industry, we need not, in this question of democracy, go beyond the usual democratic practices. Nothing will come of such tricky phrases as "industrial democracy", for they are all wrong. That is the first point. The second is production propaganda. The agencies are there. Trotsky's theses deal with production propaganda. That is quite useless, because in this case theses are old hat. We do not know as yet whether the agencies are good or bad. But we can tell after testing them in action. Let us do some studying and polling. Assuming, let us say, that a congress has 10 committees with 10 men on each, let us ask: "You have been dealing with production propaganda, haven't you? What are the results?" Having made a study of this, we should reward those who have done especially well, and discard what has proved unsuccessful. We do have some practical experience; it may not be much but it is there; yet we are being dragged away from it and back to these "theses on

principles". This looks more like a "reactionary" movement than "trade-unionism".

There is then the third point, that of bonuses. Here is the role and task of the trade unions in production: distribution of bonuses *in kind*. A start on it has been made. Things have been set in motion. Five hundred thousand poods of grain had been allocated for the purpose, and one hundred and seventy thousand has been distributed. How well and how correctly, I cannot tell. The Council of People's Commissars was told that they were not making a good job of this distribution, which turned out to be an additional wage rather than a bonus. This was pointed out by officials of the trade unions and the People's Commissariat for Labour. We appointed a commission to look into the matter but that has not yet been done. One hundred and seventy thousand poods of grain has been given away, but this needs to be done in such a way as to reward those who display the heroism, the zeal, the talent, and the dedication of the thrifty manager, in a word, all the qualities that Trotsky extols. But the task now is not to extol this in theses but to provide the bread and the beef. Wouldn't it be better, for instance, to deprive one category of workers of their beef and give it as a bonus to workers designated as "shock" workers? We do not renounce that kind of priority. That is a priority we need. Let us take a closer look at our practices in the application of priority.

The fourth point is disciplinary courts. I hope Comrade Bukharin will not take offence if I say that without disciplinary courts the role of the trade unions in industry, "industrial democracy", is a mere trifle. But the fact is that there is nothing at all about this in your theses. "Great grief!" is therefore the only thing that can be said about Trotsky's theses and Bukharin's attitude, from the standpoint of principle, theory and practice.

I am confirmed in this conclusion when I say to myself: yours is not a Marxist approach to the question. This quite apart from the fact that there are a number of theoretical mistakes in the theses. It is not a Marxist approach to the evaluation of the "role and tasks of the trade unions", because such a broad subject cannot be tackled without giving thought to the peculiar political aspects of the present situation. After all, Comrade Bukharin and I did say in the

resolution of the Ninth Congress of the RCP on trade unions that politics is the most concentrated expression of economics.

If we analysed the current political situation, we might say that we were going through a transition period within a transition period. The whole of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a transition period, but we now have, you might say, a heap of new transition periods: the demobilisation of the army, the end of the war, the possibility of having a much longer breathing space in peace than before, and a more solid transition from the war front to the labour front. This—and this alone—is causing a change in the attitude of the proletarian class to the peasant class. What kind of change is it? Now this calls for a close examination, but nothing of the sort follows from your theses. Until we have taken this close look, we must learn to wait. The people are overweary, considerable stocks that had to be used for certain priority industries have been so used; the proletariat's attitude to the peasantry is undergoing a change. The war weariness is terrible, and the needs have increased, but production has increased insufficiently or not at all. On the other hand, as I said in my report to the Eighth Congress of Soviets, our application of coercion was correct and successful whenever we had been able to back it up from the start with persuasion.* I must say that Trotsky and Bukharin have entirely failed to take account of this very important consideration.

Have we laid a sufficiently broad and solid base of persuasion for all these new production tasks? No, indeed, we have barely started doing it. We have not yet made the masses a party to them. Now I ask you, can the masses tackle these new assignments right away? No, they cannot, because while there is now no need for special propaganda on the question of, say, whether Wrangel the landowner should be overthrown or whether any sacrifices should be spared for the purpose, we have just started to work on this question of the role of the trade unions in production, and I mean the business aspect of the matter and not the question of "principle", the reasoning about "Soviet trade-unionism" and such like trifles; we have just set up the agency for

* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 497.—*Ed.*

production propaganda, but we have as yet no experience. We have introduced the payment of bonuses in kind, but we lack the experience. We have set up the disciplinary courts, but we are not yet aware of the results. Still, from the political standpoint it is the preparedness of the masses that is crucial. Has the question been prepared, studied, weighed, and considered from this angle? No, far from it. And that is a basic, deep-going and dangerous political mistake, because if ever there was need to act according to the rule of measuring your cloth seven times before cutting it once, it is in this question. We find instead that the cutting has been started in earnest without a single measure having been taken. We are told that "the Party must choose between two trends", but the false slogan of "industrial democracy" was invented without a single measuring.

We must try to understand the meaning of this slogan, especially in the present political situation, when the masses are confronted with bureaucratic practices in visual form, and when we have the question itself on the agenda. Comrade Trotsky says in his theses that on the question of workers' democracy it remains for the Congress to "enter it unanimously in the record". That is not correct. There is more to it than an entry in the record; an entry in the record fixes what has been fully weighed and measured, whereas the question of industrial democracy is far from having been fully weighed, tried and tested. Just think how the masses may interpret this slogan of "industrial democracy".

"We, the rank and file who work among the masses, say that there is need for new blood, that things must be corrected and the bureaucrats ousted, and here you are beating about the bush, talking about getting on with production and displaying democracy in achieving success in production; we refuse to get on with production under such a bureaucratic set-up of central and other boards, we want a different one." You have not given the masses a chance to discuss things, to see the point, and to think it over; you have not allowed the Party to gain fresh experience but are already acting in haste, overdoing it, and producing formulas which are theoretically false. Just think how this mistake will be further amplified by unduly zealous functionaries! A political leader is responsible not only for the quality of his

leadership but also for the acts of those he leads. He may now and again be unaware of what they are about, he may often wish they had not done something, but the responsibility still falls on him.

I now come to the November 9 and December 7 plenary meetings of the Central Committee, which gave expression to all these mistakes in action, rather than in logical categories, premises and theoretical reasoning. This threw the Central Committee into confusion; it is the first time this has happened in our Party's history, in time of revolution, and it is dangerous. The crux was that there was a division, there was the "buffer" group of Bukharin, Preobrazhensky and Serebryakov, which did the most harm and created the most confusion.

You will recall the story of Glavpolitput and Tsektran.[118] The resolution of the Ninth Congress of the RCP in April 1920 said that Glavpolitput was being set up as a "temporary" institution, and that conditions should be brought back to normal "*as soon as possible*".[119] In September you read, "Return to normal conditions".* The plenary meeting was held in November (November 9), and Trotsky came up with his theses and ideas about trade-unionism. However fine some of his words about production propaganda may be, he should have been told that all this was not to the point, quite beside the mark, and a step backward; it is something the CC should not be dealing with at present. Bukharin says: "It is very good." It may be very good, but that is no answer to the question. After a heated debate, a resolution is adopted by 10 to 4 saying in a polite and comradely way that Tsektran has itself "already got down to . . . strengthening and developing methods of proletarian democracy within the union". It adds that Tsektran must "take an active part in the general work of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, being incorporated in it on an equal footing with other trade union bodies".

* See *Izvestia of the CC, RCP* No. 26, p. 2, the resolution of the September Plenum of the CC, Paragraph 3, which said: "The CC further believes that there has been a considerable improvement in the grave situation in the transport workers' unions, which produced Glavpolitput and Politvod,[120] as temporary levers for assisting and organising the work. Therefore, incorporation of these organisations in the union, as union agencies being adapted to and absorbed by the union apparatus, can and must now proceed."

What is the gist of the Central Committee's decision? It is obviously this: "Comrades of Tsektran! You must do more than go through the motions of carrying out Congress and CC decisions, you must actually do so to help all trade unions by your work, wipe out every trace of red-tape, favouritism, arrogance, the we-are-better-than-you attitude, and boasts of being richer and getting more aid."

We then get down to brass tacks. A commission is set up, and the names of its members are published. Trotsky walks out, refuses to serve on the commission, and disrupts its work. What are his reasons? There is only one. Lutovinov is apt to play at opposition. That is true, and that also goes for Osinsky. Frankly speaking, it is not a pleasant game. But do you call that a reason? Osinsky was making an excellent job of the seed campaign. The thing to do was to work with him, in spite of his "opposition campaign", for this method of disrupting the work of a commission is bureaucratic, un-Soviet, un-socialist, incorrect and politically harmful. Such methods are doubly incorrect and politically harmful at a time when there is need to separate the wheat from the chaff within the "opposition". When Osinsky conducts an "opposition campaign", I tell him: "This is a harmful campaign", but it is a pleasure to see him conduct the seed campaign. I shall not deny that, like Ishchenko and Shlyapnikov, Lutovinov is making a mistake in his "opposition campaign", but that is no reason to disrupt the work of a commission.

What did the commission in fact signify? It signified transition to practical work from intellectualist talk about sterile disagreements. What the commission was due to discuss and deal with was production propaganda, bonuses, and disciplinary courts. It was then that Comrade Bukharin, the head of the "buffer group", together with Preobrazhensky and Serebryakov, seeing the Central Committee dangerously divided, set out to create a buffer, one that I find difficult to describe in parliamentary terms. If I could draw cartoons as well as Comrade Bukharin does, I would depict him as a man pouring a bucket of kerosene on the flames, and give the following caption: "Buffer kerosene". Comrade Bukharin wanted to create something, and his intentions were no doubt most sincere and entirely in the "buffer" spirit. But the buffer failed to materialise; the upshot was that he failed

to take account of the political situation and, what is more, made some theoretical mistakes.

Should all such disputes have been brought up for broad discussion? Was it worth going into these trifles? Was it worth wasting the few precious weeks before a Party congress? We could have used the time to analyse and study the question of bonuses, disciplinary courts and coalescence. Those are the questions we could have given a practical solution to in the CC commission. If Comrade Bukharin wished to create a buffer, instead of giving a display of barking up the wrong tree, he should have demanded and insisted that Comrade Trotsky remained on the commission. If he had said and done that, we should have been on the right track, with the commission looking into the practical aspects of such things as one-man management, democracy, appointees, etc.

But to go on. By December (the December 7 Plenary Meeting), we were already faced with this flare-up of the watermen, which intensified the conflict, and as a result there were now eight votes in the Central Committee to our seven. Comrade Bukharin, in an effort to bring about a "reconciliation" through the use of his "buffer", hastily wrote the "theoretical" part of the December plenum's resolution, but with the commission a shambles, nothing, of course, could come of it.

Where did Glavpolitput and Tsektran err? Certainly not in their use of coercion; that goes to their credit. Their mistake was that they failed to switch to normal trade union work at the right time and without conflict, as the Ninth Congress of the RCP required; they failed to adapt themselves to the trade unions and help them by meeting them on an equal footing. Heroism, zeal, etc., are the positive side of military experience; red-tape and arrogance are the negative side of the experience of the worst military types. Trotsky's theses, whatever his intentions, do not tend to play up the best, but the worst in military experience. It must be borne in mind that a political leader is responsible not only for his own policy but also for the acts of those he leads.

The last thing I want to tell you about—something I called myself a fool for yesterday—is that I had altogether overlooked Comrade Rudzutak's theses. His weak point is

that he does not speak in ringing tones; he is not an impressive or eloquent speaker. He is liable to be overlooked. Unable to attend the meetings yesterday, I went through my material and found a printed leaflet issued for the Fifth All-Russia Trade Union Conference, which was held from November 2 to 6, 1920. It is called: *The Tasks of the Trade Unions in Production.* Let me read it to you, it is not long.

FIFTH ALL-RUSSIA TRADE UNION CONFERENCE[121]

The Tasks of the Trade Unions in Production

(Theses of Comrade Rudzutak's Report)

1. Immediately after the October Revolution, the trade unions proved to be *almost the only* bodies which, while exercising workers' *control,* were able and bound to undertake the work of organising and *managing production.* In that early period of the Soviet power, no state apparatus for the management of the national economy had yet been set up, while sabotage on the part of factory owners and senior technicians brought the working class squarely up against the task of safeguarding industry and getting the whole of the country's economic apparatus back into normal running order.

2. In the subsequent period of the Supreme Economic Council's work, when a considerable part of it consisted in liquidating private enterprises and organising state management to run them, *the trade unions carried on this work jointly and side by side with the state* economic management *agencies.*

This *parallel set-up* was explained and justified by the weakness of the state agencies; historically it was vindicated by the establishment of full contact between the trade unions and the economic management agencies.

3. *The centre of gravity in the management of industry* and the drafting of a production programme *shifted to these agencies* as a result of their administration, the gradual spread of their control over production and management and the co-ordination of the several parts. In view of this, the work of the trade unions in organising production was reduced to *participation in forming the collegiums* of chief administrations, central boards, and factory managements.

4. At the present time, we are once again squarely faced with the question of establishing the closest possible ties between the economic agencies of the Soviet Republic and the trade unions, for the best use must be made of every working individual, and the whole mass of producers must be induced to take a conscious part in production, for the state apparatus of economic management, gradually gaining in size and complexity, has been transformed into a huge bureaucratic machine which is out of all proportion to the scale of industry, and is inevitably impelling the trade unions to take direct part in organising production

not only through its men in the economic agencies but also as an organised whole.

5. While the Supreme Economic Council's point of departure in drawing up an overall production programme is the *availability of the material elements of production* (raw materials, fuel, the state of machinery, etc.), the trade unions must look at it *from the standpoint of organising labour* for the tasks of production and its best use. Therefore, the overall *production programme, in whole and in part, must be drawn up with the participation of the trade unions* in order to combine the use of the material resources of production and manpower in the best possible way.

6. Only if the whole mass of those engaged in production *consciously take a hand* in establishing real labour discipline, fighting deserters from the labour front, etc., can these tasks be fulfilled. *Bureaucratic methods and orders* will not do; it must be brought home to each participant in production that his production tasks are appropriate and important; that each must take a hand not only in fulfilling his assignments, but also play an intelligent part in correcting any technical and organisational defects in the sphere of production.

The tasks of the trade unions in this sphere are tremendous. They must teach *their members in each shop* and in each factory *to react to and take account of all defects in the use of manpower arising from improper handling* of technical means or unsatisfactory management. *The sum total of the experience gained by separate* enterprises and industry as a whole must be used to combat red-tape, bureaucratic practices and carelessness.

7. In order to lay special emphasis on the importance of these production tasks, they must be organisationally worked into current operations. As the *economic departments* of the trade unions, which are being set up in pursuance of the decision of the Third All-Russia Congress, extend their activity, they must gradually explain and define the nature of all trade union work. Thus, in the present social conditions, when all of production is geared to the satisfaction of the working people's needs, *wage rates and bonuses must be closely tied in with and must depend on the extent to which the production plan is fulfilled.* Bonuses in kind and partial payment of wages in kind must be gradually transformed into *a system of workers' supply* which depends on the level of labour productivity.

8. Trade union work on these lines would, on the one hand, put an end to the existence of *parallel bodies* (*political departments, etc.*) and, on the other, restore the close ties between the masses and the economic management agencies.

9. After the Third Congress, the trade unions largely failed to carry out their programme for participation in economic construction, owing, first, to the *military conditions,* and second, to their *organisational weakness* and isolation from the administrative and practical work of the economic bodies.

10. In view of this, the trade unions should set themselves the following immediate practical tasks: (a) the most active participation in solving production and management problems; (b) direct participation, with the respective economic agencies, *in setting up competent* administrative bodies; (c) careful consideration of the various *types of management*

bodies, and their influence on production; (d) unfailing participation in working out and laying down economic *plans* and production programmes; (e) *organisation of labour* in accordance with the economic priorities; (f) development of an extensive organisation for production *agitation and propaganda.*

11. The economic departments of the *trade unions* and of their organisations must be actually transformed into powerful and expeditious levers for the trade unions' systematic participation in organising production.

12. In the matter of providing workers with steady material supplies, the trade unions must shift their *influence onto the distributive bodies of the Commissariat for Food*, both local and central, taking a practical and business-like part and exercising *control* in all the distributive bodies, and paying special attention to the activity of central and gubernia *workers' supply commissions.*

13. In view of the fact that the narrow departmental interests of some chief administrations, central boards, etc., have plunged the so-called "priority" into a state of utter confusion, the trade unions must everywhere uphold the real order of economic priorities and review the existing system so as to determine them in accordance with the actual importance of the various industries and the availability of material resources in the country.

14. Special attention must be given to the so-called model group of factories to help them set an example through the organisation of efficient management, labour discipline and trade union activities.

15. In labour organisation, apart from the introduction of a harmonious wage-rate system and the overhaul of output rates, the trade unions should take a firm hand in fighting the various *forms of labour desertion* (absenteeism, lateness, etc.). The disciplinary courts, which have not received due attention until now, must be turned into a real means of combating breaches of proletarian labour discipline.

16. The economic departments must be entrusted with the fulfilment of these tasks and also the drafting of a practical plan for production propaganda and a number of measures to improve the economic condition of the workers. It is necessary, therefore, to authorise the economic department of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions to call a special *All-Russia Conference of Economic Departments* in the near future to discuss the practical problems of economic construction in connection with the work of state economic agencies.

I hope you see now why I called myself names. There you have a platform, and it is very much better than the one Comrade Trotsky wrote after a great deal of thinking, and the one Comrade Bukharin wrote (the December 7 plenum resolution) without any thinking at all. All of us members of the Central Committee who have been out of touch with the trade union movement for many years would profit from Comrade Rudzutak's experience, and this also goes for Comrade Trotsky and Comrade Bukharin. The trade unions have adopted this platform.

We all entirely forgot about the disciplinary courts, but "industrial democracy", without bonuses in kind or disciplinary courts, is nothing but empty talk.

I make a comparison between Rudzutak's theses and those submitted by Trotsky to the Central Committee. At the end of thesis 5, I read:

> "... a reorganisation of the unions must be started right away, that is, a selection of functionaries must be above all made from precisely that angle...."

There you have an example of the real bureaucratic approach: Trotsky and Krestinsky selecting the trade union "functionaries"!

Let me say this once again: here you have an explanation of Tsektran's mistake. It was not wrong to use pressure; that goes to its credit. It made the mistake of failing to cope with the general tasks of all the trade unions, of failing to act itself and to help all the trade unions to employ the disciplinary comrades' courts more correctly, swiftly and effectively. When I read about the disciplinary courts in Comrade Rudzutak's theses it occurred to me that there might be a decree on this matter. And in fact there was. It is the *Regulations* Governing Workers' Disciplinary Comrades' Courts, issued on November 14, 1919 (*Collection of Statutes*, No. 537).

The trade unions have the key role in these courts. I don't know how good these courts are, how well they function, and whether they always function. A study of our own practical experience would be a great deal more useful than anything Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin have written.

Let me end by summing up everything there is on the question. I must say that it was a great mistake to put up these disagreements for broad Party discussion and the Party Congress. It was a political mistake. We should have had a business-like discussion in the commission, and only there, and would have in that case moved forward; as it is we are sliding back, and shall keep sliding back to abstract theoretical propositions for several weeks, instead of dealing with the problem in a business-like manner. Personally, I am sick and tired of it, and quite apart from my illness, it would give me great pleasure to get away from it all. I am prepared to seek refuge anywhere.

The net result is that there is a number of theoretical mistakes in Trotsky's and Bukharin's theses: they contain a number of things that are wrong in principle. Politically, the whole approach to the matter is utterly tactless. Comrade Trotsky's "theses" are politically harmful. The sum and substance of his policy is bureaucratic harassment of the trade unions. Our Party Congress will, I am sure, condemn and reject it. (*Prolonged, stormy applause.*)

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 19-42

THE PARTY CRISIS

The pre-Congress discussion is in full swing. Minor differences and disagreements have grown into big ones, which always happens when someone persists in a minor mistake and balks at its correction, or when those who are making a big mistake seize on the minor mistake of one or more persons.

That is how disagreements and splits always grow. That is how we "grew up" from minor disagreements to syndicalism, which means a complete break with communism and an inevitable split in the Party if it is not healthy and strong enough to purge itself of the malaise.

We must have the courage to face the bitter truth. The Party is sick. The Party is down with the fever. The whole point is whether the malaise has affected only the "feverish upper ranks", and perhaps only those in Moscow, or the whole organism. And if the latter is the case, is it capable of healing itself completely within the next few weeks, before the Party Congress and at the Party Congress, making a relapse impossible, or will the malaise linger and become dangerous?

What is it that needs to be done for a rapid and certain cure? *All* members of the Party must make a calm and painstaking *study* of (1) the essence of the disagreements and (2) the development of the Party struggle. A study must be made of both, because the essence of the disagreements is revealed, clarified and specified (and very often transformed as well) in the *course of the struggle*, which, passing through

its various stages, always shows, at every stage, a *different* line-up and number of combatants, *different* positions in the struggle, etc. A *study* must be made of both, and a demand made for the most exact, printed documents that can be thoroughly verified. Only a hopeless idiot will believe oral statements. If *no* documents are available, there must be an examination of witnesses on *both* or several sides and the grilling must take place in the presence of witnesses.

Let me outline the essence of the disagreements and the successive stages in the struggle, as I see them.

Stage one. The Fifth All-Russia Trade Union Conference, November 2-6. The battle is joined. Trotsky and Tomsky are the only Central Committee "combatants". Trotsky lets drop a "catchy phrase" about "shaking up" the trade unions. Tomsky argues very heatedly. The majority of the Central Committee members are on the fence. The serious mistake they (and I above all) made was that we "overlooked" Rudzutak's theses, *The Tasks of the Trade Unions in Production*, adopted by the Fifth Conference. That is the *most* important document in the *whole* of the controversy.

Stage two. The Central Committee Plenum of November 9. Trotsky submits his "draft theses", *The Trade Unions and Their Future Role*, advocating the "shake-up" policy, *camouflaged* or adorned with talk of a "severe crisis" gripping the trade unions, and their new tasks and methods. Tomsky, strongly supported by Lenin, considers that in view of Tsektran's irregularities and bureaucratic excesses it is the "shake-up" that is the crux of the whole controversy. In the course of it, Lenin makes a number of obviously exaggerated and therefore mistaken "attacks", which produces the need for a "buffer group", and this is made up of ten members of the Central Committee (the group includes Bukharin and Zinoviev, but neither Trotsky nor Lenin). It resolves "not to put the disagreements up for broad discussion", and, *cancelling Lenin's report* (to the trade unions), appoints Zinoviev as the rapporteur and instructs him to "present a business-like and non-controversial report".

Trotsky's theses are rejected. Lenin's theses are adopted. In its final form, the resolution is adopted by ten votes to four (Trotsky, Andreyev, Krestinsky and Rykov). And this resolution advocates "sound forms of the militarisation of labour", condemns "the degeneration of centralism and

militarised forms of work into bureaucratic practices, petty tyranny, red-tape", etc. Tsektran is instructed to "take a more active part in the general work of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, being incorporated in it on an equal footing with other trade union bodies".

The Central Committee sets up a trade union commission and elects Comrade Trotsky to it. He refuses to work on the commission, magnifying by this step *alone* his original mistake, which subsequently leads to factionalism. Without that step, his mistake (in submitting incorrect theses) remained a very minor one, such as every member of the Central Committee, without exception, has had occasion to make.

Stage three. The conflict between the water transport workers and Tsektran in December. The Central Committee Plenary Meeting of December 7. It is no longer Trotsky and Lenin, but Trotsky and Zinoviev who are the chief "combatants". As chairman of the trade union commission, Zinoviev inquires into the December dispute between the water transport workers and Tsektran. The Central Committee Plenary Meeting of December 7. Zinoviev makes a practical proposal for an immediate change in the composition of Tsektran. This is opposed by a majority of the Central Committee. Rykov goes over to Zinoviev's side. Bukharin's resolution—the substantive part of which is three-quarters in favour of the water transport workers, while the preamble, rejecting the proposal to "reconstruct" the trade unions "from above" (§ 3), approves of the celebrated "industrial democracy" (§ 5)—is adopted. Our group of Central Committee members is in the minority, being opposed to Bukharin's resolution chiefly because we consider the "buffer" a paper one; for Trotsky's non-participation in the trade union commission's work actually implies a continuation of the struggle and its transfer outside the Central Committee. We propose that the Party Congress be convened on February 6, 1921. That is adopted. The postponement to March 6 was agreed to later, on the demand of the outlying areas.

Stage four. The Eighth Congress of Soviets. On December 25, Trotsky issues his "platform pamphlet", *The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions*. From the standpoint of formal democracy, Trotsky had an uncontested right to issue his platform, for on December 24 the Central Committee had permitted free discussion. From the standpoint of revolu-

tionary interest, this was blowing up the mistake out of all proportion and *creating a faction* on a faulty platform. The pamphlet quotes from the Central Committee resolution of December 7 only that part which refers to "industrial democracy" but *does not* quote what was said against "reconstruction from above". The buffer created by Bukharin on December 7 with Trotsky's aid was wrecked by Trotsky on December 25. The pamphlet from beginning to end is shot through with the "shake-up" spirit. Apart from its intellectualist flourishes ("production atmosphere", "industrial democracy"), which are wrong in theory and in practice fall within the concept, ambit and tasks of production propaganda, it *fails* to indicate any "new" "tasks or methods" that were to gild or camouflage or justify the "shake-up".

Stage five. The discussion before thousands of responsible Party workers from all over Russia at the RCP group of the Eighth Congress of Soviets[122] on December 30. The controversy flares up to full blast. Zinoviev and Lenin on one side, Trotsky and Bukharin on the other. Bukharin wants to play the "buffer", but speaks only against Lenin and Zinoviev, and not a word against Trotsky. Bukharin reads out an excerpt from his theses (published on January 16), but *only* that part which says nothing about the rupture with communism and the switch to syndicalism. Shlyapnikov (on behalf of the Workers' Opposition[123]) reads out the syndicalist platform, which Trotsky had demolished beforehand (thesis 16 of his platform) and which (partly, perhaps, for that reason) no one is inclined to take seriously.

In my opinion, the climax of the whole discussion of December 30 was the reading of Comrade Rudzutak's theses. Indeed, Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin, far from being able to object to them, even invented the legend that the "best part" of the theses had been drawn up by *members of Tsektran*—Holtzmann, Andreyev and Lyubimov. And that is why Trotsky humorously and amiably twitted Lenin on his unsuccessful "diplomacy", by which, he said, Lenin had wanted to "call off or disrupt" the discussion, and find a "lightning conductor", "accidentally catching hold of Tsektran instead of the lightning conductor".

The legend was exploded that very day, December 30, by Rudzutak, who pointed out that Lyubimov "did not exist"

on the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, that in its presidium Holtzmann had voted against these theses, and that they had been drawn up by a commission consisting of Andreyev, Tsiperovich and himself.[124]

But let us for a moment assume that Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin's legend is true. Nothing so completely defeats them as such an assumption. For what is the conclusion if the "Tsektranites" had inserted their "new" ideas into Rudzutak's resolution, if Rudzutak had accepted them, if all the trade unions had adopted this resolution (November 2-6!), and if Bukharin and Trotsky have nothing to say against it?

It is that all of Trotsky's disagreements are artificial, that *neither* he *nor* the "Tsektranites" *have any* "new tasks or methods", and that everything practical and substantive had been said, adopted and *decided upon* by the trade unions, *even before the question was raised in the Central Committee.*

If anyone ought to be taken thoroughly to task and "shaken up", it is not the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions but the Central Committee of the RCP, for having "overlooked" Rudzutak's theses, a mistake which allowed an altogether empty discussion to flare up. There is nothing to *cover up* the mistake of the Tsektranites (which is not an excessive one but is, in essence, a very common one, consisting in some exaggeration of bureaucracy). What is more, it needs to be rectified, and not covered up, toned down or justified. That's all there is to it.

I summed up the substance of Rudzutak's theses on December 30 in four points*: (1) ordinary democracy (without any exaggerations, without denying the Central Committee's right of "appointment", etc., but also without any obstinate defence of the mistakes and excesses of certain "appointees", which need to be rectified); (2) production propaganda (this includes all that is practical in clumsy, absurd, theoretically wrong "formulas" like "industrial democracy", "production atmosphere", etc.). We have established a *Soviet institution*, the All-Russia Production Propaganda Bureau. We must do everything to support it and not spoil produc-

* See pp. 163-68.—*Ed.*

tion work by *producing . . . bad theses.* That's all there is to it; (3) bonuses in kind and (4) disciplinary comrades' courts. Without Points 3 and 4, all talk about "the role and tasks in production", etc., is empty, highbrow chatter; and it is these two points that are omitted from Trotsky's "platform pamphlet". But they are in Rudzutak's theses.

While dealing with the December 30 discussion, I must correct another mistake of mine. I said: "Ours is not actually a workers' state but a workers' and peasants' state." Comrade Bukharin immediately exclaimed: "What kind of a state?" In reply I referred him to the Eighth Congress of Soviets, which had just closed. I went back to the report of that discussion and found that I was wrong and Comrade Bukharin was right. What I should have said is: "A workers' state is an abstraction. What we actually have is a workers' state, with this peculiarity, firstly, that it is not the working class but the peasant population that predominates in the country, and, secondly, that it is a workers' state with bureaucratic distortions." Anyone who reads the whole of my speech will see that this correction makes no difference to my reasoning or conclusions.

Stage six. The Petrograd organisation issues an "Appeal to the Party" against Trotsky's platform, and the Moscow Committee issues a counter-statement (*Pravda*, January 13).[125]

This is a transition from the struggle between factions, formed from above, to the intervention of lower organisations. It is a big step towards recovery. Curiously enough, the Moscow Committee noticed the "dangerous" side of the *Petrograd organisation*'s issuing a platform, but refused to notice the *dangerous side* of Comrade Trotsky's forming a faction on December 25! Some wags have said this is "buffer" (one-eyed) blindness.

Stage seven. The trade union commission concludes its work and issues a platform (a pamphlet, entitled *Draft Decision of the Tenth Congress of the RCP on the Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions*,[126] dated January 14 and signed by nine members of the Central Committee—Zinoviev, Stalin, Tomsky, Rudzutak, Kalinin, Kamenev, Petrovsky, Artyom and Lenin, and also by Lozovsky, a member of the trade union commission; Comrades Shlyapnikov and Lutovinov seem to have "fled" to the Workers' Opposition). It

was published in *Pravda* on January 18, with the following additional signatures: Schmidt, Tsiperovich and Milyutin.

On January 16, *Pravda* carries the Bukharin platform (signed: "On behalf of a group of comrades, Bukharin, Larin, Preobrazhensky, Serebryakov, Sokolnikov, Yakovleva") and the Sapronov platform (signed: "A group of comrades standing for democratic centralism", Bubnov, Boguslavsky, Kamensky, Maximovsky, Osinsky, Rafail, Sapronov).[127] The enlarged meeting of the Moscow Committee on January 17 was addressed by spokesmen for these platforms, and also by the "Ignatovites"[128] (theses published in *Pravda* on January 19 and signed by Ignatov, Orekhov, Korzinov, Kuranova, Burovtsev, Maslov).*

What we find here is, on the one hand, increased solidarity (for the platform of the nine Central Committee members is in complete accord with the decision of the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions); and, on the other, confusion and disintegration, with Bukharin and Co.'s theses being an all-time low in *ideological* disintegration. We have here one of those "turns" which in the old days Marxists used to call "not so much historical as hysterical". Thesis 17 says: "At the present time, these nominations must be made *mandatory*" (that is, the trade unions' nominations to the respective "chief administrations and central boards").

This is a clean break with communism and a transition to syndicalism. It is, in essence, a repetition of Shlyapnikov's "unionise the state" slogan, and means transferring the Supreme Economic Council apparatus piecemeal to the respective trade unions. To say, "I propose *mandatory* nominations", is exactly the same as saying, "I appoint".

Communism says: The Communist Party, the vanguard of the proletariat, leads the non-Party workers' masses, educating, preparing, teaching and training the masses ("school" of communism)—first the workers and then the peasants—to enable them eventually to concentrate in their hands the administration of the whole national economy.

Syndicalism hands over to the mass of non-Party

* Incidentally, the Party should demand that every "platform" be issued with the full signatures of all the comrades responsible for it. This demand is met by the "Ignatovites" and the "Sapronovites" but not by the "Trotskyites", the "Bukharinites" and the "Shlyapnikovites", who refer to anonymous comrades allegedly responsible for their platforms.

workers, who are compartmentalised in the industries, the management of their industries ("the chief administrations and central boards"), thereby making the Party superfluous, and failing to carry on a sustained campaign either in training the masses or in *actually* concentrating in *their* hands the management *of the whole national economy*.

The Programme of the RCP says: "The trade unions *should eventually arrive*" (which means that they are not yet there or even on the way) "at a *de facto* concentration in their hands" (in *their*, that is, the hands of the trade unions, that is, the hands of the fully organised *masses*; anyone will see how far we have still to go even to the very first approaches to this *de facto* concentration) . . . concentration of what? "of the whole administration of the whole national economy, as a single economic entity" (hence, not branches of industry, or even industry as a whole, but industry *plus* agriculture, etc. Are we anywhere near to actually concentrating the management of agriculture in the hands of the trade unions?). The RCP Programme then speaks of the "ties" between the "central state administration" and the "broad masses of toilers", and of the "*participation* of the trade unions in running the economy".[129]

Why have a Party, if industrial management is to be appointed ("mandatory nomination") by the trade unions nine-tenths of whose members are non-Party workers? Bukharin has talked himself into a logical, theoretical and practical implication of a split in the Party, or, rather, a breakaway of the syndicalists from the Party.

Trotsky, who had been "chief" in the struggle, has now been "outstripped" and entirely "eclipsed" by Bukharin, who has thrown the struggle into an altogether new balance by talking himself into a mistake that is much more serious than all of Trotsky's put together.

How could Bukharin talk himself into a break with communism? We know how soft Comrade Bukharin is; it is one of the qualities which endears him to people, who cannot help liking him. We know that he has been ribbed for being as "soft as wax". It turns out that any "unprincipled" person, any "demagogue" can leave any mark he likes on this "soft wax". The sharp words in quotation marks were used by Comrade Kamenev, during the January 17 discussion, and he had a perfect right to do so. But, of course,

neither Kamenev nor anyone else would dream of *attributing* or reducing it all to unprincipled *demagogy*.

On the contrary, there is an objective logic in factional struggles which inevitably leads even the best of men—if they persist in their mistaken attitude—into a state which differs little if at all from unprincipled demagogy. That is the lesson of the entire history of factional wars (for example, the alliance of the Vperyodists and the Mensheviks against the Bolsheviks[130]). That is why we must make a study not only of the nature of the disagreements in the abstract, but also of their concrete development and change at the various stages of the struggle. This development was summed up in the January 17 discussion.[131] Neither the "shake-up" nor the "new production tasks" can any longer be advocated (because all the efficient and sensible ideas went into Rudzutak's theses). The alternative then is to find what Lassalle called "the physical strength of mind" (and character) to admit the mistake, rectify it and turn over this page of the history of the RCP, or—to cling to the remaining allies, no matter who they are, and "ignore" the principles altogether. There remain only the adherents of "democracy" *ad nauseam*. And Bukharin is sliding down towards them and syndicalism.

While we are slowly absorbing what was sound in the "democratic" Workers' Opposition, Bukharin has to cling to what is *unsound*. On January 17, Comrade Bumazhny, a prominent Tsektranite, or Trotskyite, expressed his readiness to accept Bukharin's syndicalist proposals. The "Sapronovites" have gone so far as to insist in the same thesis (3) on a "profound crisis" and a "bureaucratic necrosis" of the trade unions, while proposing, as being "absolutely" necessary, the "extension of the trade unions' *rights* in production" ... probably because of their "bureaucratic necrosis"? Can this group be taken seriously? They had heard the talk about the *role* of the trade unions in production, and wishing to outshout the others, blurted out: "extension of rights" on the occasion of "bureaucratic necrosis". You need read no more than the first few lines of their "practical" proposals: "The presidium of the Supreme Economic Council shall be nominated at a plenary meeting of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and confirmed by the All-Russia Central Executive Committee." And what is their *democratic*

position in "principle"? Listen to this (thesis 2): "They [Zinoviev and Trotsky] in fact express two trends within the same group of *ex-militarisers of the economy*."

Taken seriously, this is Menshevism and Socialist-Revolutionarism at their worst. But Sapronov, Osinsky and Co. should not be taken seriously, when, before every Party congress ("every blessed time on this very same spot"), these, I believe, superlative workers have a sort of paroxysmal seizure and try to outshout the others (the "champion shouter" faction) and solemnly make a hash of things. The "Ignatovites" try to keep up with the "Sapronovites". It is, of course, quite permissible (specially before a congress) for various groups to form blocs (and also to go vote chasing). But this should be done within the framework of communism and not syndicalism) and in such a way as to avoid being ridiculous. Who is the highest bidder? Promisers of more "rights" to non-Party people, unite on the occasion of the congress of the Russian Communist Party!...

Our platform up to now has been: Do not defend but rectify the bureaucratic excesses. The fight against bureaucracy is a long and arduous one. Excesses can and must be rectified at once. It is not those who point out harmful excesses and strive to rectify them but those who resist rectification that undermine the prestige of the military workers and appointees. Such were the excesses of certain Tsektranites who, however, will continue to be (and have been) valuable workers. There is no need to harass the trade unions by inventing disagreements with them, when they themselves have decided upon and accepted all that is new, business-like and practical in the tasks of the trade unions in production. On this basis, let us vigorously work together for practical results.

We have now added to our platform the following: We must combat the ideological discord and the *unsound* elements of the opposition who talk themselves into repudiating all "militarisation of industry", and not only the "appointments method", which has been the prevailing one up to now, but all "appointments", that is, in the last analysis, repudiating the *Party*'s leading role in relation to the non-Party masses. We must combat the syndicalist deviation, which will kill the Party unless it is entirely cured of it.

The Entente capitalists will surely try to take advantage

of our Party's malaise to mount another invasion, and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, to organise plots and rebellions. We need have no fear of this because we shall all unite as one man, without being afraid to admit the malaise, but recognising that it demands from all of us a greater discipline, tenacity and firmness at every post. By the time the Tenth Congress of the RCP meets in March, and after the Congress, the Party will not be weaker, but stronger.

January 19, 1921

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 43-53

ONCE AGAIN ON THE TRADE UNIONS, THE CURRENT SITUATION AND THE MISTAKES OF COMRADES TROTSKY AND BUKHARIN[132]

The Party discussion and the factional struggle, which is of a type that occurs before a congress—before and in connection with the impending elections to the Tenth Congress of the RCP—are waxing hot. The first factional pronouncement, namely, the one made by Comrade Trotsky on behalf of "a number of responsible workers" in his "platform pamphlet" (*The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions*, with a preface dated December 25, 1920), was followed by a sharp pronouncement (the reader will see from what follows that it was deservedly sharp) by the Petrograd organisation of the RCP ("Appeal to the Party", published in *Petrogradskaya Pravda*[133] on January 6, 1921, and in the Party's Central Organ, the Moscow *Pravda* on January 13, 1921). The Moscow Committee then came out against the Petrograd organisation (in the same issue of *Pravda*). Then appeared a verbatim report, published by the bureau of the RCP group of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, of the discussion that took place on December 30, 1920, at a very large and important Party meeting, namely, that of the RCP group at the Eighth Congress of Soviets. It is entitled *The Role of the Trade Unions in Production* (with a preface dated January 6, 1921). This, of course, is by no means all of the discussion material. Party meetings to discuss these issues are being held almost everywhere. On

December 30, 1920* I spoke at a meeting in conditions in which, as I put it then, I "departed from the rules of procedure", i.e., in conditions in which I could not take part in the discussion or hear the preceding and subsequent speakers. I shall now try to make amends and express myself in a more "orderly" fashion.

THE DANGER OF FACTIONAL PRONOUNCEMENTS TO THE PARTY

Is Comrade Trotsky's pamphlet *The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions* a factional pronouncement? Irrespective of its content, is there any danger to the Party in a pronouncement of this kind? Attempts to hush up this question are a particularly favourite exercise with the members of the Moscow Committee (with the exception of Comrade Trotsky, of course), who see the factionalism of the Petrograd comrades, and with Comrade Bukharin, who, however, felt obliged, on December 30, 1920, to make the following statement on behalf of the "buffer group":

"... when a train seems to be heading for a crash, a buffer is not a bad thing at all" (report of the December 30, 1920 discussion, p. 45).

So there is some danger of a crash. Can we conceive of politically conscious members of the Party being indifferent to the question of how, where and when this danger arose?

Trotsky's pamphlet opens with the statement that "it is the fruit of collective work", that "a number of responsible workers, particularly trade unionists (members of the Presidium of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions, the Central Committee of the Metalworkers' Union, Tsektran and others)", took part in compiling it, and that it is a "platform pamphlet". At the end of thesis 4 we read that "the forthcoming Party Congress will have to *choose* [Trotsky's italics] between the two trends within the trade union movement".

If this is not the formation of a faction by a member of the Central Committee, if this does not mean "heading for a crash", then let Comrade Bukharin, or anyone of his fellow-thinkers, explain to the Party any other possible mean-

* See pp. 156-78.—*Ed.*

ing of the words "factionalism", and the Party "seems to be heading for a crash". Who can be more purblind than men wishing to play the "buffer" and *closing their eyes* to *such* a "danger of a crash"?

Just imagine: after the Central Committee had spent two plenary meetings (November 9 and December 7) in an unprecedentedly long, detailed and heated discussion of Comrade Trotsky's original draft theses and of the entire trade union policy that he advocates for the Party, one member of the Central Committee, *one out of nineteen*, forms a group outside the Central Committee and presents its "collective work" as a "platform", inviting the Party Congress "to choose between *two* trends"! This, incidentally, quite apart from the fact that Comrade Trotsky's announcement of two and only two trends on December 25, 1920, despite Bukharin's coming out as a "buffer" on November 9, is a glaring exposure of the Bukharin group's true role as abettors of the worst and most harmful sort of factionalism. But I ask any Party member: Don't you find this attack and insistence upon "choosing" between two trends in the trade union movement rather sudden? What is there for us to do but stare in astonishment at the fact that after three years of the proletarian dictatorship even one Party member can be found to "attack" the two trends issue *in this way*?

Nor is that all. Look at the factional attacks in which this pamphlet abounds. In the very first thesis we find a threatening "gesture" at "certain workers in the trade union movement" who are thrown "back to trade-unionism, pure and simple, which the Party repudiated in principle long ago" (evidently the Party is represented by only one member of the Central Committee's nineteen). Thesis 8 grandiloquently condemns "the craft conservatism prevalent among the top trade union functionaries" (note the truly bureaucratic concentration of attention on the "top"!). Thesis 11 opens with the astonishingly tactful, conclusive and business-like (what is the most polite word for it?) "hint" that the "majority of the trade unionists . . . give only formal, that is, *verbal*, recognition" to the resolutions of the Party's Ninth Congress.

We find that we have some very authoritative judges before us who say the *majority* (!) of the trade-unionists give only *verbal* recognition to the Party's decisions.

Thesis 12 reads:

"... many trade unionists take an ever more aggressive and uncompromising stand against the prospect of 'coalescence'.... Among them we find Comrades Tomsky and Lozovsky.

"What is more, many trade unionists, balking at the new tasks and methods, tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of corporative exclusiveness and hostility for the new men who are being drawn into the given branch of the economy, thereby actually fostering the survivals of craft-unionism among the organised workers."

Let the reader go over these arguments carefully and ponder them. They simply abound in "gems". First, the pronouncement must be assessed from the standpoint of factionalism! Imagine what Trotsky would have said, and how he would have said it, if Tomsky had published a platform accusing Trotsky and "many" military workers of cultivating the spirit of bureaucracy, fostering the survivals of savagery, etc. What is the "role" of Bukharin, Preobrazhensky, Serebryakov and the others who fail to see—positively fail to note, utterly fail to note—the aggressiveness and factionalism of all *this*, and refuse to see how much more factional it is than the pronouncement of the Petrograd comrades?

Secondly, take a closer look at the approach to the subject: many trade-unionists "tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit".... This is an out-and-out bureaucratic approach. The whole point, you see, is not the level of development and living conditions of the masses in their millions, but the "spirit" which Tomsky and Lozovsky tend to cultivate "in their midst".

Thirdly, Comrade Trotsky has unwittingly revealed the *essence* of the whole controversy which he and the Bukharin and Co. "buffer" have been evading and camouflaging with such care.

What is the point at issue? Is it the fact that many trade-unionists are balking at the new tasks and methods and tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of hostility for the new officials?

Or is it that the masses of organised workers are legitimately protesting and inevitably showing readiness to throw out the new officials who refuse to rectify the useless and harmful excesses of bureaucracy?

Is it that someone has refused to understand the "new tasks and methods"?

Or is it that someone is making a clumsy attempt to cover up his defence of certain useless and harmful excesses of bureaucracy with a lot of talk about new tasks and methods?

It is this *essence* of the dispute that the reader should bear in mind.

FORMAL DEMOCRACY AND THE REVOLUTIONARY INTEREST

"Workers' democracy is free from fetishes", Comrade Trotsky writes in his theses, which are the "fruit of collective work". "Its sole consideration is the revolutionary interest" (thesis 23).

Comrade Trotsky's theses have landed him in a mess. That part of them which is correct is not new and, what is more, turns *against* him. That which is new is all wrong.

I have written out Comrade Trotsky's correct propositions. They turn against him not only on the point in thesis 23 (Glavpolitput) but on the others as well.

Under the rules of formal democracy, Trotsky *had a right* to come out with a factional platform even against the whole of the Central Committee. That is indisputable. What is also indisputable is that the Central Committee had endorsed this formal right by its decision on freedom of discussion adopted on December 24, 1920. Bukharin, the buffer, recognises this formal right for Trotsky, but not for the Petrograd organisation, probably because on December 30, 1920, he talked himself into "the sacred slogan of workers' democracy" (verbatim report, p. 45). . . .

Well, and what about the revolutionary interest?

Will any serious-minded person who is not blinded by the factional egotism of "Tsektran" or of the "buffer" faction, will anyone in his right mind say that *such* a pronouncement on the trade union issue by *such* a prominent leader as Trotsky does promote *the revolutionary interest*?

Can it be denied that, even if Trotsky's "new tasks and methods" were as sound as they are in fact unsound (of which later), his very approach would be damaging to himself, the Party, the trade union movement, the training of millions of trade union members and the Republic?

It looks as if the kind Bukharin and his group call them-

selves a "buffer" because they have firmly decided *not to think* about the obligations this title imposes upon them.

THE POLITICAL DANGER OF SPLITS IN THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

Everyone knows that big disagreements sometimes grow out of minute differences, which may at first appear to be altogether insignificant. A slight cut or scratch, of the kind everyone has had scores of in the course of his life, may become very dangerous and even fatal *if* it festers and *if* blood poisoning sets in. This may happen in any kind of conflict, even a purely personal one. This also happens in politics.

Any difference, even an insignificant one, may become politically dangerous if it has a chance to grow into a split, and I mean the kind of split that will shake and destroy the whole political edifice, or lead, to use Comrade Bukharin's simile, to a crash.

Clearly, in a country under the dictatorship of the proletariat, a split in the ranks of the proletariat, or between the proletarian party and the mass of the proletariat, is not just dangerous; it is extremely dangerous, especially when the proletariat constitutes a small minority of the population. And splits in the trade union movement (which, as I tried hard to emphasise in my speech on December 30, 1920, is a movement of the almost completely organised proletariat*) mean precisely splits in the mass of the proletariat.

That is why, when the whole thing started at the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions on November 2-6, 1920 (and that is exactly where it did start), and when right after the Conference—no, I am mistaken, *during* that Conference—Comrade Tomsky appeared before the Political Bureau in high dudgeon and, fully supported by Comrade Rudzutak, the most even-tempered of men, began to relate that at the Conference Comrade Trotsky had talked about "shaking up" the trade unions and that he, Tomsky, had opposed this—when that happened, I decided there and then that policy (i.e., the Party's trade union policy) lay at the root of the controversy, and that Comrade Trotsky, with

* See pp. 156-78.—*Ed.*

his "shake-up" policy against Comrade Tomsky, was entirely in the wrong. For, *even if the "shake-up" policy were partly justified* by the "new tasks and methods" (Trotsky's thesis 12), it cannot be tolerated at the present time, and in the present situation, because it threatens a split.

It now seems to Comrade Trotsky that it is "an utter travesty" to ascribe the "shake-up-from-above" policy to him (L. Trotsky, "A Reply to the Petrograd Comrades", *Pravda* No. 9, January 15, 1921). But "shake-up" is a real "catchword", not only in the sense that after being uttered by Comrade Trotsky at the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions it has, you might say, "caught on" throughout the Party and the trade unions. Unfortunately, it remains true even today in the much more profound sense that it alone epitomises *the whole spirit, the whole trend* of the platform pamphlet entitled *The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions.* Comrade Trotsky's platform pamphlet is shot through with the spirit of the "shake-up-from-above" policy. Just recall the accusation made against Comrade Tomsky, or "many trade unionists", that they "tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of hostility for the new men".

But whereas the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions (November 2-6, 1920) only saw the makings of the atmosphere fraught with splits, the split within Tsektran became a fact in early December 1920.

This event is basic and essential to an understanding of the political essence of our controversies; and Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin are mistaken if they think hushing it up will help matters. A hush-up in this case does not produce a "buffer" effect but rouses passions; for the question has not only been placed on the agenda by developments, but has been emphasised by Comrade Trotsky in his platform pamphlet. It is this pamphlet that repeatedly, in the passages I have quoted, particularly in thesis 12, raises the question of whether the essence of the matter is that "many trade unionists tend to cultivate in their midst a spirit of hostility for the new men", or that the "hostility" of the *masses* is legitimate in view of certain useless and harmful excesses of bureaucracy, for example, in Tsektran.

The issue was bluntly and properly stated by Comrade Zinoviev in his very first speech on December 30, 1920, when he said that it was "Comrade Trotsky's immoderate

adherents" who had brought about a split. Perhaps that is why Comrade Bukharin abusively described Comrade Zinoviev's speech as "a lot of hot air"? But every Party member who reads the verbatim report of the December 30, 1920 discussion will see that that is not true. He will find that it is Comrade Zinoviev who quotes and operates with the facts, and that it is Trotsky and Bukharin who indulge most in intellectualist verbosity minus the facts.

When Comrade Zinoviev said, "Tsektran stands on feet of clay and has already split into three parts", Comrade Sosnovsky interrupted and said:

"That is something you have encouraged" (verbatim report, p. 15).

Now this is a serious charge. If it were proved, there would, of course, be no place on the Central Committee, in the RCP, or in the trade unions of our Republic for those who were guilty of *encouraging a split* even in one of the trade unions. Happily, this serious charge was advanced in a thoughtless manner by a comrade who, I regret to say, has now and again been "carried away" by thoughtless polemics before this. Comrade Sosnovsky has even managed to insert "a fly in the ointment" of his otherwise excellent articles, say, on production propaganda, and this has tended to negate all its pluses. Some people (like Comrade Bukharin) are so happily constituted that they are incapable of injecting venom into their attacks even when the fight is bitterest; others, less happily constituted, are liable to do so, and do this all too often. Comrade Sosnovsky would do well to watch his step in this respect, and perhaps even ask his friends to help out.

But, some will say, the charge is there, even if it has been made in a thoughtless, unfortunate and patently "factional" form. In a serious matter, the badly worded truth is preferable to the hush-up.

That the matter is serious is beyond doubt, for, let me say this again, the *crux* of the issue lies in this area to a greater extent than is generally suspected. Fortunately, we are in possession of sufficiently objective and conclusive facts to provide an answer *in substance* to Comrade Sosnovsky's point.

First of all, there is on the same page of the verbatim report Comrade Zinoviev's statement denying Comrade

Sosnovsky's allegation and making precise references to conclusive facts. Comrade Zinoviev showed that Comrade Trotsky's accusation (made obviously, let me add, in an outburst of factional zeal) was quite a different one from Comrade Sosnovsky's; Comrade Trotsky's accusation was that Comrade Zinoviev's *speech at the September All-Russia Conference of the RCP* had helped to bring about or had brought about the split. (This charge, let me say in parentheses, is quite untenable, if only because Zinoviev's September speech was approved in substance by the Central Committee and the Party, and there has been no formal protest against it since.)

Comrade Zinoviev replied that at the Central Committee meeting Comrade Rudzutak had used the minutes to prove that "*long before* any of my [Zinoviev's] speeches and the All-Russia Conference the question [concerning certain unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy in Tsektran] had been examined in Siberia, on the Volga, in the North and in the South".

That is an absolutely precise and clear-cut statement of fact. It was made by Comrade Zinoviev in his first speech before thousands of the most responsible Party members, and his facts were *not* refuted either by Comrade Trotsky, who spoke *twice later*, or by Comrade Bukharin, who *also spoke later.*

Secondly, the December 7, 1920 *resolution of the Central Committee's Plenary Meeting concerning the dispute between the Communists working in water transport and the Communist group at the Tsektran Conference*, given in the same verbatim report, was an even more definite and official refutation of Comrade Sosnovsky's charges. The part of the resolution dealing with Tsektran says:

> "In connection with the dispute between Tsektran and the water transport workers, the Central Committee resolves: (1) To set up a Water Transport Section within the amalgamated Tsektran; (2) To convene a congress of railwaymen and water transport workers in February to hold normal elections to a new Tsektran; (3) To authorise the old Tsektran to function until then; (4) To abolish Glavpolitvod and Glavpolitput immediately and to transfer all their funds and resources to the trade union on normal democratic lines."

This shows that the water transport workers, far from being censured, are deemed to be *right* in every essential.

Yet *none* of the CC members who had signed the common platform of January 14, 1921 (except Kamenev) voted for the resolution. (The platform referred to is *The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions.* Draft decision of the Tenth Congress of the RCP, submitted to the Central Committee by a group of members of the Central Committee and of the trade union commission. Among those who signed it was Lozovsky, a member of the trade union commission but not of the Central Committee. The others were Tomsky, Kalinin, Rudzutak, Zinoviev, Stalin, Lenin, Kamenev, Petrovsky and Artyom Sergeyev.)

This resolution was carried *against* the CC members listed above, that is, against our group, for we would have voted against allowing the old Tsektran to continue temporarily. Because we were sure to win, Trotsky was forced to vote for Bukharin's resolution, as otherwise our resolution would have been carried. Comrade Rykov, who had been *for* Trotsky in November, took part in the trade union commission's examination of the dispute between Tsektran and the water transport workers in December, and saw that the latter were right.

To sum up: the December 7 majority in the Central Committee consisted of Comrades Trotsky, Bukharin, Preobrazhensky, Serebryakov and other CC members who are above suspicion of being biased *against* Tsektran. Yet the substance of their resolution did not censure the water transport workers but Tsektran, which they just stopped short of dissolving there and then. This proves Sosnovsky's charge to be quite groundless.

There is one other point to be dealt with, if we are to leave no room for ambiguity. What were these "certain unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy" to which I have repeatedly referred? Isn't *this* last charge unsupported or exaggerated?

Once again it was Comrade Zinoviev who, in his very first speech on December 30, 1920, provided the answer which was as precise as one could wish. He quoted from Comrade Zoff's water transport circular of May 3, 1920: "Committee treadmill abolished."[134] Comrade Zinoviev was quite right in saying this was a fundamental error. It exemplified the unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy and the "appointments system". But he said there and

then that some appointees were "not half as experienced or as tried" as Comrade Zoff. I have heard Comrade Zoff referred to in the Central Committee as a most valuable worker, and this is fully borne out by my own observations in the Council of Defence. It has not entered anyone's mind either to make scapegoats of such comrades or to undermine their authority (as Comrade Trotsky suggests, without the least justification, on page 25 of his report). Their authority is not being undermined by those who try to correct the "appointees' " mistakes, but by those who would defend them even when they are wrong.

We see, therefore, that the danger of splits within the trade union movement was not imaginary but real. And we find that the actual disagreements really boiled down to a demand that certain unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy, and the appointments system should not be justified or defended, but corrected. That is all there is to it.

DISAGREEMENTS ON PRINCIPLE

There being deep and basic disagreements on principle—we may well be asked—do they not serve as vindication for the sharpest and most factional pronouncements? Is it possible to vindicate such a thing as a split, provided there is need to drive home some entirely new idea?

I believe it is, provided of course the disagreements are truly very deep and there is no other way to rectify a wrong trend in the policy of the Party or of the working class.

But the whole point is that there are no such disagreements. Comrade Trotsky has tried to point them out, and failed. A tentative or conciliatory approach had been possible—and necessary—*before* the publication of his pamphlet (December 25) ("such an approach is ruled out even in the case of disagreements and vague new tasks"); but *after* its publication we had to say: Comrade Trotsky is essentially wrong on all his new points.

This is most evident from a comparison of his theses with Rudzutak's which were adopted by the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions (November 2-6). I quoted the latter in my December 30 speech and in the January 21

issue of *Pravda*.* They are fuller and more correct than Trotsky's, and wherever the latter differs from Rudzutak, he is wrong.

Take this famous "industrial democracy", which Comrade Bukharin hastened to insert in the Central Committee's resolution of December 7. It would, of course, be ridiculous to quibble about this ill-conceived brainchild ("tricky flourishes"), if it merely occurred in an article or speech. But, after all, it was Trotsky and Bukharin who put themselves into the ridiculous position by *insisting in their theses* on this very term, which is the one feature that distinguishes their "platforms" from Rudzutak's theses adopted by the trade unions.

The term is theoretically wrong. In the final analysis, every kind of democracy, as political superstructure in general (which must exist until classes have been abolished and a classless society established), serves production and is ultimately determined by the relations of production in a given society. It is, therefore, meaningless to single out "industrial democracy", for this leads to confusion, and the result is a dummy. That is the first point.

The second is that if you look at Bukharin's own explanation given in the resolution of the CC Plenary Meeting on December 7, which he drafted, you will find that he says: "Accordingly, the methods of workers' democracy must be those of industrial democracy, which means. . . ." Note the "which means"! The fact is that Bukharin opens his appeal to the masses with such an outlandish term that he must *give a gloss on* it. This, I think, is *undemocratic* from the democratic standpoint. You must write for the masses without using terms that require a glossary. This is bad from the "production" standpoint because time is wasted in explaining unnecessary terms. "Which means," he says, "that nomination and seconding of candidates, elections, etc., must proceed with an eye not only to their political staunchness, but also business efficiency, administrative experience, leadership, and proved concern for the working people's material and spiritual interests."

The reasoning there is obviously artificial and incorrect. For one thing, democracy is more than "nomination and

---

* See pp. 174-76.—*Ed.*

seconding of candidates, elections, etc.". Then, again, not all elections should be held with an eye to political staunchness and business efficiency. Comrade Trotsky notwithstanding, an organisation of many millions must have a certain percentage of canvassers and bureaucrats (we shall not be able to make do without good bureaucrats for many years to come). But we do not speak of "canvassing" or "bureaucratic" democracy.

The third point is that it is wrong to consider only the elected, the organisers, the administrators, etc. After all, they constitute a minority of outstanding men. It is the mass, the rank and file that we must consider. Rudzutak has it in simpler, more intelligible and theoretically more correct terms (thesis 6):

> "... it must be brought home to each participant in production that his production tasks are appropriate and important; that each must not only take a hand in fulfilling his assignments, but also play an intelligent part in correcting any technical and organisational defects in the sphere of production."

The fourth point is that "industrial democracy" is a term that lends itself to misinterpretation. It may be read as a repudiation of dictatorship and individual authority. It may be read as a suspension of ordinary democracy or a pretext for evading it. Both readings are harmful, and cannot be avoided without long special commentaries.

Rudzutak's plain statement of the same ideas is more correct and more handy. This is indirectly confirmed by Trotsky's parallel of "war democracy" which he draws with his own term in an article, "Industrial Democracy", in *Pravda* of January 11, and which fails to refute that his term is inaccurate and inconvenient (for he side-steps the whole issue and fails to compare his theses with Rudzutak's). Happily, as far as I can recall, we have never had any factional controversy over that kind of term.

Trotsky's "production atmosphere" is even wider of the mark, and Zinoviev had good reason to laugh at it. This made Trotsky very angry, and he came out with this argument: "We once had a war atmosphere.... We must now have a production atmosphere and not only on the surface but deep down in the workers' mass. This must be as intense and practical an interest in production as was earlier displayed in the fronts...." Well, there you are: the message

must be carried "deep down into the workers' mass" in the language of Rudzutak's theses, because "production atmosphere" will only earn you a smile or a shrug. Comrade Trotsky's "production atmosphere" has essentially the same meaning as production propaganda, but such expressions must be avoided when production propaganda is addressed to the workers at large. The term is an example of how *not* to carry it on among the masses.

POLITICS AND ECONOMICS. DIALECTICS AND ECLECTICISM

It is strange that we should have to return to such elementary questions, but we are unfortunately forced to do so by Trotsky and Bukharin. They have both reproached me for "switching" the issue, or for taking a "political" approach, while theirs is an "economic" one. Bukharin even put that in his theses and tried to "rise above" either side, as if to say that he was combining the two.

This is a glaring theoretical error. I said again in my speech that politics is a concentrated expression of economics, because I had earlier been rebuked for my "political" approach in a manner which is inconsistent and inadmissible for a Marxist. Politics must take precedence over economics. To argue otherwise is to forget the ABC of Marxism.

Am I wrong in my political appraisal? If you think so, say it and prove it. But you forget the ABC of Marxism when you say (or imply) that the political approach is equivalent to the "economic", and that you can take "the one and the other".

What the political approach means, in other words, is that the wrong attitude to the trade unions will ruin the Soviet power and topple the dictatorship of the proletariat. (In a peasant country like Russia, the Soviet power would surely go down in the event of a split between the trade unions and a Party in the wrong.) This proposition can (and must) be tested in substance, which means looking into the rights and wrongs of the approach and taking a decision. To say: I "appreciate" your political approach, "*but*" it is only a political one and we "*also* need an economic one", is tantamount to saying: I "appreciate" your point that in taking that particular step you are liable to break your neck,

but you must also take into consideration that it is better to be clothed and well-fed than to go naked and hungry.

Bukharin's insistence on combining the political *and* the economic approach has landed him in theoretical *eclecticism.*

Trotsky and Bukharin make as though they are concerned for the growth of production whereas we have nothing but formal democracy in mind. This picture is wrong, because the *only* formulation of the issue (which the Marxist standpoint *allows*) is: without a correct political approach to the matter the given class will be unable to stay on top, *and, consequently*, will be incapable of solving *its production problem* either.

Let us take a concrete example. Zinoviev says: "By carrying things to a split within the trade unions, you are making a political mistake. I spoke and wrote about the growth of production back in January 1920, citing the construction of the public baths as an example." Trotsky replies: "What a thing to boast of: a pamphlet with the public baths as an example (p. 29), 'and not a single word' about the tasks of the trade unions" (p. 22).

This is wrong. The example of the public baths is worth, you will pardon the pun, a dozen "production atmospheres", with a handful of "industrial democracies" thrown in. It tells the masses, the whole bulk of them, what the trade unions are to do, and does this in plain and intelligible terms, whereas all these "production atmospheres" and "democracies" are so much murk blurring the vision of the workers' masses, and *dimming* their understanding.

Comrade Trotsky also rebuked me for not "saying a word" (p. 66) about "that role that has to be played—and is being played—by the levers known as the trade union apparatus".

I beg to differ, Comrade Trotsky. By reading out Rudzutak's theses *in toto* and endorsing them, I made a statement on the question that was *fuller, plainer, clearer and more correct* than all your theses, your report or co-report, and speech in reply to the debate. I insist that bonuses in kind and disciplinary comrades' courts mean a great deal more to economic development, industrial management, and wider trade union participation in production than the absolutely abstract (and therefore empty) talk about "industrial democracy", "coalescence", etc.

Behind the effort to present the "production" standpoint

(Trotsky) or to overcome a one-sided political approach and combine it with an economic approach (Bukharin) we find:

(1) Neglect of Marxism, as expressed in the theoretically incorrect, eclectic definition of the relation between politics and economics;

(2) Defence or camouflage of the political mistake expressed in the shake-up policy, which runs through the *whole* of Trotsky's platform pamphlet, and which, unless it is admitted and corrected, *leads* to the collapse of the dictatorship of the proletariat;

(3) A step back in purely economic and production matters, and the question of how to increase production; it is, in fact, a step back from Rudzutak's *practical* theses, with their concrete, vital and urgent tasks (develop production propaganda; learn proper distribution of bonuses in kind and correct use of coercion through disciplinary comrades' courts), to the highbrow, abstract, "empty" and theoretically incorrect general *theses* which *ignore* all that is most practical and business-like.

That is where Zinoviev and myself, on the one hand, and Trotsky and Bukharin, on the other, actually stand on this question of politics and economics.

I could not help smiling, therefore, when I read Comrade Trotsky's objection in his speech of December 30: "In his summing-up at the Eighth Congress of Soviets of the debate on the situation, Comrade Lenin said we ought to have less politics and more economics, but when he got to the trade union question he laid emphasis on the political aspect of the matter" (p. 65). Comrade Trotsky thought these words were "very much to the point". Actually, however, they reveal a terrible confusion of ideas, a truly hopeless "ideological confusion". Of course, I have always said, and will continue to say, that we need more economics and less politics, but if we are to have this we must clearly be rid of political dangers *and political mistakes*. Comrade Trotsky's political mistakes, aggravated by Comrade Bukharin, *distract* our Party's attention from economic tasks and "production" work, and, *unfortunately*, *make us waste time* on correcting them and arguing it out with the syndicalist deviation (which leads to the collapse of the dictatorship of the proletariat), objecting to the incorrect approach to the trade union movement (which leads to the collapse of the Soviet power), and

debating general "theses", instead of having a practical and business-like "economic" discussion as to whether it was the Saratov millers, the Donbas miners, the Petrograd metal-workers or some other group that had the best results in coalescing, distributing bonuses in kind, and organising comrades' courts, on the basis of Rudzutak's theses, adopted by the Fifth All-Russia Trade Union Conference on November 2-6.

Let us now consider what good there is in a "broad discussion". Once again we find political mistakes distracting attention from economic tasks. I was against this "broad" discussion, and I believed, and still do, that it was a mistake—a political mistake—on Comrade Trotsky's part to disrupt the work of the trade union commission, which ought to have held a business-like discussion. I believe Bukharin's buffer group made the political mistake of misunderstanding the tasks of the buffer (in which case they had once again substituted eclecticism for dialectics), for from the "buffer" standpoint they should have vigorously opposed any broad discussion and demanded that the matter should be taken up by the trade union commission. Here is what came of this.

On December 30, Bukharin went so far as to say that "we have proclaimed the new and sacred slogan of workers' democracy, which means that questions are no longer to be discussed in the board-room within the corporation or at small meetings but are to be placed before big meetings. I insist that by taking the trade union issue before such a large meeting as this one we are not taking a step backward but forward" (p. 45). And this man has accused Zinoviev of spouting "hot air" and overdoing the democracy! I say that he himself has given us a lot of hot air and has shown some unexampled bungling; he has completely failed to understand that formal democracy must be subordinate to the revolutionary interest.

Trotsky is in the same boat. His charge is that "Lenin wants at all costs to disrupt or shelve the discussion of the matter in essence" (p. 65). He declares: "My reasons for refusing to serve on the commission were clearly stated in the Central Committee: until such time as I am permitted, on a par with all other comrades, to air these questions fully in the Party press, I do not expect any good to come of any

cloistered examination of these matters, and, consequently, of work on the commission" (p. 69).

What is the result? Less than a month has passed since Trotsky started his "broad discussion" on December 25, and you will be hard put to find one responsible Party worker in a hundred who is not fed up with the discussion and has not realised its futility (to say no worse). For Trotsky has made the Party waste time on a discussion of words and bad theses, and has ridiculed as "cloistered" the *business-like* economic discussion in the commission, which was to have studied and verified practical experience and projected its lessons for *progress* in real "production" work, in place of the *regress* from vibrant activity to scholastic exercises in all sorts of "production atmospheres".

Take this famous "coalescence". My advice on December 30 was that we should keep mum on this point, because we had *not studied* our own practical experience, and without that any discussion was bound to degenerate into "hot air" and draw off the Party's forces *from* economic work. I said it was bureaucratic projecteering for Trotsky to propose in his theses that from one-third to one-half and from one-half to two-thirds of the economic councils should consist of trade unionists.*

For this I was upbraided by Bukharin who, I see from p. 49 of the report, made a point of proving to me at length and in great detail that "when people meet to discuss something, they should not act as deaf-mutes" (sic). Trotsky was also angry and exclaimed:

> "Will every one of you please make a note that on this particular date Comrade Lenin described this as a bureaucratic evil. I take the liberty to predict that within a few months we shall have accepted for our guidance and consideration that the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and the Supreme Economic Council, the Central Committee of the Metalworkers' Union and the Metals Department, etc., are to have from one-third to one-half of their members in common" (p. 68).

When I read that I asked Comrade Milyutin (Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Economic Council) to let me have the available *printed* reports on coalescence, I said to myself: why not make a small start on the *study of our practical experience*; it's so dull engaging in "general Party talk"

---

* See pp. 166-67.—*Ed.*

(Bukharin's expression, p. 47, which has every chance of becoming a catchword like "shake-up") to no useful purpose, without the facts, and inventing disagreements, definitions and "industrial democracies".

Comrade Milyutin sent me several books, including *The Report of the Supreme Economic Council to the Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets* (Moscow, 1920; preface dated December 19, 1920). On its p. 14 is a table showing workers' participation in administrative bodies. Here is the table (covering only part of the gubernia economic councils and factories):

Administrative body	Total members	Workers		Specialists		Office workers and others	
		Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Presidium of Supreme Economic Council and gubernia economic councils	187	107	57.2	22	11.8	58	31.0
Collegiums of chief administrations, departments, central boards and head offices . . .	140	72	51.4	31	22.2	37	26.4
Corporate and one-man managements of factories	1,143	726	63.5	398	34.8	19	1.7
Total . . .	1,470	905	61.6	451	30.7	114	7.7

It will be seen that workers already account for 61.6 per cent, that is, closer to two-thirds than to one-half, of the staff of administrative bodies. And this *already proves* that what Trotsky wrote on this matter in his theses was an exercise in bureaucratic projecteering. To talk, argue and write platforms about "one-third to one-half" and "one-half to two-thirds" is the most useless sort of "general Party talk", which diverts time, attention and resources from *production* work. It is empty politicking. All this while, a great deal of good could have been done in the commission,

where men of experience would have refused to write any theses without a study of the facts, say, by polling a dozen or so "common functionaries" (out of the thousand), by comparing their impressions and conclusions with objective statistical data, and by making an attempt to obtain practical guidance for the future: that being our experience, do we go straight on, or do we make some change in our course, methods and approach, and how; or do we call a halt, for the good of the cause, and check things over and over again, make a few changes here and there, and so on and so forth.

Comrades, a real "executive" (let me also have a go at "production propaganda") is well aware that even in the most advanced countries, the capitalists and their executives take years—sometimes ten and more—to study and test their own (and others') practical experience, making innumerable starts and corrections to tailor a system of management, select senior and junior executives, etc., fit for their particular business. That was the rule under capitalism, which throughout the civilised world based its business practices on *the experience and habits of centuries.* We who are breaking new ground must put in a long, persistent and patient effort to retrain men and change the old habits which have come down to us from capitalism, but this can only be done little by little. Trotsky's approach is quite wrong. In his December 30 speech he exclaimed: "Do or do not our workers, Party and trade union functionaries have any production training? Yes or no? I say: No" (p. 29). This is a ridiculous approach. It is like asking whether a division has enough felt boots: Yes or no?

It is safe to say that even ten years from now we shall have to admit that all our Party and trade union functionaries do not have enough production training, in much the same way as the workers of the Military Department, the trade unions and the Party will not have had enough military experience. But we have made a *start* on production training by having about a thousand workers, trade union members and delegates, take part in management and run factories, head offices and other bodies higher up the scale. The basic principle underlying "production training"—which is the training of *our own selves*, of the old underground workers and professional journalists—is that we should start a painstaking and detailed study of our own practical expe-

rience, and teach others to do so, according to the rule: Look before you leap. The fundamental and absolute rule behind "production training" is systematic, unhurried, circumspect, practical and business-like verification of what this one thousand have done, and even more efficient and careful correction of their work, taking a step forward only when there is ample proof of the usefulness of a given method, system of management, proportion, selection of men, etc. And it is this rule that Comrade Trotsky has broken by his theses and approach. All his theses, his entire platform pamphlet, are so wrong that they have diverted the Party's attention and resources from practical "production" work to a lot of empty talk.

DIALECTICS AND ECLECTICISM. "SCHOOL" AND "APPARATUS"

Among Comrade Bukharin's many excellent traits are his theoretical ability and keen interest in getting at the theoretical roots of every question. That is a very valuable trait because you cannot have a proper understanding of any mistake, let alone a political one, unless you dig down to its theoretical roots among the basic premises of the one who makes it.

Responding to this urge, Comrade Bukharin tended to shift the controversy into the theoretical sphere, beginning from December 30, if not earlier.

> In his speech on that day he said: "That neither the political nor the economic factor can be ignored is, I believe, absolutely incontrovertible —and that is the theoretical essence of what is here known as the 'buffer group' or its ideology" (p. 47).

The gist of his theoretical mistake in this case is substitution of eclecticism for the dialectical interplay of politics and economics (which we find in Marxism). His theoretical attitude is: "on the one hand, and on the other," "the one and the other". That is eclecticism. Dialectics requires an all-round consideration of relationships in their concrete development but not a patchwork of bits and pieces. I have shown this to be so on the example of politics and economics.

That of the "buffer" has gone to reinforce the point. You need a buffer, and it is useful when the Party train is heading for a crash. No question about that at all. Bukha-

rin has built up his "buffer" problem eclectically, by collecting odd pieces from Zinoviev and Trotsky. As a "buffer", Bukharin should have decided for himself just where, when and how each individual or group had made their mistake, whether it was a theoretical mistake, one of political tact, factional pronouncement, or exaggeration, etc. He should have done that and gone *hammer and tongs at every* such mistake. But he has failed to understand his task of "buffer", and here is good proof of it.

The Communist group of Tsektran's Petrograd Bureau (the CC of the Railwaymen's and Water Transport Workers' Union), an organisation sympathising with Trotsky, has stated its opinion that, "on the main issue of the trade unions' role in production, Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin hold views which are variations of one and the same standpoint". It has issued Comrade Bukharin's report in Petrograd on January 3, 1921, in pamphlet form (N. Bukharin, *The Tasks of the Trade Unions*, Petrograd, 1921). It says:

> "Comrade Trotsky's original formulation was that the trade union leadership should be removed and suitable comrades found to take their place, etc. He had earlier advocated a 'shake-up', but he has now abandoned the idea, and it is therefore quite absurd to use it as an argument against him" (p. 5).

I will let pass the numerous factual inaccuracies in this statement. (Trotsky used the term "shake-up" at the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions, November 2-6. He mentions "selection of leadership " in Paragraph 5 of his theses which he submitted to the Central Committee on November 8, and which, incidentally, some of his supporters have published as a leaflet. The whole of Trotsky's pamphlet, *The Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions*, December 25, reveals the same kind of mentality, the same spirit as I have pointed out before. When and how he "abandoned" this attitude remains a mystery.) I am now dealing with a different matter. When the "buffer" is an eclectic, he passes over some mistakes and brings up others; he says nothing of them in Moscow on December 30, 1920, when addressing thousands of RCP functionaries from all over Russia; but he brings them up in Petrograd on January 3, 1921. When the "buffer" is a dialectician, he directs the full brunt of his attack at every mistake he sees on either side, or on all sides. And that is something Bukharin does not do. He does

not even try to examine Trotsky's pamphlet in the light of the "shake-up" policy. *He simply says nothing about it.* No wonder his buffer performance has made everyone laugh.

To proceed. In that same Petrograd speech he says (p. 7):

"Comrade Trotsky's mistake is insufficient support for the school-of-communism idea."

During the December 30 discussion, Bukharin reasoned as follows:

"Comrade Zinoviev has said that the trade unions are a school of communism, and Trotsky has said that they are a technical and administrative apparatus for industrial management. I see no logical grounds for proof that either proposition is wrong; both, and a combination of both, are right" (p. 48).

Bukharin and his "group" or "faction" make the same point in their thesis 6: "On the one hand, they [the trade unions] are a school of communism ... and on the other, they are—increasingly—a component part of the economic apparatus and of state administration in general" (*Pravda*, January 16).

That is where we find Comrade Bukharin's fundamental theoretical mistake, which is substitution of eclecticism (especially popular with the authors of diverse "fashionable" and reactionary philosophical systems) for Marxist dialectics.

When Comrade Bukharin speaks of "logical" grounds, his whole reasoning shows that he takes—unconsciously, perhaps—the standpoint of formal or scholastic logic, and not of dialectical or Marxist logic. Let me explain this by taking the simple example which Comrade Bukharin himself gives. In the December 30 discussion he said:

"Comrades, many of you may find that the current controversy suggests something like this: two men come in and invite each other to define the tumbler on the lectern. One says: 'It is a glass cylinder, and a curse on anyone who says different.' The other one says: 'A tumbler is a drinking vessel, and a curse on anyone who says different' " (p. 46).

The reader will see that Bukharin's example was meant to give me a popular explanation of the harm of one-track thinking. I accept it with gratitude, and in the one-good-turn-deserves-another spirit offer a popular explanation of the difference between dialectics and eclecticism.

A tumbler is assuredly both a glass cylinder and a drinking

vessel. But there are more than these two properties, qualities or facets to it; there are an infinite number of them, an infinite number of "mediacies" and inter-relationships with the rest of the world. A tumbler is a heavy object which can be used as a missile; it can serve as a paper-weight, a receptacle for a captive butterfly, or a valuable object with an artistic engraving or design, and this has nothing at all to do with whether or not it can be used for drinking, is made of glass, is cylindrical or not quite, and so on and so forth.

Moreover, if I needed a tumbler just now for drinking, it would not in the least matter how cylindrical it was, and whether it was actually made of glass; what would matter though would be whether it had any holes in the bottom, or anything that would cut my lips when I drank, etc. But if I did not need a tumbler for drinking but for a purpose that could be served by any glass cylinder, a tumbler with a cracked bottom or without one at all would do just as well, etc.

Formal logic, which is as far as schools go (and should go, with suitable abridgements for the lower forms), deals with formal definitions, draws on what is most common, or glaring, and stops there. When two or more different definitions are taken and combined at random (a glass cylinder and a drinking vessel), the result is an eclectic definition which is indicative of different facets of the object, and nothing more.

Dialectical logic demands that we should go further. First, if we are to have a true knowledge of an object we must look at and examine all its facets, its connections and "mediacies". That is something we cannot ever hope to achieve completely, but the rule of comprehensiveness is a safeguard against mistakes and rigidity. Secondly, dialectical logic requires that an object should be taken in development, in change, in "self-movement" (as Hegel sometimes puts it). This is not immediately obvious in respect of such an object as a tumbler, but it, too, is in flux, and this holds especially true for its purpose, use and *connection* with the surrounding world. Thirdly, a full "definition" of an object must include the whole of human experience, both as a criterion of truth and a practical indicator of its connection with human wants. Fourthly, dialectical logic holds that "truth is always con-

crete, never abstract", as the late Plekhanov liked to say after Hegel. (Let me add in parenthesis for the benefit of young Party members that you *cannot* hope to become a *real,* politically conscious Communist without making a study—and I mean *study*—of all of Plekhanov's philosophical writings, because nothing better has been written on Marxism anywhere in the world.*

I have not, of course, run through the whole notion of dialectical logic, but what I have said will do for the present. I think we can return from the tumbler to the trade unions and Trotsky's platform.

"A school, on the one hand, and an apparatus on the other," says Bukharin, and writes as much in his theses. Trotsky's mistake is "insufficient support for the school-of-communism idea"; Zinoviev errs by being lukewarm on the apparatus "factor".

Why is Bukharin's reasoning no more than inert and empty eclecticism? It is because he does not even try to make an independent analysis, from his own standpoint, either of the whole course of the current controversy (as Marxism, *that is,* dialectical logic, unconditionally demands) or of the whole approach to the question, the whole presentation—the whole trend of the presentation, if you will—of the question at the present time and in these concrete circumstances. You do not see Bukharin doing that at all! His approach is one of pure abstraction: he makes no attempt at concrete study, and takes bits and pieces from Zinoviev and Trotsky. That is eclecticism.

Here is another example to clarify the picture. I know next to nothing about the insurgents and revolutionaries of South China (apart from the two or three articles by Sun Yat-sen, and a few books and newspaper articles I read many years ago). Since there are these uprisings, it is not too far-fetched to assume a controversy going on between

---

* By the way, it would be a good thing, first, if the current edition of Plekhanov's works contained a special volume or volumes of all his philosophical articles, with detailed indexes, etc., to be included in a series of standard textbooks on communism; secondly, I think the workers' state must demand that professors of philosophy should have a knowledge of Plekhanov's exposition of Marxist philosophy and ability to impart it to their students. But all that is a digression from "propaganda" to "administration".

Chinese No. 1, who says that the insurrection is the product of a most acute nation-wide class struggle, and Chinese No. 2, who says that insurrection is an art. That is all I need to know in order to write theses *à la* Bukharin: "On the one hand, ... on the other hand". The one has failed to reckon with the art "factor", and the other, with the "acuteness factor", etc. Because no *concrete* study is made of *this particular* controversy, question, approach, etc., the result is a dead and empty eclecticism.

On the one hand, the trade unions are a school, and on the other, an apparatus; but they also happen to be an organisation of working people, an almost exclusive organisation of industrial workers, an organisation by industry, etc.* Bukharin does not make any analysis for himself, nor does he produce a shred of evidence to prove why it is that we should consider the first two "facets" of the question or object, instead of the third, the fourth, the fifth, etc. That is why his group's theses are an eclectic soap bubble. His presentation of the "school-apparatus" relationship is fundamentally eclectic and wrong.

The only way to view this question in the right light is to descend from empty abstractions to the concrete, that is, the present issue. Whether you take it in the form it assumed at the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions, or as it was presented and *slanted* by Trotsky himself in his platform pamphlet of December 25, you will find that his *whole* approach is quite wrong and that he has gone off at a tangent. He has failed to understand that the trade unions can and must be viewed as a school both when raising the question of "Soviet trade-unionism", and when speaking of production propaganda in general, and even when considering "coalescence" and trade union participation in industrial management, *as Trotsky does.* On this last point, as it is presented in Trotsky's platform pamphlet, the mistake lies in his failure to grasp that the trade unions are a *school of technical and administrative management of production.* In the context of the controversy, you cannot say: "a school,

* Incidentally, here again Trotsky makes a mistake. He thinks that an industrial union is designed to control industry. That is wrong. When you say that a union is an industrial one you mean that it admits to membership workers in one industry, which is inevitable at the present level of technology and culture (in Russia and elsewhere).

on the one hand, and something else on the other"; given Trotsky's approach, *the trade unions, whichever way you look at them, are a school.* They are a school of unity, solidarity, management and administration, where you learn how to protect your interests. Instead of making an effort to comprehend and correct Comrade Trotsky's fundamental mistake, Comrade Bukharin has produced a funny little amendment: "On the one hand, and on the other."

Let us go deeper into the question. Let us see what the present trade unions are, as an "apparatus" of industrial management. We have seen from the incomplete returns that about 900 workers—trade union members and delegates—are engaged in industrial management. If you multiply this number by 10 or even by 100—if it helps to clarify your fundamental mistake let us assume this incredible speed of "advance" in the immediate future—you still have an insignificant proportion of those directly engaged in *management*, as compared with the mass of six million trade union members. This makes it even clearer that it is quite wrong to look to the "leading stratum", and talk about the trade unions' role in production and industrial management, as Trotsky does, forgetting that 98.5 per cent (6 million minus 90,000 equals 5,910,000 or 98.5 per cent of the total) *are learning, and will have to continue to do so for a long time to come.* Don't say school *and* management, say *school of management.*

In his December 30 argument against Zinoviev, whom he accused, quite groundlessly and incorrectly, of denying the "appointments system", that is, the Central Committee's right and duty to make appointments, Comrade Trotsky inadvertently drew the following telltale comparison:

> "Zinoviev tends to overdo the propaganda angle on every practical matter, forgetting that it is not only a source of material for agitation, but also a problem requiring an administrative solution" (p. 27).

Before I explain in detail the *potential* administrative approach to the issue, let me say that Comrade Trotsky's fundamental mistake is that he treats (rather, maltreats) *the questions* he himself had brought up in his platform pamphlet as *administrative* ones, whereas *they* could be and ought to be viewed *only from the propaganda angle.*

In effect, what are Trotsky's good points? One undoubt-

edly good and useful point is his *production propaganda*, but that is not in his theses, but in his *speeches*, specially when he forgets about his unfortunate polemics with the allegedly "conservative" wing of the trade-unionists. He would undoubtedly have done (and I believe he will do) a great deal of good in the trade union commission's practical business, as speaker and writer, and as a member of the All-Russia Production Propaganda Bureau. His platform theses were a mistake, for through them, like a scarlet thread, runs the administrative approach to the "crisis" and the "two trends" within the trade unions, the interpretation of the RCP Programme, "Soviet trade-unionism", "production training" and "coalescence". I have listed all the main points of Trotsky's "platform" and they all happen to be topics which, considering the material at Trotsky's disposal, can be correctly approached at the present time only from the propaganda angle.

The state is a sphere of coercion. It would be madness to renounce coercion, especially in the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat, so that the administrative approach and "steerage" are indispensable. The Party is the leader, the vanguard of the proletariat, which rules directly. It is not coercion but expulsion from the Party that is the specific means of influence and the means of purging and steeling the vanguard. The trade unions are a reservoir of the state power, a school of communism and a school of management. The specific and cardinal thing in this sphere is *not* administration but the "*ties*" "*between* the central state administration" (and, of course, the local as well), "the national economy and the *broad masses* of the working people" (see Party Programme, economic section, § 5, dealing with the trade unions).

The whole of Trotsky's platform pamphlet betrays an incorrect approach to the problem and a misunderstanding of this relationship.

Let us assume that Trotsky had taken a different approach to this famous question of "coalescence" in connection with the other topics of his platform, and that his pamphlet was entirely devoted to a detailed investigation of, say, 90 of the 900 cases of "coalescence" where trade union officials and members concurrently held elective trade union posts and Supreme Economic Council posts in industrial manage-

ment. Let us say these 90 cases had been analysed together with the returns of a selective statistical survey, the reports of inspectors and instructors of Rabkrin and the People's Commissariats concerned: let us say they had been analysed in the light of the data supplied by the administrative bodies, the results of the work, the headway in production, etc. That would have been a correct administrative approach, and would have fully vindicated the "shake-up" line, which implies concentrating attention on removals, transfers, appointments and the immediate demands to be made on the "leading stratum". When Bukharin said in his January 3 speech, published by the Tsektran people in Petrograd, that Trotsky had at first wanted a "shake-up" but had now abandoned the idea, he made another one of his eclectical mistakes, which is ridiculous from the practical standpoint and theoretically inadmissible for a Marxist. He takes the question in the abstract, being unable (or unwilling) to get down to brass tacks. So long as we, the Party's Central Committee and the whole Party, continue to run things, that is, govern, we shall never—we cannot—dispense with the "shake-up", that is, removals, transfers, appointments, dismissals, etc. But Trotsky's platform pamphlet deals with something else, and does not raise the "question of practical business" at all. It is not this but the "*trends* within the trade union movement" (Trotsky's thesis 4, end) that was being debated by Zinoviev and Trotsky, Bukharin and myself, and in fact the whole Party.

This is essentially a political question. Because of the substance of the case—this concrete, particular "case"—it is impossible to correct Trotsky's mistake by means of eclectic little amendments and addenda, as Bukharin has been trying to do, being moved undoubtedly by the most humane sentiments and intentions.

There is only one answer.

First, there must be a correct solution of the political question of the "trends within the trade union movement", the relationship between classes, between politics and economics, the specific role of the state, the Party, the trade unions, as "school" and apparatus, etc.

Second, once the correct political decision has been adopted, a diversified nation-wide production propaganda campaign must be carried through, or, rather, systematically

carried forward with persistence and patience over a long term, under the sponsorship and direction of a state agency. It should be conducted in such a way as to cover the same ground over and over again.

Third, the "questions of practical business" must not be confused with trend issues which properly belong to the sphere of "general Party talk" and broad discussions; they must be dealt with as practical matters in the working commissions, with a hearing of witnesses and a study of memoranda, reports and statistics. And any necessary "shake-up" must be carried out only on that basis and in those circumstances: only under a decision of the competent Soviet or Party organ, or of both.

Trotsky and Bukharin have produced a hodgepodge of political mistakes in approach, breaks in the middle of the transmission belts, and unwarranted and futile attacks on "administrative steerage". It is now clear where the "theoretical" source of the mistake lies, since Bukharin has taken up that aspect of it with his example of the tumbler. His theoretical—in this case, gnosiological—mistake lies in his substitution of eclecticism for dialectics. His eclectic approach has confused him and has landed him in syndicalism. Trotsky's mistake is one-track thinking, compulsiveness, exaggeration and obstinacy. His platform says that a tumbler is a drinking vessel, but this particular tumbler happens to have no bottom.

CONCLUSION

It remains for me to go over a few more points which must be dealt with to prevent misunderstanding.

Thesis 6 of Trotsky's platform quotes Paragraph 5 of the economic section of the RCP Programme, which deals with the trade unions. Two pages later, his thesis 8 says:

"Having lost the old basis of their existence, the class economic struggle, the trade unions. . ." (that is wrong, and is a hasty exaggeration; the trade unions no longer have to face the *class* economic struggle but the *non-class* "economic struggle", which means combating bureaucratic distortions of the Soviet apparatus, safeguarding the working people's material and spiritual interests in ways and means inaccessible to this apparatus, etc. This is a struggle they will un-

fortunately have to face for many more years to come). "The trade unions", says Trotsky, "have, for various reasons, not yet succeeded in mustering the necessary forces and working out the necessary methods enabling them to solve the new task, that of *organising production*" (Trotsky's italics, p. 9, thesis 8), "set before them by the proletarian revolution and formulated in our Programme."

That is yet another hasty exaggeration which is pregnant with grave error. The Programme does not contain any such formulation, nor does it set the trade unions the task of "organising production". Let us go over the propositions in the Party's Programme as they unfold in the text:

(1) "The organisational apparatus" (but not the others) "of socialised industry should rely chiefly" (but not exclusively) "on the trade unions." (2) "They must to an ever increasing degree divest themselves of the narrow craft-union spirit" (how? under the leadership of the Party and through the proletariat's educational and other influence on the non-proletarian mass of working people) "and become large industrial associations, embracing the majority, and eventually all of the workers in the given industry."

That is the first part of the section of the Party Programme dealing with the trade unions. You will have noted that it starts by laying down very "*strict* conditions" demanding a long sustained effort for what is to follow. And what follows is this:

"The trade unions being, on the strength of the laws of the Soviet Republic and established practice, participants" (note the cautious statement: participants only) "in all the local and central organs of industrial management, should eventually arrive at a *de facto* concentration in their hands of the whole administration of the whole national economy, as a single economic entity" (note this: should arrive at a *de facto* concentration of management not of branches of industry and not of industry as a whole, but of the whole national economy, and moreover, as a single economic entity. In economic terms, this condition may be considered fulfilled only when the petty producers both in industry and agriculture account for less than one-half of the population and the national economy). "The trade unions ensuring in this way" (the way which helps to realise all the conditions listed earlier) "indissoluble ties between the central state admin-

istration, the national economy and the broad masses of working people, should draw the latter" (that is, the masses, the majority of the population) "into direct economic management on the widest possible scale. At the same time, the participation of the trade unions in economic management and their activity in drawing the broad masses into this work are the principal means of combating the bureaucratisation of the economic apparatus of the Soviet power and making possible the establishment of truly popular control over the results of production."

There again, in that last sentence, we find a very cautious phrase: "participation in economic management"; and another reference to the recruitment of the broad masses as the chief (but not the only) means of combating bureaucratic practices; finally, we find a highly cautious statement: "*making possible*" the establishment of "*popular*"—that is, workers' and peasants', and not just purely proletarian—"*control*".

It is obviously wrong to boil this down to the Party Programme "formulating" the trade unions' task as "organisation of production". And if you insist on this error, and write it into your platform theses, you will get nothing but an anti-communist, syndicalist deviation.

Incidentally, Comrade Trotsky says in his theses that "over the last period we have not made any headway towards the goal set forth in the Programme but have in fact retreated from it" (p. 7, thesis 6). That statement is unsupported, and, I think, wrong. It is no proof to say, as Trotsky did in the discussions, that the trade unions "themselves" admit this. That is not the last resort, as far as the Party is concerned, and, generally speaking, the proof lies only in a serious and objective study of a great number of facts. Moreover, even if such proof were forthcoming, there would remain this question: Why have we retreated? Is it because "many trade-unionists" are "balking at the new tasks and methods", as Trotsky believes, or because "we have not yet succeeded in mustering the necessary forces and working out the necessary methods" to cut short and correct certain unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy?

Which brings me to Bukharin's rebuke of December 30 (repeated by Trotsky yesterday, January 24, during our discussion in the Communist group of the Second Miners'

Congress[135]) that we have "dropped the line laid down by the Ninth Party Congress" (p. 46 of the report on the December 30 discussion). He alleged that at that Congress I had defended the militarisation of labour and had jeered at references to democracy, all of which I now "repudiate". In his reply to the debate on December 30, Comrade Trotsky added this barb: "Lenin takes account of the fact that ... there is a grouping of opposition-minded comrades within the trade unions" (p. 65); that I view it from the "diplomatic angle" (p. 69), and that there is "manoeuvring inside the Party groups" (p. 70), etc. Putting such a complexion on the case is, of course, highly flattering for Trotsky, and worse than unflattering for me. But let us look at the facts.

In that same discussion on December 30, Trotsky and Krestinsky established the fact that "as long ago as July (1920), Comrade Preobrazhensky had proposed to the Central Committee that we should switch to a new track in respect of the internal life of our workers' organisations" (p. 25). In August, Comrade Zinoviev drafted a letter, and the Central Committee approved a *CC letter* on combating red-tape and extending democracy. In September, the question was brought up at a Party conference whose decisions were endorsed by the Central Committee. In December, the question of combating red-tape was laid before the Eighth Congress of Soviets.[136] Consequently, the whole Central Committee, the whole Party and the whole workers' and peasants' Republic had recognised that the question of the bureaucracy and ways of combating its evils was high on the agenda. Does any "repudiation" of the Ninth Congress of the RCP follow from all this? Of course, not. The decisions on the militarisation of labour, etc., are incontestable, and there is no need for me at all to withdraw any of my jibes at the references to democracy by those who challenged these decisions. What does follow is that we shall be extending democracy in the workers' organisations, without turning it into a fetish; that we shall redouble our attention to the struggle against bureaucratic practices; and that we shall take special care to rectify any unwarranted and harmful excesses of bureaucracy, no matter who points them out.

One final remark on the minor question of priority and equalisation. I said during the December 30 discussion that Trotsky's formulation of thesis 41 on this point was theoret-

ically wrong, because it implied priority in production and equalisation in consumption. I replied that priority implied preference and that that was nothing unless you also had it in consumption. Comrade Trotsky reproached me for "extraordinary forgetfulness" and "intimidation" (pp. 67 and 68), and I am surprised to find that he has not accused me also of manoeuvring, diplomatic moves, etc. He has made "concessions" to my equalitarian line, but I have attacked him.

Actually, however, anyone who takes an interest in Party affairs, can turn to indisputable Party documents: the November resolution of the CC Plenum, point 4, and Trotsky's platform pamphlet, thesis 41. However "forgetful" I may be, and however excellent Comrade Trotsky's memory, it is still a fact that thesis 41 contains a theoretical error, which the CC resolution of November 9 does not. The resolution says: "While recognising the necessity of keeping to the principle of priority in carrying out the economic plan, the Central Committee, in complete solidarity with the decisions of the last All-Russia Conference (September), deems it necessary to effect a gradual but steady transition to equality in the status of various groups of workers and their respective trade unions, all the while building up the organisation on the scale of the union as a whole." That is clearly aimed against Tsektran, and it is quite impossible to put any other construction on the exact meaning of the resolution. Priority is here to stay. Preference is still to be given to enterprises, trade unions, trusts and departments on the priority list (in regard to fulfilment of the economic plan), but at the same time, the "equalitarian line"—which was supported not by "Comrade Lenin alone", *but was approved by the Party Conference and the Central Committee, that is, the entire Party*—makes this clear-cut demand: get on with the gradual but steady *transition* to equalisation. That Tsektran failed to carry out this CC November resolution is evident from the Central Committee's December resolution (on Trotsky and Bukharin's motion), which contains another reminder of the "principles of ordinary democracy". The theoretical error in thesis 41 is that it says: equalisation in consumption, priority in production. That is an economic absurdity because it implies a gap between production and consumption. I did not say—and could never have said—

anything of the sort. If you don't need a factory, close it down. Close down all the factories that are not absolutely essential, and give preference to those that are. Give preference to, say, transport. Most certainly. But the preference must not be overdone, as it was in Tsektran's case, which was why the *Party* (and not just Lenin) issued this directive: *get on with the gradual* but steady *transition* to equality. And Trotsky has no one but himself to blame for having come out—after the November Plenary Meeting, which gave a clear-cut and theoretically correct solution—with a factional pamphlet on "the two trends" and proposed a formulation in his thesis 41 which is wrong in economic terms.

Today, January 25, it is exactly one month since Comrade Trotsky's factional statement. It is now patent that this pronouncement, inappropriate in form and wrong in essence, has diverted the Party from its practical economic and production effort into rectifying political and theoretical mistakes. But, it's an ill wind that blows nobody good, as the old saying goes.

Rumour has it that some terrible things have been said about the disagreements on the Central Committee. Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries have sheltered (and undoubtedly shelter) behind the opposition, and it is they who are spreading the rumours, incredibly malicious formulations, and inventions of all sorts to malign the Party, put vile interpretations on its decisions, aggravate conflicts and ruin its work. That is a political trick used by the bourgeoisie including the petty-bourgeois democrats, the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, who, for very obvious reasons, hate—and cannot help hating—the Bolsheviks' guts. Every intelligent member of the Party is familiar with this political trick of the bourgeoisie, and knows its worth.

Because of the disagreements on the Central Committee, it had to appeal to the Party, and the discussions that followed clearly revealed the essence and scope of these disagreements. That killed the rumours and the slander. The Party learns its lessons and is tempered in the struggle against factionalism, a new malaise (it is new in the sense that after the October Revolution we had forgotten all about it). Actually, it is an old malaise, with relapses apparently

bound to occur over the next few years, but with an easier cure now well in sight.

The Party is learning not to blow up its disagreements. Let me quote at this point Comrade Trotsky's correct remark about Comrade Tomsky: "I have always said—even when the polemic against Comrade Tomsky was at its bitterest—that it is quite clear to me that only men with his experience and authority ought to be our trade union leaders. I told this to the Party group of the Fifth Conference of the Trade Unions, and repeated it at the Zimin Theatre a few days ago. Ideological struggle within the Party does not mean mutual ostracism but mutual influence"[137] (p. 34 of the report on the December 30 discussion). The Party will naturally apply this correct approach to Comrade Trotsky himself.

During the discussion it was Comrade Shlyapnikov and his group, the so-called Workers' Opposition, who showed the most pronounced syndicalist trend. This being an obvious deviation from communism and the Party, we shall have to reckon with it, talk it over, and make a special propaganda effort to explain the error of these views and the danger of making such mistakes. Comrade Bukharin, who actually coined the syndicalist phrase "mandatory nominations" (by trade unions to management bodies), tries to vindicate himself in today's issue of *Pravda*, but I'm afraid his line of defence is highly ineffective and quite wrong. He wants us to know, you see, that he deals with the role of the Party in his other points. I should think so! If it were otherwise it would have been more than just a *mistake*, requiring correction and allowing some slight rectification: it would have been withdrawal from the Party. When you say "mandatory nominations" but neglect to add, there and then, that they are *not* mandatory for the Party, you have a syndicalist deviation, and that is *in*compatible with communism and the Party Programme. If you add: "mandatory but *not* for the Party" you are giving the non-Party workers a false sense of having some increase in their rights, whereas in fact there will be no change at all. The longer Comrade Bukharin persists in his deviation from communism—a deviation that is wrong theoretically and deceptive politically—the more deplorable will be the fruits of his obstinacy. You cannot maintain an untenable proposition. The Party does not object to the extension of the rights of the non-Party

workers in general, but a little reflection will show what can and what cannot be done in this respect.

In the discussion by the Communist group of the Second All-Russia Miners' Congress, Shlyapnikov's platform was defeated despite the backing it got from Comrade Kiselyov, who commands special prestige in that union: our platform won 137 votes, Shlyapnikov's, 62, and Trotsky's, 8. The syndicalist malaise must and will be cured.

In this one month, Petrograd, Moscow and a number of provincial towns have shown that the Party responded to the discussion and has rejected Comrade Trotsky's wrong line by an overwhelming majority. While there may have been some vacillation "at the top" and "in the provinces", in the committees and in the offices, the rank-and-file membership—the mass of Party workers—came out solidly against this wrong line.

Comrade Kamenev informed me of Comrade Trotsky's announcement, during the discussion in the Zamoskvorechye District of Moscow on January 23, that he was withdrawing his platform and joining up with the Bukharin group on a new platform. Unfortunately, I heard nothing of this from Comrade Trotsky either on January 23 or 24, when he spoke against me in the Communist group of the Miners' Congress. I don't know whether this is due to another change in Comrade Trotsky's platform and intentions, or to some other reason. In any case, his January 23 announcement shows that the Party, without so much as mustering all its forces, and with only Petrograd, Moscow and a minority of the provincial towns going on record, has corrected Comrade Trotsky's mistake promptly and with determination.

The Party's enemies had rejoiced too soon. They have not been able—and will never be able—to take advantage of some of the inevitable disagreements within the Party to inflict harm on it and on the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia.

January 25, 1921

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 70-107

TENTH CONGRESS OF THE RCP(B)

Moscow, March 8-16, 1921[138]

SPEECH ON THE TRADE UNIONS
MARCH 14

Comrades, Comrade Trotsky was particularly polite in his polemics with me today and reproached me for being, or said that I was, extremely cautious. I thank him for the compliment, but regret that I cannot return it. On the contrary, I must speak of my incautious friend, so as to express my attitude to the mistake which has caused me to waste so much time, and which is now making us continue the debate on the trade union question, instead of dealing with more urgent matters. Comrade Trotsky had his final say in the discussion on the trade union question in *Pravda* of January 29, 1921. In his article, "There Are Disagreements, But Why Confuse Things?", he accused me of being responsible for this confusion by asking who started it all. The accusation recoils on Trotsky, for he is trying to shift the blame. The whole of his article was based on the claim that he had raised the question of the role of the trade unions in production, and that this is the subject that ought to have been discussed. This is not true; it is not this that has caused the disagreements, and made them painful. And however tedious it may be after the discussion to have to repeat it again and again—true, I took part in it for only one month—I must restate that that was not the starting-point; it started with the "shake-up" slogan that was proclaimed at the Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions on November 2-6. Already at that time it was realised by everyone who had not overlooked Rudzutak's resolution—and among those were the members of the Central Committee, including myself—that no disagreements could be found on the role of the trade unions in production. But the three-month discussion revealed them. They existed, and they were a political mistake. During a discussion at the Bolshoi Theatre, Comrade Trotsky accused me before responsible Party workers of disrupting the discussion.[139] I take that as a compliment: I did try to disrupt the discussion in the form it was being conducted, because with a severe spring ahead of us such pronouncements were harmful. Only the blind could have failed to see that.

Comrade Trotsky now laughs at my asking who started it all, and is surprised that I should reproach him for refusing to serve on the commission. I did it because this is very important, Comrade Trotsky, very important, indeed; your refusal to serve on the trade union commission was a violation of Central Committee discipline. And when Trotsky talks about it, the result is not a controversy, but a shake-up of the Party, and a generation of bitter feeling; it leads to extremes—Comrade Trotsky used the expression "diabolical rage". I recall an expression used by Comrade Holtzmann—I will not quote it because the word "diabolical" calls to mind something fiendish, whereas Holtzmann reminds one of something angelic. There is nothing "diabolical" about it, but we must not forget that both sides go to extremes, and, what is much more monstrous, some of the nicest comrades have gone to extremes. But when Comrade Trotsky's authority was added to this, and when in a public speech on December 25 he said that the Congress must choose between two trends, such words are unpardonable! They constitute the political mistake over which we are fighting. And it is naïve for people to try to be witty about two-room conferences. I should like to see the wag who says that Congress delegates are forbidden to confer to prevent their votes from being split. That would be too much of an exaggeration. It was Comrade Trotsky and Tsektran's[140] political mistake to raise the "shake-up" question and to do it in an entirely wrong way. That was a political mistake, and it is yet to be rectified. As regards transport, we have a resolution.[141]

What we are discussing is the trade union movement, and the relationship between the vanguard of the working class and the proletariat. There is nothing discreditable in our dismissing anybody from a high post. This casts no reflection upon anybody. If you have made a mistake the Congress will recognise it as such and will restore mutual relations and mutual confidence between the vanguard of the working class and the workers' mass. That is the meaning of the "Platform of Ten".[142] It is of no importance that there are things in it that can be substituted, and that this is emphasised by Trotsky and enlarged upon by Ryazanov. Someone said in a speech that there is no evidence of Lenin's having taken a hand in the platform or of his

having taken any part in drafting it. I say to this: If I had a hand, by writing or phoning, in everything I sign, I would have gone mad long ago. I say that in order to achieve mutual understanding and mutual confidence between the vanguard of the working class and the workers' mass, it was necessary, if Tsektran had made a mistake—and anyone can make a mistake—to rectify it. But it is a source of political danger to defend the mistake. We would have been faced with political bankruptcy if we had not done everything we could to turn the attitudes expressed here by Kutuzov to the service of democracy. Persuasion must come before coercion. We must make every effort to persuade people before applying coercion. We were not able to carry conviction to the broad masses, and disturbed the correct relationship between them and the vanguard.

When people like Kutuzov devote part of a business-like speech to pointing out the scandalous bureaucratic practices in our machinery we say: That is true, our state is one with bureaucratic distortions. And we invite the non-Party workers to join us in fighting them. I must say here that we should enlist comrades like Kutuzov for this work and promote them. That is the lesson of our experience.

As for the syndicalist deviation—it is ridiculous. That is all we have to say to Shlyapnikov, who maintained that the "All-Russia Congress of Producers", a demand set down in black and white in their platform and confirmed by Kollontai, can be upheld by a reference to Engels. Engels speaks of a communist society which will have no classes, and will consist only of producers.[143] Do we now have classes? Yes, we do. Do we have a class struggle? Yes, and a most furious one! To come in the midst of this furious class struggle and talk about an "All-Russia Congress of Producers"—isn't that a syndicalist deviation which must be emphatically and irrevocably condemned? We saw that in this platform hurly-burly even Bukharin was tripped up by the one-third nomination proposal. Comrades, we must not forget such waverings in the history of the Party.

And now, since the Workers' Opposition has defended democracy, and has made some sound demands, we shall do our utmost to mend our fences with it; and the Congress as such should make a definite selection. You say that we are not doing enough to combat the evils of bureaucracy—

come and help us, come closer and help us in the fight; but it is not a Marxist, not a communist notion to propose an "All-Russia Congress of Producers". The Workers' Opposition, with Ryazanov's help, is putting a false construction on our Programme which says: "The trade unions *should eventually* arrive at a *de facto* concentration in their hands of the whole administration of the whole national economy, as a single economic entity."[144] Exaggerating, as he always does, Shlyapnikov thinks that this will take us twenty-five centuries.... The Programme says: the trade unions "should eventually arrive", and when a Congress says that this has been done, the demand will have been carried out.

Comrades, if the Congress now declares before the proletariat of the whole of Russia and of the whole world that it regards the proposals of the Workers' Opposition as a syndicalist semi-deviation, I am sure that all the truly proletarian and sound elements in the opposition will follow us and help us to regain the confidence of the masses, which has been shaken by Tsektran's slight mistake. I am sure that we shall strengthen and rally our ranks in a common effort and march forward together to the hard struggle that lies ahead. And marching forward unanimously, with firmness and resolution, we shall win out. (*Applause.*)

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 32, pp. 210-13

RESOLUTION "ON PARTY UNITY"

1. The Congress draws the attention of all members of the Party to the fact that in view of a number of circumstances, which are intensifying wavering amidst the petty-bourgeois section of the country's population, unity and solidarity within the Party, implicit trust between Party members, and team work that really embodies the proletarian vanguard's unity of will are particularly vital today.

2. Some indications of factional activity, i.e., the formation of groups with their own platforms and with a certain tendency to keep to themselves and establish their own group discipline, have revealed themselves even prior to the general Party discussion on the trade unions.

All class-conscious workers must clearly see the harm

and impermissibility of any form of factional activity, which inevitably undermines team work and encourages enemies, who have wormed their way into the governing Party, to redouble their efforts to widen and utilise the division for counter-revolutionary purposes.

The Kronstadt mutiny, when the bourgeois counter-revolution and the whiteguards in all countries of the world at once showed their willingness to adopt even the slogans of the Soviet system in order to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, when in Kronstadt the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the bourgeois counter-revolution as a whole used the slogans of uprising allegedly in the name of the Soviet power against the Soviet Government in Russia, most strikingly showed how the enemies of the proletariat use all deviations from the firm and consistent Soviet line. These facts fully bear out the fact that the whiteguards are trying and know how to masquerade as Communists and as being even more to the "Left" if only that helps to weaken and demolish the mainstay of the proletarian revolution in Russia. The Menshevik leaflets distributed in Petrograd on the eve of the Kronstadt rising also show how the Mensheviks have used the divergences in the RCP actually to goad and support the Kronstadt insurgents, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the whiteguards, while giving themselves out in words as opponents of revolts and supporters of the Soviet power with what outwardly look like insignificant reservations.

3. On this issue propaganda must consist, on the one hand, of a comprehensive explanation of the harm and danger of factional activity to Party unity and the implementation of the proletarian vanguard's unity of will as the prime condition for the success of the proletarian dictatorship and, on the other hand, of an explanation of the specifics of the latest tactics used by the enemies of the Soviet power. Having realised the futility of open counter-revolution under the whiteguard flag, these enemies are now making every effort to use the divergences in the RCP to set the counter-revolution moving by transferring power, in one way or another, to political groups that are outwardly closest to recognition of the Soviet power.

Furthermore, propaganda must study the experience of preceding revolutions, when the counter-revolution supported

the petty-bourgeois groups standing closest to the most radical revolutionary party in order to shake and overthrow the revolutionary dictatorship and, thereby, open the road for the subsequent total victory of the counter-revolution, of the capitalists and landowners.

4. It must be a strict rule that unquestionably necessary criticism of shortcomings in the Party, every analysis of the Party's general line or study of its practical experience, executive control and the methods of rectifying mistakes, and so forth shall be directed by every Party organisation not towards a discussion in groups forming round some "platform" and so on, but towards a discussion by all members of the Party. To this end the Congress directs that a *Discussion Bulletin* and special collections of articles shall be published regularly. Those who offer criticism must bear in mind the Party's position amidst the enemies surrounding it, and by their direct participation in Soviet and Party activities strive to rectify the Party's mistakes by their deeds.

5. While instructing the Central Committee to put an end to all factional activity, the Congress declares that on questions attracting the special attention of Party members—the purging of the Party of non-proletarian and unreliable elements, the struggle with bureaucracy, the promotion of democracy and of the initiative of workers, and so on—all business-like suggestions must be considered with the closest attention and tested in practical work. All Party members must know that on these questions the Party is not taking all the necessary measures on account of many diverse obstacles, and that while emphatically rejecting unbusiness-like and factional criticism, it will tirelessly continue, while trying out new methods, to use all means to combat bureaucracy, extend democracy, promote initiative, and uncover, expose and expel those who have wormed their way into the Party, and so on.

6. The Congress directs that all groups that have formed round one platform or another shall be forthwith disbanded without exception, and instructs all organisations to make sure that no factional activity is pursued. Non-fulfilment of this decision of the Congress shall be followed by unconditional and immediate expulsion from the Party.

7. In order to achieve strict discipline in the Party and

in all Soviet work and secure the greatest unity while eliminating all factional activity, the Congress authorises the Central Committee, in the event of a case (or cases) of violation of discipline or of a resurgence or of tolerance of factional activity, to impose all forms of Party penalties up to expulsion, while in the case of members of the CC, their transfer to the status of alternate members or even, as an extreme measure, their expulsion from the Party. A condition for the application (to members and alternate members of the CC and members of the Control Commission) of this extreme measure must be the convocation of a plenary meeting of the CC, to which all alternate members of the CC and all members of the Control Commission shall be invited. If at such a general meeting of the most responsible leaders of the Party two-thirds of the votes are in favour of transferring a member of the CC to the status of alternate member or of his expulsion from the Party, this measure shall be put into effect forthwith.*

The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses and Conferences and of Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 218-21

REPLY TO REMARKS CONCERNING THE FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPUTY CHAIRMEN OF THE COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS[145]

May 1922

To Comrade Stalin with the request to pass it on (do not duplicate it—to do so would give publicity to polemics) to members of the Political Bureau and Comrade Tsyurupa (asking them to sign it and give the date when they have read it)

I am sorry for replying belatedly, but the delay was caused by the removal of the bullet.[146]

* By decision of the Tenth Congress Paragraph 7 of the resolution "On Party Unity" was not published; the decision to publish it was adopted in 1924 by the Thirteenth Conference of the RCP(B).—*Ed.*

Comrade Rykov's remarks are "critical", but not concrete and do not require an answer.

I consider Comrade Tomsky's remarks on the bonus system incorrect. The collapse of the trade union bonus system, which, according to Comrade Tomsky, has degenerated into "robbery of the state", must force us to be more persevering in studying and improving the methods of applying the bonus system, but we must not reject it.

Some of Comrade Trotsky's remarks are likewise vague (for example, the "apprehensions" in Paragraph 4) and do not require an answer; other remarks made by him renew old disagreements, that we have repeatedly observed in the Political Bureau. I shall reply to these on two main points: (a) the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection and (b) the State Planning Commission.

(a) As regards the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, Comrade Trotsky is fundamentally wrong. In view of the hidebound "departmentalism" that prevails even among the best Communists, the low standard of efficiency of the employees and the internal intrigues in the departments (worse than any Workers' and Peasants' Inspection intrigues), we cannot at the moment dispense with the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. A lot of hard and systematic work has to be put in to convert it into an apparatus for investigating and improving all government work. We have no other practical means of investigating, improving and giving instruction in this work. If the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection now has an inefficient and underpaid staff of 12,000, that staff should be reduced and improved; for example, reduce it to one-sixth and the payroll by half, i.e., raise salaries threefold; at first select a few dozen and later hundreds of the best, absolutely honest and most efficient employees, who are now available but not registered, not selected, not put in any group and not organised. This can and must be done; if not, it will be impossible to combat departmentalism and red-tape, it will be impossible to teach non-Party workers and peasants the art of administration, which is a task that at the present time we cannot shirk either in principle or in practice.

(b) As regards the State Planning Commission, Comrade Trotsky is not only absolutely wrong but is judging something on which he is amazingly ill-informed. The State

Planning Commission does not suffer from academic methods. On the contrary, it suffers from an overload of much too much petty, routine "vermicelli". Comrade Krzhizhanovsky, because he is soft-hearted, gives way much too easily to those who ask him for urgent assistance. Pyatakov, the new Deputy Chairman of the State Planning Commission, will, I hope, be "stricter" and help to rid the State Planning Commission of its shortcoming, which is quite the opposite of "academic methods".

Since I know full well the real shortcomings of the State Planning Commission, and in order to provide the members of the Political Bureau with factual, objective material and not with figments of the imagination, I asked Comrade Krzhizhanovsky if his work suffered from "abstractness" and what the exact facts about it were. Comrade Krzhizhanovsky sent me a list of the questions that have piled up before the Presidium of the State Planning Commission in the course of two months: February and March 1922. Result: (aa) questions concerning planning—17 per cent; (bb) questions of an important economic nature—37 per cent; (cc) "vermicelli"—46 per cent. I can send this material to any member of the Political Bureau who would like to see it.

The second paper from Comrade Trotsky, dated April 23, 1922, and addressed to the Deputy Chairmen with a copy to the Secretariat of the Political Bureau (the copy was evidently posted to me by mistake), contains, first, an extremely excited but profoundly erroneous "criticism" of the Political Bureau decree on setting up a financial triumvirate (Sokolnikov and two deputies) as of a brake between the Narrow and Full Councils of People's Commissars. The sending of this criticism to the Deputy Chairmen is not in conformity either with planned or, in general, with any organised state activity.

Secondly, this paper flings the same fundamentally wrong and intrinsically untrue accusations of academic method at the State Planning Commission, accusations which lead up to the next incredibly uninformed statement by Comrade Trotsky. "At present", he writes, "there neither is nor can be an economic plan without establishing the quantity of money issued and without distributing cash funds between the departments. Yet, *as far as I can judge*, the State

Planning Commission *has nothing whatever to do* with these basic questions."

The underscored words only make me want to ask the question: Why "judge" something about which you are uninformed? Any member of the CC or the Council of Labour and Defence could easily get the information he needs, and if he tried he would learn that the State Planning Commission has a financial and economic section, which deals precisely with the above questions. There are shortcomings in this work, of course, but they must not be sought in academic methods but in exactly the opposite direction.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*,
Vol. 33, pp. 353-55

THE STRUGGLE WAGED BY THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY AGAINST TROTSKYISM IN 1923-1925

JOINT PLENARY MEETING OF THE CC AND THE CCC WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF 10 PARTY ORGANISATIONS

Moscow, October 25-27, 1923[147]

RESOLUTION "ON THE SITUATION IN THE PARTY"

The plenary meetings fully endorse the Political Bureau's opportunely charted line aimed at promoting democracy in the Party and also its proposal to intensify the struggle against the excesses and corrupting influence of the New Economic Policy on individual Party members.

The plenary meetings instruct the Political Bureau to take all the necessary steps to speed up the work of the commissions set up by the Political Bureau and the September plenary meeting: (1) the "scissors" commission, (2) the wages commission, and (3) the commission for the study of the situation in the Party.

As soon as the necessary steps on these questions are worked out the Political Bureau shall put them into effect and report to the next plenary meeting of the CC.

The plenary meetings of the CC and the CCC with representatives of 10 Party organisations consider that at the present crucial moment to the international revolution and the Party, Comrade Trotsky's pronouncements are a gross political mistake, especially as his attacks on the Political Bureau have objectively acquired the character of a factional action threatening to hit the unity of the Party and give rise to a crisis in the Party. The plenary meetings regretfully state that to raise the questions broached by him Comrade Trotsky has chosen to appeal to individual Party members, instead of following the only permissible proce-

dure—that of raising these questions beforehand for discussion by the collegiums, of which Comrade Trotsky is a member.

The way chosen by Comrade Trotsky has served as a signal for the factional group (Statement of 46).

The plenary meetings of the CC, the CCC and representatives of 10 Party organisations unequivocally condemn the Statement of 46 as a step in factional and divisive politics which has acquired this character even if this was not intended by those who signed it. This Statement threatens to embroil the entire Party in an inner-Party struggle during the next few months and thereby weaken the Party at a most crucial moment to the destinies of the international revolution.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
8th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 495-96

THIRTEENTH CONFERENCE OF THE RCP(B)

Moscow, January 16-18, 1924[148]

RESOLUTION "ON THE RESULTS OF THE DISCUSSION AND ON THE PETTY-BOURGEOIS DEVIATION IN THE PARTY"

1. Origin of the Discussion

The plenary meeting of the CC in September 1923 and, still earlier, long before any pronouncements were made by the opposition, the Political Bureau of the CC spoke of the need to activate Party work and strengthen working-class democracy in the Party.

On the one hand, the upsurge of industry, the discontinuance of the declassing of the proletariat, the cultural growth of the working class and the increased activity among it have created more favourable conditions for really implementing the principles of inner-Party democracy. On the other hand, although the summer economic conflicts did not in themselves acquire menacing proportions and were much smaller than in the past, they showed that here and there the link of the Party organisations with the non-Party mass of workers is not strong enough.

The Party Central Committee was aware that the transition to new lines had to be accomplished thoughtfully, cautiously and after thorough preparation. In the realisation of this it started preparatory work in this field in September 1923.

Meanwhile, the old opposition groups, large and small, whose policy had been time and again condemned by the Party, found the moment suitable to launch an attack on the Party CC. Believing that the question of inner-Party democracy would give rise to accentuated attention on the part of all Party members, the opposition groups decided to exploit this slogan for factional purposes. The letter by Comrade Trotsky and, following it, the letter of 46 appeared after the publication of the decision adopted by the September plenary meeting of the CC RCP. These documents gave a totally fallacious and ultra-factional assessment of the economic situation in the country and of the inner state of the Party, forecast a grave economic crisis in the Republic and an inner crisis in the Party and accused the Party CC of incorrect leadership.

The harm of these factional pronouncements by Comrade Trotsky and the 46 was aggravated by the fact that the above-mentioned letters immediately came to the notice of broad circles of Party members, were widely circulated in the various regions, among students in Moscow and promptly throughout the USSR.

The joint plenary meetings of the CC and CCC with the participation of representatives of 10 of the largest Party organisations in October rightly condemned the actions of Comrade Trotsky and the 46 as being of a factional nature. At the same time, at their joint plenary meetings the CC and CCC unanimously approved the initiative of the Political Bureau in the question of animating inner-Party work and promoting working-class democracy. At these plenary meetings it was decided not to take the arguments raised by Comrade Trotsky and the 46 outside the CC and not to publish the letters of Comrade Trotsky and the 46 or the reply of the Political Bureau and the resolution, condemning the opposition, adopted by the CC and the CCC by a majority of 102 to 2 with 10 abstentions.

Nonetheless, Trotsky and his 46 supporters did not abide by the decision of that authoritative Party institution and

continued their systematic attacks on the Party CC, first among broad circles of the Moscow organisation and then throughout the USSR.

In line with the decisions of the joint plenary meetings, the Political Bureau began drafting the resolution on the situation in the Party and on working-class democracy. Despite Comrade Trotsky's factional activities, the majority in the Political Bureau found it necessary to reach agreement with him. After prolonged efforts by the majority in the Political Bureau, the resolution of the Political Bureau and the Presidium of the CCC on inner-Party development was adopted unanimously on December 5, 1923 and published.

When this resolution was drafted one of the most contested issues concerned factional activity. At first Comrade Trotsky raised no objection to banning factions but insisted that freedom to form groups should not be abrogated. Nonetheless, it was found possible to work out a unanimous text, which on the question of factions referred to the decision of the Tenth Congress of the RCP.

But the opposition persisted in pursuing its factional activities. While the majority of the CC and CCC, bound by their own decision to refrain from publishing the abovementioned documents, faithfully abided by that decision, the opposition went on widely distributing their factional documents. Two days after the unanimously adopted resolution of the Political Bureau and the Presidium of the CCC was published, Comrade Trotsky wrote his notorious letter under the heading "A New Policy", which was, in fact, a factional manifesto directed against the Central Committee. Comrade Trotsky's article, which appeared directly after this and also his pamphlet (*A New Policy*), brought out on the day the All-Union Party Conference opened, still further accentuated the factional nature of his actions.

The struggle has been further aggravated by the appearance of Trotsky's factional manifesto. In Moscow, particularly in the military Party cells and in the Party cells at institutions of higher learning, the opposition is starting a campaign on a scale unprecedented in our Party's history against the CC, sowing distrust of the Party CC. The opposition is sending its representatives throughout Russia. The struggle is growing unprecedentedly acute. The nucleus of

the opposition consists of members of the former "Democratic Centralism" group, which fought the Party line for a number of years. This nucleus has been joined by some former CC members who have not been re-elected at the Tenth Congress of the RCP on a motion moved by Comrade Lenin (Preobrazhensky, Smirnov, Serebryakov). This entire opposition bloc is headed by Comrade Trotsky, and for that reason at first enjoys some authority.

2. Ideological Substance of the Opposition

The discussion has shown that the following are the six major points on which the overwhelming majority of our Party is in disagreement with the opposition.

(1) With Comrade Trotsky at its head, the opposition has put forward a slogan calling for the break-up of the Party apparatus and sought to shift the centre of the struggle against bureaucracy in the state apparatus to the "bureaucracy" in the Party apparatus. This unfounded criticism and direct attempt to discredit the Party apparatus can objectively achieve nothing except break the Party's influence over the state apparatus and divorce the state apparatus from the Party. A tendency to tear the organs of state away from the influence of the Party was displayed by Comrade Trotsky even before the Twelfth Congress of the RCP. In the present discussion this tendency has only assumed a different form.

(2) The opposition has sought to contrapose young Party members to the veteran cadres of the Party and to its Central Committee. Instead of teaching the young members that our Party has to take as its example its main proletarian nucleus, the Communist workers in the factories, the opposition led by Comrade Trotsky has begun arguing that the student youth is the Party's "barometer".

(3) Comrade Trotsky has dropped veiled hints to the effect that the main cadres of our Party have degenerated, and has thereby attempted to undermine the authority of the CC, which, in the interim between congresses, is the sole representative of the entire Party. Comrade Trotsky has not only tried to counterpose himself to the rest of the Central Committee, but has levelled accusations which could not help but evoke anxiety among wide circles of the working

class and a stormy protest in the ranks of the Party as a whole.

(4) The opposition has demonstrated its bankruptcy most strongly on economic questions, having been unable to back up its accusations of the Party CC and having made no attempt to offer coherent suggestions on economic questions as an alternative to the Party's policy.

Two shades are traceable in the opposition's criticism of the Party's economic policy. Part of the opposition indulges abundantly in "Left" phrase-mongering against the New Economic Policy generally, making statements that would have had some meaning only if these comrades had suggested renouncing the New Economic Policy and returning to war communism. The other, much more influential, part of the opposition, on the contrary, reproaches the CC with being much too uncompromising with regard to foreign capital, making insufficient concessions to the imperialist powers, and so on. This part of the opposition (Radek) has bluntly proposed a reconsideration of the terms outlined by the Party in connection with the Genoa Conference and large economic concessions to international imperialism with the purpose of strengthening business relations with foreign capital. The Party unhesitatingly rejects these two errors.

(5) In all its shades the opposition has betrayed totally non-Bolshevik views on the importance of Party discipline. The pronouncements of many representatives of the opposition are a glaring violation of Party discipline and are reminiscent of the days when Comrade Lenin had to fight "intellectual anarchism" on questions of organisation and uphold the principles of proletarian discipline in the Party.

(6) The opposition has clearly violated the decision of the Tenth Congress of the RCP banning the formation of factions in the Party. It renounces the Bolshevik view that the Party is a monolithic whole for the view that the Party is a totality of all sorts of currents and factions. According to the "new" views of the opposition, these currents, factions and groups must enjoy equality in the Party, while the Party CC must be not so much the leader of the Party as a simple registrar and a factotum between the currents and groups. This view has nothing in common with Leninism. The factional activities of the opposition cannot but threaten the unity of the state apparatus. Its factional actions have

enlivened the hopes of all the enemies of the Party, including the West European bourgeoisie, for a split in the Russian Communist Party. These factional actions have sharply revived the question whether the RCP, as the governing Party, can tolerate the formation of factional groups within it.

Having summed up these disagreements and analysed the entire character of the actions of the opposition, the All-Union Party Conference has drawn the conclusion that the present opposition is not only an attempt to revise Bolshevism, not only a flagrant departure from Leninism but patently a *petty-bourgeois deviation.* There is no doubt whatever that this opposition objectively mirrors the pressure of the petty bourgeoisie on the position of the proletarian Party and its policy. Outside the Party the principles of inner-Party democracy are already beginning to be interpreted loosely: in the sense of the weakening of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the extension of the political rights of the new bourgeoisie.

In a situation in which the RCP embodies the dictatorship of the proletariat and enjoys a monopoly over legality in the country, it is inevitable that some of the least stable groups of Communists should succumb to non-proletarian influence. The Party as a whole must see this danger and vigilantly safeguard its proletarian line.

Our entire Party must wage a systematic and energetic struggle against this petty-bourgeois deviation.

3. Positive Results of the Discussion

The increased activity and the higher cultural level achieved by broad sections of the non-Party workers and part of the working peasants is a new factor, which, provided the Party pursues a correct policy, will vastly benefit the cause of the revolution. In order to be equal to the occasion and have the possibility of leading these workers and the propertyless sections of the peasants, who are joining in the active building of socialism, the Party must itself, at all costs, animate and activate its inner life. In this respect, despite the petty-bourgeois deviation of the opposition, the Party has benefited greatly by the discussion.

The petty-bourgeois errors of the opposition were rectified quickly and resolutely by the Party. As soon as the roll

within the Party was called, one after another the largest proletarian organisations in the RCP sternly criticised the opposition's petty-bourgeois vacillation and reaffirmed their support for the line pursued by the Central Committee. In this case, as formerly, during debates of principle in the Party, the first to come forward was the Petrograd organisation of the RCP, the oldest Bolshevik workers' organisation. Scores of the largest proletarian organisations in the Union of Republics unequivocally aligned themselves with the letter of the Petrograd organisation. The resolution of the Moscow Gubernia Conference, carried by an overwhelming majority vote, expressed a similarly emphatic denunciation of the opposition. At the time the All-Union Party Conference opened, the entire Party had, by an absolute majority, unanimously condemned the petty-bourgeois deviation.

As a result of the discussion, the main nucleus of the Party is more close-knit than before. Throughout the Union of Republics, the workers' cells unhesitatingly gave the most determined rebuff to the errors of the opposition. The young Party members, who witnessed sharp arguments in the Party for the first time, had the possibility of seeing real Bolshevism. The Communist youth from the Komsomol, who are closest to factory life, gave their support to the Partv's main line without hesitation. The vacillation of part of the students of institutions of higher learning is a transient phenomenon. With proper explanatory work by the Party, this vacillation will be quickly eradicated.

All members of the Party displayed increased activity and a higher level of political consciousness. Important economic and Party issues, which the Party will work on in the immediate future, were raised in a new way.

The aspiration of the whole Party to ensure Party unity was sharply accentuated. The least hint of the possibility of a split has given and gives rise to the strongest protest by the entire mass of Party members. The Party will destroy politically anybody who makes an attempt on the unity of its ranks. Greater Party unity has been secured than ever before.

4. Practical Conclusions

In view of the present state of affairs in the Party, the All-Union Party Conference considers:

(1) That the proletarian nucleus in the Party must be increased numerically and given a larger say in Party policy. Within the next year the recruitment of factory workers into membership of the Party shall be intensified in order to enrol not less than 100,000 new members. For this it is necessary to facilitate the admission of workers into the Party in every possible way. For this period admission to the Party for all non-proletarian members must be closed entirely. In the Party systematic propaganda must be conducted to the effect that the whole Party must keep in step with the main workers' nucleus.

(2) In order to achieve the utmost strengthening of the Party's ties with non-Party people, non-Party workers must be given adequate genuine representation in all the Soviets of Working People's Deputies and in all other local government organs. The Party Central Committee must most strictly enforce this decision and resolutely call to order those local organisations that violate it.

(3) Party organisations must pay particular attention to explanatory work in cells which, during the recent discussion, had vacillated in one way or another on the question of the Party line. Explanation, explanation and more explanation—such is the principal task primarily before the Party's main cadre.

(4) Unremitting attention must be given to explanatory work among young people. In view of the shortage of material means the Party must prefer to have a smaller contingent of students but, on the other hand, improve the material condition of students and better the standard of the work at institutions of higher learning. Special steps have to be taken to ensure correct Party leadership of the work among young people. The Party cannot allow flattery towards young people, but neither must it permit peremptory orders or bureaucratic tutelage. The purpose can only be served by patient explanation of the principles of Leninism.

(5) One of the most important tasks is that the study of the history of the RCP, above all, of the main facts of the struggle between Bolshevism and Menshevism, of the role of the various factions and currents during that struggle, particularly of the eclectic factions which sought to "reconcile" Bolshevism with Menshevism, must be up to the mark. The Party Central Committee must take steps to secure the

publication of the necessary number of textbooks on the history of the RCP and make the teaching of the history of the Party compulsory in all Party schools, institutions of higher learning, study circles and so forth.

(6) After the example of the largest proletarian organisations, it is necessary to set up circles in all our organisations to study Leninism, using the entire collection of the works of Comrade Lenin as the principal aid and ensuring proper guidance for these circles.

(7) The Party's Central Organ (*Pravda*) must be strengthened with the proper cadres in order to give it the possibility of systematically explaining the principles of Bolshevism and campaigning against all deviations from it.

(8) The current discussion must now be transferred from the pages of *Pravda* to the *Discussion Bulletin* published by *Pravda.*

(9) Freedom of discussion in the Party by no means implies freedom to undermine Party discipline. The Party Central Committee and all Party centres in the localities must immediately take the sternest measures to safeguard iron Bolshevik discipline wherever efforts are made to loosen it.

(10) Relentless measures up to expulsion from Party membership must be taken by the Party against the spread of unverified rumours and banned documents and similar methods usually employed by unprincipled groups infected by petty-bourgeois sentiments.

(11) The organisation of information about the work of the Central Committee and about inner-Party life generally must be improved. For this purpose the verbatim reports of Central Committee plenary meetings must be sent to all members and alternate members of the CC and the CCC and also to the Regional and Gubernia Party committees.* An efficiently functioning Party life department must be organised in *Pravda, Izvestia* and other newspapers in the centre and localities. An information department must be set up at the Party. C.C.

(12) Special attention must be given to using correct and

* The words "and also to the Regional and Gubernia Party committees" were added when the resolution of the Thirteenth Party Conference was approved by the CC RCP(B) at a plenary meeting held on January 29 and 31, 1924.—*Ed.*

healthy methods of Party work in the Army. Particularly stern punishment must be meted out by the Party for attempts to conduct factional "work" among the personnel of the Red Army.

(13) The Conference considers it quite expedient to reiterate full and unconditional support for the decision of the Tenth Congress of the RCP banning factional groups. The Conference deems it necessary to suggest that the Thirteenth Congress of the RCP endorse this decision on behalf of the Party's highest organ.

(14) The Conference suggests that the CC publishes the hitherto unpublished Paragraph 7 of the resolution on unity, adopted on Comrade Lenin's recommendation by the Tenth Congress of the RCP, empowering a joint meeting of the CC and the CCC by a two-thirds' majority to reduce members to the status of candidate members or even expel from the Party any member of the CC who violates Party discipline or engages in factional activity.*

(15) The Conference cannot overlook the decision of the recent Moscow Gubernia Conference, which informed the entire Party that a factional group undermining Party unity has been set up in Moscow. The Conference expects the Party CC and the CCC to take prompt and most resolute steps, up to expulsion from the Party, against those who are trying to split the Party in the main political centre of the USSR.

Considering that the nation-wide discussion on the questions mooted hitherto has ended, the Conference calls on all Party organisations to go over to business-like work. Unshakable unity of the RCP, the governing Party of the proletarian dictatorship, is the fundamental requisite for the further advance of the proletarian revolution. Party unity is the proletarian vanguard's main possession. The unity of the RCP must be safeguarded as the apple of one's eye. The All-Union Party Conference is confident that the Party CC, round which, as the result of the discussion has shown, the entire Party has rallied again and again, will firmly safeguard this unity.[149]

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
18th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 507-15

---

* See pp. 230-31.—*Ed.*

PLENARY MEETING OF THE CC RCP(B)

Moscow, January 17-20, 1925[100]

RESOLUTION "ON COMRADE TROTSKY'S ACTIONS"

Solid unity and iron discipline, a genuine unity of views on the basis of Leninism, have always been the key prerequisite of all the achievements of the Bolshevik Party. Comrade Trotsky's unceasing actions against Bolshevism now confront the Party with the choice of either renouncing this key prerequisite or putting an end to these actions once and for all.

Abroad Comrade Trotsky's actions against the Party are assessed by the bourgeoisie and the Social-Democratic movement as a prelude to a split in the RCP and, therefore, to the disintegration of the proletarian dictatorship itself. This is partially the basis on which international imperialism now draws its practical conclusions relative to the USSR, despite the fact that objectively the USSR is now in a stronger position than it has ever been before.

In the country Comrade Trotsky's opposition actions are regarded by all anti-Soviet and vacillating elements as a *signal* to rally against the Party's policy in order to demoralise the proletarian dictatorship and force it to make concessions to bourgeois democracy.

The anti-proletarian elements in the state apparatus, who are seeking "emancipation" from Party guidance, see their hope in Comrade Trotsky's fight against the Party CC. Enormous harm is being inflicted on the dictatorship of the proletariat and, in particular, on one of Comrade Lenin's major injunctions, namely, the need to remake the entire state apparatus in the spirit of the workers' and peasants' power.

In and around the Party, Comrade Trotsky's active opposition has turned his name into a banner for everything non-Bolshevik, for all the non-Communist and anti-proletarian deviations and groups.

In the most general outline the sum total of Comrade Trotsky's actions against the Party may now be characterised as an aspiration to turn the ideology of the RCP into a "Bolshevism" *stripped of Leninism* and "modernised" by Comrade Trotsky. This is *not* Bolshevism. It is a *revision*

of Bolshevism. It is an attempt *to supplant Leninism by Trotskyism*, i.e., an attempt to replace the Leninist theory and tactics of the international proletarian revolution with the variety of Menshevism that was represented by the old Trotskyism and which is today represented by the currently revived "new" Trotskyism. In point of fact, modern Trotskyism is a falsification of communism in a spirit close to the "European" models of pseudo-Marxism, i.e., in the final analysis, in the spirit of "European" Social-Democracy.

* * *

During the past few years of Comrade Trotsky's membership of the RCP, our Party has had to conduct four discussions with him, to make no mention of arguments on a smaller scale on extremely important issues.

First discussion—on the Brest Peace Treaty. Comrade Trotsky failed to understand that the peasants neither wanted nor could fight the war, and he pursued a policy which nearly cost the revolution its head. To rectify the error and obtain the Brest "respite"—even on harsher terms—Comrade Lenin had to threaten to resign from the government, and a tense struggle had to be waged at the Seventh Party Congress.

Second discussion—on the trade unions. Actually—the attitude to the peasants, who had risen against War Communism, the attitude to the non-Party mass of workers, generally the Party's attitude to the masses at a time when the Civil War had ended. A sharp nation-wide discussion and an energetic campaign by the Party's entire nucleus headed by Lenin against the "feverish leadership" of Trotskyism were required to save the Party from errors that might have called in question all the gains of the revolution.

Third discussion—on the "Party apparatus", on the "plan", on the alleged "peasant deviation" in the CC, on the "struggle of generations" and so on. Actually—again on the economic alliance of the proletariat with the peasants, on the prices policy, on the monetary reform, on the need to orient the Party policy on the working-class nucleus, on preserving the Party's leading role in the economy and in the organs of state, on the struggle against "freedom" of

factions and groups, on preserving the leading role of the Party's Bolshevik cadres, in short, on preserving the Party's Leninist line during the period of the New Economic Policy. In this discussion Comrade Trotsky quite clearly showed that he was the spokesman of the petty-bourgeois deviation. He made another attempt to steer the Party into a policy which might have destroyed the revolution because it would have nipped the Party's economic successes in the bud. The petty-bourgeois opposition headed by Comrade Trotsky drove itself into a situation where, because of its reluctance to admit its fundamental errors, it has to reason in accordance with the formula "the worse the better", i.e., *hope that the Party and the Soviet power would meet with setbacks.*

A tense struggle was required to repulse this petty-bourgeois onslaught on the fortress of Bolshevism. It is now obvious to everybody that the arguments of the Trotskyites in the autumn of 1923 that the "country was doomed" were nothing more than an expression of petty-bourgeois fright, distrust of the forces of our revolution and utter incomprehension of our economy. The monetary reform, which Comrade Trotsky counterposed with a "plan" and which he said would end in failure, improved the economic situation and was a major step towards the country's economic revival. Industry is back on its feet, despite the crop failure of 1924. The material condition of the workers is improving. From this test the Party emerged stronger than before. The Lenin Enrolment brought fresh proletarian forces into the Party. But had the Bolshevik Party failed to give such a sharp and unanimous rebuff to Trotsky's relapse into semi-Menshevism, the real dangers to the country, the working class and our Party would have been incalculable.

In the long run, all of Comrade Trotsky's actions against the Party's general line from 1918 to 1924 derived from his semi-Menshevik inability to appreciate the role of the proletariat relative to the non-proletarian and semi-proletarian sections of the people, belittlement of the Party's role in the revolution and socialist construction, and failure to understand that the Bolshevik Party can carry out its historic mission only if it is really united ideologically and monolithic.

The *fourth*, current, discussion has brought to light even more serious, all-embracing divergences between Comrade

Trotsky and the Bolshevik Party. It is now obviously a matter of two basically opposite systems of policy and tactics. During the present discussion Comrade Trotsky started a direct attack on the *fundamentals* of the Bolshevik world outlook. He (1) completely repudiates all that Leninism has taught since 1904 about the motive forces of the Russian revolution and on which the entire tactics of Bolshevism in the three Russian revolutions was founded; (2) opposes the Bolshevik assessment of the motive forces of the Russian revolution and Lenin's teaching of the world proletarian revolution with his old "theory" of permanent revolution, which proved to be totally abortive in the three Russian revolutions (and also in Poland and Germany) and which Comrade Lenin repeatedly characterised as an eclectic (muddled) attempt to coalesce petty-bourgeois Menshevist opportunism with "Left" verbiage and as a striving to leap over the peasantry; (3) endeavours to persuade the Party that before steering towards the dictatorship of the proletariat Bolshevism had to "rearm ideologically", i.e., alleging that it had to renounce Leninism and take the road of Trotskyism; (4) preaches the theory that Bolshevism has "split" in two: (a) Bolshevism prior to the revolution of October 1917, which is allegedly of secondary importance, and (b) Bolshevism since October 1917, which allegedly had to grow into Trotskyism in order to carry out its historic mission; (5) "expounds" the history of the October Revolution in such a way as to obliterate the role played by the Bolshevik Party and give prominence to the role of the personality of Comrade Trotsky himself, according to the "heroes and mob" formula; the claim that there had been a "peaceful uprising" as early as October 10, 1917 has nothing in common with the Bolshevik view of the armed uprising; (6) gives an extremely ambiguous picture of the role played by Comrade Lenin in the October Revolution; seeks to give the impression that Comrade Lenin advocated taking power by conspiratorial means behind the back of the Soviets and that the practical proposals made by Comrade Lenin derived from a failure to understand the situation; (7) utterly distorts the relations between Comrade Lenin and the Party CC, portraying them as a continuous war between two "powers"; Comrade Trotsky tries to make people believe this "version" by publishing (without the

permission of the CC) excerpts from various documents giving a false and distorted picture of these relations; (8) portrays the role played by the entire Party CC as the leader of the uprising in such a light as to sow the most profound distrust in the main nucleus of the Party Headquarters today; (9) misrepresents major episodes of the revolution from February to October 1917 (April and June demonstrations, the events of July, the Pre-parliament and so on); (10) distorts the tactics of the Comintern Executive in an effort to blame its nucleus for the setbacks in Germany, Bulgaria and elsewhere, thereby sowing distrust in both the CC RCP and the Comintern Executive.

Comrade Trotsky's divergence with the Bolshevik Party has thus steadily grown wider from year to year and, recently, from month to month. The divergence concerns not only issues of the past: the past itself is "revised" *in order* to "prepare" a platform for present disagreements on current policies. In particular, Comrade Trotsky retrospectively found a "Right wing" in the old Bolshevism in order to use this as a cover to win for himself the right to form a real Right wing in the RCP today—in the period of the New Economic Policy and at a time when the world revolution has slowed down and the petty-bourgeois menace, favourable to the formation of a Right wing in the RCP and the Comintern, looms large.

The "revision" of Leninism in the question of the motive forces of the revolution (i.e., above all, in the question of the relationship between the proletariat and the peasantry) is the "foundation" of the non-Bolshevik view of the Party's present policy on the question of the peasantry. All the Party's discussions with Comrade Trotsky bring us back again and again to his erroneous, anti-Leninist assessment of the role played by the peasants in the revolution. Mistakes in this question become particularly dangerous precisely today, when, in putting into effect the slogan of "facing the countryside", the Party is making every effort to strengthen the link between urban industry and the peasant economy, draw the peasant masses into Soviet development, activate the Soviets and so on, and when the further success or failure of the revolution depends precisely on whether the relationship between the proletariat and the peasantry is right or wrong.

On basic questions of international politics (the role of fascism and Social-Democracy, the role of the United States of America in Europe, the duration and nature of the "democratic pacifist era", whose assessment by Comrade Trotsky in many ways coincides with that of the Social-Democratic "Centre", and so on), Comrade Trotsky adopted a stand different from that of the RCP and the whole Comintern, without even taking the trouble to present his views to the CC or the Comintern Executive. With the complete agreement of the CC RCP, the delegation of the RCP to the Fifth Comintern Congress proposed that Comrade Trotsky should state his views on international questions to that congress. Comrade Trotsky refused to do this at the congress, but found it expedient to do so shortly afterwards, at a meeting of veterinary workers over the head of the Comintern and the RCP. In the recent period Comrade Trotsky has not acted in unison with the Party on any major issue. More frequently than not he went against the views of the Party.

An extremely important political task facing the Party is to steer a firm line towards eradicating elements separating the town from the countryside, i.e., raising in all its magnitude the question of further reducing the retail price of goods manufactured in towns, create the conditions for a real upsurge of agriculture (organisation of land exploitation, land-tenure), give the closest attention to securing a real activation, above all, of the rural co-operative (genuinely voluntary membership, electivity, credits), raise and resolve the question of reducing the taxes paid by the peasants and effecting a reform of the tax policy, and also bend every effort to resolve the problem of improving the political situation in the countryside (stricter electivity, the enlistment of non-Party peasants, and so forth).

Charted basically by Comrade Lenin, this is the only policy that can really strengthen state-run industry, ensure its further expansion and promote the growth, concentration and build-up of the social might of the industrial proletariat, i.e., consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat under the New Economic Policy not by words but by deeds.

The absolute preservation of our Party's leading role in state and economic institutions and genuine Party unity

resting on Leninism are the prime condition for implementing this entire policy.

This correlation between the Party, the working class and the peasantry, a correlation that is decisive in the present situation, is precisely what Comrade Trotsky does not understand.

The inevitable outcome of this state of affairs is that all the non-Bolshevik and anti-Bolshevik elements at home and abroad have begun to inject into Comrade Trotsky's stand their own content, valuing and supporting Comrade Trotsky exactly for what he is being censured by the RCP and the Comintern. Directing, as it does, the dictatorship of the proletariat in a situation in which all anti-proletarian parties and groups have been deprived of "freedom", the Party must inescapably have enemies. All these enemies, particularly the spokesmen of the well-to-do petty bourgeoisie, want to see in the present Comrade Trotsky a personality that will shake the iron dictatorship of the proletariat, split the Party, side-track the Soviet power, and so on.

All the leaders of the Second International, those most dangerous servants of the bourgeoisie, are trying to use Comrade Trotsky's rebellion against the foundations of Leninism to discredit Leninism, the Russian revolution and the Comintern in the eyes of the proletarian masses of Europe and thereby bind the Social-Democratic workers still more firmly to the chariot of the bourgeoisie. The renegade P. Levi has brought out a German translation of Comrade Trotsky's book *Lessons of the October Revolution* with a foreword written by himself, while the German Social-Democratic Party has undertaken to distribute this book, which it is broadly recommending as directed against communism. Souvarine, who was expelled from the Comintern, is trying to engineer a split in the French Communist Party by spreading counter-revolutionary fables about the RCP. Balabanova, Höglund and other apostates from communism are acting in approximately the same way. The Italian social-fascists from *Avanti!*, the hirelings of the German bourgeoisie from *Vorwärts*, the Renaudels and Grumbachs from *Quotidien*, and other similar elements are trying to make common cause with Comrade Trotsky in his struggle against the CC RCP and the Comintern Executive.

The *non-Party workers*, who should regard a high-ranking Party functionary as a model of solidarity with his Party, have, in effect, for the past several years seen Comrade Trotsky shaking unity of the Party with impunity. This undermines elementary class discipline, without which the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be victorious.

The *peasants*, who should see that there is not the least sign of vacillation in the RCP on the question of the alliance of the working class with the peasantry, that the Party is more united on this question than on any other, find the reverse in Comrade Trotsky's example and become receptive to all sorts of legends in this key issue. This is a deadly threat to the worker-peasant bloc. Our Party has to direct the dictatorship of the proletariat in a peasant country. With Comrade Trotsky confusing the peasants, it is not possible to implement this dictatorship.

The *young people*, who had formerly regarded Comrade Trotsky as one of the Party's top leaders, are now seeing that this leader is dragging them into a "struggle between generations", to the road of anti-Leninism.

The *Red Army and Red Navy*, which must see in the army leadership a model of Party discipline and correct understanding of the relations between the proletariat and the peasants (most of our army is drawn from the peasantry), now cannot help but see the very reverse in Comrade Trotsky. This is an explosive situation in the army.

The *entire Party* sees that with this state of affairs there can be no question of preserving genuine Bolshevik unity in the RCP and draws the conclusion that if it continues to tolerate this struggle of Comrade Trotsky against the Bolshevik Party it will be exposed to immense ideological and organisational perils. The Lenin Enrolment, which sincerely strives to assimilate genuine Leninism, finds that Comrade Trotsky is seeking to supplant Leninism by Trotskyism and demands that the Party clarify the situation.

The *whole Comintern* sees a prominent member of the RCP obstructing the Bolshevisation of the Comintern sections and actually rendering ideological and political assistance to the enemies of Bolshevism from the camp of the Second International.

In this state of affairs the joint plenary meetings of the CC and CCC find that to let matters be when the Party

adopts decisions and Comrade Trotsky continues to oppose the Party would mean laying the beginning for the Party's de-Bolshevisation and even its direct disintegration. In connection with the rebuff to Trotsky, the question is being decided of what is the RCP in 1925—a Bolshevik Party moulded of one piece and standing on the firm foundation of Leninism, or a party in which semi-Menshevik views can become a "legal shade"?

Having considered Comrade Trotsky's statement of January 15, 1925 to the CC, the plenary meetings of the CC and CCC take note of his willingness to carry out, under Party control, the work that will be assigned to him, and places it on record that in that statement Comrade Trotsky says nothing about admitting his mistakes and, in fact, tries to cling to his anti-Bolshevik platform, limiting himself to formal loyalty.

* * *

Proceeding from the above-said and, particularly, from the fact that despite the known decisions of the Thirteenth Congress Comrade Trotsky has again raised the question of a fundamental change of the Party leadership and propounds views that have been categorically condemned by that Congress, the *plenary meetings of the CC and CCC decree*:

(1) Comrade Trotsky shall be warned in the most emphatic terms that membership of the Bolshevik Party demands real, not verbal, subordination to Party discipline and total and unconditional renunciation of any attacks on the ideals of Leninism.

(2) Since leadership of the Army is inconceivable without the prestige of the whole Party behind it; since without such backing there is the danger of iron discipline being undermined in the Army; since the Conference of Political Workers, on the one hand, and the faction of the Revolutionary Military Council of the USSR, on the other, have already declared for removing Comrade Trotsky from military work; and, lastly, since in his own statement of January 15, 1925 to the CC Comrade Trotsky acknowledged that the "public interest demanded the speediest release" of Comrade Trotsky "from his duties as Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council"—*Comrade Trotsky's*

further retention in the Revolutionary Military Council of the USSR is to be deemed unfeasible.

(3) The question of Comrade Trotsky's further membership of the CC shall be deferred to the next Party congress with the warning that in the event of a fresh attempt on the part of Comrade Trotsky to violate or disregard Party decisions, the CC shall be compelled, without waiting for the congress, to pronounce Comrade Trotsky's further membership of the Political Bureau impossible and raise the question before a joint meeting of the CC and CCC of his expulsion from the CC.

(4) The discussion is declared closed.

(5) The Party shall continue, on a larger scale, its work of explaining to the membership from top to bottom the anti-Bolshevik nature of Trotskyism, beginning from 1903 to the *Lessons of the October Revolution*, and the Political Bureau shall give the propaganda organs (Party schools and so on) the proper explanation on this score; introduce the explanation of the petty-bourgeois nature of Trotskyism and so forth into the programmes of political instruction.

(6) Parallel with explanatory propaganda in the Party, the Komsomol, etc.—the various trends of Trotskyism with their misconceived aims, which lead to a rupture between the working class and the peasantry, must be explained in popular form to the broad mass of non-Party workers and peasants.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
8th Russ. ed., Vol. 3, pp. 142-50

FOURTEENTH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU(B)

Moscow, December 18-31, 1925[151]

ADDRESS TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE LENINGRAD ORGANISATION

Comrades, in view of the utterly irregular conduct of the delegation from Leningrad, which put forward its own co-rapporteur at the Congress against the CC and issued a special "Statement of the Leningrad Organisation" over the signatures of Comrade Kamenev and others, which threatens

the unity of our Party (see *Leningradskaya Pravda* No. 295), the Congress addresses you directly.

Your *conference* passed a vote of *confidence* in the Central Committee and instructed your delegation to vote for such confidence at the Congress. At the Congress your *delegation* voted *against confidence* in the CC.

Your *conference* considered Party *unity* necessary. Your delegation voted *against* the entire Congress, counterposing itself to the Congress.

All the Communist workers of Leningrad had earlier considered it was necessary to keep in step with their Party. Yet *Leningradskaya Pravda* has already started a campaign against the Congress decisions, in other words, it has started a campaign to *wreck Party unity*.

At the same time, invoking Party discipline, the Leningrad Gubernia Committee has forbidden the Vyborg District to hold a meeting in order to express its solidarity with the whole Party and its Congress. This decision of the Gubernia Committee is absolutely wrong. It runs counter to the principles of inner-Party democracy. It must be immediately revoked by the Gubernia Committee, as well as other decisions that violate the elementary rights of Party members and contravene inner-Party democracy.

The Congress calls on all members of the Leningrad organisation to put an end to all these attempts to undermine the unity of our Leninist Party.

The opposition has exposed itself utterly at the Congress. While at district conferences and even at the gubernia Party conference the leaders of the opposition made no mention of any disagreements with the CC and collected votes under the standard of fidelity to the Party leadership, at the Congress they acted as a separate group, counterposing themselves to the Central Committee of our Party.

They are wrong when they assert that the Party does not see the kulak threat.

What is dangerous is their attempt, covered by their outcry over the kulak threat, to belittle the significance of the Leninist slogan of the alliance of the proletariat and the rural poor with the middle peasants.

The assertion that the Congress did not accept amendments moved by the opposition is not true. The opposition moved no amendments, but made a statement couched in

the terms of an ultimatum, against which the Congress could not help but object.

The Congress gave its clear-cut decision in the resolution that was adopted on a motion from the Moscow, Urals, Ukrainian (together with the Donbas), Tula, Ivanovo-Voznesensk and Nizhni-Novgorod delegations. This decision (as well as other decisions) of the Congress is binding for all members of the Party. No discussion of the Congress decisions can be or will be allowed. Every Communist worker will see that the resolution on the report of the Central Committee is permeated with Leninism from beginning to end. Every Communist worker will see that it is permeated with intense concern for the unity of the Party. For the sake of this unity the Congress took the step of softening some of the formulations in the resolution. Yet your delegates voted against this resolution.

The Fourteenth Congress declares that it is slander against the Party to assert that the Party wishes to belittle the importance of the Leningrad organisation.

The Leningrad organisation has always been in the front ranks of the Party, and the Fourteenth Congress has no doubt that it will rectify the errors made by its delegation.

Long live the Leningrad organisation of the CPSU(B)!

Long live the unity of the Leninist Party!

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
8th Russ. ed., Vol. 3, pp. 261-63

RESOLUTION "ON *LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA*"

In view of the fact that after the Congress had passed its decisions *Leningradskaya Pravda* has been conducting a systematic campaign against these decisions in flagrant violation of Party discipline and disrupting Party decisions, the Congress instructs the CC to take immediate steps to change and improve the editorial staff of *Leningradskaya Pravda*.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
8th Russ. ed., Vol. 3, p. 263

THE STRUGGLE WAGED BY THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY AGAINST TROTSKYISM IN 1926-1927

JOINT PLENARY MEETING OF THE CC AND CCC CPSU(B)

October 23 and 26, 1926[153]

RESOLUTION "ON THE SITUATION IN THE PARTY IN CONNECTION WITH THE FACTIONAL ACTIVITIES AND VIOLATION OF PARTY DISCIPLINE BY SOME CC MEMBERS"

The following draft decision moved by Comrade Kirov on behalf of Leningrad members of the CC is adopted:

(1) In view of the violation of Party discipline by CC members Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Pyatakov, Yevdokimov, Sokolnikov and Smilga and alternate member of the CC Comrade Nikolayeva, the plenary meeting of the CC and CCC cautions these comrades and calls their attention to the impermissibility of conduct of this kind on the part of members of the Party's leading institution.

(2) In view of the fact that Zinoviev does not pursue the line of the CPSU(B) in the Communist International and by virtue of his leadership of factional activity in the Communist International he has lost the trust of a number of Communist parties (German, British, French, American and others), which have placed this on record in their decisions, the CC and CCC find that Zinoviev can no longer continue working in the Communist International.

(3) In view of the leadership given by Trotsky and Kamenev to factional activities in the period after the July plenary meeting of the CC and CCC, the present plenary meeting of the CC and CCC decrees that Trotsky shall be relieved of his post as member of the Political Bureau of

the CC, and Kamenev of his duties as alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CC.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
8th Russ. ed., Vol. 3, pp. 360-61

FIFTEENTH CONFERENCE OF THE CPSU(B)

Moscow, October 26-November 3, 1926[143]

RESOLUTION "ON THE OPPOSITION BLOC IN THE CPSU(B)"

A salient feature of the present period is that the struggle between the capitalist states and our country, on the one hand, and between socialist and capitalist elements in our country, on the other, has intensified.

While the attempts of world capital to encircle our country economically, isolate it politically, enforce a camouflaged blockade and, lastly, wreak vengeance for the aid rendered by the workers of the USSR to the fighting workers of the West and the oppressed peoples of the East create difficulties of an external order, our country's transition from the period of restoration to a period of reorganisation of our industry and economy generally on the basis of modern technology and the resultant exacerbation of the struggle between the capitalist and socialist elements in our economy create difficulties of an internal order.

The Party sees these difficulties and has the possibility of surmounting them. With the support of the millions of proletarians it is already ironing out these difficulties, confidently leading the country towards socialism. But not all the contingents of our Party believe that a further advance can be achieved. Some, true, numerically small, sections of the Party have been frightened by the difficulties. They feel fatigued, vacillate, give way to despair and despondency, become infected with scepticism of the proletariat's creative strength and go over to the ideology of capitulation.

In this context the present turning-point is somewhat reminiscent of the turning-point in October 1917. In the same way as in October 1917, when the critical situation and difficulties of the transition from the bourgeois to the proletarian revolution gave birth to vacillation among a

section of the Party, to defeatism and misgivings about the possibility of the proletariat seizing power and holding it (Kamenev, Zinoviev), at the present turning-point the difficulties of the transition to a new phase of socialist construction are making some circles in our Party waver, doubt that the socialist elements in our country can triumph over the capitalist elements and question the possibility of victorious socialist construction in the USSR.

These pessimistic and defeatist sentiments of a section of our Party are expressed by the opposition bloc.

The Party sees the difficulties and has the possibility of surmounting them. But before they can be eliminated, the pessimism and defeatist ideology of this section of the Party have to be overcome.

In a document dated October 16, 1926 the opposition bloc declared its repudiation of factional activity and its dissociation from patently Menshevik groups in and outside the CPSU(B) but, at the same time, stated that it would stick to its old fundamental positions, refused to abandon its basic errors and made it clear that it would uphold these erroneous views within the framework of the Party Rules.

This is an indication that the opposition bloc plans to continue cultivating pessimistic views and defeatism and propagating its erroneous views in the Party.

The Party's immediate task is, therefore, to show that the opposition bloc's basic views are untenable in principle, explain why they are incompatible with the principles of Leninism and wage a determined ideological struggle against the opposition bloc's fundamental errors in order to surmount them.

I. The "New Opposition's" Switch to Trotskyism on the Basic Question of the Nature and Prospects of Our Revolution

The Party acts on the principle that ours is a socialist revolution, that the October Revolution is the signal, stimulus and starting point of the socialist revolution in the West, but that, at the same time, it is, firstly, the basis for the further unfolding of the world revolution and, secondly, ushers in the period of transition from capitalism to social-

ism in the USSR (dictatorship of the proletariat), in the course of which the proletariat, provided it pursues a correct policy towards the peasantry, can and will successfully build the entire edifice of socialist society if, of course, the might of the international revolutionary movement, on the one hand, and the strength of the proletariat of the USSR, on the other, will be sufficient to safeguard the USSR against military intervention by imperialism.

Trotskyism propounds totally different views about the nature and prospects of our revolution. Although in October 1917 Trotskyism marched in step with the Party, its point of departure has been and remains that *in itself* our revolution is not *essentially* socialist, that the October Revolution is *only* the signal, stimulus and starting point of the socialist revolution in the West, but if the world revolution is delayed and the socialist revolution in the West is not victorious in the immediate future, the proletarian power in Russia will fall or degenerate (which is the same thing) under pressure of inevitable clashes between the proletariat and the peasants.

While the Party, in organising the October Revolution, contended that "the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone", that after "expropriating the capitalists and organising their own socialist production, the victorious proletariat" can and must stand up "*against* the rest of the world—the capitalist world—attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries, stirring uprisings in those countries against the capitalists, and in case of need using even armed force against the exploiting classes and their states"* (Lenin, Vol. XIII, p. 133), Trotskyism, on the contrary, although it co-operated with the Bolsheviks during the October Revolution, held that "it is hopeless to imagine ... for example, that revolutionary Russia can hold its own against conservative Europe" (Trotsky, Vol. III, Part 1, p. 90, *Peace Programme*, first published in *August* 1917).

While the Party's point of departure is that the Soviet Union has "all that is necessary and sufficient" "to build a complete socialist society",** (Lenin, "On Co-operation"),

---

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 342.
** Ibid., Vol. 33, p. 468.

Trotskyism, on the contrary, argues that "a genuine upsurge of the socialist economy in Russia will become possible only after the proletariat is victorious in the major countries of Europe" (Trotsky, Vol. III, Part 1, p. 93, "Afterword" to the *Peace Programme* written in 1922).

While the Party believes that "ten or twenty years of regular relations with the peasantry and victory is assured on a world scale",* (Lenin, "Plan of the Pamphlet *The Tax in Kind*"), Trotskyism, on the contrary, says that the proletariat cannot establish correct relations with the peasantry until the victory of the world revolution, that having seized power the proletariat "will find itself in hostile collision not only with the bourgeois groups that supported it at the initial stage of its revolutionary struggle but also with the broad peasant masses with whose assistance it came to power", that "the contradictions in the position of a workers' government in a backward country, in which the overwhelming majority of the population are peasants, can only be resolved on an international scale, in the arena of the world revolution of the proletariat" (Trotsky, *Foreword* to his book *1905*, written in 1922).

The Conference places on record that the views of Trotsky and his supporters on the fundamental question of the nature and prospects of our revolution have nothing in common with the views of our Party, with Leninism.

The Conference considers that these views belittle the historic role and importance of our revolution, as the base for the further development of the world revolutionary movement, and undermine the will of the Soviet proletariat to continue the building of socialism, thereby obstructing the unfolding of the forces of the world revolution and running counter to the principles of genuine internationalism and the basic line of the Communist International.

The Conference considers that these views of Trotsky and his supporters approximate those of Social-Democracy as expounded by its present leader Otto Bauer, who maintains that "in Russia, where the proletariat comprises an insignificant minority of the nation, it can establish its rule only temporarily", that "it must inevitably lose it again as soon as the peasant mass grows sufficiently mature cultur-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 323.

ally to take power into its own hands", that "the temporary rule of industrial socialism in agrarian Russia is only a flame that summons the proletariat of the industrial West to the struggle", that "only the conquest of political power by the proletariat of the industrial West can ensure the prolonged rule of industrial socialism" in Russia (see Otto Bauer, *Bolshevism or Social-Democracy*, German edition).

The Conference therefore qualifies these views of Trotsky and his supporters as a *Social-Democratic deviation* in our Party on the basic question of the nature and prospects of our revolution.

The salient point in the development of inner-Party relations in the CPSU(B) after the Fourteenth Congress (which condemned the fundamental views of the "New Opposition") is that the "New Opposition" (Zinoviev, Kamenev), which had formerly been opposed to Trotskyism, to the Social-Democratic deviation in our Party, has adopted the ideological positions of Trotskyism, wholly and completely abandoning its former general Party stand relative to Trotskyism, and is now coming out *for* Trotskyism with the same zeal as it had formerly been *against* it.

Two principal circumstances are behind this switch of the "New Opposition" to Trotskyism. They are:

(a) fatigue, vacillation, unproletarian pessimism and defeatism among the supporters of the "New Opposition" in face of fresh difficulties in the present period of change; the current vacillation and defeatism displayed by Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev are not accidental—they are a repetition and recurrence of the vacillation and pessimism which these comrades displayed nine years ago, in October 1917, in face of the difficulties of that period of change;

(b) the utter defeat of the "New Opposition" at the Fourteenth Congress and the resultant aspiration to achieve unity with the Trotskyites at all costs in order to fuse the two groups, the Trotskyites and the "New Opposition", and thereby make up for their weakness and isolation from the proletarian masses, especially as the ideological stand of Trotskyism fully accords with the present pessimism of the "New Opposition".

This also explains the fact that the opposition bloc has become the rallying centre of all bankrupt trends inside and outside the CPSU(B) that have been denounced by the Party

and the Comintern: from the "Democratic Centralists" and the "Workers' Opposition" in the CPSU(B) to the "ultra-Left" opportunists in Germany and the liquidators of the Souvarine type in France.

Hence the unscrupulousness in means and the lack of principle in policy underlying the existence of the bloc consisting of the Trotskyites and the "New Opposition" and without which they would not have brought together the various anti-Party trends.

The Trotskyites and the "New Opposition" have thus come together quite naturally on the *common* platform of the Social-Democratic deviation and the unprincipled association of the most diverse anti-Party elements in a struggle against the Party, thereby forming an opposition bloc which represents something in the nature of a revival of the August bloc (of 1912-1914).

II. Practical Platform of the Opposition Bloc

The practical platform of the opposition bloc is a direct continuation of the principal error of this bloc on the question of the nature and prospects of our revolution.

Its key features are:

(a) *Questions relating to the international movement.* The Party's view is that the leading capitalist countries are now by and large experiencing a state of partial, temporary stabilisation, that the present is a period between revolutions which binds the Communist parties to prepare the proletariat for the coming revolution, that the offensive of capitalism, which is vainly seeking to consolidate this stabilisation, will unavoidably give rise to a retaliatory struggle and the unification of the working class against capitalism, that the Communist parties must intervene in the growing class struggle and turn the attacks of the capitalists into counter-attacks of the proletariat with the objective of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, that to achieve these purposes the Communist parties have to win over the millions of workers still siding with the reformist trade unions and the Second International, and that the united front tactics are thus vital and mandatory for all the Communist parties.

The opposition bloc acts on totally different premises. Having no faith in the inner forces of our revolution and falling into despair in face of the delay of the world revolution, it is sliding from a Marxist analysis of the class forces of the revolution to "ultra-Left" self-deceit and "revolutionary" adventurism, fails to see the partial capitalist stabilisation and thus adopts the tactics of putschism.

Hence its insistence on a revision of the united front tactics, its wrecking of the Anglo-Russian Committee, its failure to understand the role of the trade unions and its slogan calling for the replacement of the trade unions with new, imaginary "revolutionary" organisations of the proletariat.

Hence its support for the ultra-Left tub-thumpers and opportunists in the Communist International (for instance, in the German party).

The Conference considers that the opposition bloc's international policy does not conform to the interests of the international revolutionary movement.

(b) *The proletariat and peasantry in the USSR.* The Party's standpoint is that the "supreme principle of the dictatorship is the maintenance of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry in order that the proletariat may retain its leading role and its political power" (Lenin, Vol. XVIII, Part 1, p. 331),* that the proletariat can and must be the predominant force relative to the main mass of peasants in the economy, in the building of socialism, because in October 1917 it led the peasantry politically, in the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat; that the country's industrialisation can only be effected if it rests on the gradual improvement of the material condition of the majority of the peasants (poor and middle peasants) who represent the principal market for our industry; that, as a consequence, an economic policy (prices, taxation, etc.) must be pursued which will strengthen the link between industry and the peasant economy and preserve the alliance of the working class with the main mass of peasants.

The opposition bloc holds totally different views. Having departed from the basic line of Leninism in the peasant

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 490.

question, having no faith in the hegemony of the proletariat relative to the peasantry in the building of socialism, and regarding the peasantry chiefly as a hostile force, the opposition bloc proposes economic and financial measures that can only rupture the link between the town and countryside, destroy the alliance of the working class with the peasantry and thereby wreck any possibility of actually promoting industrialisation. Such are, for example: (a) the proposal to raise the wholesale prices of manufactured goods, an increase that cannot fail to cause a rise of retail prices, the impoverishment of the poor and considerable sections of the middle peasants, the narrowing down of the home market, friction between the proletariat and the peasantry, a fall of the exchange rate of the gold ruble and, ultimately, a drop in real wages; (b) the proposal to exert the maximum tax pressure on the peasantry—such pressure cannot fail to cause a crack in the alliance between the workers' and peasants.

The Conference considers that the opposition bloc's policy in relation to the peasantry does not conform to the interests of the country's industrialisation and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

(c) *The struggle against the Party apparatus under the guise of fighting bureaucracy in the Party.* The Party holds that its apparatus and membership are a single whole, that the Party apparatus (CC, CCC, regional organisations, gubernia committees, area committees, uyezd committees, cell bureaus, etc.) embody the leading element in the Party as a whole, that this apparatus is composed of the finest proletarians, who can and must be criticised for mistakes, who can and must be "freshened up" but who cannot be defamed without running the risk of disintegrating the Party and leaving it unarmed.

The opposition bloc, on the contrary, contraposes the Party membership to the Party apparatus, seeks to belittle the leading role of this apparatus, reducing it to the functions of a registrar and propagandist, and to incite the Party membership against the Party apparatus, thus trying to discredit the apparatus and weaken its position in the leadership of the state.

The Conference considers that, having nothing in common with Leninism, this policy of the opposition bloc can only

disarm the Party in its struggle against bureaucracy in the state apparatus, to secure an effective reorganisation of this apparatus and thus strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat.

(d) *Struggle against the "regime" in the Party under the guise of fighting for inner-Party democracy.* The Party's point of view is that "whoever brings about even the slightest weakening of the iron discipline of the Party of the proletariat (especially during its dictatorship), is actually aiding the bourgeoisie against the proletariat" (Lenin, Vol. XVII, p. 136),* that the purpose of inner-Party democracy is not to weaken and break down proletarian discipline in the Party but to strengthen and consolidate it, for the dictatorship of the proletariat is inconceivable without iron discipline in the Party, without a firm regime in the Party backed by the sympathy and support of millions of proletarians.

The opposition bloc, on the contrary, contraposes inner-Party democracy to Party discipline, confuses freedom for factions and groups with inner-Party democracy and tries to use this sort of democracy to destroy Party discipline and undermine Party unity. Naturally, the opposition bloc's appeal for a struggle against the "regime" in the Party, which ultimately leads to upholding freedom for factions and groups within the Party, is thereby an appeal which the anti-proletarian elements in our country are snatching at as a sheet-anchor against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Conference considers that, having nothing in common with the organisational principles of Leninism, the opposition bloc's struggle against the "regime" in the Party can only undermine Party unity, weaken the dictatorship of the proletariat and let loose the anti-proletarian forces in the country who are trying to weaken and destroy the dictatorship.

The opposition bloc has chosen a nation-wide discussion, which it tried to start last October, as a means of shattering Party discipline and aggravating the struggle in the Party. While holding that free discussion of divergences is necessary in our Party's theoretical journals and recognising the right of every Party member to free criticism of shortcomings

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 45.—*Ed.*

of our Party work, the Conference recalls Lenin's words to the effect that our Party is not a debating club but a fighting organisation of the proletariat. The Conference considers that a nation-wide discussion may be found necessary only in the event: (a) this need is recognised by at least some of the local Party organisations of gubernia or regional level; (b) if a sufficiently firm majority is non-existent in the CC on major questions of Party policy; (c) if, in spite of the existence of a firm majority in the CC on a definite point of view, the CC feels the need for checking the correctness of its policy through a discussion in the Party. However, in all these cases, a nation-wide discussion may be started only after the appropriate decision by the CC.

The Conference places it on record that none of these conditions obtained at the time the opposition bloc demanded a nation-wide discussion.

The Conference declares, therefore, that the Central Committee had acted quite correctly when it found a discussion inexpedient and condemned the opposition bloc for its attempts to force on the Party a nation-wide discussion on questions that had already been decided by the Party.

In summing up its analysis of the opposition bloc's practical platform, the Conference finds that this platform marks the opposition bloc's departure from the class line of the proletarian revolution on key questions of foreign and domestic policy.

III. The "Revolutionary" Words and Opportunist Actions of the Opposition Bloc

A specific of the opposition bloc is that while actually representing the Social-Democratic deviation in our Party and propounding an opportunist policy, it is nonetheless trying to camouflage its actions with revolutionary verbiage, seeking to criticise the Party from the "Left", to pose as "Lefts". The reason for this is that the Communist proletarians, to whom the opposition bloc chiefly appeals, are the most revolutionary of all the proletarians in the world, that, having been educated in the spirit of revolutionary traditions, they simply will not listen to outspoken critics from the Right. Therefore, in order to sell its opportunist goods

the opposition bloc has been compelled to give them a revolutionary label in the knowledge that this is the only subterfuge that will help to attract the attention of revolutionary proletarians.

But inasmuch as the opposition bloc continues to act as the Social-Democratic deviation since, in fact, it advocates an opportunist policy, its actions invariably belie its words. Hence the inner contradiction in its activity. Hence the discord between words and deeds, between revolutionary words and opportunist actions.

The opposition clamorously criticises the Party and the Comintern from the "Left" and insists on a revision of the united front tactics, the disbandment of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and the replacement of the trade unions by new "revolutionary" organisations, in the belief that this will push the revolution, whereas actually they will only be helping James Thomas and J. Oudegeest, divorcing the Communist parties from the trade unions, weakening the position of world communism and, consequently, holding up the revolutionary movement. In words they are "revolutionaries" but in deeds they are accomplices of the Thomases and Oudegeests.

The opposition thunders against the Party from the "Left" and, at the same time, demands an increase of the retail prices of manufactured goods in the belief that this will speed up industrialisation, whereas, in fact, it will only disorganise the home market, destroy the union between industry and the peasant economy, reduce the exchange rate of the gold ruble, diminish real wages and, consequently, undermine industrialisation in any form. In words it favours industrialisation but in deeds it aids and abets the adversaries of industrialisation.

The opposition accuses the Party of being reluctant to combat bureaucracy in the state apparatus and, at the same time, suggests raising retail prices in the belief, evidently, that higher retail prices have nothing to do with bureaucracy in the state apparatus, whereas, in fact, this will make the state economic apparatus bureaucratic from top to bottom because high retail prices are the surest means of strangling industry and bureaucratising the economic apparatus. In words they are against bureaucracy but in deeds they defend and propound the bureaucratisation of the state apparatus.

The opposition holds forth against private capital and, at the same time, suggests channelling state capital from the sphere of circulation into industry in the belief that this will undermine private capital, whereas in fact it will only make for an immense strengthening of private capital because the extraction of state capital from circulation, which is the basic sphere of the operation of private capital, will place trade entirely in the hands of private capital. While fighting private capital in words, the opposition helps it in deeds.

The opposition vociferously accuses the Party apparatus of degeneration, but in fact when the CC raised the question of expelling Mr. Ossovsky, a Communist who had really degenerated, the opposition displayed the utmost loyalty to that gentleman, voting against his expulsion. In words it is against degeneration, but in deeds it aids and defends degeneration.

The opposition raised an outcry about inner-Party democracy and, at the same time, demanded a nation-wide discussion thereby thinking to effectuate inner-Party democracy, whereas in fact by trying to force a discussion on the overwhelming majority of the Party membership on behalf of an insignificant minority it most flagrantly violated every form of democracy. In words it is for inner-Party democracy, but in deeds it violates the fundamental principles of any democracy.

During the present aggravation of the class struggle, the working-class movement can pursue only one of two possible policies: either a Menshevik policy or the policy of Leninism. The attempts of the opposition bloc to steer a middle course between these antipodal lines under cover of "Left", "revolutionary" phrase-mongering and by levelling sharp criticism at the CPSU(B) had to and did indeed take it into the camp of the opponents of Leninism.

The enemies of the CPSU(B) and of the Comintern know the worth of the opposition bloc's "revolutionary" verbiage. Therefore, ignoring this verbiage as worthless, they unanimously laud the opposition bloc for its unrevolutionary deeds, adopting as their own its slogan calling for a struggle against the main line pursued by the CPSU(B) and the Comintern. It cannot be considered accidental that the Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Constitutional Democrats, the

Russian Mensheviks and the German "Left" Social-Democrats have all found it possible to give open support for the opposition bloc's struggle against the Party, calculating that this struggle will lead to a split and that a split will untie the anti-proletarian forces in our country to the delight of the enemies of the revolution.

The Conference considers that the Party must pay special attention to exposing the opposition bloc's "revolutionary" disguise and showing its opportunist substance.

The Conference considers that the Party must safeguard the unity of its ranks as the apple of its eye, believing that the unity of our Party is the most potent antidote to all the counter-revolutionary assaults of the enemies of the revolution.

IV. Conclusions

In summing up the past stage of the inner-Party struggle, the Fifteenth Conference of the CPSU(B) places it on record that in this struggle the Party has demonstrated its immense ideological growth, unhesitatingly rejected the fundamental views of the opposition and won a quick and decisive victory over the opposition bloc, compelling it to renounce openly its factional activity and to dissociate itself from patently opportunist groups in and outside the CPSU(B).

The Conference declares that as a result of the opposition attempts to force a discussion on the Party and undermine its unity, the Party masses have rallied still more closely round the CC, thereby isolating the opposition and achieving real unity of the Party ranks.

The Conference considers that it was only due to the active support of the broad Party masses that the CC achieved these successes and that the activity and political awareness displayed by the Party masses in the struggle against the opposition bloc's disorganising work are the best indications of the fact that the Party lives and develops on the basis of real inner-Party democracy.

While wholly and completely approving the policy of the CC to ensure unity, the Conference considers that the course to be followed by the Party is:

1. To make sure that the achieved minimum needed for Party unity is actually implemented.

2. To wage a determined ideological struggle against the Social-Democratic deviation in our Party, explaining the fallacy of the opposition bloc's fundamental views to the masses and exposing the opportunist content of these views no matter what "revolutionary" verbiage is used to disguise them.

3. To secure from the opposition bloc an admission that its views are wrong.

4. To safeguard Party unity in every possible way and cut short any attempt to renew factional activities and violate discipline.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
8th Russ. ed., Vol. 3, pp. 401-12

JOINT PLENARY MEETING OF THE CC AND CCC CPSU(B)

July 29-August 9, 1927[184]

RESOLUTION "ON VIOLATIONS OF PARTY DISCIPLINE BY ZINOVIEV AND TROTSKY"

Since 1923 the opposition, first with Trotsky at its head, and since 1926, led by Trotsky and Zinoviev, has used every difficulty that the Party has had to surmount in building socialism to strike at its unity and leadership, not shrinking from any violation of Party discipline.

In 1923, when the first serious difficulties stemming from the New Economic Policy and caused by the marketing crisis and the money reform were encountered, Trotsky and his group, mirroring the petty-bourgeois vacillation in the country, sought to use these difficulties for their factional purposes by declaring that the policy pursued by the Party had brought the country to the verge of ruin. However, the facts showed that the opposition was mistaken. It mistook its own defeat among the people for the country's ruin. At the time the Party and the Comintern analysed the behaviour of the Trotskyite opposition, denounced it and characterised its views as amounting to a petty-bourgeois deviation.

At the close of 1925, when new difficulties linked with the relations between the working class and the peasantry, were encountered by the Party, it became apparent that Zinoviev, Kamenev and others had gone over to Trotskyism.

The Fourteenth Party Congress (December 1925) was unanimous in its appraisal of this departure of the "New Opposition" (Zinoviev and others) from the Leninist line expressed by their repudiation of the socialist nature of our industry, underestimation of the middle peasant, demand for freedom for factions and groups, and so forth. In the spring and summer of 1926 the "New Opposition" finally formed a bloc with Trotsky and other factional groups, whose views had been denounced by the Party, and the "New Opposition" led by Zinoviev finally adopted the ideological positions of Trotskyism.

In the course of its unceasing attacks on the Party in the summer of 1926 the opposition went so far as to give concrete shape to its factional organisation, turning it into an illegal organisation and holding illegal meetings in the forest (the affair of Lashevich and others). The opposition furthered its factional activities by going over from secret meetings to open factional acts (at the Aviapribor, Krasny Putilovets and other factories) in an effort to force the Party to start a discussion on issues that had already been decided by the Party Congress. When it was given a unanimous rebuff by the entire Party and was most emphatically rejected by the workers belonging to Party cells, the opposition had to capitulate and give a pledge to the Party that it would cease its factional struggle (declaration of October 16, 1926).

In that declaration the opposition acknowledged "its duty to implement..." "the Party's decision banning factional activity".

In that declaration the opposition acknowledged that "no encouragement whatever was permissible for the activities of people already expelled from the Party and the Comintern, such as Ruth Fischer and Adolf Maslow", who sided with the opposition in our Party.

In this declaration the opposition said: "We regard the decisions of the Fourteenth Congress and of the Party CC and CCC as binding and shall unconditionally submit to and put them into effect."

The opposition stated: "We categorically repudiate the right of those who conduct *any* agitation against the Comintern, the CPSU or the USSR to claim any solidarity with us." In its declaration it denounced "criticism of the Comintern or the policy of the Party which grows into baiting that weakens the position of the Comintern as the militant organisation of the proletariat, of the CPSU as the advanced contingent of the Comintern, or of the USSR as the first state of the proletarian dictatorship".

However, the experience of all the activities of the opposition after its October pledge showed that it had not fulfilled *any* of the commitments it had made to the Party, and instead of diminishing its factional activities it has steered towards a direct split and the organisation of another party.

Despite the fact that the Fifteenth Party Conference, whose decisions were endorsed by the Comintern Executive, had sternly condemned the opposition line as a Social-Democratic deviation, as a Right-wing deviation disguised by Left phrase-mongering, and despite the fact that the opposition has received no support in *any Party cell* it stubbornly continues its factional activities and is becoming a growing menace to the Party's unity.

Lately, in connection with the Soviet Union's grave international difficulties and the partial setbacks of the Chinese revolution, the opposition has concentrated its attacks on the Party's foreign policy (China, Britain). In answer to the threat of war, which has loomed large for the USSR, it has made pronouncements which undermine the Party's efforts to mobilise the masses against this threat and to strengthen the Soviet Union's defence capability. The allegations that the CC was degenerating into Thermidorianism, that the Party was following a national-conservative line and pursuing an Ustryalov-type* kulak policy, that "the most deadly danger was not the threat of war but the Party regime"—all these allegations, aimed at sapping the will of the world proletariat to defend the

* N. Ustryalov was an ideologist of a section of the Russian bourgeoisie, mainly white émigré intellectuals. He expounded his views in *Smena Vekh*, advocating co-operation with the Soviet power and hoping for the bourgeois degeneration of the Soviet state. Nothing came of his counter-revolutionary calculations.—*Ed.*

USSR, were assessed by a plenary meeting of the Comintern Executive as "a means, in face of the threat of war ... to conceal their desertion from the workers".

This entire campaign has been accompanied by patently anti-Party factional activity, which has lately acquired an impermissible character. Instead of honouring the pledge given by it on October 16 to abide by Party discipline, the opposition has been printing factional literature and circulating it not only among Party members but also among non-Party people; organising underground factional groups, circles and conferences; distributing the grossly anti-Party Declaration of 84 containing unprecedented slanderous charges against the Party; Trotsky delivered a speech at the Eighth Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive in May 1927, which the Comintern Executive unanimously qualified as an anti-Party, flagrantly factional pronouncement; and Zinoviev spoke at a non-Party meeting on May 9, 1927, appealing to non-Party people against the Party and its leading bodies, thereby violating all the traditions of the Bolshevik Party and elementary Party discipline. Lastly, at a meeting of the Presidium of the Comintern Executive (in June 1927) Trotsky made an unheard-of charge against the Party, accusing it of Thermidorianism.

In spite of the fact that the CC had turned the question of Zinoviev's disorganising speech over to the Central Control Commission, and despite the fact that the Comintern Executive has condemned Trotsky's speech as patently factional, on June 9, 1927, at a time when British imperialism was savagely attacking the USSR, Trotsky and Zinoviev took part in a political anti-Party demonstration organised by the opposition at a railway station on the pretext of giving a send-off to Smilga, who had for several weeks ignored the Party's decision to send him to work in the Soviet Far East. At the Yaroslavl Railway Station Trotsky addressed the demonstration, in which people who had chanced to be at the railway station took part together with members of the opposition who had been assembled through the factional apparatus.

By these actions Trotsky and Zinoviev showed that:

(a) the pledge given by them to observe discipline was only a tactical manoeuvre designed to deceive the Party;

(b) at a time when war threatens, when the Party's

central task is to strengthen the rear, and the main condition for strengthening the rear is to enhance the Party's preparedness for combat and its discipline, the opposition, in pursuance of its factional aims, steers towards the disintegration of Party discipline and helps to untie the hands of the anti-Soviet forces in our country.

At the Tenth Party Congress, in the resolution on Party unity, Lenin pointed out that it was necessary to show the Party "the experience of preceding revolutions, when the counter-revolution gave its support to petty-bourgeois groups standing closest to the most radically revolutionary party in order to shake and overthrow the revolutionary dictatorship and thereby open the road for the subsequent total victory of the counter-revolution, of the capitalists and landowners".*

The joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC draws the attention of the whole Party to the fact that on account of its factional activities the opposition is objectively becoming a rallying centre for anti-Party and anti-Soviet forces, a centre on whose corrupting activities the internal and foreign counter-revolution now counts.

For a number of years the Party has displayed the utmost tolerance and patience, repeatedly cautioning the opposition and trying to bring the leaders of the opposition round to observing Party discipline.

However, the latest pronouncements by Trotsky and Zinoviev show that although the Party has exhausted all the means of cautioning, it has been unable to get the leaders of the opposition really to submit to the will of the Party, that the leaders of the opposition are flagrantly and systematically flouting the very foundations of the Party spirit and Party discipline, which are binding on all Party members without exception, whoever they may be, and that the opposition, headed by the opposition members in the CC, is giving momentum to its factional activities, undermining the Party's unity and steering towards a split.

Lastly, in view of the above-mentioned facts and on the basis of the debate at the present, joint Plenary Meeting, the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission have to put on record:

---

* See pp. 229-30.—*Ed.*

(1) that in their factional blindness the opposition (Trotsky and Zinoviev) is sliding into a course against the absolute and unconditional defence of the USSR in the struggle against imperialist intervention; moreover, the opposition is trying to substantiate this erroneous line by alleging that the existing leading organs of the CPSU(B) and the USSR are of the "Thermidorian" type, in view of which, according to the opposition, it is necessary first to replace these organs and then to organise the defence of the USSR (Trotsky's thesis on Clemenceau);

(2) that the opposition (Trotsky and Zinoviev) is steering towards a direct split of the Comintern by organising in Germany a second party headed by Adolf Maslow and Ruth Fischer, who have been expelled from the Comintern, and using it as a weapon to split the other European sections of the Comintern;

(3) that the opposition (Trotsky and Zinoviev) is moving towards the organisation of a new party against the CPSU(B), towards an open split in the CPSU(B) systematically violating the decisions of our Party, shaking the Party spirit and Party discipline and thereby helping to disarm the proletariat of the USSR in face of the mounting threat of war.

The joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC is obliged to state that through these crimes against the Party and the proletariat the leaders of the opposition (Trotsky and Zinoviev) have found themselves in a blind alley, alienated their relations with the Party and put the Party in a position where it has no alternative but to apply the Tenth Congress decision on Party unity to them.

That decision makes it incumbent upon the joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC to raise the question not only of the expulsion of manifest splitters and disorganisers of the Party and the Comintern from the Central Committee but also their expulsion from the Party. Nevertheless, desiring to give the leaders of the opposition an opportunity to rectify their mistakes and stop their criminal actions against the Party, the Presidium of the CCC limited itself to proposing the expulsion of Trotsky and Zinoviev from the Central Committee of the CPSU(B).

Moreover, wishing to give the leaders of the opposition, who have driven themselves into an impasse, a way out

and facilitate peace in the Party, the Presidium of the CCC and the joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC made a last attempt to retain Trotsky and Zinoviev in the Central Committee by suggesting that they accept a number of elementary terms, which are binding on all members of the Bolshevik Party and vital to peace in the Party, namely:

(1) renounce Trotsky's semi-defeatist theory in face of the threat of war (Trotsky's thesis on Clemenceau), take the road of absolute and unconditional defence of our socialist motherland against imperialism and denounce the opposition's slander that our Party and Soviet leadership have degenerated into Thermidorianism;

(2) renounce the policy of splitting the Comintern, denounce the party formed by Maslow and Fischer, who have been expelled from the Comintern, rupture all contacts with that anti-Leninist, divisive party and carry out all the decisions of the Communist International;

(3) renounce the policy of splitting the CPSU(B), denounce the attempt to form a second party, disband the faction and pledge to carry out all the decisions of the CPSU(B) and its Central Committee.

However, despite the pliability of the Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC and the elementary nature of these terms, they were rejected by the leaders of the opposition.

It was only after the joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC was compelled, in view of this stand, to assume as a basis a resolution to expel Zinoviev and Trotsky from the Party Central Committee—it was only after this that the opposition found it necessary to beat a retreat, repudiate some of its errors, accept the proposal of the Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC with reservations, and make the corresponding "statement".

In view of this the joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC passed a decision to remove from the agenda the question of the expulsion of Zinoviev and Trotsky from the Central Committee and sternly reprimand and caution them with the corresponding entry to be made in their Party registration card.

The joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC considers that all this may prove to be a step towards peace in the Party. However, it is far from considering the "statement"

of the opposition a sufficient act capable of ensuring the necessary peace in the Party.

Nevertheless, the joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC has every reason to note with satisfaction that:

(1) in its "statement" the opposition has had to repudiate a number of errors and its vacillation on the question of the nature of the Soviet Union's future war against intervention and on the unconditional defence of the USSR against imperialism, although by its reluctance to condemn outright Trotsky's semi-defeatist thesis on Clemenceau the opposition has left for itself soil for future possible vacillation on the question of the unconditional defence of the USSR;

(2) the opposition has had to repudiate its anti-Party slander to the effect that the Party leadership was degenerating into Thermidorianism, although by its reservation that the Party was not fighting Thermidorian trends in the country vigorously enough it left for itself a loophole for further attacks on the Party along this line;

(3) the opposition has had to abandon, on formal grounds, it is true, its organisational ties with the divisive, anti-Leninist Urbahns-Maslow group, although by its reluctance to withdraw support for this group it left itself a loophole for further attacks on the Comintern;

(4) the opposition has had to give up factional activity in the CPSU(B) and recognise the need for eradicating all elements of such factional activity, although by its reservation and attack on the "regime in the Party" it seeks to justify its previous divisive activity and, moreover, leaves itself soil for fresh attacks on the CPSU(B).

The joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC has no grounds for guaranteeing that the opposition's retreat and repudiation of some of its errors are genuinely sincere. The experience of a similar "statement" by the opposition on October 16, 1926 shows that it has never been inclined to honour its commitments to the Party. The reservations in its present "statement" on issues put before it at this joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC indicate that it has not renounced further struggle against the leadership of the Party and the Comintern. In view of this the joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC makes it obligatory for the opposition forthwith to disband its faction and calls

on all organisations and all members of our Party to take every measure to secure the total abolition of factional activities, actions and groups.

While systematically implementing inner-Party democracy and in no way hindering business-like comradely criticism of the Party's shortcomings, the joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC considers that on this point Party organisations must be guided by the decision of the Tenth Party Congress, which states:

"It must be a strict rule that unquestionably necessary criticism of shortcomings in the Party, every analysis of the Party's general line or study of its practical experience, executive control and the methods of rectifying mistakes, and so forth shall be directed by every Party organisation not towards a discussion in groups forming round some 'platform' and so on, but towards a discussion by all members of the Party."*

In putting an end to factional activity and upholding unity and iron discipline in the Party, the Party organisations must be guided by the decision of the same Tenth Congress, which states:

"The Congress directs that all groups that have formed round one platform or another shall be forthwith disbanded without exception, and instructs all organisations to make sure that no factional activity is pursued. Non-fulfilment of this decision of the Congress shall be followed by unconditional and immediate expulsion from the Party."**

JOINT PLENARY MEETING OF THE CC AND CCC CPSU(B)

October 21-23, 1927[155]

DECISION "ON THE DISCUSSION"

The joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC approves the decision on the "draft platform" of Trotsky, Zinoviev, Muralov and others passed by the Political Bureau of the CC and the Presidium of the CCC on September 8, 1927, and decrees:

---

* See p. 230.—*Ed.*
** Ibid.

1. In line with the decision of the Tenth Party Congress to publish the theses of the CC on congress procedure not later than a month before a congress, and in accordance with the decision of the Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC in August 1927 the theses approved by the present Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC shall be published for discussion at Party meetings and in the press as soon as the plenary meeting is ended.

2. On the basis of the decision of the Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC in August 1927, a *Discussion Bulletin*, in which counter-theses, amendments to the theses of the CC, concrete suggestions on the theses, critical articles and so on are to be printed, shall be published by *Pravda*.

3. The discussion shall be conducted in accordance with the following decision of the Tenth Party Congress:

"It must be a strict rule that unquestionably necessary criticism of shortcomings in the Party, every analysis of the Party's general line or study of its practical experience, executive control and the methods of rectifying mistakes, and so on, shall be directed by every organisation not towards a discussion in groups forming round some 'platform' and so on, but towards a discussion by all members of the Party."*

4. The Political Bureau of the CC and the Presidium of of the CCC shall make sure that the discussion is conducted within a framework and in a tone compatible with the Party spirit and comradely relations.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
8th Russ. ed., Vol. 3, p. 541

DECISION "ON THE EXPULSION OF ZINOVIEV AND TROTSKY FROM THE CC CPSU(B)"

The joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC held in August 1927 displayed the greatest patience and conciliation with regard to Trotsky and Zinoviev, giving these comrades the opportunity to honour their promise of August 8 to put an end to elements of factional activity, and limited itself to a last warning.

However, Trotsky and Zinoviev have again deceived the

* See p. 230.—*Ed.*

Party and most flagrantly broken their pledge. Far from putting an end to "elements of factional activity" they have increased the factional struggle against the Party and its unity to a point bordering on the formation of a new anti-Leninist party jointly with bourgeois intellectuals.

In view of this, the joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC decrees: Comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev shall be *expelled* from the CC.

Further, the Joint Plenary Meeting of the CC and CCC decrees that all the information about the divisive activities of the leaders of the Trotskyite opposition (the organisation of an illegal anti-Party printshop for the destruction of the Party, the bloc with the renegades Maslow, Ruth Fischer and Souvarine for the destruction of the Comintern, and so on), and also about the group led by V. Smirnov and Sapronov shall be submitted for consideration by the Fifteenth Party Congress.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
8th Russ. ed., Vol. 3, p. 542

FIFTEENTH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU(B)

Moscow, December 2-19, 1927[158]

From THE RESOLUTION "ON THE REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE"

(Carried unanimously)

The Fifteenth Congress finds that despite the warning of the Thirteenth Congress of the Party, which took note of the "petty-bourgeois deviation" of the Trotsky group, and despite the warning of the Fifteenth All-Union Party Conference about a "Social-Democratic deviation" united under the leadership of the Trotsky opposition, the latter continued, month in and month out, to deepen its revisionist errors and fight the CPSU(B) and the teaching of Lenin, and build up its own special party, taking the struggle outside the CPSU(B) and appealing to non-proletarian elements in the country against the dictatorship of the proletariat. The ideology of the opposition, which has openly formed a bloc with renegades to world communism (Maslow, Souvarine and Co.), has now taken final shape as *Menshev-*

ism in its Trotskyite interpretation. Repudiation of the socialist nature of Soviet state enterprises, repudiation of the possibility of socialism being built successfully in our country, repudiation of the alliance of the working class with the main mass of the peasants, and repudiation of the organisational principles of Bolshevism (the policy of splitting the CPSU(B) and the Comintern) have logically brought the Trotsky-Menshevik opposition round to slandering the USSR with the allegation that it has degenerated into a Thermidorian state, to rejecting the proletarian dictatorship in the USSR and to waging a counter-revolutionary struggle against it.

As a result, the opposition has severed its ideological ties with Leninism, degenerated into a Menshevik group, taken the road of capitulation to the forces of the international and internal bourgeoisie and objectively become a third force against the proletarian dictatorship. That is why it has been given such a crushing rebuff by the entire Party membership and by the working class as a whole.

The Fifteenth Congress finds that all the decisions of the CC and CCC against the disorganising activities of the Trotskyites were correct and necessary as a minimum measure, and instructs the Central Committee to continue ensuring the Party's Leninist unity at all costs.

Taking into account the fact that the divergences between the Party and the opposition have grown from tactical into programme disagreements, and that the Trotskyite opposition has objectively become a factor of the anti-Soviet struggle, the Fifteenth Congress proclaims affiliation to the Trotskyite opposition and the propagation of its views as incompatible with membership of the Bolshevik Party.

On behalf of the CPSU(B) and on behalf of the working class of the Soviet Union, the Fifteenth Congress expresses its firm proletarian confidence in the triumph of socialism in our country in spite of all difficulties. The historic experience of the decade of the existence of the proletarian dictatorship fully bears out the correctness of the Leninist line followed by the CPSU(B). The Fifteenth Congress instructs the CC to continue steadfastly pursuing that line, rally ever larger masses of working people in our country round the banner of socialist construction, strengthen the fraternal ties of solidarity with the proletariat of all coun-

tries and unswervingly turn the USSR into an ever more powerful outpost of the world socialist revolution.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
8th Russ. ed., Vol. 8, pp. 20-21.

From THE RESOLUTION "ON THE REPORT OF THE CPSU(B) DELEGATION IN THE COMINTERN EXECUTIVE"

In view of the extremely complex tasks facing the Communist proletariat there must be absolute ideological unity and iron organisational solidarity of the Comintern ranks. The Congress places on record that the sections and the Executive Committee of the Comintern have given the CPSU(B) solid and unanimous support against the Trotskyite opposition, whose behaviour the Comintern Executive has denounced as a betrayal of communism. Having broken completely with Leninism and adopted the Menshevik-liquidationist platform, the Trotskyite opposition, which by its slander against the USSR continues to help the Soviet Union's most bitter enemies, openly engages in the unprecedentedly brazen divisive activity and has rallied under its banner the most odious renegades and apostates—from Korsch and Ruth Fischer to Souvarine and Liebers—can no longer be tolerated in the ranks of the Comintern. The task is to purge the Comintern thoroughly of all the anti-communist elements that have rallied round the Trotskyite opposition.

Despite individual opportunist errors in a number of Communist parties, errors that are systematically rectified by the leadership of the Comintern Executive, the Bolshevisation of the Comintern sections has made further considerable progress during the past two years. The Congress expresses the confidence that the Comintern leadership will ensure the further Bolshevisation of its ranks and their further education in the spirit of genuine Leninism. In this respect the Congress considers that it is particularly important, on the one hand, to surmount parliamentary illusions and traditions and wage a determined struggle against opportunist deviations generally and, on the other, to make

every effort to intensify and promote work among the masses and in the trade unions.

The largest sections of the Comintern and the Communist International as a whole have grown sufficiently strong ideologically and organisationally to give political leadership to the new upsurge of the working-class movement and direct it along the revolutionary road.

The Congress instructs the CC to give its utmost attention to the further strengthening of the Comintern, of its prestige among the proletarian masses, of its work in general and of its organisational apparatus in particular.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
8th Russ. ed., Vol. 4, p. 30

ON THE OPPOSITION

Having heard the report of the commission and exhaustively studied all the documents, the Fifteenth Congress places the following on record:

1. *Ideologically* the opposition has moved from divergences of a tactical nature to disagreements of a *programme* character, revising the teaching of Lenin and lapsing into Menshevism. Repudiation of the possibility of successfully building socialism in the USSR and, consequently, of the socialist nature of our revolution; repudiation of the socialist nature of state industry; repudiation of the socialist ways of development in the countryside under the proletarian dictatorship and of the policy of alliance of the proletariat with the main mass of the peasants on the foundation of socialist construction; and, lastly, the virtual repudiation of the proletarian dictatorship in the USSR ("Thermidor") and the accompanying capitulationism and defeatism—this entire ideological line has turned the Trotskyite opposition into a weapon of petty-bourgeois democracy in the USSR and an auxiliary detachment of international Social-Democracy abroad.

2. *Tactically*, having stepped up and intensified its activities against the Party, the opposition has gone beyond the limits permitted not only by the Party Rules but also by Soviet legality (illegal meetings, illegal printshops, illegal

press organs, forcible seizure of premises and so forth). The climax of these anti-Soviet tactics was the transition to an open struggle against the proletarian dictatorship and the organisation of street demonstrations against the Party and the Soviet Government on November 7, 1927. The opposition's anti-Soviet tactics abroad, linked with the propagation of slanderous charges against the USSR, have in fact brought it into the same rank with open enemies of the country of the proletarian dictatorship.

3. In questions of *organisation* the opposition has, on the basis of a revision of Lenin's teaching, moved from factional activity to the formation of its own Trotskyite party. The commission has established beyond any doubt that the opposition has its own central committee, regional, gubernia, town and district centres, a secretariat, membership dues, press organs and so on. Abroad the Trotskyite party has contacted not only small factional anti-Leninist groups in the parties of the Comintern but also organisations, groups and individuals who have never belonged to the Comintern, and enemies and traitors to the communist movement who have been expelled from the Communist International (Maslow, Ruth Fischer, Korsch, Souvarine, Rosmer, Roland-Holst, Liebers and many others). The result of this *organisational* practice of the opposition is that in the USSR the opposition has established contact with non-Party bourgeois intellectuals (Shcherbakov and Co.), who are, in their turn, linked with open counter-revolutionaries, while abroad the opposition has become the object of extensive support by the bourgeoisie of all countries.

On the basis of the aforesaid, the Fifteenth Congress considers that the CC and CCC have acted correctly by expelling Trotsky and Zinoviev from the CPSU(B) on November 14, 1927, and expelling other opposition members of the CC and CCC from these bodies and bringing up the question of the opposition as a whole at the Congress.

In its decision on the report of the CC the Congress declared that affiliation to the Trotskyite opposition and propagation of its views are incompatible with membership of the CPSU(B). In this connection the Congress considers that the opposition must disarm ideologically and organisationally, strongly condemn its views, stated above, as anti-Leninist, as Menshevik, and undertake to uphold the views

and decisions of the Party, of its congresses and conferences, and of its Central Committee.

However, the opposition has rejected this demand of the Party. In a document dated December 3, 1927 and signed by 121 active members, the opposition not only refuses to abandon its Menshevik views but, on the contrary, insists on propagating them.

After the Congress had adopted its decision on the report of the Central Committee, the commission received two new documents from the opposition dated December 10, 1927. In one of them (signed by Rakovsky, Muralov and Radek) it insists not only on upholding these Menshevik views but also on propagating them. In the other document (signed by Kamenev, Bakayev, Yevdokimov and Avdeyev) it insists on retaining its Menshevik views while agreeing to stop propagating them. This defies the demand for ideological disarmament and signifies a refusal to uphold the Party's decisions.

The Congress notes the obvious contradiction between the two opposition groups and considers that both statements of the opposition are totally unsatisfactory.

Proceeding from the aforesaid and taking into account the opposition's two violations of its solemn pledge to renounce factional activity, the Congress decrees:

1. The expulsion from the Party of the following active members of the Trotskyite opposition:

(1) I. Avdeyev, (2) A. Alexandrov, (3) Ausem, (4) A. Batashov, (5) S. Baranov, (6) I. Bakayev, (7) Budzinskaya, (8) M. Boguslavsky, (9) Vaganyan, (10) I. Vardin, (11) I. Vrachov, (12) S. Gessen, (13) N. Gordon, (14) A. Gertik, (15) A. Guralsky, (16) Drobnis, (17) T. Dmitriyev, (18) G. Yevdokimov, (19) S. Zorin, (20) P. Zalutsky, (21) Ilyin, (22) L. Kamenev, (23) S. Kavtaradze, (24) Kaspersky, (25) M. Krasovskaya, (26) Kovalevsky, (27) A. S. Kuklin, (28) V. Kasparova, (29) Komandir, (30) Kagalin, (31) Kostritsky, (32) A. Konkova, (33) I. N. Katalynov, (34) M. Lashevich, (35) V. Levin, (36) G. Lubin, (37) P. Lelozol, (38) Lizdin, (39) G. Lobanov, (40) N. Muralov, (41) A. Minichev, (42) N. Nikolayev, (43) M. Y. Natanson, (44) Y. Pyatakov, (45) V. Ponomaryov, (46) Pitashko, (47) A. Peterson, (48) I. Paulson, (49) I. Reingold, (50) O. Ravich, (51) K. Radek, (52) H. Rakovsky, (53) Rotskan,

(54) R. Rafail, (55) V. Rumyantsev, (56) G. Safarov, (57) I. Smilga, (58) Sokolov, (59) K. Solovyov, (60) L. Sosnovsky, (61) I. N. Smirnov, (62) Z. Senkov, (63) Tuzhikov, (64) F. Tartakovskaya, (65) O. Tarkhanov, (66) I. I. Tarasov, (67) Ukonen, (68) G. Fyodorov, (69) I. Fortin, (70) I. Filippov, (71) N. Kharitonov, (72) Chernov, (73) M. Shepsheleva, (74) Y. Eshba, (75) Z. I. Lilina.

2. The expulsion from the Party of the Sapronov group as being patently anti-revolutionary:

(1) N. Zavaryan, (2) B. Yemelyanov (Kalin), (3) M. N. Mino, (4) M. I. Minkov, (5) V. M. Smirnov (6) T. Kharechko, (7) V. P. Oborin, (8) S. Shraiber, (9) M. Smirnov, (10) F. I. Pilipenko, (11) E. Dune, (12) A. L. Slidovker, (13) L. Tikhonov, (14) Ustimchik, (15) A. Bolshakov, (16) D. I. Kirillov, (17) P. P. Mikini, (18) M. V. Pronayev, (19) V. F. Varguzov, (20) P. L. Stroganov, (21) M. S. Penko, (22) P. S. Chersanov, (23) D. G. Putilin.

3. The CC and CCC are instructed to take all steps to influence the rank-and-file members of the Trotskyite opposition ideologically in order to prevail upon them and, at the same time, purge the Party of all patently incorrigible elements of the Trotskyite opposition.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
8th Russ. ed., Vol. 4, pp. 70-73

RESOLUTIONS OF LOCAL PARTY ORGANISATIONS ON THE STRUGGLE AGAINST TROTSKYISM

RESOLUTION OF A GENERAL MEETING OF WORKER MEMBERS AND CANDIDATE MEMBERS OF THE PARTY OF THE IVANOVO-VOZNESENSK TOWN DISTRICT ON THE QUESTION OF INNER-PARTY DEMOCRACY

December 19, 1923

1. Having heard the report on the Party's current tasks, the general district meeting fully subscribes to the resolution of the Central Committee of the RCP and strongly condemns groups and factions of all kinds, which under present-day conditions threaten to splinter the Party and, consequently, the state power.

2. The general district meeting considers it mandatory for itself and all the cells of the Gubernia Party organisation strictly to promote and renew the Party apparatus but, at the same time, we emphatically condemn the viewpoint that unfoundedly separates the Party apparatus and suggests the break-up of the main nucleus of the Party apparatus.

3. Further, the meeting considers it wrong and harmful to contrapose the youth to veterans, and considers that in connection with this counterposing the hints about the possibility of our old battle-tested leaders degenerating into opportunism are particularly dangerous.

4. The general district meeting recommends that all cells should start a business-like discussion of all the questions deriving from the resolution of the Central Committee of the RCP and map out measures to ensure the fullest implementation of these resolutions.

5. The meeting emphatically condemns as impermissible the sharp forms that the discussion has lately acquired. The Party's least painful switch to the new course can be guaranteed only by unshakable unity in the Party.

6. The meeting considers that all cells should without delay discuss the situation in our economy and its prospects, the question of "scissors", wages, the role of state trade, co-operatives, private trade, the plan of organising the economy and so on. In particular, the question of the relations between the economic bodies and the trade unions must be thoroughly examined.

7. In order to carry out the tasks set in the resolution of the Central Committee of the RCP, the meeting proposes that the elections of the cell bureaus should be held not later than in January 1924.

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration of the Economy (1921-1925), Russ. ed., Moscow, 1961, pp. 516-17

From THE RESOLUTION OF A GENERAL MEETING OF RCP(B) CELL BUREAUS AND FUNCTIONARIES OF THE KHARKOV PARTY ORGANISATION ON THE QUESTION OF PARTY DEVELOPMENT

December 19, 1923

Attended by over 1,000 Party members

The meeting fully subscribes to the resolution of the Central Committee of the RCP and expresses complete confidence in the CC RCP and its policy. The meeting notes that while being a means of ascertaining defects and of charting the work of the whole Party, the current discussion should under no circumstances be turned into a struggle of individual groups, for that might lead to the danger of a split in the Party. Believing that a unanimous settlement of all the questions raised in the resolution of the Political Bureau of the CC and the Presidium of the CCC is the guarantee that the Party will unanimously embark on the implementation of these decisions, the

meeting notes the mistake committed by Trotsky in printing the article "A New Course", which is widely used by the opposition to intensify the struggle against the Central Committee.

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 517

From THE RESOLUTION OF AN EXTENDED PLENARY MEETING OF THE BAKHMUTSKY AREA PARTY COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION IN THE PARTY AND ON THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF PARTY WORK IN THE DONBAS

December 1923

Having heard the report on the situation in the Party and on the immediate tasks of Party work in the Donbas, the Plenary Meeting of the Bakhmutsky Area Party Committee fully approves and whole-heartedly supports the CC line stated in the resolution of the CC and CCC on Party development. This resolution ... must underlie all Party activity. The Plenary Meeting believes that in the current discussion the Donets organisation, which is the most thoroughly proletarian, must be a model of unity and solidarity, and of the ability to put the decisions of the CC quickly into effect. The Plenary Meeting calls on all members of the organisation to carry on the discussion in such a way as to lead to the animation of Party thinking, unity and further strengthening of the organisation from top to bottom.

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 520

RESOLUTIONS OF PETROGRAD PARTY ORGANISATIONS ON QUESTIONS OF INNER-PARTY DEMOCRACY

January 1924

SAMOILOVA FACTORY

Having heard and discussed the report on inner-Party democracy, the personnel of the Samoilova First State Confectionery Factory welcomes the decision of the CC

and CCC on this question and will, for its part, apply all its energy and ability to put the charted measures into effect. At the same time, having acquainted itself with the divergences on the question of inner-Party democracy, the personnel *wholly subscribes to the letter of the Petrograd organisation* and calls upon all factories to rally round the Party's leading organs and work together to raise the cultural level and draw more factory workers into the Party.

3RD AND 4TH ARMOURED CAR DIVISIONS

Having heard the report on Party development, we fully and *wholly subscribe to the resolution of the Central Committee of the RCP of December 7 and the appeal of the Petrograd organisation to all members of our Party.*

We declare that under the Bolshevik guidance of the Central Committee and our leaders we have, since the Tenth Congress of the RCP(B), achieved considerable success in economic work and in politically strengthening the international and domestic position of the workers' and peasants' power.

Without relaxing its efforts to promote our country's economy, our Party is now in a position *to begin the vigorous implementation of the resolution of the Central Committee of the RCP and the Central Control Commission.*

In this work the Party as a whole and its organisations in the localities must firmly bear in mind that the success of our further work will depend on the preservation of complete unity in the ranks of the RCP(B).

Factions and groups, including the present faction of the official opposition, must be disbanded immediately.

We consider that *in this respect the coming all-Union conference of the RCP(B) must give the existing factions a worthy Bolshevik rebuff and firmly call to order all comrades who are pursuing an anti-Bolshevik policy in the Party.*

It is time we went over from discussion to work!

Long live the Central Committee of the RCP(B) and the Party leader Comrade Lenin!

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 522

From THE RESOLUTION OF THE THIRTEENTH CONFERENCE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS) OF BYELORUSSIA ON THE QUESTION OF PARTY ORGANISATION

May 14, 1924

1. Considerable successes have been scored during the past year in restoring the Republic's entire economy, both in industry and agriculture.

The restoration of industry has been accompanied by an end to the declassing of the proletariat, by its numerical growth and by a rise of its material and cultural level.

The restoration of agriculture has led to the stratification of the peasantry expressed, on the one hand, in the resurgence of the stronger elements in the countryside and, on the other, in a considerable increase of the weak elements.

2. The economic growth of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois strata in town and countryside under the New Economic Policy is leading to increasing political activity by them, thereby creating the danger of these strata ideologically influencing the peasant and proletarian masses.

The growth of political activity in the bourgeois strata of town and countryside has led to the petty-bourgeois sentiments infecting our Party, this being confirmed by the Thirteenth All-Union Party Conference, which qualified the opposition as a petty-bourgeois deviation in our Party.

The Party must forestall the possibility of similar deviations arising in the future by a series of measures ensuring Party unity. Particular importance, therefore, attaches to measures aimed at making the composition of the Party membership socially homogeneous by increasing its proletarian nucleus.

This task must determine the main content of Party work in the immediate future.

3. The past year has again showed that the entire working class wholly and undividedly supports our Party.

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 529

From THE RESOLUTION OF A PLENARY MEETING OF THE MOSCOW-NARVA DISTRICT COMMITTEE OF THE RCP(B), LENINGRAD, JOINTLY WITH PARTY FUNCTIONARIES

November 1924

(*Present: 209 persons. Resolution carried unanimously*)

Having heard and deliberated the report on the plenary meeting of the Gubernia Committee and, in particular, on Trotsky's new article "The Lessons of the October Revolution", the Plenary Meeting of the Moscow-Narva District Committee jointly with Party functionaries resolves:

1. To subscribe wholly and completely to the decisions of the extended plenary meeting of the Gubernia Committee of November 10 on the report on the October plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the RCP(B).

2. To recognise Trotsky's action as a direct continuation of his factional activities and policy in the Party, which have been time and again condemned by Party congresses. This time Trotsky has elaborated a more or less full and integral platform, a programme of his faction.

In practice, the aim of this programme is to effect a radical change in the Central Committee, in its Political Bureau and in the leading bodies of the Comintern. Theoretically this programme is the first most systematic attempt to revise Leninism and Trotskyise the Bolshevik Party.

Both the practical objective and the theoretical idea of the article "Lessons of the October Revolution" are not new in Trotsky's factional policy. It only repeats his old errors and old anti-Bolshevik policy.

This article upholds and gives more distinct shape to his contraposition of himself to the Central Committee, his accusations of "opportunism" and "degeneration" levelled at veteran Bolshevik cadres, his justification of his erroneous theoretical and political line before and after the October Revolution on key questions of the revolution, and other propositions which he expounded in all his pronouncements on the eve of the Thirteenth Party Congress.

All this goes to show that Trotsky has not admitted his errors in the Party discussion at the Thirteenth Congress and refuses to admit them to this day, that by having ac-

cused the leading cadres of "opportunism", of pursuing a "Right-wing policy", during the discussion, he holds similar views with regard to the Party CC (particularly with regard to its leading cadres) to this day.

Thus, in spite of the decisions of the Thirteenth Congress of the RCP(B), Trotsky is continuing to oppose the genuinely Leninist policy of the Central Committee of the RCP(B)—follower of Lenin, and the leaders of our Party who are true to the teaching and precepts of Leninism.

Such a policy cannot be tolerated in the Party.

Trotskyism must be uprooted from our ranks.

The Plenary Meeting of the District Committee jointly with Party functionaries considers it necessary to adopt the most determined measures, in accordance with the resolutions of the Tenth and Thirteenth Party congresses, against this unceasing factional activity by Trotsky and generally against all factional actions regardless of whether they emanate from individual Party members or from individual groups.

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 532

RESOLUTION OF AN EXTENDED PLENARY MEETING OF THE VYBORG DISTRICT COMMITTEE OF THE RCP(B), LENINGRAD

November 1924

(*Present: 65 persons. Resolution carried unanimously*)

Having heard and discussed the report on Trotsky's new pronouncement (the article "Lessons of the October Revolution"), the extended plenary meeting of the Vyborg District Committee of the RCP(B) considers it necessary to declare that this article distorts the history of our Party and of our Leningrad organisation and is, thereby, a fresh attack on the Party.

The District Committee considers that another discussion cannot be permitted at a time when the entire Party is engaged in extremely important practical work. However,

the District Committee considers that the leading Party organs must take the most determined measures against distortions of the history of the Party, against this new revision of Leninism undertaken by Trotsky.

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 533

RESOLUTION OF AN EXTENDED PLENARY MEETING OF THE PARTY COMMITTEE OF THE CENTRAL DISTRICT, LENINGRAD, JOINTLY WITH PARTY COLLECTIVE AND SHOP ORGANISERS

November 1924

(*Present: 257 persons. Resolution carried unanimously with 1 abstention*)

Having heard and discussed the report of Comrade Naumov on Trotsky's latest pronouncement in the foreword to the book *The Year 1917*, the extended Plenary Meeting of the Party District Committee of the Central City District jointly with Party collective and shop organisers considers that this was an anti-Bolshevik pronouncement. It revises the principles of Leninism and distorts the history of our Party with the aim of de-Bolshevising it. It represents an attempt to push the Party into another discussion and prepare the ground for factions.

The extended Plenary Meeting considers that with this pronouncement, which is utterly impermissible for a member of the Bolshevik Party, Trotsky flouts the decisions of the Thirteenth Congress of the RCP(B) and the Fifth World Congress of the Comintern on the Bolshevisation of the Communist parties and contraposes himself to the Communist International and our Party.

Proceeding from the above-said, the extended Plenary Meeting of the District Committee *resolves*:

To send a strong protest to the Central Committee against the anti-Bolshevik actions of Trotsky and his attempts to revise the principles of Leninism.

To request the Gubernia Committee to call Trotsky to order as a member of the CC and a Party member through the CC and the CCC. We consider that the sternest Party penalties must be applied for such pronouncements.

To call upon young Party members to make a particularly close study of the principles of Leninism and steel their Bolshevik spirit in struggle with Trotsky's revisionist attempts.

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 533

MESSAGE OF GREETINGS FROM THE TENTH ORENBURG GUBERNIA CONFERENCE OF THE RCP(B) TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS)

December 7, 1924

The Tenth Orenburg Gubernia Conference of the RCP(B) considers as impermissible any attempt on Trotsky's part to spark a discussion calling in question the principles of Bolshevism, any attempt at revising Leninism and any deviation from it. The Conference emphatically condemns such deviations.

At the same time, the Conference considers that it is vital for members and candidate members of the Party to begin immediately an intensive study of the real history of the RCP(B) and the October Revolution in the light of Lenin's behests as a means of Party education.

The Conference insists that the Party CC take stringent measures against any deviation from Bolshevism.

Presidium of the Tenth Orenburg Gubernia Party Conference

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., pp. 534-35

RESOLUTION OF THE FIFTH PARTY CONFERENCE OF THE KRASNAYA PRESNYA DISTRICT, MOSCOW, ON THE REPORT OF THE WORK OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RCP(B)

December 13, 1924

Having heard the report on the work of the Central Committee, the Fifth Party Conference of the Krasnaya Presnya District wholly and completely approves the political line and practical work of the Party Central Committee.

The Conference notes with satisfaction the major successes of the Central Committee's foreign policy line, which culminated in the recognition of the USSR by all the leading capitalist powers of Europe, and also the conspicuous achievements in the Soviet Union in the development and strengthening of the national economy, in balancing the budget and effecting the union between town and countryside.

The Conference considers as absolutely correct the course towards the Bolshevisation of the fraternal parties of the West as charted by the Fifth Congress of the Comintern and successfully pursued by the RCP delegation in the Comintern Executive.

The Conference regards these undeniable successes as indisputable proof of the correctness of the political line and practical leadership of the CC and the untenability of the line which the petty-bourgeois opposition contraposed to the Leninist stand of the CC during the first discussion.

The Conference assesses Trotsky's latest so-called literary pronouncement as a new attack on the leading nucleus of the CC and as another attempt to revise the principles of Leninism by replacing them with Trotskyism, which is a variety of Menshevism.

While denouncing Trotsky's pronouncement, the Conference considers that an end must be put once and for all to his indiscipline and opposition to the entire CC, which is the collective leader of our Party.

The Conference regards the decisions of the Thirteenth Party Congress and of the Fifth Congress of the Comintern as absolutely immutable and expects them to be considered

as binding not only for rank-and-file members of the Party but also for Trotsky.

On behalf of the 22,000 members of the Krasnaya Presnya organisation the Conference assures the Leninist CC of its complete support for all its measures to achieve a further strengthening of the Soviet Union's internal situation and position abroad, for all its measures directed towards strengthening the Party on the basis of uncompromising Leninism, and safeguarding the ideological heritage of Comrade Lenin against petty-bourgeois revision.

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 535

RESOLUTION OF THE FOURTH PARTY CONFERENCE OF THE ROGOZHSKY-SIMONOVSKY DISTRICT, MOSCOW, ON M. V. FRUNZE'S REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RCP(B)

December 15, 1924

Having heard Comrade Frunze's report on the work of the Central Committee, the Fourth Rogozhsky-Simonovsky District Conference fully approves the political and organisational line of the Central Committee of the RCP(B) in home and foreign policy.

The Conference notes that the uninterrupted growth and strengthening of the national economy are the best proof of the total bankruptcy of last year's opposition and of the correctness of the Central Committee's leadership.

The Conference takes particular note of the Central Committee's measures to raise the economic and cultural level of the countryside, improve the local government apparatus and strengthen the alliance of the working class with the peasants.

The Conference most emphatically condemns the actions of Trotsky, who is again trying to direct the Party along the false road of departure from the fundamental precepts of the teaching of Lenin.

The Conference expresses the confidence that the Central Committee will be able to safeguard the Party against possible further actions of this kind by Trotsky.

The Rogozhsky-Simonovsky organisation of the RCP(B), which has time and again proved its Bolshevik staunchness, declares that it will always be in the front ranks of the struggle for Leninism.

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 536

From THE RESOLUTION OF THE FOURTH PARTY CONFERENCE OF THE BAUMANSKY DISTRICT, MOSCOW, ON THE REPORT OF THE WORK OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RCP(B)

December 19, 1924

The Conference acclaims the uncompromising Bolshevik ideological rebuff which the leading Leninist nucleus of the CC has given to Trotsky's attempt to plunge the Party into another discussion, revise the principles of Leninism and distort the history of the Party and the Revolution.

The Conference considers Trotsky's latest literary work an act against the Party and indignantly rejects as worthless to the Party the old, Menshevik theory of Trotskyism, which this work attempts to palm off on the Party.

The Party will not allow itself to be headed off the correct, genuinely revolutionary road charted by Lenin, a road that has been tested by the entire history of the working-class struggle in Russia.

The Conference declares that exhaustive measures must be taken to exclude any further attempts by Trotsky to demolish the policy and leadership of our Party.

Long live Leninism! Long live the Bolshevik Central Committee!

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., pp. 536-37

From THE RESOLUTION OF THE THIRD PARTY CONFERENCE OF THE ZAMOSKVORECHYE DISTRICT, MOSCOW, ON M. I. KALININ'S REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RCP(B)

December 20, 1924

The Third Zamoskvorechye District Party Conference unanimously denounces Trotsky's attempt to revise Leninism, distort the history of the October Revolution and replace Leninism with Trotskyism, which is a variety of Menshevism. The Conference suggests that at its next meeting the Central Committee should examine Trotsky's pronouncement and give a resolute rebuff to his attempts to substitute Trotskyism for Leninism, under whose banner our Party came into being, grew and moved from victory to victory.

The Conference notes that our delegation in the Comintern acted correctly in aiming to turn all the sections of the Comintern into genuinely Bolshevik parties.

Today our Party is united on the basis of Leninism and is stronger than ever before. Closer ties must be established with the workers and the peasant masses, and the Party must redouble its efforts in the struggle for the development of our Soviet Union and for the world revolution.

Long live our Leninist Central Committee!

Long live the Leninist Comintern!

Long live uncompromising Leninism!

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 537

From THE RESOLUTION OF THE EIGHTEENTH NOVGOROD GUBERNIA CONFERENCE OF THE RCP(B)

December 1924

1. THE STRENGTHENING OF LENINISM

The discussion of Trotsky's article "Lessons of the October Revolution" has shown that in the main the Party organisation has understood the anti-Leninist substance of this

article and has steered a fully consistent line towards preventing any Menshevik-petty-bourgeois vacillation among the youngest and inadequately steeled section of the Party organisation. Nonetheless, the Conference considers that one of the immediate tasks for the winter period must be the study of the Party's history and the fundamental points of divergence between Bolshevism and Trotskyism.

The propaganda departments of the uyezd and gubernia committees must make sure that propagandists are thoroughly conversant with the divergences between Bolshevism and Trotskyism in order to give young members of the Party organisation a correct understanding of the essence of Bolshevism, and of the history of the Party and the Revolution.

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 540

RESOLUTION OF A MEETING OF THE PARTY CELL AT THE TRYOKHGORNAYA TEXTILE MILL, KRASNAYA PRESNYA DISTRICT, MOSCOW, ON THE REPORT OF THE KRASNAYA PRESNYA DISTRICT COMMITTEE OF THE RCP(B)

1924

Having heard the report by Comrade Vasilyev on the work of the Krasnaya Presnya District Committee, the General Meeting of RCP(B) members of the cell at the Tryokhgornaya Textile Mill finds the work of the District Committee satisfactory. During the period of its work among the worker masses in the Krasnaya Presnya the District Committee has consistently pursued the Leninist line, educating the workers in the spirit of Bolshevism. The result of this work is that the District Committee has strengthened the RCP's ties with and influence over the non-Party masses in the Krasnaya Presnya District. The Meeting considers that the District Committee must further intensify its work of promoting the Party's ties with and influence over the non-Party masses, strictly purging the Party ranks of alien elements and safeguarding the purity of its weapon—Leninism—against all non-Bolshevik deviations. In implementing the decisions of the Thirteenth Party Congress, the

District Committee will rally the working class round its leader, the RCP, under the banner of Leninism, which has been tested in the battles for the cause of the working class. The meeting considers that Trotsky's attempt to revise Leninism shows that he is contraposing himself to the Party and ignoring the role played by the Party in the October Revolution. We categorically protest against this attitude of Trotsky's and declare that we shall not tolerate any encroachment on the teaching of Lenin, which has embodied the interests of the working class and with which the working class triumphed in the October Revolution.

(Carried unanimously.)

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., p. 541

From THE RESOLUTION OF THE NINTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS) OF THE UKRAINE ON THE REPORTS OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RCP AND THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CP(B)U

Kharkov, December 6 - 12, 1925

15. The period since the Eighth All-Ukraine Party Conference has witnessed the strengthening of the Party's ties with the broad masses and a huge growth of the Party itself. The pessimistic statements of the opposition on the eve of the Thirteenth Congress, alleging that the Party has divorced itself from the proletarian masses, have been strikingly refuted by the doubling of the Party membership, chiefly through an influx of factory workers, and lately through the growth and strengthening of the rural organisation. While further promoting the attraction of factory workers into the Party and regulating the Party's social composition towards increasing the number of factory workers, the Congress considers it wrong to bring the majority of the proletariat into the Party immediately. Attention must be given to the qualitative aspect of the work, to improving the services for and education of new members and candidate members of the Party, and intensifying Party educational work, bearing in mind that every effort must

be made to raise the ideological and political level of the Party membership.

16. The new methods of leadership presently implemented with regard to the Soviets and the trade unions are all the more necessary in the Party organisation itself. The Congress approves the appeal of the July plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the CP(B)U and the October plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the RCP(B) for speeding up the implementation of the principles of inner-Party democracy in all the Party's work as the basic condition for successful Party leadership of the worker and peasant masses under conditions witnessing a growth of their activity. The Congress notes the Party's considerable achievements in this sphere and, furthermore, notes the extensive activity displayed by the entire Party organisation of the Ukraine at all stages of the election of Party organs during the preparations for the Congress in discussing its agenda at cells, Party meetings and district and area conferences. At the same time, the Congress does not close its eyes to the shortcomings and certain passivity in some organisations, and the certain inertness in implementing inner-Party democracy. Inner-Party democracy must continue to be implemented most vigorously. By firmly maintaining inner-Party democracy, which will grow together with the growth of our economic and political might, the Party bears in mind that in its history there have been cases of attempts to secure a radical change of the Party line, revise Leninism and remove the Leninist leadership under the guise of inner-Party democracy. Lately, during the preparations for the Congress, there have been individual cases in which the slogan of inner-Party democracy has been used with the object of discrediting the Party, its apparatus and its line. By no means identifying any business-like Party criticism with the opposition deviation, considering, on the contrary, a critical discussion of its work and the work of individual Party organs with the broad Party masses as extremely useful, the Party must, however, continue giving a firm rebuff to all attempts, under the guise of inner-Party democracy, to change its Leninist line, discredit its Leninist leading cadres and undermine its unity and discipline.

17. In a situation witnessing the Party's rapid growth and the implementation of inner-Party democracy, it is

of paramount importance to preserve, promote and select veteran, experienced and steeled Party leaders. At the same time, while selecting and preserving veteran cadres, it is necessary to step up the promotion and training of new cadres, particularly women, and strengthen the ties between leading Party cadres and the broad mass of new Party members. This is the only condition under which the successiveness of the firm Leninist line can be ensured in the Party.

18. The Congress considers that unshakable Bolshevik unity and discipline in our Party are the fundamental condition for preserving and strengthening the proletarian dictatorship and the Soviet power in our country. This unity and discipline must be absolutely ensured in the entire Party from top to bottom, beginning with the Central Committee, which must be the model and example for the whole Party. Unconditional fulfilment of the decisions adopted by the Party and the subordination of lower to higher Party organs are mandatory for all Party members and organisations no matter what services they may have rendered. Without this there can be no Bolshevism and no Leninism. The Congress calls on the Central Committee of the CP(B)U and the Central Committee of the RCP to continue taking the most determined steps against all attempts to undermine the Leninist Bolshevik discipline in our Party.

19. The difficult conditions for building socialism in a single country encircled by capitalist states have given and are giving rise to ideological departures from the Leninist line accompanied by attacks on the Central Committee of the Party, which pursues the Leninist line. The Party has always found sufficient inner strength to fight and overcome these deviations (Workers' Opposition, the 1923 opposition, Trotskyism) and repulse the attacks on the Leninist Central Committee. The Party will continue to rid itself of the remnants of old groups and ideological deviations and prevent the emergence of new ones.

The protraction of the world revolution is making individual Party members lose sight of that revolution. On the other hand, this gives rise to pessimism and lack of faith in socialist construction in one country and to underestimation of the achievements of this construction in the USSR.

With this are linked the allegations that our state industry is not socialist but amounts to state capitalism, panic fear of elements of capitalism that we are permitting under strict state control, the accusations that the Party is degenerating, and so on, the exaggeration of the role and importance of the kulaks in the present-day Soviet countryside, the trend to ignore the role of the co-operative, and the efforts to achieve a so-called neutralisation of the middle peasants instead of actively drawing them to the side of the Soviet power. On the other hand, there is a trend to belittle the danger from the kulaks and the profiteers. Survivals of national chauvinism—Great Russian, Ukrainian and so on—have still to be reckoned with in the Party ranks in the Ukraine.

The Congress considers that the Party has to intensify its work of putting down and overcoming all the above-mentioned deviations. The Congress believes that at present the press is acquiring immense significance in giving Party guidance to the masses. The Congress notes with satisfaction that *Pravda*, central organ of the RCP and *Kommunist*, central organ of the CP(B)U, have been pursuing a correct line. The Congress greets the editorial board of *Pravda* as being a consistently militant organ of the Bolshevik Party.

The Congress expresses the firm confidence that on the basis of inner-Party democracy, by drawing the entire Party membership more and more into the discussion and settlement of questions of Party policy and practice, and by rallying round its leading organs, which are pursuing a consistently Leninist policy, above all, round its Central Committee, the tested headquarters of Leninism, the Party will successfully resolve the tasks confronting it.

The Party in the Struggle for the Restoration etc., pp. 557-58

RESOLUTION OF A MEETING OF THE PARTY ORGANISATION AT THE KRASNY PUTILOVETS WORKS, LENINGRAD, APPROVING THE DECISION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE AND THE CENTRAL CONTROL COMMISSION OF THE CPSU(B) ON THE EXPULSION OF TROTSKY AND ZINOVIEV FROM THE PARTY

November 16, 1927

Having heard the report on the decision of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the CPSU(B) on the leaders of the Trotskyite opposition, who have isolated themselves from the Party and the working class, the Meeting of the Krasny Putilovets Works Party organisation approves the expulsion of the political bankrupts Trotsky and Zinoviev from the Bolshevik Party and also the expulsion of the group of 11 presumptuous factionalists and disorganisers of the Party from the CC and CCC, the headquarters of the Bolshevik Party.

The Meeting of the Party organisation of the Krasny Putilovets Works expresses its utmost confidence that the Fifteenth Party Congress will put an end to the corrupting activities of the splitters from the Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition.

The Meeting calls on all Party members to keep a close watch on the activities of the remnants of the Trotskyite junk and put a stop to their anti-Soviet sallies once and for all.

Greetings to the First Leningrad Regional Party Conference!

The Struggle of the CPSU for the Country's Socialist Industrialisation and to Prepare for Nation-Wide Collectivisation (1926-1929),
Russ. ed., Moscow, 1960, pp. 492-93

RESOLUTION OF A PARTY AND KOMSOMOL MEETING AT THE FIRST OILFIELD, SURAKHAN DISTRICT, BAKU, ON THE RESULTS OF THE OCTOBER JOINT PLENARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE AND CENTRAL CONTROL COMMISSION OF THE CPSU(B) AND THE DEMAND TO EXPEL THE OPPOSITIONISTS FROM THE PARTY

November 16, 1927

Having heard the report on the results of the October Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU(B) and on the five-year plan of economic development, the Plenary Meeting of the Party cell jointly with members of the Komsomol considers as correct the plan drawn up by the Central Committee of the CPSU(B) for all branches of our national economy, and therefore pledges to make every effort to carry out all the measures mapped out by our CC and to give every possible assistance to socialist construction in the USSR.

We solemnly declare that we shall abide by Lenin's behests and move as one family along the charted road to socialism.

We find that the opposition's sallies at the celebrations of the October Revolution in Moscow and Leningrad are impermissible, demand the expulsion of all disorganisers from our Party and approve the expulsion of Trotsky and Zinoviev.

Long live the Leninist Central Committee of the CPSU(B)!

Long live the united, steel-strong Leninist Party!

The Struggle of the CPSU etc., p. 493

MESSAGE OF GREETINGS OF THE WORKERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE HAMMER AND SICKLE WORKS, MOSCOW, TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU(B) ON THE OCCASION OF THE 10th ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT OCTOBER SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

November 25, 1927

The meeting of workers and employees of the Hammer and Sickle Works held to mark the 10th anniversary of the October Revolution sends ardent greetings to its leader and guide, the *Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*.

Unflinching revolutionary will, steeled in the heroic battles with tsarism, defeated the most sinister enemies of the working class—Wrangel, Yudenich and others. The gigantic economic work that followed could only be carried out by the Communist Party and its Leninist Central Committee.

As we mark the first decade of the October achievements, we, the workers of the Hammer and Sickle Works, are firmly confident that the Central Committee of the CPSU(B) will continue to lead the working class along the correct Leninist road to further achievements.

To all slanderers, splitters and oppositionists, who are obstructing our work, we declare that the working class, which has traversed the tortuous path of revolutionary struggle under the leadership of the Party of *Lenin*, will not be diverted from the Leninist road to the road of Menshevism.

Long live the Central Committee of the CPSU(B), the Leninist headquarters!

Long live the unity of the CPSU(B)!

Long live the Comintern, leader and guide of the world proletariat!

The Struggle of the CPSU etc., pp. 493, 496

From THE MESSAGE OF GREETINGS OF THE MAKEYEVKA FACTORY WORKERS TO THE FIFTEENTH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU(B)

December 2, 1927

The metalworkers of the Makeyevka Factory, Donbas, send ardent proletarian greetings to the Fifteenth Congress of the CPSU(B), leader of the Party and the working class.

During the past two years factory workers have closely followed the activities of the Party and its headquarters, the Central Committee.

In practice, at our own factory, we have seen for ourselves that the Party and its CC have pursued a correct *Leninist* policy aimed at furthering the building of socialism and improving the living standard of the working class.

The opposition enjoys no success either in the Party or among the working class because its lying words are completely refuted by our reality.

We are confident that the Congress will put an end to all the activities of the *Trotskyite* opposition. For our part we pledge our utmost support.

The workers are sending a model of the blast-furnace, the largest in the USSR, under construction at our factory, and request their Party to see to it that the building of the blast-furnace continues with the same success as before.

Down with the oppositionists, who are hindering us in the building of our blast-furnaces!...

The Struggle of the CPSU etc., pp. 496-97

RESULTS OF THE PRE-CONGRESS DISCUSSION IN THE CPSU(B)

Result on December 2, 1927

Number of participants—730,862. Votes for the CC line—724,066; against—4,120 or 0.5 per cent; abstentions—2,676 or 0.3 per cent

The theses of the CC have been discussed at 10,711 cell meetings. The meetings were attended by 730,862 Communists; votes for the CC line—724,066; against 4,120 (or 0.5 per cent of the total number of participants in the meetings); abstentions—2,676 (or 0.3 per cent).

The Struggle of the CPSU etc., p. 497

ADDENDA

DECISIONS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL IN SUPPORT OF THE CPSU AGAINST TROTSKYISM

RESOLUTION ON THE RUSSIAN QUESTION

(Adopted by the Fifth Comintern Congress, 1924)

As a result of the victorious October Revolution, the Russian Communist Party was put in power by the working class and embarked on the organisation of socialist society. The decisive factor in this epoch-making event was that the RCP was highly organised, that in its ranks were revolutionaries steeled in the struggle against the opportunism of the Second International, and that it applied revolutionary proletarian tactics which were devised under Comrade Lenin's leadership. Thanks to this, the RCP was the fundamental force in the establishment of the Comintern, and to this day it is one of the chief factors determining the success of the international communist movement. The RCP's successes, and equally, its failures, and particularly the formation of separate factions or groups in its ranks, cannot but strongly affect the revolutionary movement in the other countries of the world.

The RCP carries on its revolutionary work of building socialist society in a country (the USSR), which is encircled by capitalist states, at a time when the Communist parties of other countries are only entering the stage of struggle for power.

The New Economic Policy, which at the present time represents the foundation of the RCP's economic activity,

determines the inevitable growth of socialist elements but, at the same time, allows for the development of bourgeois relations and, consequently, for bourgeois influences on the state apparatus and on individual contingents of the Party.

In order to combat the capitalist environment successfully, render these bourgeois influences harmless and ensure the USSR's advancement on the road to communism, the RCP's revolutionary staunchness and internal unity, that have developed out of the theory and practice of Leninism, are essential.

In view of all these facts, the situation in the Russian Communist Party is of special importance to the Communist International.

Last autumn's discussion in the RCP, and the opposition that was formed against the majority in the Central Committee of the RCP have confronted the Congress with the necessity of closely studying this question, despite the fact that at its Thirteenth Congress the RCP had itself unanimously denounced the opposition as an offshoot of petty-bourgeois influences, and had emerged from the discussion stronger and more united than ever.

Although the Comintern, with the agreement of the RCP delegation, invited them to present and substantiate their case before the Congress, the representatives of the opposition in the RCP used a formal pretext to turn down this opportunity.

Moreover, the Congress has received no proof that the opposition has acknowledged its errors and rallied entirely to the standpoint of the Thirteenth Congress of the RCP. This state of affairs creates the danger of a resurgence of the discussion in the RCP. At the same time, the Congress observes that the opposition in the RCP has the support of groups in other Communist parties (the Polish, some elements in the German and French parties, etc.), groups which, as the opposition in the RCP, represent a Right-wing (opportunist) deviation in these parties and have been emphatically condemned by the Fifth Congress of the Comintern.

Having heard the special report on the situation in the USSR and in the RCP and studied all the materials relating to these questions in the various sections, the Congress resolves:

(a) to endorse the resolutions of the Thirteenth Conference

and the Thirteenth Congress of the RCP denouncing the opposition's platform as a petty-bourgeois deviation and its actions as a menace to the unity of the Party and, consequently, to the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR;

(b) to append the resolutions of the Thirteenth Conference and the Thirteenth Congress of the RCP to the present resolution and publish them as a decision of the Fifth Congress of the Communist International.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
6th Russ. ed., Part II, pp. 788-89

RESOLUTION ON THE DISCUSSION IN THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY*

(Adopted at the Fifth Extended Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive, 1925)

The Extended Plenary Meeting finds that Comrade Trotsky's action, which started a new discussion in the Russian Communist Party, was an attempt to revise Leninism and disorganise the leadership in the RCP(B).

The Extended Plenary Meeting finds that this action was supported by all the forces hostile to Bolshevism. In the Comintern it was supported by all the Right-wing elements in the Communist parties, namely by elements whose tactics have been repeatedly condemned at international congresses as being of a semi-Social-Democratic nature. Outside the Comintern, this action was supported by a number of persons who have been expelled from the communist ranks (Levi, Rosmer, Monatte, Balabanova, Höglund and others). Lastly, the Social-Democratic and bourgeois press made every effort to take advantage of this action.

Objectively, this action was, thus, not only an attempt to disorganise the ranks of the RCP(B), but inflicted immense injury to the Comintern as a whole.

The Extended Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive associates itself entirely with the resolution of the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the RCP(B) in both the part giving a principled assessment of Trotskyism and the part stating the measures that have been taken.

* Adopted at the 14th session, April 6, 1925.—*Ed.*

The Extended Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive is of the opinion that the RCP(B) must continue to give a similarly unanimous rebuff to all attacks on Leninist theory and practice. The Plenary Meeting welcomes the explanatory campaign conducted by the RCP(B) and considers that an explanatory campaign of an equally high level against anti-Leninist deviations should be conducted by the Communist parties of other countries.

The Plenary Meeting is of the opinion that the RCP(B) can fulfil its great historical mission provided there is solid unity in its leadership. Any attempt to shake this unity will inflict the greatest injury to the whole of the Communist International, and will, therefore, be most sternly and emphatically condemned by it.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
6th Russ. ed., Part II, p. 789

ON THE STATEMENTS OF TROTSKY AND VUYOVICH AT A PLENARY MEETING OF THE ECCI*

(Adopted at the Eighth Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive, 1927)

The Plenary Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Communist International declares before the Communist workers of the whole world that in the present extremely serious situation, in face of the enemy's attack, some former leading members of the Comintern have ventured to make gross and impermissible assaults on the Bolshevik Party, a party of world-wide importance. The actions of these leaders of the opposition complicate and impede the settlement of the revolutionary problems of the present moment: the mobilisation of all revolutionary forces and the rousing of the entire international working class against the imperialist war.

The Fifth World Congress of the Communist International condemned Trotskyism as a "petty-bourgeois devia-

* Moved by the delegations of the Communist parties of Germany, Great Britain, France, Italy, Czechoslovakia and the United States of America and adopted on May 30, 1927.—*Ed.*

tion". The Seventh Extended Plenary Meeting of the ECCI in December 1926 adopted a resolution on the Soviet Union in which it condemned the opposition bloc as embodying a "Social-Democratic deviation" whose aim is to "continue fostering defeatist sentiments and a capitulationist ideology in the Party". The Plenary Meeting pointed out that "these views are incompatible with the fundamentals of Leninism" and declared that the platform of the opposition runs counter "to the principles of true internationalism and to the fundamental line of the Communist International". The Seventh Enlarged Plenary Meeting declared that "the opposition bloc has become a rallying centre for all bankrupt trends inside and outside the CPSU(B) that have been condemned by the CPSU(B) and the Comintern". The Plenary Meeting branded particularly the disorganising activity of the opposition bloc.

In spite of their own solemn pledge given in the declaration of October 16, 1926, in spite of the clear-cut decisions of the Party membership and of the Fifteenth All-Union Conference of the CPSU(B), and in spite of the decisions of the Seventh Extended Plenary Meeting of the ECCI, instead of ceasing their factional activity directed against the policy of the Comintern, Trotsky and Zinoviev have stepped it up.

Inasmuch as Zinoviev has been barred from all activity in the Communist International by decision of the Seventh Extended Plenary Meeting and has thus been unable to attend the present session, Trotsky has come forward as the spokesman of the opposition bloc. Using unprecedentedly sharp words he repeated the attacks of the opposition bloc on the Leninist policy in all the fundamental questions of the revolution.

A deep and unbridgeable gulf lies between the policy represented by Trotsky and Vuyovich at the present Plenary Meeting of the ECCI and fully endorsed by Zinoviev and Radek, and the policy of the Communist International substantiated by Lenin. The main features of this opposition, anti-communist line are:

(1) Disruption and discrediting of the struggle of the Communist International against the menace of war. The Trotskyites do not direct their energy against the imperialist instigators of war. On the contrary, Trotsky declared

that "the greatest danger of all is the Party regime". Under this slogan Trotsky preaches what, in effect, is reactionary defeatism, contraposing it to the cause of the proletarian revolution. At the same time, in spite of repeated cautions, he has not swerved an inch from his old anti-Leninist standpoint in regard to fundamental questions of revolutionary tactics in the first imperialist world war. It was precisely the divergences then existing between Trotskyism and Lenin (repudiation of revolutionary defeatism, rejection of the slogan calling for turning the imperialist war into a civil war, and rejection of the slogan calling for fraternisation) that during the world war formed the dividing line between Bolshevism and all shades of Social-Democratic opportunism. Contrary to Lenin's directive that the maximum attention should be given to real practical work against the menace of war, Trotsky did not submit to the Plenary Meeting of the ECCI a single practical proposal concerning the struggle against the imperialist war. He confined himself to the demand, repeatedly rejected by the Communist International, to break up the Anglo-Russian Committee, which at this moment would only facilitate the designs, lying in the same plane, of the reformist betrayers of the British working class.

(2) An utterly wrong estimate of the character of the Chinese revolution running counter to Lenin's basic ideas about the tasks of the Communists during a bourgeois-democratic revolution in backward, semi-colonial countries. Defeatist exploitation of individual and partial setbacks of the Chinese revolution, particularly of the Chiang Kai-shek coup, in order to spread petty-bourgeois liquidationist panic moods. Gross misrepresentation of the policy of the CPSU(B) and the Communist International before and after the Shanghai uprising for the purpose of charging them with betraying the Chinese revolution. At the Plenary Session of the ECCI Trotsky, who on the threshold of the proletarian revolution in Germany in 1923 opposed the formation of Soviets, insisted on the immediate establishment of dual power in the form of Soviets and steering towards the immediate overthrow of the Left-wing Kuomintang Government. This outwardly ultra-Left but actually opportunist demand is nothing but a repetition of the old Trotskyite standpoint of skipping the petty-bourgeois-peasant stage of

the revolution, which Trotsky advocated as early as 1905 jointly with the Mensheviks against Comrade Lenin.

(3) A complete political and organisational alliance with the Maslow-Ruth Fischer group of renegades, who have been expelled from the Communist Party of Germany. Their immediate reinstatement in the Comintern was proposed by Comrade Trotsky, and their *Information Bulletin* is continually supplied with material by the opposition leaders. Thus, not only the expelled ultra-Left groups, but also all other class enemies regularly receive from the opposition leaders distorted information on the internal affairs of the Party heading the proletarian dictatorship. The alliance between the Trotskyites and renegades of the Maslow type acquires a purely disorganising significance in view of the fact that the Maslow group intends to publish an anti-Communist daily newspaper, preparing to form a party hostile to the Comintern and working to set up a counter-revolutionary "Fourth International".

(4) The insistence that in the struggle against the menace of war the orientation of the Comintern should be towards the anarcho-syndicalist elements. The revolutionary united front tactics, the Bolshevik line of winning over the proletarian masses, which is today more necessary than ever before in face of the direct threat of war, is thus substituted by a sectarian policy of rapprochement with international anarcho-syndicalism, which is using the foulest means to fight the Comintern and the Soviet Union side by side with the worst whiteguard elements.

(5) Deliberate defamation and discrediting of the Communist International, which Trotsky charges with pursuing a hangman's policy against the Chinese proletariat. He calls the leadership (of the Comintern) an institution of bourgeois-liberal "public criers of a national bloc", and opposes its policy on the grounds that it is a "disgraceful policy". Deliberate defamation and discrediting of the Soviet Union, whose policy Trotsky labels as "national-conservative narrowness". This lie is the direct complement to the bourgeois-Social-Democratic incitement campaign against the alleged "Red imperialism" of the Soviet Union.

All these attacks by Trotsky on Leninism are the continuation of the struggle against the inner-Party "regime" of the CPSU(B) and the Communist International under the

false banner of "freedom of opinion" borrowed from Menshevism, a struggle that has been condemned by the Fifth World Congress and the Seventh Extended Plenary Meeting. The sole aim of these attacks by Comrade Trotsky is to shatter the discipline of the Bolshevik organisation of the revolutionary proletariat, undermine its unity, impair its prestige in the eyes of the working class and weaken it in face of imperialist and social-traitor enemies.

Trotsky tried in vain to disguise his Menshevik attacks by "revolutionary", pseudo-radical Left phraseology, by hypocritical assurances of his willingness to submit to the decisions which have been made and by dishonest offers "to settle the conflict" in order to conceal his desertion from the Communist workers. The futility of such manoeuvres is particularly evident in Trotsky's latest pronouncement, in which he openly declared: "We will fight this course to the end." He sought in vain to disguise his divisive policy by suggesting with the help of ludicrous, spurious verbiage, that he was not upholding the Social-Democratic standpoint, but rather that the Comintern was pursuing an opportunist policy.

Trotsky and Vuyovich endeavoured to wreck the Plenary Meeting of the ECCI by continuously circulating anti-Party factional material, by systematically interrupting the meeting and having recourse to other disorganising actions.

The Plenary Meeting of the ECCI is sitting at a time when the international situation is extremely serious and critical. The distinctive feature of the present world situation is not only the growing acuteness of all class struggles but, above all, the immediate danger of a predatory attack of the British imperialists and their vassals on the Soviet Union, the intervention of the imperialists against the national liberation struggle in China which is already in full swing, the joint fierce offensive of all reactionary forces against the Comintern, the attempt of the bourgeoisie to suppress and crush the working-class movement and the Communist parties in the leading capitalist countries.

This is the moment that Trotsky and his followers have chosen to launch a most violent attack on the Comintern, which is the only leading organ of the world revolution, and against the Soviet Union, the only state-organised form

of the world revolution. At a moment like this the Trotskyites accuse a Communist Party of world importance of treachery and make the charge of degeneration against the state of the proletarian dictatorship. This attack of the Trotskyite opposition follows the same lines as the onslaught of the bourgeoisie and its agents designed to destroy the key strongholds of the proletarian world revolution.

The present situation makes it incumbent on the entire Communist International to repulse this attack of the opposition bloc, ensure firm, unshakable unity in its ranks and concentrate all its forces on the preparations for the struggle against the imperialist war, on a most active defence of the world's only proletarian state and on the utmost support for the great Chinese revolution.

The Plenary Meeting of the ECCI replies to Trotsky attacks, which are nothing but a desperate struggle by individual political deserters against the front of the Communists of the world, with an inexorable determination to put an end to these divisive intrigues. The basic line of the opposition leaders, like their actions, constitutes sabotage of the Communist struggle against the imperialist war. The attitude of Trotsky and of those who share his views is imbued with the spirit of solidarity with renegades, with the spirit of Menshevik wobbling between the camp of the proletarian revolution and the camp of the imperialist counter-revolution. This wobbling, which is characteristic of Trotskyism, is a crime in the present aggravation of the class struggle. The Comintern feels in duty bound to put an end once and for all to this ultra-Left Social-Democratic trend and to the continuous hostile attacks of this group of bankrupt leaders, who are going farther and farther away from the proletarian movement.

Therefore, the Plenary Meeting of the ECCI resolves:

(1) The ECCI declares that the principal policy as well as the actions of Trotsky and Vuyovich are incompatible with their position as member and alternate-member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

(2) The ECCI categorically forbids Trotsky and Vuyovich to continue the factional struggle in any way.

(3) The Plenary Session of the ECCI empowers the Presidium of the ECCI and the International Control Commission to effect the formal expulsion of Trotsky and

Vuyovich from the ECCI if this struggle is not discontinued.

(4) The ECCI instructs the Central Committee of the CPSU(B) to take resolute measures to safeguard the CPSU(B) against the factional struggle waged by Trotsky and Zinoviev.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
6th Russ. ed., Part II, pp. 791-93

ON THE TROTSKYITE OPPOSITION

(Adopted at the Ninth Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive, 1928)

The Plenary Meeting of the ECCI notes with satisfaction that the Fifteenth Congress of the CPSU(B) resolutely put an end to the Trotskyite opposition by expelling it from the Party. The Plenary Meeting is in full and complete solidarity with the decisions of the CPSU(B) and the measures taken by it through the Soviet organs to stop the anti-Soviet activities of the opposition.

The Plenary Meeting of the ECCI holds that the decisions of the Fifteenth Congress are of immense significance for the further consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship and for the building of socialism in the USSR.

Unquestionably, the Fifteenth Congress of the CPSU(B) correctly charted the further socialist industrialisation of the Soviet economy through an enhancement of the influence of planning by the proletarian state on the country's economic development, the further ousting of private capitalist elements, extensive collectivisation of the peasant husbandries and an improvement of the living standard of the working class and the broad toiling masses in general.

Whereas in all capitalist countries capitalism is on the offensive against the working class, finding expression, for example, in the lengthening of the working day, the working day in the USSR is being shortened to seven hours and mounting efforts are being made to raise the cultural level of the working people.

The Plenary Meeting welcomes the decisions of the CPSU(B) Congress directed towards improving and simplifying the machinery of proletarian dictatorship and

towards drawing larger sections of the masses of workers and peasants into the administration of the country. The influx of a hundred thousand factory workers to the Party at the moment when the struggle of the opposition against the CPSU(B) reached its highest point shows that the CPSU(B), its leadership and policy enjoy the absolute confidence and support of broad masses of the working class, who regard the Leninist unity and the Leninist policy of their Party the guarantee of a firm and victorious proletarian dictatorship.

The Plenary Meeting of the ECCI considers that the international economic and political situation was correctly analysed by the Fifteenth Congress of the CPSU(B), which noted the following characteristic tendencies in the current historical period:

1. The sharpening contradictions between the capitalist groups in the struggle for spheres of domination and the redivision of the world, the sharpening of the struggle between imperialism and the oppressed colonial peoples, the sharpening struggle of imperialism against the USSR, the growing prerequisites for new imperialist wars.

2. The growing power of the capitalist trusts, their increasing integration with the bourgeois state, the increasing fusion of the Social-Democratic and reformist leaders with the economic and political system of the imperialist organisations, the mounting capitalist pressure on the working class.

3. The radicalisation of the working masses as a result of the bourgeois offensive on the proletariat. This finds expression in the growth of the strike struggle, the increasing political activity of the working class, the waxing sympathy of the international proletariat for the USSR, the growth of the elements of a new revolutionary upsurge in Europe.

4. The general assault on the Communists by the employers' organisations, the bourgeois states and the Social-Democratic parties; the striving of the social-reformists to expel the Communists from the mass organisations of the working class; the intensification of the reformist campaign of slander and calumny against the Communists in general and against the world's first proletarian dictatorship in particular.

The coming phase of development will be marked by further collisions between the working class and the bourgeoisie and an unremitting struggle between the Social-Democrats and the Communists for influence among the working class. The international Social-Democratic movement, which has long since taken a turn towards coalition with the bourgeoisie and full support of its imperialist policy, towards class peace and support of capitalist rationalisation, is trying to stop the radicalisation of the working class and side-track it onto the path of its treacherous policy. This object is served, on the one hand, by the sharp struggle against the Communists—expelling them from the trade unions, helping the machinery of the bourgeois dictatorship to persecute them, and resorting to vile slander and falsehood. On the other hand, the international Social-Democratic movement is viciously slandering the USSR and the CPSU(B), realising that one of the most important forms of the radicalisation of the working class is its growing sympathy for the USSR.

This whole machinery of falsehood and slander has been set in motion by the Social-Democrats in order to undermine the growing sympathy of the international proletariat for the USSR and communism, in order to discredit the tangible achievements of socialist construction in the world's first country of proletarian dictatorship, in order to divert the workers from the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and persuade them to support the bourgeois policy of capitalist rationalisation implemented at the expense of the working class, and to adopt their treacherous policy of "industrial peace".

An especially false and pharisaical role in this struggle against the USSR and the CPSU(B) is played by the leaders of the so-called "Left" wing of social reformism—the Max Adlers, Bauers, Levis, Longuets, Lansburys and Maxtons, who, taking the sympathies of the radicalising workers for the USSR into account, come out against the proletarian dictatorship more cunningly and disguise their attacks on the USSR with hypocritical phrases of sympathy and "conditional" support for it. The purpose of these tactics is to stop the working masses from siding with communism and to preserve their support for Social-Democracy. From the standpoint of the struggle to win over the radicalising masses

of workers, these so-called "Left" leaders of opportunism are the most dangerous enemies of communism, the Comintern and the USSR. The menace of Trotskyism in the international working-class movement consists, in the present period, in the fact that the Trotskyites directly support the ideas and policies of the "Left" servitors of reformism, that they strengthen the hand of the "Left" leaders of opportunism in their attacks on communism and the USSR, that they increase the means of deception and slander used by the reformists against communism, that Trotskyism has become a species of Bauerism and similar agents of reformism. The Trotskyite opposition has gone over entirely to the position of the "Left" myrmidons of opportunism on all basic questions, acquiring an avowedly counter-revolutionary character. Hurling slander, under cover of verbiage about loyalty to the revolution and the USSR, on the Communist International, the CPSU(B) and the proletarian dictatorship, whose foreign and domestic policy they falsify and distort as much as the Social-Democrats, the Trotskyites, together with the international Social-Democratic movement, pin their hopes on the fall of the Soviet government.

From a factional struggle within the CPSU, the Trotskyite opposition went over to the organisation of a second party, to a *struggle in the streets* and to open anti-Soviet actions, which, had they not received a crushing rebuff from the broad masses of the proletariat, might have developed into a certain menace for the proletarian dictatorship, rallying the class elements inimical to the proletarian dictatorship round the banner of the Trotskyite opposition. A more openly counter-revolutionary character has been acquired by the group headed by Sapronov, which directly attacks Leninism and openly calls for a struggle against the Soviet government. In programme and tactics it differs in no respect from counter-revolutionary types such as Korsch, Katz, Eastman, Souvarine and others. The proletarian dictatorship cannot and must not allow any counter-revolutionary action, no matter what banner it is flying.

The Trotskyite opposition, which sought to blow the CPSU up from within, was ideologically and organisationally smashed thanks to the principled firmness and iron solidarity of the CPSU(B) and the working class of the USSR and

splintered into several groups, some of which (Kamenev and Zinoviev) are beginning, not without vacillation, to return to the Party positions, gradually abandoning Trotskyism—which proves once more the correctness of the political line of the CPSU(B) and the Communist International—and some are vacillating between the Party and the Trotskyites. The insignificant Trotskyite group which remained intact, having suffered defeat in the CPSU(B) and in the USSR, is now trying to shift the centre of its struggle to the other sections of the Comintern. The true opportunist face of the Trotskyite opposition is most clearly expressed in its programme for the consolidation of kindred groups in other countries. It appeals, first and foremost, to patently opportunist and counter-revolutionary elements, such as Souvarine and Paz in France. It entered into an alliance with the anti-proletarian petty-bourgeois Maslow group in Germany, the Treint and Suzanne Girault group in France, with the groups which are now speaking about a turn towards "fascism" and "tsarism" in the USSR. The German group is the strongest base of the Trotskyite opposition outside the USSR. It has established connections, on the one hand, with the counter-revolutionary Korsch group (joint actions during the Hamburg elections) and, on the other, it is making contact with the Left Social-Democrats. It is now beginning to organise openly into an independent party under the spurious name of "Lenin League". It is aiming at becoming an international centre uniting all opposition groups against the Communist International and the USSR.

The Trotskyite opposition is trying to win over to its side the renegades Rosmer and Monatte. Such anti-proletarian opportunist elements are now rallying to the Trotskyite opposition as the Hula group in Czechoslovakia, Roland-Holst in Holland and the "Left" Social-Democrats in Belgium, a group of Italian émigrés in France propounding the same counter-revolutionary platform as Korsch, and finally the Right-wing elements expelled from the American Communist Party (Lore and others, who are supported by the German Social-Democrats of America).

All the worst elements in the working-class movement, the openly opportunist elements in the communist movement and all renegade groups flung out of the ranks of the Comintern are now uniting under the Trotskyite banner

against the USSR, the CPSU(B) and the Comintern, playing the role of a most abominable tool of international Social-Democracy against the Communists in the latter's struggle for influence among the broad masses of the working class.

The Plenary Meeting of the ECCI considers that the Trotskyite opposition's evolution towards Social-Democracy, its avowedly anti-Soviet stand, which is thoroughly hostile to the proletarian dictatorship, and its divisive methods in the Communist parties have resulted in a situation in which adherence to the Trotskyite opposition and solidarity with its views is *incompatible with further membership of the Communist International.*

The Communist parties must wage an uncompromising struggle to uproot the Trotskyite groups, concentrating the struggle primarily against their leaders. At the same time, it is necessary to continue an ideological struggle to win those workers who are vacillating but have not yet broken with the opposition.

Furthermore, the Communist parties must step up their work of showing the working-class masses the true face of the Trotskyite opposition because the aggravation of the struggle of the Communists against international Social-Democracy inevitably means a sharpening of the struggle against the anti-Communist, Trotskyite groups both in the USSR and in other countries.

The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,
6th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 495-96

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY TRADE UNION ORGANISATIONS ON THE STRUGGLE AGAINST TROTSKYISM IN THE TRADE UNIONS

From THE REPLY OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE CC OF THE METALWORKERS' TRADE UNION TO A LETTER OF THE LEADERS OF THE "NEW OPPOSITION" OF JUNE 29, 1927*

OUR REPLY TO YEVDOKIMOV, ZINOVIEV AND TROTSKY**

July 13, 1927

In connection with the resolution passed by the Seventh Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the All-Union Metalworkers' Trade Union on June 27 of this year on Comrade Lepse's report on the current situation, in which the Plenary Meeting condemned, in particular, the disorganising activities of the opposition, you sent us your letter on July 1 of this year addressed solely to the CC of the All-Union Metalworkers' Trade Union, in which you declared that you could not pass the resolution of our Plenary Meeting over in silence "if only out of respect for the Metalworkers' Trade Union". We thank you for your respect, but here it is not a matter of the Metalworkers' Trade Union, which you respect, but of something else: you have simply used another pretext to write yet another anti-Party document for wide legal and illegal circulation. This is borne out by the fact that you have mailed this letter to the central committees of all the other trade unions, which you evidently respect just as much.

1. You reproach us for having "transferred questions of

---

* Copies were sent to the Central Committee of the CPSU(B), and the Presidium of the All-Union Central Committee of Trade Unions.

** The heading of the letter.—*Ed.*

the inner-Party struggle to a plenary meeting of the CC of the trade union, which is a non-Party institution", and in a paternally didactic tone you lecture us on Party discipline, declaring that there had been no precedents of this kind in our trade unions.

To say nothing of the circumstance that the CC plenary meeting, which adopted this resolution, was attended solely by members of the trade union CC, all of whom are Party members, we can, in point of fact, say with indignation only the following:

those who organised the opposition demonstration at the Yaroslavl Railway Station and harangued chance passers-by against the Party;

those who used the rostrum at the House of Trade Unions at the large non-Party meeting marking the *Pravda* anniversary on May 9 of this year for gross, slanderous attacks on the Central Committee of the Communist Party and its central organ;

those who support foreign renegades of communism—Ruth Fischer, Maslow, Urbahns, fill their counter-revolutionary newspaper with anti-Party documents of the opposition and turn it into a medium of their malicious agitation and propaganda abroad;

those who have deceived the Party, even after the declaration of October 16, 1926 renouncing the factional struggle, continue this struggle against the Party and its Central Committee by underground anti-Party methods, circulate their anti-Party literature at the factories among non-Party workers, have not the least moral right to accuse us of violating Party discipline and traditions and preceptorially lecture us on good Party conduct. It is not for those who grossly violate all the Leninist traditions and behests, who disgracefully harass the Party and shatter its ranks to speak of the unprecedented nature of our action.

We repeat, we are deeply shocked by the glaring hypocrisy of this reproach and statement by persons, who, while having rendered the Party and the revolution services in the past, have profoundly discredited themselves by their reprehensible and unparalleled disorganising activities in our Party.

With an air of injured innocence you write: "By your appeal to non-Party people against the opposition you

intimate that you want to force us to explain not only to Party members but also to non-Party people that our position has nothing in common with the slanderous assertions in your resolution", and with virtuous indignation you promise at the end of your letter "in the name of elementary revolutionary duty to our Party and the workers' state" to take all the measures in your power to refute our assertions "before the Party and the non-Party masses".

This statement is a piece of smug hypocrisy and duplicity from beginning to end.

As though you have to be "forced" to appeal to the non-Party masses! You have long ago started your "explanatory" anti-Party campaign not only before the non-Party workers but also before the philistines, before renegades of communism, who use your "explanations" from the rostrum of the German Reichstag to the sheer delight of the bourgeoisie.

If anyone has been forced to embark on an unprecedented action, it is we Communists working in the trade unions who have been forced by you to do so, because your disorganising conduct has long ago given rise to bewilderment and protesting inquiries not only from rank-and-file Party members but also from all class-conscious rank-and-file non-Party workers, members of our trade union, who, like us, have the interests of the Party at heart, work together with the Party, trust it and are alarmed by the attacks on it.

You have forced us, a trade union that, incidentally, has never been neutral on questions of Party politics, to state, as we should and must do, our opinion and the opinion of the organised metalworkers on the opposition in the Communist Party.

Metalworkers, builders of the Party, the Soviet power and the socialist economy, are not at all indifferent to the destiny of this Party. That is why we are in duty bound to reply to the legitimate alarm of the class-conscious members of our trade union.

2. You are not pleased with the appraisal given of the opposition by the Seventh Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the All-Union Metalworkers' Trade Union, which denounced it for continuing the pernicious propagation of its defeatist ideology. You have taken on the air

of amazement as though you have learned of this assessment of your ideology for the first time. You are making a theoretical incursion into the history of the Party, fabricating an analogy between our statement and the Bolshevik slogan adopted during the imperialist war. . . .

In the "Statement of 83", which you write about and which you circulate illegally, you have not found a single bright spot, a single correct measure in either the foreign or domestic policy of the Central Committee of our Communist Party.

This "Statement of 83" can only beget despondency and pessimism. It gives rise to lack of faith in one's own strength and gives the impression of total defeat and bankruptcy. It seems that in the history of our Party there has never been a more pessimistic and defeatist document than this statement signed by 83 people, who come from the ranks of our own Party. In it everything is painted in sombre, dark colours.

But do you really imagine that the entire cheerless ideology of this document can give class-conscious workers and peasants any hope for the possibility of a more radical improvement of their condition in the event the leadership of the Party is in the hands of the opposition? No, the very nature of the cheap demagogy thickly garnishing this document speaks against such a possibility, because every worker and toiling peasant can see through the falsity of your promises.

The working masses are perfectly well aware of and see all the difficulties in our development, in the same way as do their trade unions, to whom these difficulties are better known than to many of those who signed the statement. They are working side by side with the entire Party to surmount these difficulties. And they know quite well that the Party is doing everything to ensure the victorious development of the proletarian revolution and improve the condition of the workers and the peasant masses. All the more so that the masses of workers and their trade unions well remember other times, they well remember and know the "democracy" and "love of workers" of Trotsky, the author of the notorious slogan of shaking up the trade unions, to put the least faith in these promises. It seems to us that the peasants, too, with all their respect for

Trotsky, will have not a grain of trust in Trotsky, who contraposes himself to our Party, as a solicitor for peasant affairs.

3. Why have you taken offence and put on the air of make-believe bewilderment when we called things by their names, when we called your ideology defeatist? Is it really news to you?

Or have you forgotten how your "ideological trend in the CPSU(B)" was defined by the Fifteenth All-Union Conference of the CPSU(B) in October 1926, which declared that the "opposition bloc expresses ... pessimistic and defeatist sentiments among a section of our Party" and that to surmount the difficulties facing the Party and the country "pessimism and defeatist ideology" in the Party "have to be overcome", not cultivated (Resolution of the Fifteenth Conference "On the Opposition Bloc"). This assessment was fully endorsed by the Seventh Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive. Why were you not horrified then and why did you not draw similar analogies? That, you will recall, is the very decision of the Party and the Comintern that was unanimously approved by the Plenary Meeting of the CC of the Metalworkers' Trade Union.

4. You needed the analogy with the historic Bolshevik slogan in order to use an imaginary, "monstrous" accusation, which you yourselves have invented, that you are "mortal enemies of the Soviet state" as a means of intimidating the imagination of the non-Party masses, to whom you are appealing, of diverting their attention from the real meaning and significance of our assertions and of again "explaining" your defeatist ideas and moods to them. This is borne out by the very nature of the document.

Why, for instance, did you have to list in your letter all the responsible representatives of the opposition and give all their past and present titles and posts? Was not your purpose to confuse and frighten people by showing them that "strong forces" are on the side of the opposition?

Your listing of the opposition diplomatists, your listing of the names of a number of veteran Party members who signed the "Statement of 83" had no other aim than to sow among Party members and the non-Party masses defeatism, distrust, uncertainty, fear, and doubt in the possibility of coping with the difficulties.

The doubt you want to sow is: "Will we cope without—such-and-such—prominent members of the Party, and will we be able to direct the foreign and domestic policy of the Soviet state without the opposition?". From this angle the document is outrageous and strikingly emphasises that we were correct in our statements about the continuation of your pernicious propagation of defeatist ideology.

Is it necessary to say that the entire body of veteran Party members (with rare exceptions), that the entire basic cadre of old Bolsheviks, including Bolshevik workers, are the solid foundation of our Party and, together with its CC, emphatically denounce the opposition?

Moreover, it is also known that the broad masses of workers are in solidarity with the veteran cadres of the Party in this attitude towards the opposition. Therefore, with all our respect for some of the comrades mentioned by you, we can only reply with a caution from the many thousands of metalworkers and the rest of the working class, which every day moves forward new contingents of active builders of the Soviet state, the Party, the trade unions and the economy: "Do not go to extremes, do not play with fire and do not intimidate the working class! Do not abuse your former services and your past as 'leaders'. Do not forget that the creative strength (which you are vainly trying to bury) of the working class is inexhaustible, that during the ten years of the proletarian dictatorship it has produced a huge replacement of rank-and-file and responsible builders of the Party, the Soviet state and the socialist economy."

5. Most curious and ludicrous of all is that you, who are now carrying on disastrous factional activities, are concealing yourselves from us behind a mask of loyalty. You are "protecting" the Party CC from us! You accuse us of factional activities!

As though it were not you who slandered and lied against the Party CC at all the crossroads with unprecedented insolence, but the members of the Central Committee of the Metalworkers' Trade Union, all of whom are devoted to the proletariat and its Party, who have done this at our plenary meeting!

As though it is not you, but the Metalworkers' CC, who are recklessly circulating lies and demagogic statements (in

the hope they leave their mark) to further the factional struggle.

As though it is not you who are compromising the Party and yourselves in the eyes of the worker masses, poisoning their minds with the venom of your ideology, but we, members of the Metalworkers' CC, who have done so in our resolution!

Who are you trying to trap with this cheap gimmick?

After reading this letter every rank-and-file Communist and every honest class-conscious worker will ask: If you found errors in the pronouncements of Communists at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Metalworkers' Union why did you, instead of taking the matter directly to the Central Committee of our Party and insisting on making them answer to the Party, write an open letter to the Metalworkers' CC and the central committees of other trade unions, sending it by the ordinary and not secret mail and thereby making it known to the entire apparatus of these institutions? Who will now believe in your loyalty to the Party?

You are trying to get new supporters among the metalworkers. But we repeat what has been unanimously said by the Seventh Plenary Meeting of the Metalworkers' CC: "Among the advanced trade union contingent of metalworkers not only will you fail to find any support but you will receive a vigorous proletarian rebuff."

In reply to your threat to take all the steps in your power to refute our statements before the Party and non-Party masses, we declare that we shall use all the prestige enjoyed by the Central Committee of the Metalworkers' Trade Union among the workers united by it to expose your defeatist ideology if it begins to penetrate our membership, and we shall organise the entire force of proletarian resistance to avert the consequences of your disorganising policy, which is threatening the Party, the working class and the Soviet state.

Presidium, Central Committee of the All-Union Metalworkers' Trade Union

Sovetskiye arkhivy, 1967, No. 3, pp. 28-31

DECISION OF THE CC OF THE TEXTILE WORKERS' TRADE UNION IN SUPPORT AND APPROVAL OF THE LETTER OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE METALWORKERS' CC TO THE LEADERS OF THE "NEW OPPOSITION"*

July 23, 1927

Having heard the letter signed by Yevdokimov, Zinoviev and Trotsky, received by ordinary mail and addressed to the CC, on the question of the resolution passed by the Plenary Meeting of the Metalworkers' CC on the international and internal situation, and having heard the reply of the metalworkers to this letter:

(1) The Presidium of the Central Committee of the All-Union Textile Workers' Trade Union declares that it considers as a most heinous crime against the revolution and the working class the squabble started by the opposition against the Party and its attempts to draw the country into a new discussion and, thereby, divert the attention of the Party, the trade unions and the organs of Soviet power from the practical tasks linked with the immense difficulties that now face our country.

(2) The Presidium of the Central Committee declares that it fully supports the political line of the Leninist Central Committee of the CPSU(B) and that in its work it has been and shall be guided by the decisions of the Fourteenth Party Congress, the Fifteenth Party Conference and the plenary meetings of the CC.

(3) The Presidium of the Central Committee declares that hundreds of thousands of textile workers have learned to believe in and follow the leadership of the Leninist Party as a whole, and not only to believe but to understand this leadership, and that no individual high-ranking personalities, no matter how important their role has been in the past and no matter what post they held or hold, will set them against the Leninist Party and its CC.

(4) The Presidium of the Central Committee considers that revolutionary and Party discipline must be similarly binding on rank-and-file worker members of the Party and

* From the minutes of the sitting of the Textile Workers' CC on July 23, 1927, No. 54.

on those who strive to lead it; the decision of the Party majority must be a law for the minority in the Leninist Party. Persons who list their past services to the revolution and the Party and, for all that, organise a faction that circulates illegal documents among Party members and non-Party people, sponsor "petition campaigns" and "signature collections" round platforms directed against the Party CC, are the most flagrant and criminal violators of revolutionary Party discipline because their actions are, in effect, directed against the Party and aim at wrecking the colossal work that the country has accomplished under its leadership. These persons and their faction must receive the most resolute rebuff from the Party and from the organisations that have rallied round it.

(5) The Presidium of the Central Committee of the Textile Workers' Trade Union wholly and fully associates itself with the reply of the Presidium of the Metalworkers' CC of July 13, 1927 to the leaders of the opposition and wholly subscribes to the opinion of the metalworkers that the opposition's accusation that they have created a precedent by shifting the inner-Party struggle to non-Party organisations is sheer hypocrisy.

(6) Those who signed the letter to the metalworkers are the initiators, organisers and ideological inspirers of the struggle being waged against the Party. They have shifted and still are shifting their criminal activities to the non-Party environment. They organised a public demonstration against the Party (at the Yaroslavl Railway Station). One of the signatories was the first to attack the Party at a non-Party meeting. Had Yevdokimov, Trotsky and Zinoviev sincerely considered the action of the metalworkers as disloyal, they would not have circulated their reply to the central committees of all the trade unions, which are non-Party organisations, but would have taken the matter to the CC and the Central Committee of the CPSU(B). The opposition is doubtlessly aware of these normal Party channels for protesting against various actions of Communist workers either in Party or non-Party organisations.

(7) We regard the opposition's action of sending our Central Committee a copy of its letter to the metalworkers as a call to denounce the metalworkers and the line of the Party's Leninist CC and, thereby, introduce elements of

strife and struggle into the trade union movement, as an attempt to steer us to the road of struggle against the Party and its CC. To this we reply: Hands off the Party! Hands off the trade unions!

(8) In face of all the difficulties which the opposition is trying to create, the members of the Textile Workers' Trade Union and its Central Committee and Presidium will unite more closely than ever before in support of the Leninist CC and will be able to give a worthy rebuff to anybody who seeks to split the Party, the trade unions and the working class. Like the metalworkers, the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Textile Workers' Trade Union will use the entire force of its prestige and authority in order, as the metalworkers have put it in their letter, "to expose the defeatist ideology" if it penetrates our trade union. We shall mobilise the entire force of proletarian resistance to avert the consequences of the opposition's disorganising policy, which is threatening the Party, the working class and the Soviet state.

(9) The Presidium of the Central Committee of the All-Union Textile Workers' Trade Union notes the hypocritical nature of the charges made against the Metalworkers' CC by those who undermine the strength of our CPSU(B) and support the renegades Ruth Fischer, Maslow and Urbahns, who are grinding out propaganda against the USSR and the CPSU(B).

(10) The textile workers are sickened by the systematic, annually repeated attempts of the intellectual opposition to turn the country into a debating club. They insist that the CPSU(B) and the trade unions take practical steps to carry out the assignments charted in the decisions of the Fourteenth Party Congress and the Seventh Congress of Trade Unions, because they believe that the implementation of these decisions will make it possible to foster the country's welfare, improve the living and cultural level of the workers and strengthen the power of the workers and peasants.

Melnichansky, Chairman, Central Committee AUTWTU
Smirnov, Member, Presidium of the CC
Certified true: *A. Afanasyev,* Acting Secretary, Presidium of the CC

Sovetskiye arkhivy, 1967, No. 3, pp. 31-32

LETTER OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE CC OF THE AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY WORKERS' TRADE UNION TO THE METALWORKERS' CC IN SUPPORT AND APPROVAL OF THE LETTER OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE METALWORKERS' CC TO THE LEADERS OF THE "NEW OPPOSITION"*

July 29, 1927

Dear Comrades, having acquainted itself with the resolution on the current situation passed by the Seventh Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the AUMTU, with the collective letter of Yevdokimov, Zinoviev and Trotsky to the Metalworkers' CC and with the reply of the metalworkers, the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Agricultural and Forestry Workers' Trade Union feels that inasmuch as the comrades of the opposition have circulated their letter to all the central committees, including the Agricultural and Forestry Workers' Central Committee, and have thereby appealed to the opinion of these organisations, it has to state the following:

(1) The Presidium of the CC fully approves and associates itself with the reply of the Metalworkers' CC.

(2) The factional struggle started by the opposition against the Central Committee of the CPSU(B), against the Party line, and, in particular, the attempt to provoke a discussion and draw into it not only the Party membership but also the non-Party masses are, in our view, impermissible, especially at a time when the Party and the working class of our country are faced with the militant tasks of socialist construction, when these tasks, difficult in themselves, are made more complicated by the threat of war.

(3) The Presidium of the CC is confident that despite the opposition's playing up to the interests of the poor peasants and farm labourers, the organised mass of agricultural and forestry proletarians will not let themselves be deceived, and that among them there will be no sympathy for the opposition's irresponsible statements.

---

* Copies were sent to the Central Committee of the CPSU(B), the Presidium of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and to the central committees of all trade unions.

In letters to the trade union CC foremost agricultural and forestry workers declare that they have in many ways learned to see through and understand the true essence of the opposition. The opposition's petty-bourgeois character, exposed by its general platform and the methods of its actions, is, in our view, most striking in its attitude to the rural proletariat.

It is characteristic that despite the florid demagogical statements about the rural poor and so on, the opposition cannot lay claim to having made any constructive suggestion or to having even simply raised questions aimed at improving the condition of agricultural and forestry workers, supporting their struggle against exploiting elements in the countryside or promoting the social activity of these masses.

The leaders of the opposition are experts at inserting the words "farm labourer" and "poor peasant" in their speeches and documents regardless of whether they are opportune or not, and at complaining that few farm labourers have been elected to the Soviets and the co-operatives (to make political capital out of this "concern"—everything will come in useful in the struggle against the Party), but they are unable (because of their isolation from life, particularly from life in the countryside) and have no desire (being preoccupied not with day-to-day creative work but with political intrigues) to consider practically, for example, the question of strengthening the state farms, which employ several hundred thousand workers, or real measures to improve the condition of the millions of seasonal, day and permanent agricultural and forestry workers.

And here again, what is the opposition doing at a time when the Party CC distinctly and in a Leninist way approaches the work of organising the farm labourers, safeguarding their class interests, strengthening the state farms, promoting the development of co-operatives in the countryside and giving its assistance to the poor peasants (poor peasant funds, co-operatives, cash credits and so on)? It makes deliberately impracticable promises concerning the poor peasants, shouts about the kulak menace with the hysteria of a political neurotic (the Party sees and knows the actual not exaggerated danger) and, still worse, instead of calling attention to the real threat hanging over the

Union of Socialist Republics at the present moment, raises demoralising questions and doubts, asking: What are the worker, farm labourer and peasant going to fight for?

For its part, casting away these doubts without panic, the Party is, by its correct policy and work, strengthening the alliance of the working class with the main mass of peasants, building up the forces, including the agricultural consumers' co-operatives and the farm labourers' trade unions, in opposition to the growth of kulak elements, boosting the influence of the poor peasants and farm labourers in the rural Soviets, directing the upsurge of agriculture and giving the utmost support to the state and collective farms. Under the leadership of the Party the working class is surmounting the kulak influence in the countryside not by empty words but by persevering work, by deeds, and thereby prepares the workers, including the farm-labourer masses, for war with the bourgeois world if such a war is forced on us.

Those who obstruct this work, sow doubt in the success of socialist construction and in the ability of the worker, farm-labourer and peasant masses to give a timely rebuff to hostile class forces in and outside the country, try to shatter the iron ranks of the Leninist Party, and contrapose the will of individuals and groups to the collective will of the Party, are, regardless of their past services, bringing grist to the mill of our enemies.

That is why the CC of the trade union unanimously aligns itself with the assessment of the opposition as defeatist given by the Plenary Meeting of the Metalworkers' CC.

We are for iron discipline in the Party because that is the prime condition for the further strengthening of the proletarian dictatorship, for consolidating the alliance of the working class with the main mass of peasants and for the successful building of socialism in our country.

We are against all who undermine the Party's unity and flout Party discipline, against all who by their policy aimed against the Central Committee of the CPSU(B) and, thereby, against the entire Party, are trying to split its ranks and divide the working class.

The farm labourers are the most backward section of the working class in the USSR, but the rural proletariat and semi-proletariat, which has gone through the school

of Civil War and several years of peaceful Soviet construction, know that there is no better champion of their interests than the Communist Party and its Central Committee.

The difficulties of building socialism in the countryside are especially great, the living standard of the farm labourers is extremely low, the condition of the rural poor is very hard indeed, but for all their backwardness and despite the hard conditions of their life and work, the farm labourers and poor peasants do not believe in the miracles held out by the opposition, they do not believe the irresponsible promises however alluring they may be.

The Central Committee of the CPSU(B), in its decisions on the work among agricultural and forestry workers and on strengthening the state farms, and the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection and the CCC, as a result of their study of hired labour in the countryside, have correctly mapped out the line and practical steps that can improve the organisation, protection and class education of the agricultural and forestry proletariat.

This is a hard but sure road.

The growing activity and organisation of the agricultural and forestry proletariat (on April 1, 1927 the trade union had more than a million members) may serve as confirmation that the Party is effectively working in this sphere.

Under the leadership of the Central Committee of their trade union the agricultural and forestry workers are advancing and, we are certain, will continue to advance along the road charted by the Communist Party.

Presidium, Central Committee of the
Agricultural and Forestry Workers'
Trade Union of the USSR

Sovetskiye arkhivy, 1967,
No. 3, pp. 33-34

DECISION OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE CC OF THE PAPER INDUSTRY WORKERS' TRADE UNION IN SUPPORT AND APPROVAL OF THE LETTER OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE METALWORKERS' CC TO THE LEADERS OF THE "NEW OPPOSITION"*

August 9, 1917

Having discussed the copy of a letter received from the Central Concessions Committee** and signed by Trotsky, Zinoviev and Yevdokimov, the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Paper Industry Workers' Trade Union denounces the actions of the above-mentioned comrades aimed at disorganising the trade unions, actions which have compelled us to raise this question at a meeting of the Presidium; finds that the letter of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Yevdokimov is an appeal to public organisations (trade unions) to protect their misconceived, clearly untenable views, which are a Trotskyite variation of Menshevism; fully subscribes to the reply of the Central Committee of the Metalworkers' Trade Union to the letter from Trotsky, Zinoviev and Yevdokimov and regards it as the reply of the Paper Industry Workers' Trade Union; and, in addition to what was said in the reply of the Central Committee of the Metalworkers' Trade Union, declares that this new sally of the opposition has neither had nor will have the least sympathy from the Paper Industry Workers' Trade Union.

The Paper Industry Workers' Trade Union has worked, is working and will go on working under the guidance of our leader and teacher—the Leninist CPSU(B) and its Central Committee.

Copy certified true***

Sovetskiye arkhivy, 1967, No. 3, p. 34

* From the minutes of the sitting of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Paper Industry Workers' Trade Union of July 29, 1927, No. 13.

** The Central Concessions Committee of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR conducted talks with applicants for concessions and drew up drafts for concessions agreements for approval by the Government. The Communist Party and the Soviet Government regarded concessions as an ancillary means of development with the result that very few concessions were granted.—*Ed.*

*** Signature illegible.

DECISION OF THE BUREAU OF THE CPSU(B) GROUP IN THE CC OF THE TANNERS' TRADE UNION IN SUPPORT AND APPROVAL OF THE LETTER OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE METALWORKERS' CC TO THE LEADERS OF THE "NEW OPPOSITION"*

August 9, 1927

DECISION: In connection with the letter of Comrades Yevdokimov, Zinoviev and Trotsky to the Metalworkers' CC, sent to the central committees of all trade unions, including the Tanners' CC, and the reply of the metalworkers to this letter the Party group bureau in the CC of the Tanners' Trade Union considers it necessary to state that today, more than ever before, the tanners regard as impermissible any divisive activities in the Party, qualifying such activities as a crime against the working class, their Party and the Soviet Union. Any factional struggle, particularly today, when the international situation has alarmingly deteriorated, is a blow at the working class, at its dictatorship, at the Soviet Union and, consequently, can only play into the hands of the enemies of the gains of the October Revolution.

The fact that every action of the opposition as a whole or of its individual representatives is eagerly grasped at and widely used by the deadly enemies of the proletarian revolution in the Soviet Union and abroad should bring the opposition to its senses and show it that it is vital to put an end to what is so irritating to the Party, hinders its extremely difficult work and most surely inflicts irreparable harm on socialist construction and the organisation of the Soviet Union's defence.

The opposition, which poses as the champion of Leninism, must cease all activity that may in one way or another injure the cause of Lenin, his Party and the Soviet Union, and submit unconditionally to the decisions of Party

---

* From the minutes of the sitting of the Bureau of the CPSU(B) group in the Central Committee of the Tanners' Trade Union of August 9, 1927.

congresses and the Comintern and to the day-to-day leadership of the Party CC and the Comintern Executive.

Secretary, Party Group Bureau
in the Central Committee
*of the Tanners' Trade Union**

Sovetskiye arkhivy, 1967,
No. 3, p. 35

From DECISION OF THE BUREAU OF THE CPSU(B) GROUP AT THE EXTRAORDINARY SIXTH PLENARY MEETING OF THE CC OF THE BUILDING WORKERS' TRADE UNION IN SUPPORT AND APPROVAL OF THE LETTER OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE METALWORKERS' CC TO THE LEADERS OF THE "NEW OPPOSITION"

August 9, 1927

Having heard the report on the resolution of the Plenary Meeting of the Metalworkers' Trade Union CC on the international and domestic situation and having acquainted itself with the letter of Trotsky, Yevdokimov and Zinoviev on this question, and, further, having acquainted itself with the metalworkers' reply to that letter and with the resolution adopted by the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Textile Workers' Trade Union, the Central Committee of the Building Workers' Trade Union strongly denounces the disorganising behaviour of Trotsky, Yevdokimov and Zinoviev and wholly and completely aligns itself with the metalworkers' answer to the leaders of the opposition.

Trotsky, Yevdokimov and Zinoviev took offence at the metalworkers calling the opposition's ideology defeatist and disastrous for the revolution.

But as early as October 1926 the Fifteenth All-Union Conference of the CPSU(B) declared that the "opposition bloc expresses ... pessimistic and defeatist sentiments".

---

* Signature illegible.

This assessment was reiterated by the Seventh Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive. Thus, the metalworkers had, in effect, expressed their complete agreement with the Party's decisions. For this the opposition leaders accused them of setting the precedent of shifting an inner-Party struggle to non-Party organisations. But such is the logic of monstrous hypocrisy. The letter to the metalworkers, copies of the letter to other trade unions, the sending of these letters by ordinary mail—these, in the opinion of the opposition leaders, are good methods. But when a trade union organisation expresses its solidarity with the decisions of the Party and the Comintern, the opposition leaders become agitated. Since when have the trade unions had no right to express their views?

While the opposition leaders "paternally" lecture the trade unions in the interests of a factional struggle against the Leninist Party and its CC, playing into the hands of the avowed enemies of the proletariat, they expect the trade unions to keep silent and have no opinion of their own.

The opposition leaders are agitating the Leninist Party, leader of the trade unions, and seek to embroil the country in various discussions in order to divert the attention of the Leninist Party, the trade unions and the Soviet power from the building of socialism, and all this time, at the bidding of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Yevdokimov, the trade unions must close their eyes to all this and keep silent.

The opposition has launched on underground activities, trying to set up its own "party" in our Party, circulating illegal documents among not only Party members but also non-Party people, collecting signatures under petitions against the Leninist Party and its CC, and shaking the country's organism, but the trade unions must see and do nothing—that is what Trotsky, Yevdokimov and Zinoviev want.

The opposition not only wages a factional underground struggle, but organises open, public demonstrations against the Party before the eyes of the non-Party masses (Yaroslavl Railway Station, the Zinoviev speech at the *Pravda* anniversary meeting). The opposition is fishing among the non-Party people, appealing to them, and even at such a

moment, according to Trotsky, Yevdokimov and Zinoviev, the trade unions must be "loyal" to. . .* the opposition.

What does the sending of the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Yevdokimov letter to the other trade unions signify? It is an appeal to denounce the metalworkers and, with them, the Leninist Party and its CC, to inject elements of strife and struggle into the trade union movement, to set the trade unions against each other, and to incite them against the Party CC. Is this situation to be tolerated? No, a thousand times no. It would be a most heinous crime on the part of the trade unions not to say: Is it not time to ask the Leninist Party sternly call the disorganisers to order? Is it not time the opposition was told in emphatic terms to keep its hands off the Party?

Not only the Party and the trade union rank-and-file but non-Party workers are infuriated and sickened by the behaviour of the handful of disorganisers.

The trade unions cannot remain neutral on questions of Party policy.

That is why the members of the Building Workers' Trade Union, its Central Committee and Presidium will rally still closer in support of the Leninist Party CC and will be able to give a worthy rebuff to anybody trying to split the Party, the trade unions and the working class.

Like the metalworkers and the textile workers, the Plenary Meeting of the CC of the Building Workers' Trade Union will use the entire force of its influence and authority to expose the defeatist ideology of the opposition if it penetrates our trade union. We shall mobilise all our forces to avert the consequences of the activities of the oppositionists, who have thrown aside all restraint.

Although the Building Workers' Trade Union is still not properly steeled in the proletarian spirit, it will, under the leadership of the Leninist Party, move in step with the other trade unions along the Leninist road, and not along the road of Trotsky, Yevdokimov, Zinoviev and Co. Our trade union has veteran workers capable of setting an example for young builders and seasonal workers.

The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Building Workers categorically sweeps aside all who under-

* This leader is in the document.—*Ed.*

mine the strength of the CPSU(B), weaken the dictatorship of the proletariat to the delight of all the enemies of the revolution, support the renegades Ruth Fischer, Maslow and Urbahns, and direct propaganda against the USSR, the CPSU(B) and the Comintern.

Like the metalworkers, the textile workers and other fraternal trade unions, the building workers are fed up with the hysterical, Social-Democratic diseases of Trotsky, Zinoviev and other oppositionists. The building workers have colossal work to do: they are in the front line of industrialisation. Let nobody wear down the strength of the builder carrying out tasks set by the Leninist Party and the Seventh Congress of Trade Unions, because the builder believes in the ultimate victory of socialism. If the opposition lacks this faith, this gives it no right to agitate the Party and the trade unions. At a time when the sinister forces of counter-revolution want to strangle our country, the building workers are determined to make the greatest use of the respite for production so that the rebuff to the enemy is stronger. Let the opposition not play into the hands of the enemy.

The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Building Workers' Trade Union declares this with confidence on behalf of the millions of building workers....

Extract certified true:
Mesyatsev, Executive Secretary of the CC
Certified copy

Sovetskiye arkhivy, 1967,
No. 3, pp. 35-36

NOTES

[1] *The Second Congress of the RSDLP* sat in the period from July 17(30) to August 10(23), 1903. The first 13 sittings were held in Brussels, after which, because of police persecution, the sittings were moved to London.

This Congress was prepared by *Iskra* (The Spark), which, with Lenin at its head, did much to rally the Russian Social-Democrats on the principles of revolutionary Marxism. At a turning point in world history, when imperialism replaced pre-monopoly capitalism, the Second Congress laid the foundations for a Party of a new type. The principal task of the Congress was "to create a *real* party on the basis of the principles and organisational ideas that had been advanced and elaborated by *Iskra*" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 211).

Iskra's editors drew up and submitted to the Congress a draft programme for the party (published in *Iskra* No. 21, June 1, 1902). Some of the documents for the Congress were written by Lenin: these were the draft Rules of the RSDLP, several draft resolutions, and the outline of a report on *Iskra*'s activities. Moreover, Lenin thoroughly planned the agenda and the procedure at the Congress. The members of *Iskra*'s editorial staff and then the Congress delegates were acquainted with the draft Rules and the draft procedure in advance.

The Congress was attended by 43 delegates with a vote. They represented 26 organisations (the Emancipation of Labour group, the *Iskra* organisation, the Foreign and Central Committees of the Bund, the League of Russian Revolutionary Social-Democracy Abroad, the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, and 20 Social-Democratic committees and unions in Russia). Some of the delegates had two votes each, and this brought the number of votes at the Congress to 51.

The composition of the Congress was heterogeneous. It was attended not only by supporters of *Iskra*'s Leninist ideological line but also by its adversaries, and by unstable, vacillating elements.

The key items on the Congress agenda were the endorsement of the Party's Programme and Rules and the election of the leading Party centres. At the Congress Lenin and his supporters made a determined stand against the opportunists, one of whom was Trotsky.

The opportunists violently attacked the Party's draft programme, drawn up by the *Iskra* editors, and, particularly, the proposition on the leading role of the Party in the working-class movement, the point on the need to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat, and the agrarian section of the programme. Alluding to the programmes of the West European Social-Democratic parties, which said nothing about the dictatorship of the proletariat, the opportunists attacked this proposition directly and indirectly. Trotsky offered an opportunist interpretation of the question of the proletarian dictatorship. He held that for its establishment it was indispensable to make almost no distinction between the Party and the working class and turn the proletariat into the majority of the nation. The reformists, with Trotsky among them, failed to see that Lenin's idea of the proletarian dictatorship called for the conquest of power by the proletariat with the support of the working peasants, who comprised the majority of the nation. The Congress rejected all the attempts of the opportunists to amend the *Iskra* draft programme in the spirit of the programmes of the West European Social-Democratic parties and unanimously (with one abstention) adopted the Party Programme, which formulated both the immediate tasks of the proletariat in the pending bourgeois-democratic revolution (minimum programme) and the tasks calculated to bring about the victory of the socialist revolution and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship (maximum programme). The adoption of the revolutionary, Marxist programme of the Party was a signal victory of the Leninist-*Iskra* trend.

In the debate on the Party Rules a sharp struggle flared up over the principles governing the Party's organisation.

Lenin and his supporters pressed for the establishment of a militant revolutionary Party of the working class and held that its Rules had to make it difficult for all unstable and vacillating elements to become members. Therefore, in the wording of the first paragraph of the Rules, as proposed by Lenin, membership of the Party was made conditional not only on the recognition of the programme and on financial support for the Party but also on personal participation in one of the Party organisations. Lenin and his supporters fought for a centralised, monolithic, militant and disciplined proletarian Party. On the other hand, the opportunists, Trotsky among them, wanted a loose, poorly organised petty-bourgeois party. At the Congress Martov submitted his own wording of the first paragraph, which made membership of the Party conditional, in addition to recognition of the programme and financial support, only on regular personal assistance to the Party under the leadership of one of its organisations. Martov's wording,

which opened the door of the Party to all unstable elements, was supported at the Congress not only by the anti-Iskrists and the "Marsh" ("Centre") but also by the "soft" (unstable) Iskrists, and was passed by the Congress by an insignificant majority. On the whole, however, the Rules as drawn up by Lenin were endorsed by the Congress.

At the Congress a split took place between the consistent adherents of the *Iskra* orientation (the Leninists) and the "soft" Iskrists (Martov and his followers). The supporters of the Leninist orientation received the majority (*bolshinstvo* in Russian) of the votes at the elections to the Party's central organs and became known as Bolsheviks, while the opportunists, who found themselves in the minority (*menshinstvo* in Russian), became known as Mensheviks.

This Congress had an immense impact on the development of the working-class movement in Russia. It put an end to amateur methods and sectarianism in the Social-Democratic movement and laid the beginning for a Marxist revolutionary party in Russia, the Bolshevik Party. Lenin wrote: "As a current of political thought and as a political party, Bolshevism has existed since 1903" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 24).

By setting up a new type of proletarian Party, which became the model for the revolutionary Marxists of all countries, the Second Congress of the RSDLP marked a turning point in the international working-class movement. p. 23

[2] This refers to Lenin's wording of Paragraph 1 of the Party Rules: "A member of the Party is one who accepts its Programme and who supports the Party both financially and by personal participation in one of the Party organisations" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 244). The wording suggested by Martov was: "A member of the RSDLP is one who accepts its programme, supports the Party financially and renders it regular personal assistance under the leadership of one of its organisations" (*Second Congress of the RSDLP*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1959, p. 425). The votes were divided at a sitting of the Rules Committee on July 30 (August 12). Both wordings of Paragraph 1, with the exception of the phrase about financial support, which the Rules Committee deleted by a majority vote, were debated at the Congress. The Martov wording was adopted by 28 to 22 votes with one abstention. By a majority of 26 to 18 the Congress restored the phrase on financial assistance to the Party.

The debate and the voting on this issue are analysed by Lenin in *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* (*Collected Works*, Vol. 7, pp. 241-278). p. 23

[3] The reference is to the newspaper *Iskra* (The Spark), which was taken over by the Mensheviks in November 1903. p. 26

[4] *Economists*—spokesmen of Economism, an opportunist current in the Russian Social-Democratic movement at the close of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century. They preached that the working-class should confine itself to an economic struggle to secure higher wages, better working conditions and so forth, maintaining that

the political struggle was the business of the liberal bourgeoisie. The Economists refused to recognise the leading role of the Party of the working class, advocating the harmful theory of letting the working-class movement develop spontaneously.

The views of the Economists were most strikingly expressed in a document headed *Credo*, written in 1899 by Y. D. Kuskova.

Lenin devoted a number of his works to an exhaustive criticism of Economism.

A large role in the struggle with Economism was played by the Leninist *Iskra*. p. 26

[5] *Social-Democracy and the Provisional Revolutionary Government* was written by Lenin at the close of March 1905, when the upsurge of the revolutionary movement gave rise to a vigorous discussion in Social-Democratic circles of one of the vital issues of the revolution—the provisional revolutionary government and the participation in it of Social-Democrats. In this article Lenin criticised the standpoint of the Mensheviks, who were opposed to Social-Democrats participating in a provisional revolutionary government. p. 27

[6] *Sisyphean labour*—backbreaking and futile, from the myth about the Corinthean king Sisyphus. According to the legend he was punished for offending the gods: his task was to roll a huge stone up a hill, but before reaching the top the stone constantly slipped from his hands and rolled back. Sisyphus had to begin this task over and over again but never reached the top of the hill.

Lenin used this phrase to hint at a cartoon by P. Lepeshinsky portraying Plekhanov abortively trying to drag Martov out of the Menshevik "Marsh". p. 27

[7] The *Party Council* (1903-05) was, in accordance with the Party Rules adopted at the Second Congress of the RSDLP, set up as the highest body to co-ordinate and unite the activities of the Central Committee and the editorial staff of the Central Organ, restore the CC and the CO editorial staff in the event the entire composition of any of these bodies was incapacitated, and represent the Party in relations with other parties. The Council had the duty of convening Party congresses at the time fixed by the Party Rules or before the appointed time if this was demanded by Party organisations aggregating half the votes at a congress. The Council consisted of five members, one of whom was appointed by the Party Congress, and two each by the Central Committee and the CO. Plekhanov was elected the fifth member of the Council by the Second Congress of the RSDLP. Lenin was initially a member of the Council from the CO, and later, after he left *Iskra*, from the Central Committee. After Plekhanov's defection to opportunism and *Iskra*'s seizure by the Mensheviks, the Council became a tool of the Mensheviks against the Bolsheviks. In the Council Lenin consistently worked to unite the Party and exposed the disorganising, divisive activities of the Mensheviks. The Council was abolished under the Rules adopted at the Third Congress of the RSDLP. Since then the Central Committee has been the Party's sole leading organ

in the interim between congresses. It appoints the editorial staff of the CO. p. 27

[8] *Socialist-Revolutionaries*—members of a petty-bourgeois Party which emerged in Russia at the close of 1901 and the beginning of 1902 through the merging of Narodnik groups and study circles. The newspaper *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* (1900-05) and the journal *Vestnik Russkoi Revolutsii* (1901-05) became its official organs. The views of the Socialist-Revolutionaries were an eclectic mixture of Narodnik ideals (a petty-bourgeois current in the Russian revolutionary movement in the 1860s and 1870s) and revisionism. They tried, as Lenin put it, to mend "the rents in the Narodnik ideas" "with bits of fashionable opportunist 'criticism' of Marxism" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 310). They saw no class distinction between the proletariat and the peasantry, slurred over the class stratification and contradictions within the peasantry, and repudiated the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution. They preached individual terror tactics as the principal means of fighting the autocracy, thereby inflicting enormous harm on the revolutionary movement and hindering the organisation of the masses for a revolutionary struggle.

Their agrarian programme envisaged the abolition of private landownership and the transfer of the land to communes on the basis of egalitarian use, and urged the development of all sorts of co-operatives. This programme, which the Socialist-Revolutionaries portrayed as a programme for the "socialisation of the land", had nothing to do with socialism because, as Lenin pointed out, the abolition of private ownership solely of land could not put an end to capitalist rule and the poverty of the masses. The real, historically progressive content of the Socialist-Revolutionary agrarian programme was that it called for the abolition of the landed estates. This objectively reflected the interests and aspirations of the peasants during the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The Bolshevik Party exposed the attempts of the Socialist-Revolutionaries to pose as socialists, fought them for influence among the peasants and showed that their individual terror tactics were harming the working-class movement. At the same time, the Bolsheviks were inclined, under certain conditions, to come to a temporary agreement with the Socialist-Revolutionaries in the struggle against tsarism.

The class heterogeneity of the peasantry gave rise, in the long run, to political and ideological instability and organisational discord in the Socialist-Revolutionary Party and to their constant vacillation between the liberal bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The Right wing of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party broke away during the first Russian revolution and formed the legal Trudovik Popular Socialist Party, whose views were close to those of the Constitutional-Democrats, while the Left wing evolved into the semi-anarchist "Maximalist" League. The Socialist-Revolutionary Party completely disintegrated ideologically and organisationally during the period of the Stolypin reaction. During the First World War most of the Socialist-Revolutionaries propounded social-chauvinistic views.

After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, together with the Mensheviks and Constitutional-Democrats, were the mainstay of the bourgeois-landowner Provisional Government, in which SR leaders (Kerensky, Avksentyev and Chernov) participated. Influenced by the peasants' growing revolutionary sentiment, the Socialist-Revolutionary Left wing became the independent Left Socialist-Revolutionary Party at the close of November 1917. In order to retain their influence among the peasant masses, the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries formally recognised the Soviet power and entered into agreement with the Bolsheviks, but shortly afterwards they turned against the Soviet power. During the foreign military intervention and the Civil War the Socialist-Revolutionaries engaged in counter-revolutionary subversion, actively supported the interventionists and the whiteguard generals, took part in the counter-revolutionary conspiracies and organised acts of terrorism against leaders of the Soviet Government and the Communist Party. After the Civil War ended they continued their hostile activities against the Soviet state from within and without. p. 28

[9] The *Fifth Congress of the RSDLP*—was held from April 30 to May 19 (May 13-June 1), 1907 in London.

The opportunist line pursued by the Menshevik-controlled Central Committee, elected at the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the RSDLP (the CC consisted of seven Mensheviks and three Bolsheviks; on the CO editorial staff there were five Mensheviks), made it imperative to convene this Congress. This line, which contravened the will of the majority in the Party, suffered total bankruptcy. Not a single measure taken by the Menshevik CC in connection with the major developments in the country had the support of most of the largest Party organisations in the industrial centres. On the contrary, these measures were condemned by them.

In August 1906 the St. Petersburg Committee of the RSDLP passed a resolution calling for the immediate convening of an extraordinary Party congress and brought this resolution to the notice of all Party organisations, requesting them to state their opinion on it. Despite the opposition of the CC, the demand for a congress became so widespread that as early as October the resolution of the St. Petersburg Committee received the backing of the Moscow Committee of the RSDLP, most of the Party organisations in Russia and also of the Social-Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania, and the Central Committee of the Social-Democrats of the Lettish Region, which had joined the RSDLP at the Fourth Party Congress. At the end of September 1906 the Party organisations favouring a congress adopted an "Appeal to the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party" in which they demanded the convening of an extraordinary congress without delay. Although there was strong resistance from the Menshevik CC the Second (First All-Russia) Conference of the RSDLP, held in November 1906, passed a decision to convene a Party Congress on March 15 (28), 1907. The preparations were marked by a bitter struggle between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, who advanced their own programme (the Bolshevik programme was stated in

Draft Resolutions for the Fifth Congress of the RSDLP, see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, pp. 133-45).

The Congress was attended by 336 delegates representing more than 147,000 Party members. There were 105 Bolshevik delegates, 97 Mensheviks, 57 Bundists, 44 Polish Social-Democrats, 29 representatives of the Social-Democrats of the Lettish Region, and 4 "non-factional" delegates.

The large industrial centres delegated Bolsheviks to the Congress.

The debate over the agenda lasted nearly four sittings and revealed far-reaching divergences of principle between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. The Bolsheviks wanted the agenda to include the principal fundamental theoretical and political questions: the tactics of the Social-Democratic movement in the contemporary period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and the attitude towards the bourgeois parties. The Mensheviks and the Bundists, supported by Trotsky, were opposed to this and made every effort to remove from the agenda the general questions of the basic tactics of the Party in the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

After a hard struggle, the Bolsheviks, supported by the Polish and Lithuanian Social-Democrats, succeeded in including in the agenda only one issue of general principle: the attitude towards the bourgeois parties. "This question," Lenin pointed out, "not only took first place among the Congress questions of principle but also among all work in general" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 12, p. 489).

Lenin was elected to the Congress presidium. He delivered a report and made the concluding speech on a key item on the agenda —the attitude towards the bourgeois parties—and spoke in the discussion of the report on the CC's activities and the report on the work of the Duma group, took the floor to press for the inclusion in the agenda of questions of general principle concerning the tactics of the Party in the bourgeois revolution, and made speeches against the Mensheviks, the Bundists and Trotsky. He chaired the 6th, 7th, 14th, 15th, 27th, 34th and 35th sittings.

At the Congress the Bolsheviks were supported by the delegates from the Social-Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania and the Social-Democrats of the Lettish Region. Rallying them round a revolutionary platform, the Bolsheviks gained the majority at the Congress and ensured the victory of the revolutionary Marxist line. Bolshevik resolutions were adopted by the Congress on all fundamental issues.

On the question of the attitude towards the bourgeois parties the Congress passed the resolution drafted by Lenin. This resolution gave a Bolshevik assessment of all the non-proletarian parties—the Black Hundreds, Octobrists, Constitutional-Democrats and Socialist-Revolutionaries—and charted the tactics to be employed by the revolutionary Social-Democrats towards these parties. This was a major triumph for the Bolsheviks. The Party, Lenin subsequently wrote, "drew the main lessons of the revolution in the London resolution on the non-proletarian parties. In this resolution the Social-Democratic proletariat made a clear and precise appraisal of the class relations in the revolution, defined the social basis of all the major parties and the general tasks of the workers' move-

ment in the fight for democracy" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 132).

The Congress adopted the Bolshevik resolution on the Duma, which formulated the tasks of the Duma Social-Democratic group. It stressed that the Social-Democrats had to subordinate their activity in the Duma to their work outside it and use the Duma primarily as a means for exposing the autocracy and the bourgeois conciliatory policies, and for the propaganda of the Party's revolutionary programme. In its resolution on the Duma group's report, the Congress expressed its confidence that the Social-Democratic group in the Duma would serve the cause of the Russian proletariat in line with the Congress directives and under the guidance of the Party Central Committee.

On the question of a "workers' congress" the Congress passed a Bolshevik resolution that was drawn up on the basis of Lenin's draft resolution under the heading *Non-Party Workers' Organisations and the Anarcho-Syndicalist Trend Among the Proletariat* (*Collected Works*, Vol. 12, pp. 142-44). In its resolution on the question of the "Trade Unions and the Party", the Congress rejected the opportunist theory about the "neutrality" of the trade unions and found that it was necessary for the Party to provide the trade unions with ideological and political guidance. The Congress amended the Party Rules, abolishing the dual centre (election of the CC and the CO at congresses). Under the amended Rules only the Central Committee was elected at the Congress, while the CO was appointed by the CC and operated under its control. The Rules provided for periodical Party conferences in order to examine the most vital problems of Party life.

The new Central Committee consisted of five Bolsheviks, four Mensheviks, two Polish Social-Democrats, and one Lettish Social-Democrat. Ten Bolsheviks, seven Mensheviks, three Polish and two Lettish Social-Democrats were elected alternate members of the CC. The members and alternate members of the new CC included V. I. Lenin, F. E. Dzerzhinsky, I. F. Dubrovinsky, V. P. Nogin, L. B. Krasin, L. Tyszka and J. Marchlewski. Three other persons—two from the Bund and one from the Social-Democrats of the Lettish Region—were subsequently elected to the CC.

Because reliable leadership could not be provided by the Central Committee consisting of representatives of different trends (representatives of national Social-Democratic organisations frequently vacillated between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks), a Bolshevik Centre headed by Lenin and including the editors of the newspaper *Proletary* was elected at a meeting of the Bolshevik group towards the end of the Congress.

The Fifth Congress of the RSDLP was a triumph of Bolshevism in the working-class movement of Russia. The decisions of this Congress mirrored Bolshevism's ascendancy over the Party's opportunist Menshevik wing in the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The Bolshevik tactics were accepted by the whole Party. p. 31

[10] The *Bund* (General Jewish Workers' Union of Lithuania, Poland and Russia) was organised in 1897 at the constituent congress of Jewish Social-Democratic groups in Vilna. Its members were mostly semi-proletarian elements among the Jewish handicraftsmen in the western regions of Russia. At the First Congress of the RSDLP

(1898) the Bund joined the RSDLP "as an autonomous organisation independent only in questions affecting solely the Jewish proletariat" (*The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 1, p. 16).

The Bund preached nationalism and separatism in the working-class movement of Russia. At its Fourth Congress in April 1901 it adopted a decision to amend its organisational relations with the RSDLP as laid down at the First Congress of the RSDLP. In the relevant decision it was stated that the Bund regarded the RSDLP as a federative association of national organisations and that the Bund should belong to it only on a federative basis.

The Bund withdrew from the Party at the Second Congress of the RSDLP after its demand to be recognised as the sole representative of the Jewish proletariat was denied. In 1906 it returned to the RSDLP on the basis of a decision passed by the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the Party.

In the RSDLP the Bundists unremittingly supported the opportunist wing (the Economists, Mensheviks, liquidators) and attacked the Bolsheviks and Bolshevism. In March 1921 the Bund was disbanded and a section of its members were admitted to the RCP(B) under the general rules. p. 31

[11] The *Peasant Union* (All-Russia Peasant Union)—a revolutionary-democratic organisation founded in 1905. Its establishment was initiated by the peasants of Moscow Gubernia. A constituent congress, which laid the beginning for the Union, was held in Moscow on July 31-August 1 (August 13-14). The Union's Second Congress was held on November 6-10 (19-23). At these congresses the Union worked out its programme and tactics. It demanded political freedom and the immediate convening of a constituent assembly, and called for a boycott of the First Duma. Its agrarian programme demanded the abolition of private landownership, and the transfer of the land owned by the monasteries, the Church, the landed gentry, the Crown and the state to the peasants without redemption. Being influenced by the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the liberals, the Peasant Union suffered from petty-bourgeois indecision and vacillation. While demanding the abolition of the landed estates, it agreed that the landowners should receive partial compensation. As Lenin wrote, it was an organisation which shared "of course, in a number of peasant prejudices, and" was "susceptible to the petty-bourgeois illusions of the peasants (just like our Socialist-Revolutionaries); but it was undoubtedly a real organisation of the masses, of 'men of the soil', unquestionably revolutionary at bottom, capable of employing genuinely revolutionary methods of struggle" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 259). From the very outset the Union was persecuted by the police, and ceased to exist early in 1907. p. 33

[12] The *All-Russia Railwaymen's Union* was formed at the First All-Russia Railwaymen's Congress held in Moscow on April 20-21 (May 3-4), 1905. This Congress put forward a number of political and economic demands: the attainment of political freedoms, the convening of a Constituent Assembly, an improvement of the working conditions on the railways, and so forth. With the development of the Revolution of 1905-07 Bolshevik influence steadily increased in the Railwaymen's Union. The Second All-Russia Railwaymen's Con-

gress, held in Moscow on July 22-24 (August 4-6), 1905, passed a decision forthwith to agitate for a nation-wide political strike on the railways. Under pressure from the revolutionary masses, the All-Russia Railwaymen's Congress (also known as the Delegates' Congress), held in St. Petersburg in September and October 1905, drew up a series of demands which were submitted to the government. These demands called for an eight-hour working day, the electivity of the railway administration from top to bottom, the immediate release of people arrested for taking part in strikes, the lifting of martial law and extended protection, the granting of political freedom, an amnesty, national self-determination, and the immediate convening of a Constituent Assembly on the basis of universal, equal, direct voting by secret ballot. Lenin noted the leading role played by the railway workers and the Railwaymen's Union in the October general political strike.

The All-Russia Conference of representatives of 29 railways supported the decision of the Moscow City Bolshevik Conference to call a general political strike, and on December 6 (19), 1905 passed a decision to join this strike and immediately proclaim a nation-wide railwaymen's strike. After the December armed uprising of 1905 was crushed, the Railwaymen's Union, in effect, went underground. A railwaymen's conference was held in August 1906. In connection with the disbandment of the First Duma the conference raised the question of a general strike and of preparing for an uprising. At the close of 1906, having fallen under the influence of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Railwaymen's Union lost its importance as a revolutionary organisation. At a conference convened in February 1907 by the Central Committee of the RSDLP, the leading Social-Democratic railwaymen's organisations demanded that all revolutionary Social-Democrats leave the Railwaymen's Union. p. 34

[13] The *All-Russia Teachers' Union* was founded in the spring of 1905. It was influenced mostly by Socialist-Revolutionaries, whose petty-bourgeois narrowness and love of revolutionary phrases was reflected in the Union's programme. A tendency to limit its activity to a struggle for the interests of teachers as a profession became pronounced in the Union. Nonetheless, under the impact of the revolutionary developments the Union associated itself with the slogans of revolutionary democracy. Its members declared their intention to take part in the people's struggle for land, freedom and power and called upon teachers to "promote the people's self-awareness and help to organise the struggle for the great ideals of the working people" (*Minutes of the 3rd Delegates' Congress of the All-Russia Union of Teachers and Workers in Public Education, June 7-10, 1906*, Russ. ed., 1906, p. 135). The Union supported the demand for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly "on the basis of universal, equal and direct voting by secret ballot irrespective of sex, nationality or creed" (ibid.). The Union considered that one of its basic tasks was to press for a fundamental reorganisation of the public education system in Russia: the introduction of universal, free and compulsory elementary education and free secondary and higher education, instruction in the native language, the co-ordination of all types of schools so that the general education school of the higher

type would be the direct continuation of schools of a lower type, and so on. The means recommended for achieving these aims included: open criticism of the existing school system, the organisation of collective protests by teachers and students against the arbitrary practices of the education authorities, broad propagation of the Union's aims, and so forth.

On June 6(19), 1906, under the name of Karpov, Lenin spoke on the agrarian question before a group of delegates to the All-Russia Teachers' Congress. This speech was reported in the Socialist-Revolutionary newspaper *Golos* (Voice) (No. 15, June 8 (21), 1906). p. 34

[14] *Sotsial-Demokrat*—a newspaper illegally published by the Central Committee of the RSDLP in St. Petersburg from September 17 (30) to November 18 (December 1), 1906. Altogether, seven issues were printed. The editorial board, elected at the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the RSDLP, consisted solely of Mensheviks (F. I. Dan, L. Martov, A. S. Martynov, P. P. Maslov, A. N. Potresov). To all intents and purposes, this newspaper was the mouthpiece of the Menshevik faction. p. 34

[15] *Sotsial-Demokrat*—central organ of the RSDLP published illegally from February 1908 to January 1917. The editorial board was appointed by the Central Committee of the RSDLP elected at the Fifth (London) Congress and consisted of representatives of the Bolsheviks, the Mensheviks and the Polish Social-Democrats. In effect, the newspaper was directed by Lenin. p. 36

[16] This is a reference to the uprising in Catalonia and to the general strike which broke out in Sweden on August 4, 1909 in retaliation to the lockout of 83,000 workers in different industries. These events were dealt with in No. 47-48 of *Proletary*: an editorial "Lessons of the Class Struggle (the General Strike in Sweden)" and "Colonial Pillage and Revolution". p. 37

[17] The polemics Lenin intended to write about unfolded in June and August-September 1909 in *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* (Voice of the Social-Democrat) Nos. 15 and 16-17 after a Menshevik anti-liquidator residing in Geneva, evidently Viktor Tevzaya (Georgien), wrote an article headed "Two Words on a Topical Subject" championing an illegal party and calling for the expulsion of legalist-liquidators from Menshevik organisations. In editorials headed "Regarding the Article by a Geneva Comrade" and "Regarding the Debate on Organisation", the *Golos* editors denied their "connivance" with liquidationism and accused the author of sectarianism. In the article "On the Same Subject" written in reply, Georgien cited documents showing the activity of the liquidators in Party organisations in Russia. No article specially devoted to these polemics appeared in *Proletary*. A reference to the pending analysis and evaluation of the liquidationist ideas "piled up" in *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* No. 15 is contained in the note to the article "The Liquidation of Liquidationism" (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 460). p. 37

[18] Lenin's articles "The Liquidators Exposed", "On the Open Letter of the Executive Committee of the Moscow Regional Committee"

and "The Election in St. Petersburg" appeared in the newspaper *Proletary* No. 47-48, and the article "The Faction of Supporters of Otzovism and God-building" was printed in the supplement to the same issue (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, pp. 15-61). p. 37

[19] *Vorwärts* (Forward)—a daily newspaper, central organ of the German Social-Democratic Party. Its publication was started in Berlin by decision of the Halle Party Congress as the continuation of the *Berliner Volksblatt* (Berlin People's Daily), which had been in publication since 1884. The newspaper's name was changed to *Vorwärts. Berliner Volksblatt.* Through this newspaper Engels fought all manifestations of opportunism. In the latter half of the 1890s, after Engels's death, *Vorwärts* passed into the hands of the Party's Right wing and regularly printed articles written by opportunists. It tendentiously reported the struggle against opportunism and revisionism in the RSDLP, supporting the Economists and then, after the division in the Party, the Mensheviks. During the years of reaction *Vorwärts* printed slanderous articles penned by Trotsky, denying Lenin and the Bolsheviks the opportunity to refute the slander and give an objective assessment of the state of affairs in the Party. During the First World War *Vorwärts* preached social-chauvinism. After the Great October Socialist Revolution it ground out anti-Soviet propaganda. It was published in Berlin until 1933. p. 37

[20] *Pravda* (The Truth) (Viennese)—mouthpiece of the Trotskyite faction, published from 1908 to 1912. The first three issues were printed in Lvov, after which the publication was moved to Vienna, Austria; altogether 25 issues were brought out. After the first two issues, which were printed under the auspices of the Spilka (a Ukrainian pro-Menshevik organisation), the newspaper did not represent any Party organisation in Russia and was, as Lenin described it, a "private enterprise". Its editor was Trotsky.

While claiming to belong to no faction, the newspaper, from its very first issue, attacked Bolshevism, upholding liquidationism and otzovism; it expounded the Centrist "theory" that revolutionaries and opportunists should co-operate in a single party. After the plenary meeting of the Central Committee in January 1910 the newspaper adopted an openly liquidationist stand, supporting the *Uperyod* anti-Party group.

In 1912 Trotsky and his newspaper were the principal organisers of the anti-Party August bloc. p. 37

[21] L. B. Kamenev's article on the five-volume Menshevik publication *The Social Movement in Russia at the Beginning of the 20th Century* appeared on September 5 (18) and October 3 (16), 1909 in *Proletary* Nos. 47-48 and 49, a newspaper edited by L. Martov, P. Maslov and A. Potresov (also see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 43, pp. 215-17). p. 37

[22] *Liquidators*—representatives of an opportunist trend in the RSDLP during the period of reaction from 1907 to 1910. The Mensheviks were utterly demoralised by the defeat of the revolution of 1905-1907. They wanted the disbandment of illegal Party organisations and the cessation of underground revolutionary activity. Their aim

was to liquidate the revolutionary Party of the working class and set up an openly reformist party. The liquidators urged the working class to come to terms with the bourgeoisie, to reconcile itself to the reactionary regime in Russia.

The liquidators were headed by Martov, Axelrod, Dan, Martynov and other Menshevik leaders. By supporting the Mensheviks, Trotsky in effect sided with the liquidators.

At the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the RSDLP (January 1912), the liquidators were expelled from the Party. p. 38

[23] *Otzovists*—an opportunist group formed in the RSDLP in 1908. It was led by A. Bogdanov.

From behind a screen of revolutionary verbiage the otzovists demanded the recall of the Social-Democratic deputies from the Third Duma and the cessation of Party activity in legal and semi-legal organisations, maintaining that because reaction was on the rampage the Party had to confine itself to illegal work.

This would have isolated the Party from the masses and turned it into a sectarian organisation incapable of mustering the forces for another revolutionary upsurge.

Lenin showed that the views of the otzovists were inconsistent, unprincipled and hostile to Marxism. At a conference of an extended editorial board of the Bolshevik newspaper *Proletary* in June 1909 a decision was passed which stated that "as a clear-cut trend in the RSDLP Bolshevism has nothing in common with otzovism or ultimatumism" (a variety of otzovism). A. Bogdanov, the otzovist leader, was expelled from the Bolshevik Party. p. 38

[24] *A Necessary Supplement to G. V. Plekhanov's "Dnevniki"*—a Menshevik-liquidator leaflet levelled at G. V. Plekhanov, printed by *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* in April 1910. p. 38

[25] *Golosists*—members of the editorial board and supporters of the newspaper *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata*, a Menshevik organ published from February 1908 to December 1911, first in Geneva and then in Paris. Its editors were P. B. Axelrod, F. I. Dan, L. Martov, A. Martynov and G. V. Plekhanov.

From the very outset this newspaper backed the views of the liquidators, justifying their anti-Party activities. After Plekhanov denounced the newspaper's liquidationist stand and resigned from the editorial board, it took final shape as the ideological headquarters of the liquidators. p. 39

[26] *Uperyodists*—members of the anti-Party *Uperyod* group set up in 1909 on the initiative of A. Bogdanov and G. Aleksinsky and consisting of otzovists, ultimatumists, god-builders and empiriomonists (exponents of idealist philosophy). This group had its own newspaper of the same name.

At a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the RSDLP in January 1910 the Vperyodists opposed the Bolsheviks in close alliance with the liquidators, Golosists and Trotskyites. The *Uperyod* group had no influence in the working-class movement. p. 39

[27] *Nasha Zarya* (Our Dawn)—a monthly journal printed legally by the Menshevik-liquidators in St. Petersburg from January 1910 to

September 1914. Its editor-in-chief was A. N. Potresov and its contributors included F. I. Dan and S. O. Tsederbaum (V. Yezhov). The liquidators in Russia rallied round this journal. In a resolution passed by the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the RSDLP in 1912 it was noted that the "section of Social-Democrats grouped round the journals *Nasha Zarya* and *Dyelo Zhizni* (Life's Cause) is openly championing trends that have been condemned by the entire Party as the product of bourgeois influence on the proletariat" (*The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 1, p. 341).

Vozrozhdeniye (Regeneration)—a legal journal of the Menshevik-liquidators published in Moscow monthly from December 1908 to July 1910, and fortnightly in 1910. Among the contributors were F. Dan, L. Martov and A. Martynov. p. 46

[28] This article was written after *Die Neue Zeit* (New Times), journal of the German Social-Democrats, printed articles by L. Martov and L. Trotsky in September 1910, in which they misrepresented the meaning of the inner-Party struggle and distorted the history of the Revolution of 1905-1907 in Russia.

From a number of letters it was known that Lenin intended writing a reply to these articles by Martov and Trotsky. On September 30, 1910 he wrote to K. Radek: "I want to reply to Martov and Trotsky in *Neue Zeit*. I have already written to Kautsky and asked him whether they would carry it and how long it could be" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 173). But the journal's editors—Kautsky and Wurm—were reluctant to print an article by Lenin. On their suggestion, J. Marchlewski (Karski) undertook to write a reply to Martov. Marchlewski sent his article to Lenin for a preliminary review and on his own and Kautsky's behalf requested Lenin to agree to limit the reply to this article. In an answer to Marchlewski on September 24 (October 7), 1910, Lenin gave his agreement. He wrote: "I have already written about half of a long article against both Martov and Trotsky. I shall have to leave it and start on an article against Trotsky. Since you meet Kautsky, please tell him that I am taking care of the reply to Trotsky" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 34, p. 424). In the same letter he suggested some additions to the article: "I enclose a brief enumeration of what it is desirable to add against Martov. If you include even a part of it in your article, it would be very good" (ibid., p. 425). The additions proposed by Lenin consisted of seven points, and the additions themselves filled three pages (ibid.). The fact that Lenin wrote an article against Trotsky is known from his letter to Karl and Louise Kautsky, the facsimile of whose last page was printed in *Der Abend*, supplement in the evening issue of *Vorwärts*, Berlin, December 12, 1928.

In his letter to K. Radek of September 26 (October 9) Lenin mentioned that Karski had written an article against Martov. "But I cannot, however, leave unanswered Martov and Trotsky's most incredible absurdities and distortions. About a third or a half of my article is now ready. Its subject is *'The Historical Meaning of the Inner-Party Struggle in Russia'*" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 174). Further, Lenin asked whether it was possible to have it printed in *Leipziger Volkszeitung*.

The article "The Historical Meaning of the Inner-Party Struggle

in Russia" was only printed on April 29 (May 12), 1911 in No. 3 of the *Diskussionny Listok*. p. 47

[29] *Bulygin Duma*—a representative consultative body whose convocation was entrusted by the tsar to A. G. Bulygin, then the Minister for the Interior. The electoral rights for the elections to the Duma were granted only to the landowners, the big capitalists and a small number of well-to-do peasants.

The Bolsheviks called on the workers and peasants to boycott the Duma and, at the same time, launched a campaign of agitation to prepare for an armed uprising. The government failed in its efforts to convene the Bulygin Duma on account of the mounting wave of revolutionary sentiment and the all-Russia political strike of October 1905. p. 51

[30] *Black Hundreds*—the name by which the gangs of counter-revolutionary thugs were known in Russia since the revolution of 1905-1907. p. 52

[31] *Octobrists*—members of the League of October Seventeen that was formed in Russia after the publication of the tsarist Manifesto of October 17, 1905. This was a counter-revolutionary party, which represented and upheld the interests of the big bourgeoisie and landowners, who ran their enterprises along capitalist lines. This party was headed by the well-known industrialist and Moscow real estate magnate A. I. Guchkov and the big landowner M. V. Rodzyanko. The Octobrists gave every support to the policy of the tsarist government. p. 52

[32] *Zhizn* (Life)—a legal socio-political journal published by the Menshevik liquidators in Moscow in August and September 1910. Only two issues were printed. See Note 27 for the newspapers *Nasha Zarya* and *Vozrozhdeniye*. p. 53

[33] *The Polish comrade*—Adolf Warski (A. S. Warszawski). p. 56

[34] The *Russian Collegium of the CC* functioned in Russia and consisted of members and alternate members of the Central Committee elected at the Fifth (London) Congress of the RSDLP (in 1907). Initially it was formed at a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the RSDLP in August 1908 and consisted of five members (one Menshevik, one Bolshevik, and three representatives of non-Russian organisations). According to the Rules of the Central Committee, adopted at the CC plenary meeting in January 1910, the Russian Collegium had to consist of seven members (four CC members and three representatives of non-Russian organisations). The Collegium was vested with the right of co-optation against the contingency of any member falling out. However, it did not prove possible to organise the work of the Russian Collegium after the January plenary meeting of the CC. All the Party work in Russia (selection of agents, inspection of organisations, contact with the Social-Democratic group in the Duma, and so forth) was conducted by the Bolshevik members and alternate members of the CC: first by I. P. Goldenberg (Meshkovsky) and I. F. Dubrovinsky (Innokenty), and then, after they were arrested, by V. P. Nogin (Makar) and G. D. Leitei-zen (Lindov), who in 1910-1911 were the Central Committee Bureau

in Russia. The Menshevik-liquidator members and alternate members of the CC absented themselves from the work, while I. A. Isuv (Mikhail), P. A. Bronstein (Yuri) and K. M. Yermolayev (Roman) not only refused to participate in its work but declared they felt that the very existence of the Central Committee was harmful. All the attempts of the Bureau to convene the Russian Collegium proved to be abortive.

The Central Committee Bureau in Russia ceased to exist in March 1911, after Nogin and Leitcizen were arrested.

While commending the efforts of the Bureau to organise the work in Russia and convene the Russian Collegium of the CC, Lenin sharply criticised the conciliatory attitude of the members of the Bureau (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, pp. 268-69). p. 56

35 This is a reference to representatives of the Polish Social-Democrats in the Central Committee Bureau Abroad.

Social-Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania—a revolutionary party of the Polish working class which was formed in 1893 first as the Social-Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland, and then, in August 1900, it became known as the Social-Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania after the congress of the Social-Democratic organisations of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania at which the Polish and part of the Lithuanian Social-Democrats merged in a single party. The service rendered by this party was that it directed the Polish working-class movement towards an alliance with the working-class movement in Russia and fought nationalism.

During the revolution of 1905-1907 the SDPKP and L waged a struggle under slogans that were close to those of the Bolshevik Party and adopted an unrelenting stand towards the liberal bourgeoisie. However, it erred on a number of points: it denied the party a leading role in the democratic revolution, underrated the peasants as an ally of the working class and underestimated the significance of the national liberation movement. While criticising the errors of the SDPKP and L, Lenin pointed to its services to the revolutionary movement in Poland. He noted that the Polish Social-Democrats had created "for the first time a purely proletarian party in Poland and" proclaimed "the extremely important principle that the Polish and the Russian workers must maintain the closest alliance in their class struggle" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 434). At the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the RSDLP in 1906 the SDPKP and L was admitted to the RSDLP as a territorial organisation.

The SDPKP and L welcomed the Great October Socialist Revolution and launched a struggle for the proletarian revolution in Poland. At the Unity Congress of the SDPKP and L and the Left wing of the PSP in December 1918 the two parties merged to form the Communist Workers' Party of Poland. p. 58

36 A reference to members of the Central Committee Bureau Abroad—representatives of the Social-Democrats of the Latvian Region and the Bund.

The Social-Democratic Party of the Latvian Region (until 1906—the Lettish Social-Democratic Labour Party) was founded in June 1904 at the Party's First Congress. In 1905-07 the Lettish Social-

Democratic Labour Party directed the revolutionary actions of the workers. Lenin wrote that "during the revolution the Lettish proletariat and the Lettish Social-Democratic Party occupied one of the first and most prominent places in the struggle against the autocracy and all the forces of the old order" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 260).

At the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the RSDLP in 1906 the LSDLP joined the RSDLP as a territorial organisation. After this Congress it became known as the Social-Democrats of the Latvian Region. p. 58

[37] A reference to N. A. Semashko, the Bolshevik representative on the RSDLP Central Committee Bureau Abroad. p. 58

[38] This is a reference to the International Socialist Congress in Copenhagen (Eighth Congress of the Second International), which was held from August 28 to September 3, 1910. It was attended by 896 delegates representing countries of Europe, North and South America and South Africa, and also Australia. Russia, like Austria, Britain, Germany and France, had 20 votes: of these votes the Social-Democrats (including the Lithuanian and Armenian Social-Democrats) had 10, the Socialist-Revolutionaries 7 and the trade unions 3. At the Congress the RSDLP was represented by V. I. Lenin, G. V. Plekhanov, A. M. Kollontai, A. V. Lunacharsky and others.

Several commissions—on co-operatives; trade unions, international solidarity and the unity of the trade union movement in Austria; the struggle against war; labour legislation and unemployment; for the drawing up of resolutions on socialist unity, the death penalty, Finland, Argentina, Persia, and so on—were set up to discuss and draft resolutions on various problems.

Lenin was elected to the co-operative commission. After the debate on the role and tasks of the co-operatives in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and on the relations between the co-operatives and the Socialist parties, a resolution was passed in which, as Lenin pointed out, "the International gave, in essentials, a correct definition of the tasks of the proletarian co-operative societies" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 283).

In "Courts of Arbitration and Disarmament", a resolution on the struggle against war, the Congress reiterated the points made in "Militarism and International Conflicts", a resolution passed by the Stuttgart Congress in 1907, which contained the amendments proposed by Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg requiring the socialists of all countries to take advantage of the war-engendered economic and political crisis to overthrow the bourgeoisie. Moreover, the Copenhagen Congress bound the Socialist parties and their representatives in the parliaments to demand that their governments cease arming and settle inter-state conflicts at courts of arbitration, and urged the workers of all countries to organise protests against the threat of war.

With the aim of uniting revolutionary Marxists throughout the world, Lenin held a conference with the Left Social-Democrats attending the Congress. In his outline for a pamphlet to be headed *The European War and European Socialism* (this pamphlet was not written), he listed those who participated in the conference: Jules Guesde and Charles Rappoport of France; Louis de Brouckère of Belgium;

Rosa Luxemburg and Emanuel Wurm of Germany; Julian Marchlewski (Karski) of Poland; Pablo Iglesias of Spain; A. Braun of Austria; V. I. Lenin, G. V. Plekhanov and others of Russia (see *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, Russ. ed., p. 22).

During the Congress a conference was also held between representatives of the RSDLP (Bolsheviks), pro-Party Mensheviks and representatives of the Social-Democratic group in the Duma. This conference was attended by Lenin, Plekhanov, Poletayev and others. A decision was adopted to publish legal and illegal press organs in which pro-Party Mensheviks were to co-operate.

Lenin and Plekhanov, representing the Russian delegation, and Adolf Warski (A. S. Warszawski), representing the Polish Social-Democrats, sent a protest to the Central Committee of the German Social-Democratic Party against the appearance in *Vorwärts*, the GSDP's central organ, of the unsigned article by Trotsky slandering the RSDLP. p. 59

[39] The *School Commission* (or the School Committee) was set up at the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the RSDLP in January 1910 to organise a Party school abroad. It consisted of nine persons: two Bolsheviks, two Mensheviks, two Vperyodists and one each from national organisations—the Bund, the Lettish and the Polish Social-Democrats. p. 70

[40] The news item mentioned by Lenin was printed in *Sotsial-Demokrat* No. 23 on September 1 (14), 1911. It stated that at a meeting of Social-Democratic workers in the Vyborg District of St. Petersburg a prominent liquidator, a writer by profession, had suggested setting up "initiative groups" for legal educational work instead of restoring the Party organisation. This suggestion was unanimously rejected by the meeting, which was attended also by pro-Party Mensheviks. It did not get a single vote. p. 71

[41] *Rabocheye Dyelo* (Workers' Cause)—a magazine, organ of the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, published in Geneva from April 1899 to February 1902. Its editors were B. N. Krichevsky, P. F. Teplov (Sibiryak), V. P. Ivanshin, and then also A. S. Martynov; altogether 12 issues (nine volumes) were brought out. This magazine's editorial office was the centre of the Economists residing abroad; the magazine supported the Bernsteinian slogan of "freedom to criticise" Marxism, adopting an opportunist stand on questions relating to the tactics and organisational tasks of the Russian Social-Democratic movement, refused to recognise the revolutionary potentialities of the peasantry, and so on. One of its editors, V. P. Ivanshin, helped to edit *Rabochaya Mysl*, organ of overt Economists, who were supported by *Rabocheye Dyelo*. At the Second Congress of the RSDLP the *Rabocheye Dyelo* group represented the extreme Right, opportunist wing in the Party. p. 72

[42] *Rabochaya Mysl* (Workers' Thought)—a newspaper published by the Economists from October 1897 to December 1902 (altogether 16 issues were printed). The first two issues were mimeographed in St. Petersburg, Nos. 3-11 were printed abroad, in Berlin; Nos. 12-15 were printed in Warsaw; the last issue, No. 16, was printed abroad. The newspaper was edited by K. M. Takhtarev and others.

In the article "A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social-Democracy" (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 255-85), in articles published in the newspaper *Iskra* and in the book *What Is To Be Done?* Lenin showed that the views preached by *Rabochaya Mysl* were a variety of international opportunism. p. 72

[43] The *Russian Organising Commission* was set up by the June 1911 meeting of members of the Central Committee of the RSDLP for the express purpose of convening an All-Russia Party conference; it functioned until the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the RSDLP opened in January 1912. In a special resolution, passed on a motion by Lenin, it was noted that the Russian Organising Commission accomplished extremely important work in uniting all the Party organisations in the country and in restoring the Party. p. 73

[44] This campaign was started by the liquidators and Trotsky round a "petition" compiled by the St. Petersburg liquidators in December 1910. It was planned to send the "petition"—a plea for freedom of trade unions, meetings and strikes—to the Third Duma on behalf of the workers. The "petition" was taken round factories to get the workers to sign it. However, the campaign failed, and only 1,300 signatures were collected. The Bolsheviks exposed the substance of this campaign. Their standpoint was substantiated in the "petition campaign" resolution passed by the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the RSDLP (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, pp. 479-80). p. 75

[45] The resolution on "Elections to the Fourth Duma" adopted by the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the RSDLP (see V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, pp. 468-71). p. 76

[46] The Organising Committee, set up in January 1912 at a conference of liquidators, consisted of representatives of the Bund, the Caucasian Regional Committee and the Central Committee of the Social-Democrats of the Latvian Region. In addition to national Social-Democratic organisations, an active part in the work of the Organising Committee was taken by the editors of the Viennese *Pravda* and *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata*, the *Uperyod* group and representatives of the St. Petersburg "initiative group" of the liquidators. The Organising Committee was, in effect, headed by Trotsky and was the official organ charged with convening the anti-Party conference of August 1912. p. 77

[47] Lenin means the *Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the RSDLP*, held on January 5-17 (18-30), 1912, which, in effect, played the role of a Party congress.

Representatives were sent to this conference by more than 20 Party organisations and also by the newspapers *Sotsial-Demokrat* and *Rabochaya Gazeta*, the Committee of Organisations Abroad and the transport group of the Central Committee of the RSDLP. All the delegates, with the exception of two pro-Party Mensheviks, were Bolsheviks.

The proceedings were directed by Lenin, who spoke on the question of constituting the Conference, delivered reports on the current situation and the Party's tasks, and on the work of the

International Socialist Bureau, made a number of announcements, and took the floor in the debates on the work of the Central Organ, the tasks of Social-Democracy in fighting the famine, the question of organisation, the work of the Party organisation abroad, and other questions. He drafted the resolutions on all the major points on the agenda (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, pp. 451-86).

In the report on the current situation and the tasks of the Party, and in the Conference resolutions Lenin profoundly analysed the political situation in Russia and showed that revolutionary feeling was mounting. It was underscored that the conquest of power by the proletariat, which led the peasants, remained the objective of the democratic revolution in Russia.

A key task of the Conference was to purge the Party of opportunist elements. Its resolutions "On Liquidationism and the Liquidator Group" and "On Party Organisation Abroad" were of fundamental practical significance. The liquidators were grouped round two legal journals—*Nasha Zarya* and *Dyelo Zhizni*. The Conference declared that "by its behaviour the *Nasha Zarya* and *Dyelo Zhizni* group had finally placed itself outside the Party". The liquidators were expelled from the RSDLP. The Conference denounced the activities of anti-Party groups abroad—the Menshevik Golosists, the Vperyodists and the Trotskyites. It found that it was vital to have abroad a united Party organisation working to promote the Party under the control and direction of the Central Committee, and pointed out that the groups abroad "not subordinated to the Russian centre of Social-Democratic activities, i.e., the Central Committee, and fomenting disorganisation through contact with Russia over the head of the CC cannot use the name of the RSDLP". These resolutions greatly strengthened the unity of the Marxist Party in Russia.

One of the major questions examined by the Conference was that of participation in the elections to the Fourth Duma. It was emphasised that the principal task of the Party at the elections and of the Social-Democratic group in the Duma itself was to conduct socialist class propaganda and organise the working class. The Party's main election slogans, formulated by the Conference, comprised the cardinal demands of the minimum programme, namely, a democratic republic, an eight-hour working day and the confiscation of all landed estates.

The Conference passed a resolution "On the Nature and Organisational Forms of Party Work", endorsed the amendments of the Party's Organisational Rules as drafted by Lenin, approved the newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat* as the Party's Central Organ, elected the Party Central Committee and set up the CC Bureau in Russia.

This Conference was a milestone in the development of the Bolshevik Party as a new type of political organisation. It summed up an entire period of the struggle of the Bolsheviks against the Mensheviks and reinforced the victory of the Bolsheviks, expelling the Menshevik liquidators and bringing the Party organisations in the localities together on the basis of its decisions, thereby strengthening the Party as an all-Russia organisation. It defined the Party's political line and tactics in a situation witnessing a new revolutionary upswing. Having purged itself of opportunists, the Party now headed the new powerful upsurge of the popular revolutionary struggle. The

Prague Conference was of great international significance, giving the revolutionary elements in the parties of the Second International an example of resolute action against opportunism by completing the organisational rupture with the opportunists. p. 77

[48] *Za Partiyu* (For the Party)—a leaflet published periodically in Paris from April 16 (29), 1912 to February 1914 by pro-Party Mensheviks and conciliators. Its contributors included G. V. Plekhanov, S. A. Lozovsky and A. I. Lyubimov. The leaflet was distributed mainly abroad and expressed the views chiefly of the Plekhanov group in Paris. p. 78

[49] *Pravda* (The Truth)—a daily legal Bolshevik newspaper founded by Lenin; the first issue was printed in St. Petersburg on April 22 (May 5), 1912. p. 79

[50] In their issue No. 25 of April 23 (May 6), 1912, the editors of Trotsky's Viennese *Pravda* ran a squib accusing the Bolsheviks of appropriating the name of their newspaper. They wrote that they had "officially" requested *Pravda* to renounce the name. p. 79

[51] *Luch* (The Ray)—a daily legal newspaper of the Menshevik liquidators, published in St. Petersburg from September 16 (29), 1912 to July 5 (18), 1913. Altogether 237 issues were brought out. The newspaper operated mainly on donations from the liberals. Its ideological leaders were P. B. Axelrod, F. I. Dan, L. Martov and A. S. Martynov. Through this newspaper the liquidators attacked the revolutionary tactics of the Bolsheviks, pressed for the establishment of an "open party", opposed the revolutionary mass strikes of the workers and tried to revise the basic propositions of the Party Programme. Lenin wrote that *Luch* was enslaved by liberal policy and called it a mouthpiece of renegades. p. 79

[52] The *August bloc*—an anti-Party bloc of liquidators, Trotskyites and other opportunists directed against the Bolsheviks. It was organised by Trotsky at a conference of representatives of anti-Party groups and trends in August 1912 in Vienna. Representatives to this conference were sent by the Bund, the Caucasian Regional Committee, the Social-Democrats of the Latvian Region, and small groups of liquidators, Trotskyites and otzovists abroad (the newspaper *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata*, Trotsky's Viennese *Pravda* and the *Vperyod* group). From Russia delegates were sent by the St. Petersburg and Moscow liquidationist "initiative groups", the Krasnoyarsk organisation, the Sevastopol Social-Democratic Military Organisation, the editors of the liquidationist publications *Nasha Zarya* and *Nevsky Golos*; also present at the conference was a representative of the Spilka Committee Abroad. The overwhelming majority of the delegates were persons resident abroad, isolated from the working class of Russia and having no first-hand knowledge of local Party activity. The conference passed anti-Party, liquidationist decisions on all questions of Social-Democratic tactics and came out against the existence of an illegal Party.

The attempt of the liquidators to set up their own, Centrist, party in Russia was not supported by the workers. Unable to elect a Central Committee, they confined themselves to setting up an orga-

nising committee. Consisting of ill-assorted elements, the anti-Bolshevik bloc, whose formation was the principal aim of the conference, began to disintegrate even before the conference ended. The *Uperyod* representative walked out of the conference and was followed by the Lettish Social-Democrats and then by all the other participants. Under blows struck by the Bolsheviks the August bloc came apart within 18 months. For the collapse of the August bloc see Lenin's articles "The August Fiction Exposed" and "Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Outcries for Unity" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 182-85, 325-47), and also pp. 84-104 of the present volume. p. 81

[53] *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta* (Northern Workers' Gazette)—a daily newspaper of the Menshevik-liquidators; published in St. Petersburg instead of *Novaya Rabochaya Gazeta* from January 30 (February 12) to May 1 (14), 1914; from May 3 (16) published as *Nasha Rabochaya Gazeta*. Lenin ironically called it the "northern liquidationist newspaper" and "our liquidationist newspaper". p. 82

[54] *Against two "pillars"*, i.e., against the slogans in the Party Programme: a democratic republic and the confiscation of all landed estates. These slogans, like the slogan calling for an eight-hour working day, served as the basis for the ideological unity of all the propaganda and agitation of the Bolshevik Party. p. 83

[55] *The Social-Democratic group in the Fourth Duma* consisted of six Bolsheviks and seven Mensheviks. The Bolsheviks—A. Y. Badayev, G. I. Petrovsky, M. K. Muranov, F. N. Samoilov, N. R. Shagov and R. V. Malinovsky (who was later exposed as a provocateur)—were elected to the Duma from six main industrial centres which had four-fifths of the workers of Russia. The Mensheviks represented non-industrial gubernias. At the beginning the Social-Democratic group acted in concert, but within the group the Bolsheviks waged a constant struggle against the Menshevik seven, who obstructed the revolutionary work.

On October 1 (14), 1913, after the Poronin conference of the Central Committee ended, the Party CC held a meeting jointly with the Bolshevik deputies in the Fourth Duma. At this meeting, which was presided over by Lenin, they discussed the steps that had to be taken by the Bolshevik deputies in view of the behaviour of the Mensheviks. It was decided that upon their return to Russia the Bolshevik Deputies would present an ultimatum to the Menshevik seven demanding equality in the group. Lenin wrote the statement (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 446-48), which the Bolshevik deputies were to present to the group if the Mensheviks did not give a positive reply to the ultimatum. This statement was discussed at the CC meeting.

The ultimatum was presented on October 16 (29), 1913 at the very first meeting of the Social-Democratic group that was held as soon as the second session of the Duma was opened. Failing to get a satisfactory reply, the Bolshevik deputies walked out of the group meeting and on the next day handed the seven the official written statement which had been drawn up under Lenin's guidance at the CC meeting.

This statement was published over the signatures of the Bolshevik deputies in the newspaper *Za Pravdu* on October 18, 1913, and was accompanied by an appeal to the workers to discuss the demands of the six and help the deputies restore unity in the Social-Democratic group in the Duma. On instructions from Lenin *Za Pravdu* launched a campaign against the disorganising activities of the seven, explaining the significance of the struggle in the group and citing figures to show that a huge mass of workers was on the side of the Bolshevik deputies. These figures demonstrated that nine-tenths of the total number of workers were in the regions represented by the Bolshevik deputies, and only one-tenth was behind the Menshevik deputies.

In their official reply on October 25 (November 7), the seven refused to recognise the equality of the six. The Bolshevik deputies countered this with two appeals "To All Workers" (published in Nos. 15 and 20 of *Za Pravdu* on October 20 and 26), in which they gave the history of the split and called upon the workers to support the Bolshevik six. In their reply to the seven, the Bolshevik deputies stated that they had constituted themselves into an independent group and proposed united action in the Duma.

The struggle of the six as an independent group in the Duma was directed by Lenin. It was on Lenin's recommendation that they called themselves the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group. The statement of the Bolshevik deputies ("Reply to the Seven Deputies") that they had constituted themselves into an independent group in the Fourth Duma was printed on October 29 in *Za Pravdu* No. 22. In the same issue Lenin wrote a long article entitled "Material on the Conflict Within the Social-Democratic Duma Group", in which he exposed the disorganising behaviour of the Menshevik seven (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 458-74).

The struggle between the six and the seven stirred the worker masses, particularly in St. Petersburg. Workers held meetings to discuss the situation in the Social-Democratic Duma group. The meetings showed that the workers were on the side of the Bolsheviks. *Za Pravdu* published numerous resolutions by workers under the general heading *Workers for Their Labour Deputies*. These resolutions were summed up by Lenin in an article headed *How the Workers Responded to the Formation of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Group in the Duma* (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 536-43).

In this campaign Lenin and the Bolshevik Party gave a striking example of how workers' deputies had to act to create the conditions for making better use of the parliament for revolutionary purposes. Functioning under the direct leadership and control of the CC, the Bolshevik group in the Fourth Duma carried out the will of the Party, the will of the majority of the politically conscious workers. Its work in the Duma was a model of the parliamentary activities of the proletarian Party and made a tremendous impact on the entire international communist movement. p. 84

[56] Reference is to *Prosveshcheniye* (Enlightenment)—a monthly Bolshevik theoretical journal published in St. Petersburg from December 1911 to June 1914. Its circulation reached 5,000.

It was founded on Lenin's initiative in place of the Bolshevik journal *Mysl*, whose publication in Moscow was stopped by the tsarist government. The contributors included V. V. Vorovsky, A. I. Ulyanova-Yelizarova, N. K. Krupskaya, V. M. Molotov, M. S. Olminsky, J. V. Stalin and M. A. Savelyev. Lenin enlisted A. M. Gorky to head *Prosveshcheniye*'s belles lettres department. Lenin directed the journal from Paris and then from Cracow and Poronin, editing articles and corresponding regularly with the editors. The journal printed "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism", "Critical Remarks on the National Question", "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination", "Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Outcries for Unity" and other works by Lenin.

The journal exposed the opportunists—liquidators, otzovists and Trotskyites—and the bourgeois nationalists, wrote of the new upsurge of the revolutionary movement and propagated the Bolshevik slogans during the elections to the Fourth Duma; it attacked revisionism and Centrism in the parties of the Second International, and played an important part in promoting the Marxist education of advanced workers in Russia in an internationalist spirit.

It was closed by the tsarist authorities on the eve of the First World War. Publication was resumed in the autumn of 1917, but only one (double) issue was brought out. It carried articles by Lenin: "Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?" and "Revision of the Party Programme". p. 84

[57] *The Stockholm Congress*—Fourth (Unity) Congress of the RSDLP, held on April 10-25 (April 23-May 8), 1906. It was attended by 112 delegates with a casting vote, representing 57 local organisations of the RSDLP, and 22 delegates with a consultative voice.

At this Congress the Mensheviks controlled the majority due to the fact that many of the Bolshevik organisations which had headed the armed actions of the masses were shattered and were unable to send delegates. On the other hand, the Mensheviks had the largest organisations in the non-industrial areas, where no mass revolutionary action took place, and this gave them the possibility of sending more delegates.

The questions considered by the Congress were: (1) a revision of the agrarian programme; (2) an assessment of the current situation and the class tasks of the proletariat; (3) the attitude to the Duma; (4) an armed uprising; (5) spontaneous action; (6) amalgamation with non-Russian Social-Democratic parties; and (7) the Party Rules.

Over all these questions a bitter struggle raged between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. Lenin spoke on the agrarian question and dealt with the current situation and the class tasks of the proletariat, the attitude to the Duma, the armed uprising and other questions; he was a member of the commission appointed to draft the Rules of the RSDLP. The numerical preponderance of the Mensheviks determined the nature of the decisions adopted at the Congress. After a bitter struggle the Congress endorsed the Menshevik resolution on the Duma and the armed uprising and adopted the Menshevik agrarian programme. On the question of the attitude to the bourgeois parties, the Congress confined itself to reiterating the resolution passed by the Amsterdam International Congress.

Without a debate it passed a compromise resolution on the trade unions and a resolution on the attitude to the peasant movement.

Meeting the demand of the Party membership, the Congress adopted Lenin's wording of the first paragraph of the Rules, thus rejecting the opportunist wording moved by Martov. For the first time the Bolshevik formulation on democratic centralism was introduced into the Rules.

The CC elected at the Congress consisted of three Bolsheviks and seven Mensheviks. Only Mensheviks were elected to the editorial board of *Sotsial-Demokrat*, the Central Organ.

The struggle at the Congress showed the Party membership the content and depth of the fundamental differences between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. This Congress is analysed by Lenin in the pamphlet *Report on the Unity Congress of the RSDLP (A Letter to the St. Petersburg Workers)* (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, pp. 317-82).

About the Fifth (London) Congress of the RSDLP (1907) see Note 9. p. 86

[58] *Pro-Party Bolsheviks*—conciliators who gravitated towards the liquidators. They were headed by A. I. Lyubimov (M. Sommer). For details see Lenin's article "Adventurism" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 356-59).

During the years of reaction the pro-Party Mensheviks led by G. V. Plekhanov opposed the liquidators. While adhering to the Menshevik platform, the Plekhanov group favoured the preservation and strengthening of the illegal Party organisation and for this purpose aligned itself with the Bolsheviks. At the close of 1911 Plekhanov broke the bloc with the Bolsheviks. Under the guise of fighting "factionalism" and the split in the RSDLP, he sought to reconcile the Bolsheviks with the opportunists. In 1912, together with the Trotskyites, the Bundists and the liquidators, the Plekhanov group attacked the decisions of the Prague Conference of the RSDLP. p. 87

[59] At a meeting in London on December 13 and 14, 1913, the International Socialist Bureau passed a resolution instructing its Executive to convene a conference of representatives of "all factions of the working-class movement in Russia, including Russian Poland, which accept the Party Programme or whose programmes conform to the Social-Democratic programme, for an exchange of views (Aussprache) on issues dividing them". In justification of this resolution, Kautsky declared in a speech on December 14 that the old Social-Democratic Party in Russia was dead. It had to be revived in view of the Russian workers' striving for unity. In the article "A Good Resolution and a Bad Speech" Lenin laid bare the content of this resolution and assessed Kautsky's speech as monstrous (*Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 529). p. 98

[60] The pamphlet *Socialism and War (The Attitude of the RSDLP Towards the War)* was planned by Lenin in connection with the preparations for the first international socialist conference. Zinoviev took part in this work, but most of the pamphlet was written by Lenin, and he edited it.

Lenin called it a "commentary to the resolutions of our Party, i.e., a popular exposition of these resolutions". He felt that it was of prime importance to use the first international socialist conference in Zimmerwald to unite the Left elements of the international Social-Democratic movement on the basis of a revolutionary programme and made every effort to time the printing of the pamphlet to the opening of the conference.

Socialism and War was brought out on the eve of the Zimmerwald Conference as a small pamphlet in the Russian and German languages and was distributed to the participants. The supplement to this pamphlet contained the Manifesto of the Central Committee of the RSDLP (*The War and Russian Social-Democracy*), Lenin's article "The Conference of the RSDLP Groups Abroad" with the resolutions of the conference published in *Sotsial-Demokrat*, and the resolution on the national question passed at the meeting held by the Central Committee of the RSDLP with Party functionaries at Poronin in October 1913. After the Zimmerwald Conference the pamphlet was brought out in the French language in France. It was printed in the Norwegian language in the newspaper of the Norwegian Left Social-Democrats. Lenin tried to get this pamphlet published in English in the United States, but nothing came of these attempts at the time.

Lenin attached immense importance to securing the greatest possible circulation for *Socialism and War*. After the revolution of February 1917 he pressed for a new printing in Petrograd—"at least under the heading *From the History of the Last Years of Tsarism*—of the newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat*, the pamphlet *Socialism and War*, the journal *Kommunist* and the *Sbornik "Sotsial-Demokrata"*.

In 1918 the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Red Army Deputies published *Socialism and War* as a separate pamphlet. Printed in many languages, it gained a wide circulation. p. 106

61 *Brentanoism*—a bourgeois-reformist doctrine evolved by the German economist Lujo Brentano as a variety of bourgeois distortion of Marxism. Brentano preached "social peace" in capitalist society, claiming that social contradictions could be settled without a class struggle and that reformist trade unions and factory legislation were the necessary preconditions for resolving the labour problem and reconciling the interests of the workers and the capitalists. Hiding behind Marxist terminology, Brentano and his followers tried to subordinate the working-class movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie. p. 106

62 *Internationale Korrespondenz*—a weekly journal published in Berlin by German social-chauvinists from the close of September 1914 to October 1, 1918. p. 109

63 *Sovremenny Mir* (The Modern World)—a monthly literary, scientific and political journal published in St. Petersburg from October 1906 to 1918. The Mensheviks, G. V. Plekhanov among them, were closely associated with this journal. While the bloc with the Plekhanov group was in existence and also at the beginning of 1914 the Bolsheviks co-operated with the journal. During the First World War it became the mouthpiece of the social-chauvinists. p. 109

[64] Here the reference is to the statement of the Norwegian Left Social-Democrats on their agreement, in principle, with Lenin's draft resolution of the Left Social-Democrats for the first international socialist conference. The Swedish Left Social-Democrats later subscribed to it. The statement was handed to Lenin by Alexandra Kollontai, and today it is in the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the Central Committee of the CPSU. p. 111

[65] *War industries committees*—bourgeois organisations that existed in Russia during the First World War. They were set up in 1915 to support the tsarist government, make more effective use of industry to meet the requirements of the war, secure a higher degree of exploitation of the workers by the capitalists and bring the working-class movement under bourgeois influence. p. 111

[66] *Nash Golos* (Our Voice)—a legal Menshevik newspaper published in Samara in 1915-1916; it propounded social-chauvinistic views. p. 113

[67] *The Zimmerwald Left* was founded on Lenin's initiative at the International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald in September 1915. It united representatives of eight organisations: the Central Committee of the RSDLP, the Left Social-Democrats of Sweden, Norway, Switzerland and Germany, the Polish Social-Democratic Opposition and the Social-Democrats of the Latvian Region. Headed by Lenin, the Zimmerwald Left waged a struggle against the Centrist majority at the conference and moved draft resolutions denouncing the imperialist war, exposing the treachery of the social-chauvinists and calling for an active struggle against the war. These draft resolutions were rejected by the Centrist majority. However, the Zimmerwald Left secured the inclusion of a number of key propositions from the draft resolutions in the manifesto adopted by the conference. Assessing it as the first step in the struggle against the imperialist war, the Zimmerwald Left voted for the manifesto, issuing a special statement in which it noted the sketchy nature and inconsistency of the manifesto and gave the motives for voting for it. The Zimmerwald Left declared that while on the whole remaining in the Zimmerwald association it would disseminate its views and work independently on the international scene. It elected its leading organ, a Bureau, which included Lenin, Zinoviev and Radek. The Zimmerwald Left published its own journal, *Vorbote*, in the German language. A number of articles by Lenin appeared in this journal.

In the Zimmerwald Left the Bolsheviks were the leading force. They adhered to a consistently internationalist stand. Lenin censured Radek's opportunist vacillation and criticised the errors of some other members of the Left. The internationalist elements in the world Social-Democratic movement began to rally round the Zimmerwald Left. At the Second International Socialist Conference in Kienthal (near Berne) in April 1916 the Zimmerwald Left united 12 of the 43 delegates, and on a number of issues its motions won more than half the votes. Social-Democrats belonging to the Zimmerwald Left conducted extensive revolutionary work and played an important part in founding Communist parties in their respective countries.

For the Zimmerwald Left see Lenin's articles "The First Step" and "Revolutionary Marxists at the International Socialist Confer-

ence, September 5-8, 1915" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 383-88, 389-93). p. 114

[68] The leaflet of the Moscow Bureau mentioned by Lenin was not published in the Party newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat*. The newspaper's last issue, No. 58, appeared in January 1917.

At the time the Moscow Bureau was the name of the leading organ of the Moscow Regional Bolshevik Party organisation. The members of the Bureau included R. S. Zemlyachka, M. S. Olminsky and I. I. Skvortsov-Stepanov. p. 114

[69] *Minoritaires*, or *Longuetists*—a minority that emerged in the French Socialist Party in 1915. The minoritaires, supporters of the social-reformist Jean Longuet, held Centrist views and pursued a conciliatory policy towards the social-chauvinists. During the First World War they expounded social-pacificism. After the October Socialist Revolution in Russia they proclaimed their support for the dictatorship of the proletariat, but in fact were opposed to it. They continued co-operating with the social-chauvinists and gave their backing to the predatory Peace of Versailles. Finding themselves in the minority at the Congress of the French Socialist Party in Tours in December 1920, where the Left wing was victorious, the Longuetists broke away from the Party, together with the open reformists, and joined the so-called Two-and-a-Half International, and then, after its disintegration, returned to the Second International. p. 118

[70] *The Independent Labour Party*—a reformist organisation founded in 1893 by the leaders of the "new trade unions" in a period witnessing an activation of the strike struggle and a growth of the working-class movement in Britain to win independence from the bourgeois parties. The ILP was joined by the "new trade unions" and a number of the old trade unions, intellectuals and petty bourgeois influenced by the Fabians. The party was headed by James Keir Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald. From the moment of its foundation the ILP adopted a bourgeois-reformist stand and gave its attention mostly to parliamentary forms of struggle and to parliamentary deals with the Liberal Party. Characterising the Independent Labour Party, Lenin wrote that it was "actually an opportunist party that has always been dependent on the bourgeoisie" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 494).

When the First World War broke out, the ILP published a manifesto against the war, but it soon went over to a social-chauvinist position. p. 118

[71] *The British Socialist Party* was founded in 1911 in Manchester through the fusion of the Social-Democratic Party with other Socialist groups. It carried on agitation in the spirit of Marxist ideas. It was not an opportunist party and was "*really* independent of the Liberals" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 273). However, its numerically small membership and its weak ties with the masses gave it a somewhat sectarian character. During the First World War there was a sharp struggle in the party between the internationalist (William Gallacher, Albert Inkpin, John Maclean, Th. Rothstein and others) and the social-chauvinist trend headed by Henry Mayers Hyndman. In the internationalist group there were inconsistent

elements who adopted a Centrist stand on a number of questions. In February 1916 a group of BSP leaders founded the newspaper *The Call*, which played a large part in uniting the internationalists. The annual BSP conference at Salford in 1916 denounced Hyndman and his supporters for adopting a social-chauvinist stand and expelled them from the party.

The British Socialist Party welcomed the Great October Socialist Revolution. Its members were in the forefront of the movement of the British working people in defence of Soviet Russia against the foreign intervention. In 1919 the majority of the party's organisations (98 against 4) voted for affiliation to the Communist International. Together with the Communist Unity Group, the British Socialist Party played the principal role in forming the Communist Party of Great Britain. At the First (Unity) Congress in 1920 the overwhelming majority of the BSP local organisations joined the Communist Party. p. 118

[72] *Demain*—a monthly literary and political journal founded by Henri Guilbeaux, French internationalist, writer and journalist, published from January 1916 to 1919 (with an interval from January to April 1917) first in Geneva and then in Moscow. The journal attacked chauvinism and propagated the Zimmerwald programme. The contributors to *Demain* included Romain Rolland and Stefan Zweig. The journal printed some articles and speeches by Lenin ("Speech on the Dissolution of the Constituent Assembly Delivered to the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, January 6 (19), 1918", "On the History of the Question of the Unfortunate Peace"). From September 1919 onwards the journal was published as the organ of the French Communist group in Moscow. p. 119

[73] *The Trade-Unionist*—a British trade union newspaper published in London from November 1915 to November 1916. Its publisher was E. Pratt. p. 119

[74] *The Socialist Labour Party of America* was set up in 1876 at a unity convention in Philadelphia as a result of the amalgamation of the American sections of the First International and other socialist organisations. The convention was held under the leadership of F. A. Sorge, who was an associate of Marx and Engels. The bulk of the party's membership consisted of immigrants, who had weak ties with the American workers. During the initial years the leading position in the party was occupied by Lassalleans, who committed errors of a sectarian and dogmatic nature. Some of the party's leaders held that parliamentary activity was the main task and underrated the importance of guiding the economic struggle of the masses, while others slid into trade unionism and anarchism. The ideological and tactical vacillation of the leadership weakened the party and induced some groups to leave it. Marx and Engels sharply criticised the sectarian tactics of the American socialists.

The Left wing headed by Daniel De Leon took over the party leadership in the 1890s, but it made mistakes of an anarcho-syndicalist nature. The party abandoned the struggle for the partial demands of the working class and gave up its activities in the reformist trade unions, with the result that it lost more and more of its

already weak ties with the mass working-class movement. During the First World War it was inclined towards internationalism. Under the impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution the most revolutionary section of the SLP was active in helping to found the Communist Party of the United States. Today the SLP is a small organisation enjoying no influence in the working-class movement of the USA. p. 120

[75] *The Socialist Party of America* was formed in July 1901 at a convention in Indianapolis as a result of the merging of groups that had broken away from the Socialist Labour Party and the Social-Democratic Party of the USA, one of whose organisers was Eugene Debs, a popular leader of the working-class movement in the USA. Debs was also one of the founders of the new party. The social composition of this new party was heterogeneous: American workers, immigrant workers, small farmers and petty-bourgeois elements. The party's Centrist and Right-wing, opportunist leadership (Victor L. Berger, Morris Hillquit and others) rejected the need for a dictatorship of the proletariat, renounced revolutionary methods of struggle and reduced the party's activities mainly to participation in election campaigns. Three trends took shape in the Socialist Party during the First World War: social-chauvinists, who supported the government's imperialist policy; Centrists, who opposed the imperialist war only in words; a revolutionary minority, which adhered to international positions and campaigned against the war.

Relying on proletarian elements, the Left wing in the Socialist Party led by Charles Ruthenberg, William Z. Foster, William Haywood and others waged a struggle against the party's opportunist leadership, pressing for independent political action by the proletariat and the formation of trade unions founded on the principles of the class struggle. A split occurred in the Socialist Party in 1919. The Left wing broke away from the party and formed the nucleus of the newly founded Communist Party of the USA.

At present the Socialist Party is a small sectarian organisation. p. 120

[76] *The Internationalist*—a weekly newspaper of the Left wing of the Socialist Party published at the beginning of 1917 in Boston by the Socialist Propaganda League of America. The editors were American and other internationalists: John D. Williams, Howard A. Gibbs, A. S. Zartarian, F. Rosin, Sebald J. Rutgers and Alfred S. Edwards. p. 120

[77] *Tribunists*—members of the Social-Democratic Party of Holland, which published the newspaper *De Tribune*. The leaders of the Tribunists were D. Wijnkoop, Herman Gorter, Anton Pannekoek and Henriette Roland-Holst. The Tribunists were not a consistently revolutionary party but they represented the Left wing of the working-class movement of Holland and during the First World War adhered mainly to internationalist positions.

In 1918 the Tribunists formed the Communist Party of Holland.

De Tribune—a newspaper founded in 1907 by the Left wing of the Social-Democratic Labour Party of Holland. In 1909 after the Lefts were expelled from the party and organised the Social-Demo-

cratic Party of Holland it became the latter's organ; from 1918 and until 1940 it was the organ of the Communist Party of Holland. p. 120

[78] Lenin gave the name *Party of the Young*, or *Lefts* to the Left trend in the Social-Democratic Party of Sweden. During the First World War the Young expounded internationalist views and aligned themselves with the Zimmerwald Left. In May 1917 they formed the Left Social-Democratic Party of Sweden. At its congress in 1919 this party decided to join the Communist International. In 1921 the revolutionary wing formed the Communist Party of Sweden. p. 120

[79] *Tesnyaki*—the revolutionary Social-Democratic Labour Party of Bulgaria founded in 1903, following the split in the Social-Democratic Party. Its founder and leader was D. Blagoev. Subsequently the Tesnyaki were headed by Blagoev's followers—G. Dimitrov, V. Kolarov and others. In 1914-1918 the Tesnyaki agitated against the imperialist war. In 1919 they joined the Communist International and formed the Communist Party of Bulgaria, which was subsequently reorganised as the Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communists). p. 120

[80] The *Regional Executive* and the *Chief Executive* were the leading bodies of the Social-Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania.

After the defeat of the Revolution of 1905-07 differences flared up in the SDPKP and L over inner-Party issues, which at the beginning of 1912 led to a split into supporters of the Chief Executive, which pursued a conciliatory line towards the liquidators and had at one time, for all practical purposes, backed up the anti-Bolshevik trends in the RSDLP, and supporters of the Regional Executive, which relied on the Warsaw and Lodz Party organisations. The Regional Executive established contact with the Bolsheviks and aligned itself with the Central Committee of the RSDLP.

During the First World War both groups united in a single party which propounded an internationalist platform. The Party waged an active struggle against the Pilsudski and Narodowci (National-Democrats) groups, which collaborated with the foreign imperialists, and pursued a line that was close to that of the Bolsheviks. However, the party committed errors and failed to wage a consistent struggle against the Centrists and conciliators. p. 120

[81] These are documents on the discussion of the unification of the RSDLP(B) and the so-called Inter-Regional Organisation of United Social-Democrats (*inter-regional*—mezhrayonny in Russian).

The Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the RSDLP(B) held in 1917 adopted a resolution "On the Unification of the Internationalists Against the Petty-Bourgeois Defencist Bloc", which reads: "To recognise as necessary rapprochement and unification, on the basis of rejecting the policy of petty-bourgeois betrayal of socialism, with all groups and trends taking a genuinely internationalist stand" (*The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 1, p. 450).

In compliance with this decision Lenin presented on May 10 (23), 1917, the views of the CC of the RSDLP(B) on the problems and conditions of unification in his speech at the Mezhrayontsi con-

ference. Lenin concluded his speech by reading his own text of conditions for co-operation (Lenin's text is under figure II).

After Lenin the floor was taken by Trotsky who opposed Lenin's terms of unification.

Lenin put down the essential points in Trotsky's speech (the notes are under figure III).

The conference rejected Lenin's terms.

The Sixth RSDLP(B) Congress held in August 1917 confirmed Lenin's terms of unification (see p. 123 of this volume). p. 121

82 *The Sixth Congress of the RSDLP(B)* was held semi-legally in Petrograd from July 26 to August 3 (from August 8 to 16), 1917. It was attended by 157 delegates with a casting vote and 110 delegates with a consultative voice, representing 240,000 members. Lenin directed the work of the Congress from underground, maintaining contact with Petrograd through comrades appointed for this purpose by the Central Committee. These comrades travelled to Lenin's place of concealment in Razliv. Lenin's theses "The Political Situation", and the article "On Slogans" and other articles underlay the decisions passed by the Congress. Although Lenin was at Razliv he helped to draft the key resolutions. He was elected honorary chairman of the Congress.

The following items were on the agenda: (1) report of the Organisational Bureau; (2) report of the Central Committee; (3) reports from the localities; (4) the current situation: (a) the war and the international situation, (b) the political and economic situation; (5) revision of the programme; (6) the organisational question; (7) elections to the Constituent Assembly; (8) the International; (9) Party unity; (10) the trade union movement; (11) elections; (12) miscellaneous. The question whether Lenin should appear in court was discussed.

On behalf of the Central Committee the political report of the Central Committee and the report on the political situation were delivered by J. V. Stalin. Propositions formulated by Lenin were used as the basis for the Congress resolution assessing the political situation in Russia after the July events and laying down the Party's political line at the new stage of the revolution. The Congress noted that the peaceful development of the revolution had ended and that the power in the country had passed virtually into the hands of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. On Lenin's recommendation, the Congress temporarily waived the slogan "All power to the Soviets", because headed by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Soviets had been turned into tools of the Provisional Government. However, this temporary waiving of the slogan did not signify the abandonment of the Soviets as a state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Congress called for an armed uprising to overthrow the dictatorship of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and secure the conquest of power by the proletariat in alliance with the poorest sections of the peasants.

The Congress rejected the anti-Leninist arguments moved by Preobrazhensky, who held that the socialist revolution could not triumph in Russia and that the country could be directed towards the road of socialism only if there was a proletarian revolution in

the West. The Congress also gave a rebuff to Bukharin, who attacked the Party's line aimed at accomplishing a socialist revolution, arguing that the peasants were supporting the bourgeoisie and would not follow the working class.

In its decisions the Congress strongly emphasised the Leninist proposition on the alliance of the proletariat with the poorest peasants as the cardinal condition for the victory of the socialist revolution. "Provided it is supported by the poorest peasants", stated the resolution on the political situation, "the revolutionary proletariat is the only force capable of accomplishing this task of achieving a fresh upsurge" (*The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 1, p. 488).

The Congress emphatically ruled against Lenin appearing in court and expressed a "strong protest against the disgusting persecution of the leaders of the revolutionary proletariat by the procurator and police spies" and sent a message of greetings to Lenin.

Y. M. Sverdlov, who delivered the report on the Central Committee's organisational work, pointed out that during the three months that had passed since the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference the Party membership had trebled (from 80,000 to 240,000) and that the number of Party organisations had increased from 78 to 162. The Congress heard 19 reports from the localities, the rapporteurs noting the extensive work by the Bolshevik organisations in the localities and the steady growth of the Bolshevik influence among the masses.

The Congress debated and approved the Party's economic programme, which envisaged the following revolutionary measures: nationalisation and centralisation of the banks, nationalisation of the large-scale industry, confiscation of the landed estates and nationalisation of all the land, establishment of workers' control over production and distribution, organisation of a rational exchange between town and country, and so on.

The Congress adopted new Party Rules. Paragraph 1 contained the statement that Party decisions were binding on all members; those wishing to join the Party had to have recommendations from two members and their admittance had to be endorsed at a general meeting of the relevant Party organisation. All Party organisations, it was underscored, were structured on the principle of democratic centralism. Party congresses were to be convened annually, and Central Committee plenary meetings were to be held at least once in two months.

The Congress upheld the decision of the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the RSDLP(B) on the need to reconsider the Party Programme along the lines charted by the Conference. It was decided to convene a congress to draw up the new programme, and the Central Committee and all Party organisations were instructed to conduct a broad pre-congress discussion on the proposed revision of the programme.

In the resolution on youth leagues the Congress stated that one of the most pressing tasks was to help set up class socialist organisations of young workers and instructed the Party organisations to give the maximum attention to this question. After the debate on the trade union movement the Congress criticised the theory that the

trade unions should be neutral, pointing out that they were vitally interested in bringing the revolution to a victorious conclusion and could carry out the tasks facing the working class of Russia only if they remained militant class organisations recognising the political leadership of the Bolshevik Party.

The purpose of all the decisions adopted at the Congress was to prepare the proletariat and the poorest sections of the peasants for an armed uprising, for a victorious socialist revolution. The manifesto issued on behalf of the Congress called on all the working people, on all workers, soldiers and peasants of Russia to accumulate strength and prepare for a decisive battle with the bourgeoisie under the banner of the Bolshevik Party. The Congress elected a new Central Committee, which included V. I. Lenin, Y. A. Berzin, A. S. Bubnov, F. E. Dzerzhinsky, A. M. Kollontai, V. P. Milyutin, M. K. Muranov, V. P. Nogin, Y. M. Sverdlov, F. A. Sergeyev (Artyom), J. V. Stalin, M. S. Uritsky and S. G. Shahumyan, p. 123

[83] "*The Crisis Has Matured*" was written by Lenin in Vyborg. It consisted of six chapters, the last of which was not intended for publication, but for distribution. The manuscript of only the fifth and sixth chapters of this work is extant. It was first published in the newspaper *Rabochy Put* No. 30 on October 20 (7), 1917, which printed not five but four chapters. At the time of publication one of the chapters was omitted. The fifth chapter was printed as the fourth. This was established when the newspaper text was compared with the manuscript of the fifth chapter.

The article was published by the Bolshevik press: *Sotsial-Demokrat* (Moscow), *Proletarskoye Dyelo* (Kronstadt), *Burevestnik* (Minsk), *Proletarskaya Pravda* (Tula), *Uperyod* (Ufa), *Bakinsky Rabochy, Uralsky Rabochy, Krasnoyarsky Rabochy* and other newspapers. p. 124

[84] *The All-Russia Democratic Conference* was convened by the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary Central Executive Committee of the Soviets ostensibly for the purpose of deciding the question of power. Actually, its organisers wanted to divert the masses from the mounting revolution. The conference was held on September 14-22 (September 27-October 5), 1917 in Petrograd. The Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary leaders went to all lengths to reduce the representation of the workers and peasants and increase the number of delegates from the various petty-bourgeois and bourgeois organisations, thereby ensuring themselves a majority.

The Bolsheviks attended the conference in order to use its rostrum to expose the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. Their tactics at this conference were planned by Lenin.

The conference passed a decision on the organisation of a Pre-parliament (Provisional Council of the Republic). This was an attempt to create the impression that a parliamentary system had been set up in Russia. However, under the regulations adopted by the Provisional Government, the Pre-parliament was to be only a consultative organ under the government.

On Lenin's initiative the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party passed a decision, despite resistance from Kamenev, Rykov and other capitulationists, to withdraw from the Pre-parliament. On

October 7 (20), the day the Pre-parliament opened, the Bolsheviks announced this decision and walked out. p. 124

[85] This is a reference to the stand adopted by Kamenev, Zinoviev, Trotsky and their supporters. Kamenev and Zinoviev spoke against Lenin's plan for preparing an armed uprising, arguing that the working class of Russia was unable to accomplish a socialist revolution. They slid into the stand of the Mensheviks who wanted a bourgeois republic. Trotsky insisted on postponing the uprising until the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets. This would have wrecked the uprising because it would have given the Provisional Government time to concentrate its forces. p. 125

[86] The question of war and peace was debated at a meeting of the Central Committee on January 11 (24), 1918, after Lenin had taken the floor. The "Left Communists" and Trotsky spoke in opposition to Lenin. Some of the "Left Communists"—Bukharin, Uritsky and Lomov (Oppokov)—seconded Trotsky's motion of "neither peace nor war". Stalin, Sergeyev (Artyom) and Sokolnikov spoke in favour of signing peace. Having no faith in the success of the slogan calling for an immediate revolutionary war (it got only two votes), the "Left Communists" sided with Trotsky's motion, which received nine votes against seven. Hoping to overcome the resistance in the CC to signing the peace and bring about a change in the feelings of the section of the people supporting the proponents of a revolutionary war, Lenin moved that every effort should be made to draw out the negotiations. This motion was carried by 12 votes with one against. p. 128

[87] Lenin evidently means an anonymous article printed in the newspaper *Novaya Zhizn* No. 7 on January 11 (24), 1918 under the heading "The Bolsheviks and German Social-Democracy". In the newspaper it was said that this article was by a prominent member of the German Independent Social-Democratic Party. p. 129

[88] Lenin had in mind the following words from the minutes of a speech by Stalin: "Comrade Stalin feels that by adopting the slogan of revolutionary war we are playing into the hands of imperialism. Trotsky's stand is untenable. No revolutionary movement exists in the West, there are no facts, only potentialities, and we cannot take potentialities into consideration. If the Germans begin an offensive it will strengthen the counter-revolution in our country."

Lenin had in mind the following words from the speech made by Zinoviev: "...we are confronted, of course, by a serious surgical operation because by signing peace we shall strengthen chauvinism in Germany and for some time weaken the movement throughout the West. The other prospect looming before us is the destruction of the socialist republic" (*Minutes of the Central Committee of the RSDLP(B), August 1917-February 1918*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1958, pp. 171-72). p. 130

[89] On January 28 (February 10), 1918, at the peace conference in Brest-Litovsk, in spite of Lenin's instructions to sign the peace treaty if the Germans demanded it in categorical terms, Trotsky declared that the Soviet Government would not sign the peace treaty

on Germany's terms but that it would consider the war ended and would demobilise its army. On the same day, without informing the Central Committee of the RCP(B) and the Council of People's Commissars, Trotsky sent the Supreme Commander-in-Chief a provocative telegram instructing him to issue an Order of the Day in the night of January 29 (February 11) proclaiming the termination of the state of war with Germany and her allies and ordering to begin the demobilisation of the Russian Army. Nothing was said in the telegram about the suspension of the peace talks in Brest, but the conclusion that could be drawn from it was that the conference had ended with the signing of a peace treaty. Early in the morning of January 29 (February 11), acting on the telegram from Trotsky, the Supreme Commander-in-Chief N. V. Krylenko issued an Order of the Day stating that peace had been signed, that military operations were to be halted on all fronts and that the demobilisation of the army was to be started. This prompted the publication of this and the following telegrams. p. 131

[90] The atmosphere was extremely tense at the sitting of the Party Central Committee in the evening of February 18, 1918. The CC was compelled to meet because of the offensive that the Germans had started that day along the entire front, and their swift advance and capture of the town of Dvinsk. At this sitting the "Left Communists" again came out against Lenin, while Trotsky proposed asking Berlin and Vienna for the terms of the German Government without mentioning the Soviet agreement to sign a peace treaty. Sverdlov, Stalin and Zinoviev proposed that the German Government should be sent a telegram to inform it of the agreement to resume negotiations. At this sitting, after a sharp struggle, Lenin won the majority for the first time for his motion to sign a peace treaty: this motion that the German Government should be immediately informed of the Soviet agreement to sign a peace treaty was carried by seven votes against six. p. 132

[91] With the publication of the article "The Revolutionary Phrase" in *Pravda* on February 21, 1918 Lenin began an open press campaign for a peace treaty. p. 134

[92] German troops were in occupation of Belgium for nearly four years, from the outbreak of the First World War to Germany's defeat in 1918. p. 134

[93] *Novy Luch* supporters—Mensheviks grouped round *Novy Luch* (New Ray), a newspaper published by the united Menshevik Central Committee in Petrograd from December 1 (14), 1917 to June 1918, when it was closed for counter-revolutionary agitation. Its editors included Dan, Martov and Martynov. p. 135

[94] *Dyelo Naroda* (People's Cause)—mouthpiece of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. It was published in Petrograd from March 1917 to July 1918, repeatedly changing its name. Propounding defencism and conciliation, it supported the bourgeois Provisional Government. Its publication was resumed in October 1918 in Samara (four issues) and in March 1919 in Moscow (ten issues). It was closed for counter-revolutionary activities.

Novaya Zhizn (New Life)— a daily newspaper, published in Petrograd from April 18 (May 1), 1917 to July 1918. It was run by Menshevik-internationalists and writers grouped round the journal *Letopis*. Characterising this group Lenin noted, "intellectual scepticism, which conceals and expresses lack of principle, is the dominant mood" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 271) and ironically called them "would-be internationalists" and "would-be Marxists". The newspaper was hostile to the October Socialist Revolution and the establishment of the Soviet power. From June 1, 1918 until its closure in July of the same year it was published simultaneously in Petrograd and Moscow. p. 135

95 Lenin refers to the telegram sent by the Council of People's Commissars and the All-Russia Central Executive Committee to all gubernia and uyezd Soviets and to all gubernia, uyezd and volost land committees requesting them to state, without delay, their attitude to the acceptance of the peace terms offered by the German Government. The inquiry was sent on the basis of a resolution passed by the Central Committee of the RSDLP(B) on a motion by Lenin on February 23, 1918. The inquiry gave the German peace terms, stated that the All-Russia Central Executive Committee had agreed to accept these terms, gave the results of the voting in the All-Russia CEC and outlined the two viewpoints on the question of signing a peace treaty.

Lenin carefully analysed the replies. "On the next day (after the inquiry was sent out.—*Ed.*) I took part of these replies, which we received by telegraph," B. Malkin wrote in his reminiscences, "to Lenin, who quickly sorted them out by industrial and peasant centres and said: *'The peasants obviously do not want to fight—we must sound out all the volosts and then we'll have a clear picture.'* Urgent telegrams were sent everywhere, down to volost level, in the name of the Council of People's Commissars and the All-Russia Central Executive Committee. In the course of the next two weeks replies began to come from all over Russia" (B. Malkin, "Lenin and the Brest Peace Treaty", *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, No. 56, March 6, 1928). The replies were published in *Izvestia* from February 28 to March 8. Lenin grouped the replies under the two headings of "For Peace" and "For War" (See *Lenin Miscellany XI*, Russ. ed., pp. 59-60, XXXVI, p. 30).

The final table, compiled by Lenin evidently on the eve of the Seventh Party Congress, contained the following:

For Peace		*For War*
Feb. 26	60	61
Feb. 27	54	24
Feb. 28	26	23
March 1		7
March 2	6	4
Total	155	119
March 3, 4 and 5	12	9
	167	128

Recipient	*Replies:* For *Peace*	*War*
CPC	155	+ 119 = 274
CEC	95	+ 105 = 200
	Σ = 250	+ 224 = 474
	167	+ 128 = 295
	95	+ 105 = 200
	262	+ 233 = 495 p. 137

[96] *The Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the RCP(B)* was held at the Taurida Palace in Petrograd on March 6-8, 1918. This was the first congress of the Communist Party after the Great October Socialist Revolution. It was convened to decide the question of signing a peace treaty with Germany, a question over which a tense struggle was raging in the Party.

Lenin and the CC members supporting him wanted Soviet Russia's withdrawal from the imperialist war. Lenin's principled stand was most fully expressed in his "Theses on the Question of the Immediate Conclusion of a Separate and Annexationist Peace" (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, pp. 442-50). The peace treaty was opposed by the "Left Communists" led by Bukharin. Trotsky's position was close to that of the "Left Communists". Heading the Moscow, Petrograd, Urals and some other Party organisations, the "Left Communists" virulently attacked Lenin's line. The Moscow Regional Bureau passed a resolution of no confidence in the Central Committee and, as Lenin put it, made a "strange and monstrous" (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 68) statement that in the interests of the international revolution it might be expedient "to accept the possibility of losing Soviet power". The adventurist slogans of the "Left Communists" were rejected by most of the lower Party organisations. By the time the Congress opened, Lenin's line of concluding a peace treaty had won the support of the majority of the Party organisations.

Such was the situation when the Seventh Congress began its sittings. It was attended by 47 delegates with a casting vote and 59 delegates with a consultative voice, representing over 170,000 members, including the largest Party organisations: Moscow, Petrograd, Urals and Volga area. At the time of the Congress the Party had nearly 300,000 members, but many organisations were unable to send delegates because of the haste with which the Congress was convened or because of the German occupation of some regions.

The agenda and questions of procedure were considered on March 5 at a preliminary conference of delegates. At its first sitting the Congress approved the agenda: report of the CC; the question of war and peace; revision of the Party Programme and change of the Party's name; organisational questions; elections of the CC.

Lenin directed the work of the Congress, delivering the CC report, speaking on the revision of the Party Programme and the change of the Party's name and taking part in the discussion of all the points on the agenda. He took the floor 18 times.

After the political report of the CC was delivered, Bukharin, as leader of the "Left Communists", delivered a co-report, in which he upheld the adventurist demand for a continuation of the war with Germany.

Eighteen delegates spoke in the heated debate of the two reports. Y. M. Sverdlov, F. A. Sergeyev (Artyom), I. T. Smilga, Rozanova (representing Yaroslavl) and other delegates spoke in support of Lenin. Influenced by Lenin's cogent arguments some of the "Left Communists" reconsidered their position.

After unanimously approving the CC report, the Congress debated the question of war and peace. By a roll-call vote of 30 against 12 with 4 abstentions, the Congress rejected the "Theses on

the Current Situation" submitted by the "Left Communists" as the basis for a resolution. On the question of the Brest peace treaty it passed the resolution drafted by Lenin (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 118-19).

The Congress then debated the question of revising the Party Programme and changing the Party's name. The report on this question was delivered by Lenin, who based himself on his "Rough Outline of the Draft Programme" (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 152-58), which was handed to the delegates when the Congress opened. Pointing out that the Party's name should mirror its aims, Lenin suggested renaming it the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and amending its Programme. Unanimously voting for Lenin's resolution, the Congress adopted his suggestion for the Party's name. The Congress elected a commission of seven with Lenin as chairman to draw up the Party Programme.

By a secret ballot the Congress elected a Central Committee consisting of 15 members and eight alternate members. The "Left Communists" elected to the CC—Bukharin, A. Lomov (G. I. Oppokov) and M. S. Uritsky—declared at the Congress that they would not work in the CC, and despite the CC's emphatic orders they did not attend its sittings for several months.

This was a historic Congress. It showed that the foreign policy principles laid down by Lenin were correct (it was a foreign policy aimed at winning a peaceful respite), defeated the disorganisers of the Party—the "Left Communists" and the Trotskyites—and directed the Communist Party and the working class to the fulfilment of the basic tasks of socialist construction. The Congress decisions were discussed in all local Party organisations and won universal approval despite the continuing divisive activities of the "Left Communists."

The Extraordinary Fourth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, held soon afterwards, on March 14-16, ratified the Brest peace treaty. p. 138

[97] The words "field revolution on a world-wide scale" were used by V. V. Obolensky (N. Osinsky) in the "Theses on the Question of War and Peace", which he wrote for the meeting of the Central Committee on January 21 (February 3), 1918, and published on March 14 in the No. 8 issue of the "Left Communist" newspaper *Kommunist*. Explaining these words, he wrote: "A revolutionary war, like a field civil war, cannot have the nature of conventional military operations by national armies conducting strategic operations.... Field action is of the nature of a partisan struggle (similar to fighting at barricades) and combines with class agitation." p. 139

[98] The *Peace of Tilsit*, signed by France and Prussia in July 1807, bound Prussia to onerous and humiliating commitments. Prussia lost a large territory and had to pay an indemnity amounting to 100 million francs; she was committed to reduce her army to 40,000 men, supply Napoleon, on demand, with auxiliary military forces and cease trade with Britain. p. 140

[99] *Kommunist*—a daily newspaper published by the "Left Communists" in Petrograd from March 5 to 19, 1918 as the organ of the Petro-

grad Committee and the Petrograd District Committee of the RSDLP. Altogether, 11 issues were brought out. The publication of this newspaper was stopped by decision of the Petrograd City Party Conference on March 20, 1918, which found that the Petrograd Committee's policy, as expressed in *Kommunist*, was profoundly erroneous and that it did not in any way reflect the stand of the Petrograd organisation of the Communist Party. The Conference replaced *Kommunist* by *Petrogradskaya Pravda* as the organ of the Petrograd Party organisation. p. 140

[100] Lenin evidently means the period from the beginning of the German offensive—February 18—to the arrival of the Soviet delegation in Brest-Litovsk on February 28, 1918. The German offensive continued until March 3, the day on which the peace treaty was signed. p.141

[101] *The Finnish revolution* began on January 27, 1918, in response to a call by the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party of Finland. The bourgeois government headed by Svinhufvud was deposed and power was seized by the workers. A revolutionary government—Council of People's Representatives, in which posts were held by E. Gylling, O. Kuusinen, J. Sirola, A. Taimi and others—was formed on January 29. The major measures implemented by this government included: the passage of a law on the transfer, without compensation, to landless peasants of the land tilled by them, the exemption of the poorest sections of the population from all taxes, the expropriation of factories belonging to people who had fled the country, and the establishment of state control over private banks (their functions were transferred to the state bank).

However, the revolution triumphed only in the south of Finland. The Svinhufvud government entrenched itself in the north of the country, where it began to mass the forces of the counter-revolution, and appealed for assistance to the German Kaiser. As a result of the German armed intervention the workers' revolution in Finland was crushed on May 2, 1918 after a bitter civil war lasting for three months. White terror swept across the country. Thousands of revolutionary workers and peasants were executed or tortured to death in prisons. p. 142

[102] This is a reference to the resolution passed on February 24, 1918 by the Moscow Regional Bureau of the RSDLP. For a criticism of this anti-Party document see Lenin's article "Strange and Monstrous" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 68-75). p. 143

[103] Lenin refers to a talk with the French officer Count Jean de Lubersac on February 27, 1918. p. 147

[104] In this manifesto the People's Commissariat for Military Affairs called upon all the workers and peasants in the Soviet Republic to take up military training voluntarily. This step was necessary because under the terms of the peace treaty with Germany the Russian Army had to be demobilised. The manifesto was published in *Izvestia* No. 40 on March 5, 1918. p. 147

[105] *Canossa*—a castle in North Italy. In 1077 the German emperor Henry IV, after suffering defeat at the hands of Pope Gregory VII

stood for three days in the robes of a penitent before the gates of Canossa in order to receive absolution and recover imperial powers. Hence the expression "to go to Canossa", meaning to do penance and submit to the enemy. p. 148

[106] Under the armistice agreement signed on December 2 (15), 1917 at Brest-Litovsk by the Soviet Government and the powers of the Quadruple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey), any one of the parties could resume the hostilities only after a seven-day warning. The German military command, however, violated this condition by beginning an offensive along the entire front on February 18—two days after giving notice that it was breaking the armistice. p. 149

[107] Under Article VI of the Brest peace treaty, signed on March 3, 1918, Russia was obliged to conclude peace with the counter-revolutionary Ukrainian Central Rada. No peace talks were conducted between the Soviet Government and the Rada at the time. On April 29, 1918, with the help of the Constitutional-Democratic and Octobrist bourgeois parties the German occupation forces deposed the Rada and replaced it with a dictatorship headed by Hetman Skoropadsky. The negotiations between Soviet Russia and the Skoropadsky administration began on May 23 and an armistice was signed on June 14, 1918. p. 150

[108] *The Left Socialist-Revolutionary (Internationalist) Party* was formed at its First All-Russia Congress on November 19-28 (December 2-11), 1917. Prior to this the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries comprised the Left wing of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, which took shape during the First World War. Its leaders were M. A. Spiridonova, B. D. Kamkov and M. A. Natanson (Bobrov). At the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets, the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries comprised the majority in the Socialist-Revolutionary group, which split in two over the question of participation in the Congress: the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries walked out as instructed by their CC, while the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries remained at the Congress and voted with the Bolsheviks on a number of major points on the agenda. However, they rejected the Bolshevik offer of posts in the Soviet Government.

After long vacillation and aspiring to preserve their influence among the peasants, the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries reached agreement with the Bolsheviks and received appointments to the collegiums of some people's commissariats. One of them, the party leader A. L. Kolegayev, was appointed People's Commissar of Agriculture. While co-operating with the Bolsheviks, the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries disagreed with them on basic problems of socialist construction and were opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat. In January and February 1918 the CC of the Left Socialist-Revolutionary Party made every effort to prevent the signing of the Brest peace treaty, and after the treaty was concluded and ratified by the Fourth Congress of Soviets in March 1918 the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries resigned from the Council of People's Commissars but remained in the collegiums of the people's commissariats and in the local organs of power. Anti-Soviet attitudes became predominant among the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries when the socialist

revolution spread in the countryside. In July 1918 their CC organised the assassination of the German Ambassador in Moscow in the hope of provoking war between Soviet Russia and Germany, and sparked an armed uprising against the Soviet power. After the uprising was suppressed the Fifth All-Russia Congress of Soviets expelled from the Soviets all Left Socialist-Revolutionaries who shared the views of their leaders. p. 150

109 *March 12*—the day on which it was intended to convene the Extraordinary Fourth All-Russia Congress of Soviets to decide the question of the ratification of the peace treaty. The Congress sat on March 14-16, 1918. p. 150

110 During the debate on Lenin's resolution on war and peace, Trotsky, supported by the "Left Communists", moved amendments forbidding the Soviet Government to conclude peace with the Ukrainian Central Rada and the bourgeois government of Finland. After Lenin spoke against the attempts of Trotsky and the "Left Communists" to deprive the CC of freedom of action, these amendments were rejected by a majority vote. p. 153

111 Here the reference is to a decision concerning General Headquarters passed by the Central Committee of the RCP(B) on June 15, 1919. In a statement to the CC, Trotsky attacked this decision, maintaining that it was "full of whims, mischief", and so on. p. 155

112 In 1919 Kolchak's army suffered a series of signal defeats at the hands of the Red Army and the Siberia partisans, as a result of which in the summer of 1919 the chief role in the fighting against the Soviet Republic passed from Kolchak to Denikin. Receiving generous aid from the Entente imperialists and supplied with everything it needed, the Denikin army started an offensive in which it seized the Donets region, the Crimea and a considerable part of the Ukraine. After bitter fighting, the Red Army left Tsaritsyn on June 30, and Kharkov fell on July 24.

This gave rise to a threatening situation. In mid-summer the firing lines drew close to the central regions of Soviet Russia.

At a plenary meeting on July 3-4, the Central Committee of the RCP(B) charted measures against the Denikin army. It discussed the question of a new Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the Red Army, rejecting the nomination proposed by Trotsky and, despite his objections, appointed S. S. Kamenev Commander-in-Chief of the Eastern front.

In accordance with the instructions of the plenary meeting a plan was drawn up for a counter-offensive on the Southern front. This plan was approved by the Party CC.

Trotsky, who was Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic, was against the strategic plan adopted by the Central Committee, and obstructed its implementation when he toured the Southern front.

The cited telegram from Lenin was sent in reply to a telegram from Trotsky and his supporters, Serebryakov and Lashevich, of September 5, 1919, in which they suggested amending the approved plan of struggle against Denikin. On September 6 the Political Bureau of the CC RCP(B) considered Trotsky's telegram and

decided to "approve the draft reply of the Commander-in-Chief and telegraph the Political Bureau's surprise that this question has been raised again" (Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CC CPSU). p. 155

[113] The speech at the joint sitting of the RCP(B) group at the Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and the Moscow City Council of Trade Unions at the Bolshoi Theatre on December 30, 1920 was Lenin's first pronouncement to the Party *aktiv* in connection with the discussion of the role and tasks of the trade unions in socialist construction.

The discussion was forced on the Party by Trotsky, who at a meeting of the RCP(B) group at the Fifth All-Russia Trade Union Conference spoke against the Party line of promoting democratic principles in the trade unions. He called for a "tightening up of the screws of War Communism".

The differences were over the question of the "different *approach* to the mass, the different way of winning it over and *keeping in touch* with it" (see the present volume, p. 159). The differences that arose in the group were brought up for discussion at a plenary meeting of the CC RCP(B). However, by the end of December the discussion of the trade unions went beyond the Central Committee. On December 24 Trotsky addressed a meeting of the *aktiv* of the trade union movement and delegates to the Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets. On December 25 he issued a pamphlet which marked the emergence of an anti-Party group. This was the signal for action by other anti-Party groups: "buffer", "Workers' Opposition", "Democratic Centralism" and others.

Lenin was against this discussion, believing that it would divert the Party's attention and energy from the fulfilment of pressing economic tasks aimed at fighting the economic dislocation and the famine. But in view of the action taken by opposition elements, Lenin started a resolute struggle against them, directing the main blow at the Trotskyites, who were the rallying force of the anti-Party groups. In a number of speeches and the articles "The Party Crisis" and "Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin" (see the present volume, pp. 178-224)—he laid bare the real meaning of the inner-Party struggle, exposed the factional nature of the opposition's actions, which were undermining Party unity, and showed the harm of the discussion they had forced on the Party. He advanced and developed a number of fundamental propositions on the role played by the trade unions under the dictatorship of the proletariat and on their tasks in socialist construction.

The discussion of the trade unions lasted more than two months, in the course of which the overwhelming majority of Party organisations stated their approval of the line charted by Lenin. In all the main Party organisations the opposition suffered total defeat. The results of the discussion were summed up at the Tenth Party Congress, which was held on March 8-16, 1921. p. 156

[114] At the Ninth Congress the agenda included questions relating to the immediate tasks in economic development and to the trade union movement. The Congress defined these immediate tasks and

stressed that the trade unions had to help carry them out. This was reflected in the resolutions "On the Immediate Tasks in Economic Development" and "On the Question of the Trade Unions and Their Organisation" (see *The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 150-64, 164-69). p. 158

115 A reference to the resolution passed by the Ninth All-Russia Conference of the RCP(B) "On the Immediate Tasks in Party Development" (see *The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 189-95). p. 164

116 *Izvestia Tsentralnogo Komiteta Rossiiskoi Kommunisticheskoi Partii (Bolshevikov)*—an information bulletin of the CC on questions of Party life. Publication was started on May 28, 1919 by decision of the Eighth Congress of the RCP(B). The first issues were brought out as weekly supplements to the newspaper *Pravda*. In October 1920 it began to be published as an independent organ.

In 1929 it became the fortnightly journal *Partiinoye Stroitelstvo*, and in June 1946 it was renamed *Partiinaya Zhizn*. p. 164

117 The *buffer group*—an anti-Party faction that came forward during the trade union discussion of 1920-1921. Headed by Bukharin, it included Y. Larin, Y. A. Preobrazhensky, L. P. Serebryakov, G. Y. Sokolnikov and V. N. Yakovleva and others. Under the guise of smoothing over the differences between Lenin and Trotsky over the question of the role and tasks of the trade unions, the buffer group sought to reconcile Leninism with Trotskyism. While assuming the role of conciliator, Bukharin took every opportunity to uphold Trotsky and attack Lenin. Characterising Bukharin's attitude, Lenin described him as "a man pouring a bucket of kerosene on the flames" (see the present volume, p. 172). The buffer group facilitated Trotsky's factional activities and inflicted great harm on the Party. In fact, it aided and abetted the worst and most injurious kind of factional activity: the theses presented by Bukharin and his supporters were called by Lenin "an all-time low in *ideological* disintegration" (see the present volume, p. 184). Bukharin soon abandoned his own platform and openly sided with Trotsky.

The buffer group and its anti-Party views were assessed by Lenin in the article "The Party Crisis", the pamphlet *Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin* (see the present volume, pp. 178-224) and other works. p. 164

118 *Glavpolitput (Central Political Department of the People's Commissariat for Communications)* was set up in February 1919 as a temporary political agency functioning directly under the leadership of the Central Committee of the RCP(B); in January 1920 it was reorganised as the Main Political Department of the People's Commissariat for Communications. Glavpolitput was formed to carry through extraordinary measures to prevent the threatening total collapse of transport due to the imperialist and civil wars, strengthen the leadership of Party and political work among transport workers, reinforce the railwaymen's trade union and turn it into a vehicle for the further development of transport. Glavpolitput

instituted military discipline on the railways, subordinating them entirely to the war-time tasks. The emergency measures taken by Glavpolitput made it possible to save transport from breaking down, but at the same time it intensified bureaucratic practices and gave rise to a tendency towards isolation from the masses, towards renunciation of democratic methods of work in the trade unions.

When the Civil War ended and peaceful development started Glavpolitput was abolished by decision of a plenary meeting of the CC RCP(B) on December 7, 1920.

Tsektran (Central Committee of the United Railwaymen's and Water Transport Workers' Trade Union) was set up in September 1920. These two transport unions were merged because it was necessary to create a strong centralised leadership capable of ensuring the restoration of transport, whose collapse threatened to paralyse the national economy. This situation required a temporary policy of emergency measures and military methods of work in the trade union. Although Tsektran accomplished much in the way of restoring transport, it steadily developed into a bureaucratic agency isolated from the trade union membership. The Trotskyites in key posts encouraged bureaucratic practices, armchair methods of management, appointment of trade union executives and rejection of democratic principles, all of which set the workers against the Party and sowed dissension among the transport workers. These vicious methods were denounced by the Party Central Committee. At its plenary meetings on November 8 and December 7, 1920 the Central Committee passed decisions to include Tsektran in the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions on an equal footing with other trade unions and insisted that Tsektran abide by the principles of trade union democracy and ensure the electivity of all trade union bodies.

The First All-Russia Congress of Transport Workers, convened in March 1921 by decision of the Party Central Committee, expelled the Trotskyites from the Tsektran leadership and mapped out new methods of work. p. 171

[119] See *The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 160-61. p. 171

[120] *Politvod* (*Glavpolitvod—Central Political Administration of the Water Transport of the People's Commissariat for Communications*) was formed in April 1920 as a department of Glavpolitput. Its functions were to maintain political control of the administrative and technical apparatus, direct political education with a view to achieving the rapid restoration of the water transport, raise labour productivity and ensure labour discipline. It was abolished in December 1920. p. 171

[121] *The Fifth All-Russia Conference of Trade Unions* was held in Moscow on November 2-6, 1920 (it was officially opened on November 3). It was attended by 202 delegates with a casting vote and 59 with a consultative voice. The transition to peaceful socialist construction necessitated the reorganisation of the work of the trade unions and the promotion of democratic principles in their organisation and activities. At a meeting of the Communist group at the

Conference on November 3, Trotsky spoke against any transition to new methods, insisting that the trade unions should be forthwith turned into state agencies and that they should continue to employ military methods of administration. This speech started a discussion in the Party and was condemned by the Communist delegates to the Conference.

The report on the production tasks of the trade unions was delivered by Y. E. Rudzutak. The theses suggested by him were adopted by the Conference. These theses were founded on Lenin's propositions on the need to enhance the role of the trade unions in the development of production, to extend the democratic basis of their activities and strengthen the Party's leadership of the trade union movement. All these propositions were later enlarged on in the decision "On the Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions" passed by the Tenth Congress of the RCP(B) (see *The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 226-42). p. 174

122 *The Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers', Peasants', Red Army and Cossack Deputies* was held in Moscow on December 22-29, 1920. More representative than any preceding Congress of Soviets, it was attended by 2,537 delegates of whom 1,728 had a casting vote and 809 a consultative voice. The Party composition of the delegates was: Communists—91.7 per cent; Communist sympathisers—2.7 per cent; non-Party—3.9 per cent; Mensheviks—0.3 per cent; Bundists—0.3 per cent; Left Socialist-Revolutionaries—0.15 per cent; anarchists—0.15 per cent; members of other parties—0.8 per cent. This strikingly showed the growth of the Communist Party's prestige and the political downfall of the petty-bourgeois parties, which had discredited themselves in the eyes of the people as anti-Soviet, counter-revolutionary parties.

The Congress was held after the Civil War had ended victoriously, and economic development had become "the chief and fundamental factor" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 495). The items on the agenda were: report on the work of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars; the electrification of Russia; the restoration of industry and transport; the development of agricultural production and aid to the peasant economy; improvement of the work of local government bodies and the struggle against bureaucracy. The main items on the agenda were discussed in advance at meetings of the RCP(B) group. To allow for a thorough discussion of all the questions before it, the Congress set up three sections: industry, agriculture and Soviet development.

The work of the Congress was directed by Lenin, who spoke at the plenary sittings, delivered the report on the work of the All-Russia CEC and the Council of People's Commissars on December 22, and made the closing speech on the report on December 23. Moreover, he spoke six times at sittings of the Communist group (December 21, 22, 24 and 27) on the question of concessions and in connection with the debate on the draft law to strengthen and promote the peasant economy.

On Lenin's report on the work of the All-Russia CEC and the Council of People's Commissars the Congress passed a resolu-

tion by an overwhelming majority, approving the Government's policy. Nothing came of an attempt by representatives of petty-bourgeois parties, who made anti-Soviet declarations, to secure the passage of their own draft resolution.

The Congress adopted a plan for the country's electrification which was drawn up on Lenin's initiative and instructions. This was the first Soviet long-term economic development plan and Lenin called it the "Party's second programme". The resolution passed on the report delivered by G. M. Krzhizhanovsky was written by Lenin (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 532-33).

One of the key items on the agenda was the draft law to promote and strengthen agriculture which had been adopted by the Council of People's Commissars on December 14, 1920. Stressing the importance of this draft law, Lenin said that round it, "as on a focal point, are grouped hundreds of decisions and legislative measures of the Soviet government" (ibid., p. 506). The main provisions of the law were discussed with Lenin's participation at a conference of non-Party peasant delegates to the Congress on December 22 and in the RCP(B) group on December 24 and 27 (see ibid., pp. 525-31, and Vol. 42, pp. 257-66). The law was passed unanimously by the Congress.

The transition to peaceful construction demanded an improvement and reorganisation of the entire government apparatus. On this question the Congress adopted an extended decision regulating the relations between the central and local organs of power and management. Another important question dealt with at the Congress was the reorganisation of the entire system of economic management in accordance with the new economic tasks. The Congress approved the new Rules of the Council of Labour and Defence.

The Congress instituted the Order of the Red Banner of Labour as a decoration for dedicated work, initiative, and organisational ability. p. 181

123 *Workers' Opposition*—an anti-Party faction headed by A. G. Shlyapnikov, S. P. Medvedev, A. M. Kollontai, I. I. Kutuzov, Y. K. Lutovinov and others. The group first used this demagogic name in September 1920 at the Ninth All-Russia Conference of the RCP(B); in November it embarked on a factional struggle and tried to undermine the Party's unity, organising a special conference at the Moscow Gubernia Conference of the RCP(B). It took final shape during the trade union discussion of 1920-1921. Its views were an expression of the anarcho-syndicalist deviation in the Party. They were most fully expounded by A. M. Kollontai in *The Workers' Opposition*, a brochure published on the eve of the Tenth Congress of the RCP(B). The opposition wanted the management of the entire national economy to be placed in the hands of an "All-Russia Congress of Producers", united in trade unions, which would elect a central agency to direct the country's economy. The Workers' Opposition counterposed the trade unions to the Soviet Government and the Communist Party, holding that the highest form of working-class organisation was not the Party but the trade unions. Its platform on inner-Party questions consisted of slanderous accusations that the Party leadership was "isolated from

the Party masses", "underrated the creative potentialities of the proletariat" and had "degenerated". The arguments of the Workers' Opposition were demolished at the Tenth Party Congress. In the resolution "On the Syndicalist and Anarchist Deviation in Our Party", proposed by Lenin, it was underscored that the views of the Workers' Opposition were theoretically untenable and "in practice weaken the Communist Party's guideline and in fact help the class enemies of the proletarian revolution" (*The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 223-24). The Congress ruled that the propagation of the ideas of the Workers' Opposition was incompatible with membership of the Communist Party and demanded the immediate disbandment of all factional groups. After this Congress the Workers' Opposition lost most of its rank-and-file members, who gave their unequivocal support to the Party line. However, the remnants of this group, headed by Shlyapnikov and Medvedev, continued functioning as an illegal organisation and conducting anti-Party propaganda under cover of ultra-revolutionary verbiage. In February 1922 they sent the Comintern Executive the "Statement of 22", which contained malicious slander against the Party. After considering this statement the Comintern Executive emphatically condemned the group's activities and warned it that further activity along the same lines would place it outside the Third International. This group's organisational defeat was completed in 1922 at the Eleventh Congress of the RCP(B). p. 181

[124] At a joint sitting of the RCP(B) group at the Eighth Congress of Soviets, the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and the Moscow City Council of Trade Unions an argument flared up as to whether Y. E. Rudzutak was the author of the theses "Production Tasks of the Trade Unions". Lenin requested the All-Russia CCTU to produce documentary proof of the origin of these theses. He was given an excerpt from Minutes No. 44 of a meeting of the All-Russia CCTU Presidium on November 1 and an accompanying note from S. A. Lozovsky. The excerpt stated that the Presidium had discussed Rudzutak's theses and had adopted them as a basis. M. P. Tomsky and Rudzutak had then been instructed to elaborate on the details. In the note it was stated that Tomsky did not take part in this work and that the details were enlarged by Rudzutak. The Fifth All-Russia Trade Union Conference heard Rudzutak's report, adopted his theses as a basis and set up a commission consisting of G. V. Tsiperovich, A. A. Andreyev and Rudzutak to edit them. The commission collectively reworded some of the points and made additions.

The collected materials and Rudzutak's theses were sent to *Pravda* by Lenin. In the accompanying letter he wrote: "I request the Editorial Board to publish Rudzutak's theses, which were adopted by the Fifth All-Russia Trade Union Conference held from November 2 to 6, 1920; they are extremely necessary as material for discussion. I also append material on the debate which has started in Party circles concerning the origin of these theses." Lenin's letter and the material sent by him were printed in *Pravda* No. 13 on January 21, 1921. p. 182

[125] The *Appeal to the Party by the Petrograd Organisation of the*

RCP(B) was adopted on January 3, 1921 at a meeting of representatives of the district Party organisations. On January 6 it was approved by a general city meeting held in the People's House with the attendance of over 4,000 members and candidate members of the Party. Not more than 20 people voted against it. At district meetings the appeal received 95-98 per cent of the votes.

The appeal stated the views of the Petrograd Bolsheviks on the role and tasks of the trade unions, upheld Lenin's stand on this question and denounced the platform offered by Trotsky. The Petrograd organisation called on all other Party organisations to support Lenin's line and drew the Party's attention to the fact that implementation of Trotsky's programme would abolish the trade unions and undermine the dictatorship of the proletariat. The "Appeal to the Party" was published in *Pravda* No. 7 on January 13.

The Moscow Committee of the RCP(B), which maintained a "buffer" position at the time, issued a counter-statement to the appeal of the Petrograd organisation. In the resolution, published in the same issue of *Pravda*, it was stated that the Moscow Committee considered it was "absolutely impossible" to subscribe to the suggestions made in the "Appeal to the Party". The Moscow Committee assessed the action of the Petrograd Party organisation as an "extremely dangerous" tendency towards becoming a special centre in the preparations for the Party Congress, but did not condemn the formation of a faction by Trotsky, thereby aiding his factional struggle. p. 183

126 *The draft decision of the Tenth Congress of the RCP on the role and tasks of the trade unions*, submitted for consideration by the Party CC by a group of CC members and members of the Trade Union Commission at the CC, was the Leninist platform ("Platform of Ten") to which the platforms of the anti-Party groups were opposed. In this document the role of the trade unions was defined in the light of the country's new tasks arising from the end of the Civil War and the transition to peaceful socialist construction. The trade unions were assigned the role of a school of administration, a school of economic management and a school of communism. Their principal functions were to participate in the administration of the state, train cadres for the local government and economic apparatuses and strengthen labour discipline. Their work had to be founded on education and persuasion and on broad democratic principles. The "Platform of Ten", supported during the trade union discussion by most of the local Party organisations, was used as the basis for the decision on the role and tasks of the trade unions passed by the Tenth Congress of the RCP(B). p. 183

127 The "anti-Party group of *Democratic Centralists*" ("Decists")—an opportunist faction led by M. S. Boguslavsky, A. Z. Kamensky, V. N. Maximovsky, N. Osinsky, Rafail (R. B. Farbman) and T. V. Sapronov. This group first came out against Lenin's principles on questions of Party and local government development at the Eighth Congress of the RCP(B). At the Ninth Congress the "Decists" put forward their own co-rapporteurs on economic development and on the question of organisation. The Congress exposed and

rejected the anti-Party views of the "Decists", who argued that the Party should not play the leading role in the Soviets and the trade unions, opposed one-man management and personal responsibility in industry, came out against Lenin's principles on questions of organisation and demanded freedom for factions and groups. Their representatives advocated the merging of the Council of People's Commissars with the Presidium of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and demanded an end to the subordination of local to central organs of power. They were opposed to the CC being simultaneously the political and the organisational leader and demanded that the Organisational Bureau of the CC relinquish the political leadership. In the Ukraine the "Decists" opposed the establishment of poor peasants' committees, which were the vehicles of the proletarian dictatorship in the countryside.

The "Decists" had no influence in the Party. On many issues the Mensheviks saw eye to eye with them.

During the trade union discussion in 1920-1921 the "Democratic Centralism" group published its own factional programme, advertising it at pre-Congress meetings in an effort to win votes. At the Tenth Congress it abandoned this platform, giving its members freedom to vote and shifting the struggle to the question of Party development. On this issue the group presented a co-report which was delivered at the Congress by V. N. Maximovsky. After the Tenth Congress, anti-Party activities were continued only by the group's leaders. In 1923 they formed a bloc with the Trotskyites, and in 1926 they set up the so-called "group of 15" led by Sapronov and Smirnov. This group was expelled from the Party at the Fifteenth Congress. p. 184

[128] *Ignatovites, or "group of functionaries in the city districts of Moscow"*—an anti-Party, anarcho-syndicalist group led by Y. N. Ignatov. It existed during the trade union discussion of 1920-1921 and confined its activities to the Moscow Party organisation. It had no influence in the Party or among the workers of Moscow. On the eve of the Tenth Congress it presented two programmes—on the immediate tasks of the trade unions and on the question of Party development. The Ignatovites shared the anarcho-syndicalist views of the Workers' Opposition, demanding the transfer of the management of the national economy to an agency to be elected by the All-Russia Congress of Trade Unions. But as distinct from the latter, they held that the elected agency should be subject to endorsement by the All-Russia Central Executive Committee. Like the Workers' Opposition, the Ignatovites counterposed the trade unions to the Soviet Government, rejected the leading role of the Party in socialist construction, were opposed to democratic centralism and demanded freedom for factional activity. At the Tenth Congress Ignatov delivered an official report on Party development on behalf of the "Workers' Opposition". The Ignatov group was dissolved after the Congress. p. 184

[129] See *The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, p. 51 (Paragraph 5). p. 185

[130] A reference to the amalgamation of the Vperyodists (the *Vperyod*

anti-Party group which included the otzovists, the ultimatumists and the god-builders) with the Menshevik liquidators and the Trotskyites after the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the RSDLP in order to fight the decisions of that Conference.

The opportunists started a vicious campaign against the Bolsheviks in order to split the revolutionary working-class movement and undermine and destroy the proletarian Party. They tried to form a bloc on a liquidationist basis, demanding the Party's "reorganisation" which would, in fact, have meant its liquidation. But having been formed on an unprincipled foundation this association was extremely unstable and soon fell apart. p. 186

131 Lenin had in mind the discussion of the role and tasks of the trade unions on January 17, 1921 at an extended sitting of the Moscow Committee of the RCP(B) jointly with representatives of the Moscow district Party organisations and of uyezd organisations.

The draft theses presented by the various groups during the discussion were heard and considered at this sitting. In the preliminary voting Lenin's theses received 76 votes, Trotsky's 27, Bukharin's 5, Shlyapnikov's 4, Sapronov's 11, Ignatov's 25, Nogin's zero and Ryazanov's zero. At the final voting for the two main platforms, Lenin's theses received 84 votes and Trotsky's 27. The theses signed by Lenin and his supporters were thus adopted by an overwhelming majority.

On the next day, January 18, the Moscow Party Committee adopted an appeal "To All Party Organisations", which called upon all Party members to give Lenin's platform their unanimous support. p. 186

132 The pamphlet *Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin* was started by Lenin on January 21 or 22, 1921 in Gorki, where he went for a rest. In the evening of January 22, Lenin returned to Moscow and brought most of the pamphlet, giving it to his secretary with instructions to have it typed. The pamphlet was finished on January 25 and sent to the printshop on the same day. Part of the printed copies of the pamphlet were handed out late in the evening of January 26 to members of the CC who were leaving for the localities to take part in the discussion of the role and tasks of the trade unions. The rest of the copies of this pamphlet were printed on the next day, January 27. p. 188

133 *Petrogradskaya Pravda* (Petrograd Truth)—a daily newspaper whose printing was started on April 2, 1918, as the organ of the Central and Petrograd Committees of the RCP(B). In January 1924 the newspaper was renamed *Leningradskaya Pravda*, under which name it is published to this day. p. 188

134 *V. I. Zoff's circular of May 3, 1920* was published in the same year in *Byulleten Mariinskogo Oblastnogo Upravleniya Vodnogo Transporta* No. 5. It stated in part: "A radical change is thus looming in the water transport. Parochial methods, the committee treadmill, lack of system and anarchy are receding into the past. The water transport is becoming an affair of the state. It will

be headed by political commissars vested with the adequate powers. The right of committees, the trade unions and elective delegates to interfere in technical and management matters is being annulled."

This circular exemplified the excesses of administration by injunction and of the bureaucracy which the Trotskyite leadership of Tsektran was energetically planting, and was a vivid testimony of its incomprehension of the role of the trade unions in restoring transport. The trade unions were equated to the outworn army committees, called the "committee treadmill" and peremptorily removed from taking part in normalising the work of the water transport. p. 197

135 *The Second All-Russia Miners' Congress* took place in the Hall of Columns of the House of Trade Unions in Moscow from January 25 to February 2, 1921. It was attended by 341 delegates (295 with a casting vote and 46 with a consultative voice), representing over 332,000 members of the miners' trade union. Among the delegates were 259 Communists and probationary members of the Party. Lenin, M. I. Kalinin and other Party leaders were elected honorary chairmen of the Congress.

The Congress heard and discussed the report of the Union's CC, and also the reports of the Miners' Council and the central administrations, and discussed questions related to the fuel supply, the tasks of the trade union, the organisation of production, wages, organisational, cultural and educational work, labour protection, international contacts, and concessions, and elected a new Central Committee of the Union. The Congress ended with the adoption of an appeal to the organised workers of all countries to unite.

The Congress was preceded by four meetings of the RCP(B) group (February 22-24), which discussed the role and tasks of the trade unions. The rapporteurs at these meetings were Lenin, Trotsky and Shlyapnikov. The absolute majority of the members of the group sided with Lenin. The platform presented by Lenin received 137 votes, Shlyapnikov's theses received 61 votes and Trotsky's theses 8 votes.

This Congress was of major significance in the struggle to end the fuel shortage that was being experienced by the Soviet Republic at the time, and helped to draw up production programmes for the mining industry. p. 219

136 See Note No. 122 of the present volume. p. 220

137 On December 24, 1920 Trotsky spoke on the tasks of the trade unions in production at a joint meeting of functionaries of the trade union movement and delegates to the Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, organised at the former Zimin Theatre by the Central Committee of the United Union of Railwaymen and Water Transport Workers. p. 223

138 *The Tenth Congress of the RCP(B)* was held in Moscow on March 8-16, 1921. It was attended by 694 delegates with a casting vote and 296 delegates with a consultative voice, representing 732,521 Party members. The Congress discussed: (1) the report of the Central Committee; (2) the report of the Control Commission; (3) the trade unions and their role in the country's economic life; (4) the socialist

republic encircled by capitalist countries, foreign trade, concessions and so on; (5) food supply, surplus food appropriation, the tax in kind and the fuel crisis; (6) Party development; (7) the Party's immediate tasks in the national question; (8) the reorganisation of the army and the question of the militia; (9) the Central Political Education Department and the Party's agitation and propaganda work; (10) the report of the RCP(B) representative in the Comintern and his immediate tasks; (11) the report of RCP(B) members in the International Trade Union Council; (12) elections to the Central Committee, the Control Commission and the Auditing Commission.

The Congress passed decisions on the basic questions of the country's political and economic life. Its work was directed by Lenin. He spoke at the opening and closing sessions, delivered reports on the CC's political activity, the replacement of the surplus food appropriation system by a tax in kind, Party unity and the anarcho-syndicalist deviation, the trade unions and the fuel question. He drafted the major resolutions of the Congress. In the report on the work of the Central Committee and in the report on the replacement of the surplus food appropriation system by a tax in kind, he profoundly showed the theoretical and political necessity for going over to the New Economic Policy. On the report delivered by Lenin the Congress passed its historic decision to replace the surplus food appropriation system by a tax in kind, and effect the transition from War Communism to the New Economic Policy aimed at drawing millions of peasants into the building of socialism.

Party unity was one of the major questions dealt with at the Congress. Lenin sharply criticised the anti-Marxist views of the opposition groups. In the resolution "On Party Unity", moved by Lenin (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 241-44), the Congress ordered the immediate disbandment of all factional groups, which were weakening the Party and undermining its unity. The Congress empowered the Central Committee to apply the extreme measure of expulsion from the Party to those who engaged in factional activities.

The Congress passed a resolution "On the Syndicalist and Anarchist Deviation in Our Party", which was also drawn up by Lenin (ibid., pp. 245-48). In this resolution it was stated that the views of the Workers' Opposition were an expression of petty-bourgeois, anarchist vacillation. The propagation of anarcho-syndicalist ideas was found to be incompatible with membership of the RCP(B). With the country engaged in peaceful socialist construction, the Congress demanded an extension of inner-Party democracy and the reorganisation of the Party's work on the broadest democratic basis.

The role of the trade unions in economic development was dealt with at length. The Congress summed up the results of the discussion of the trade unions, unequivocally condemned the views of the Trotskyites, the Workers' Opposition, the Democratic Centralism group and other opportunist trends and by an overwhelming majority approved Lenin's platform, which defined the role and tasks

of the trade unions as a school of communism and proposed steps to extend trade union democracy.

The Congress decisions on the national question drawn up by a commission headed by Lenin played an immense role in determining the Party's national policy under the new conditions. The Congress set the task of abolishing all signs of the inequality of the formerly oppressed peoples, and drawing them into active participation in the building of socialism. It denounced great-power chauvinism and local nationalism, manifestations of which in the Party, in the centre and in the localities were a serious threat to communism and proletarian internationalism. A new Central Committee consisting of 25 members was elected.

The decisions passed at this Congress were of historic significance. They outlined the concrete ways and means of achieving the transition from capitalism to socialism, determined the methods of building socialism under the new conditions and strongly emphasised the need to strengthen the alliance of the proletariat with the peasants and enhance the Party's leading role in the successful building of socialism. p. 225

[139] This is a reference to the speech made by Trotsky at the joint meeting of Communist delegates to the Eighth Congress of Soviets and members of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and the Moscow City Council of Trade Unions on December 30, 1920. p. 225

[140] *Tsektran*—see Note 118 of the present volume. p. 226

[141] Lenin refers to the resolution, passed on December 29, 1920 by the Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, on the situation on the railways and the water transport and on the further prospects of strengthening and developing them. p. 226

[142] "*Platform of Ten*" ("*Draft resolution of the Tenth Congress of the RCP(B) on the role and tasks of the trade unions*" drawn up in November 1920 during the trade union discussion) was signed by V. I. Lenin, F. A. Sergeyev (Artyom), G. Y. Zinoviev, M. I. Kalinin, L. B. Kamenev, S. A. Lozovsky, J. V. Stalin, M. P. Tomsky, Y. E. Rudzutak and G. I. Petrovsky. Supported by the vast majority of the Party membership, the "Platform of Ten" was used as the basis for the decision adopted by the Tenth Congress of the RCP(B) on the role and tasks of the trade unions (see *The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 226-42). p. 226

[143] See F. Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 330). p. 227

[144] See *The CPSU in Resolutions etc.*, 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 2, p. 51. p. 228

[145] The document contains the following instructions to the secretary: "To Comrade Lepeshinskaya: make three copies: two for Stalin and one for me. *Double-check* the copies *personally*. May 5. Lenin."

The notes to the draft "Decree on the Functions of the Deputy

Chairmen" (see *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 335-43), received by Lenin were, evidently, on his instructions summarised by his secretary and sent to all members of the Political Bureau and to A. D. Tsyurupa. Written in Lenin's hand on the envelope, in which documents on this question were kept in the Lenin archives, are the words: "Decree on the Functions of the Deputy Chairmen, April 11, 1922, and the 'polemics', May 1922". p. 231

146 At the Soldatyonkovskaya Hospital (now the Botkin Hospital) on April 23, 1922 Lenin underwent an operation for the removal of one of the bullets that remained lodged in his body after the assassination attempt of August 30, 1918. p. 231

147 *The plenary meeting of the CC and the Central Control Commission held jointly with representatives of ten Party organisations* in Moscow on October 25-27, 1923, considered the situation in the Party and stigmatised the anti-Party, factional, slanderous speech made by Trotsky on October 8, 1923. This speech was the signal for all the opposition groups to unite for an attack on the Party and on Leninism. The plenary meeting branded the platform concocted by Trotsky called the statement of 46. All the opposition groups—the Trotskyites, the Decists, the remnants of the "Left Communists" and of the Workers' Opposition—joined forces to attack the Leninist Party. In their statement they prophesied a grave economic crisis and the downfall of the Soviet power and demanded, as the only way out of the situation, freedom for factions and groups that had been banned by the Tenth Party Congress on Lenin's initiative. p. 235

148 *The Thirteenth Conference of the RCP(B)* was held in Moscow on January 16-18, 1924. It was attended by 128 delegates with a casting vote and 222 delegates with a consultative voice. It discussed the immediate tasks of economic policy: Party development and the international situation, and adopted resolutions on these questions. In addition, it passed a resolution "On the Results of the Discussion and on the Petty-Bourgeois Deviation in the Party" and a message of greetings to *Pravda*, the Party's Central Organ.

The Conference summed up the discussion and exposed the anti-Party substance of the Trotskyite opposition. It condemned this opposition, declaring that it was a *petty-bourgeois deviation* from Leninism. It ruled that Paragraph 7 of the resolution "On Party Unity", adopted at the Tenth Congress on a motion from Lenin, had to be published. The decisions passed by this Conference were approved by the Thirteenth Party Congress and the Fifth Congress of the Comintern.

In the message of greetings to *Pravda* the Conference stated its approval of the line followed by the newspaper in upholding the fundamental ideas of Leninism in the discussion.

In line with the task of strengthening the alliance of the working class with the peasants, the Conference passed a number of decisions on questions related to economic policy—the money reform, the organisation of credits, reduction of prices of manufactured goods, and so on.

The Conference censured the Right-opportunist capitulationist

stand adopted by Radek and others during the events of 1923 in Germany. p. 236

149 *The plenary meeting of the CC RCP(B) of January 29 and 31, 1924* approved the resolution "On the Results of the Discussion and the Petty-Bourgeois Deviation in the Party" with the following addition: "While endorsing the resolution on the results of the discussion, the Central Committee urgently draws the attention of all the local organisations, where the discussion was of a sharp nature, to the need to overcome the aggravation as quickly as possible and strengthen the solid unity of the ranks, which is particularly necessary today in view of Comrade Lenin's death" (see *The CPSU in Resolutions etc.,* 8th Russ. ed., Vol. 3, p. 11). p. 245

150 *The CC RCP(B) held a plenary meeting with the participation of members of the Central Control Commission* in Moscow from January 17 to 20, 1925. The following questions were discussed: the resolutions adopted by local organisations on the pronouncements made by Trotsky; the enlargement of the budget; the situation in and prospects of the metal industry; the report of the Organising Bureau of the CC on the steps taken to intensify political work among women workers and peasants; the extended plenary meeting of the Comintern Executive. Moreover, it considered a number of current organisational questions and heard reports on the international situation and on concession negotiations.

A brief report on the resolutions of the local organisations regarding Trotsky's pronouncements was made by the CC Secretariat, in which it was pointed out that in the main these resolutions fell into three categories: (1) demanding Trotsky's expulsion from the Party; (2) demanding his removal from the Revolutionary Military Council and the Political Bureau; (3) demanding his removal from the Revolutionary Military Council and his continued membership of the CC Political Bureau with reservations. On January 17 after discussing this report the plenary meeting passed this resolution. p. 246

151 The *Fourteenth Congress of the CPSU(B)* was held in Moscow on December 18-31, 1925. It was attended by 665 delegates with a casting vote and 641 delegates with a consultative voice, representing 643,000 members and 445,000 probationary members.

The agenda consisted of the following: (1) the political report of the CC; (2) the organisational report of the CC; (3) the report of the Auditing Commission; (4) the report of the Central Control Commission; (5) the report of the RCP(B) representative in the Comintern Executive; (6) current tasks in economic development; (7) the work of the trade unions; (8) the work of the Komsomol; (9) amendment of the Party Rules; (10) elections to the Party's central bodies.

The Congress approved the CC's political and organisational line, and its policy of promoting the Soviet Union's socialist industrialisation, and instructed it to press for complete unity in the Party.

At the Congress the Party line was attacked by the New Opposition headed by Zinoviev and Kamenev, who argued that

socialism could not be built in the Soviet Union. The Congress exposed the Trotskyite-Menshevik theories of the New Opposition, showing that the Zinoviev supporters were poorly disguised Trotskyites. The Congress unanimously rejected the capitulationist plans of the opposition and instructed the CC to go forward with the country's socialist industrialisation, strengthen the alliance of the working class with the middle peasants, relying on the poor peasants, and cut the ground from under the feet of capitalist elements. It was stressed that the building of socialism in the USSR was the Party's principal task.

The Congress adopted an address to all the members of the Leningrad Party organisation, in which it was pointed out that the Zinoviev opposition had betrayed the trust of the Leningrad organisation by coming out, contrary to its will, against the Party line. The address called on the Leningrad organisation to put an end to all attempts to undermine the Party's unity.

Known as the Industrialisation Congress, it charted the further drive towards socialism and armed the proletariat with faith in the victory of socialism.

The Congress approved the change of the Party's name to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) and adopted new Party Rules. p. 225

152 The *joint plenary meeting of the CC and CCC CPSU(B)* was held on October 23 and 26, 1926. It was attended by members of the Central Auditing Commission.

On October 23 this plenary meeting endorsed the theses "On the Economic Situation and the Tasks of the Party" and "Results of the Work and Immediate Tasks of the Trade Unions", which had been in the main approved by the CC Political Bureau, and passed a decision to submit these theses for consideration by the Fifteenth Party Conference.

The plenary meeting approved the agenda for the Fifteenth Party Conference, which had been published earlier in the press, adding to it the question of the opposition and the situation in the Party.

It passed the relevant decision after hearing the report of the CC Political Bureau and the Central Control Commission on the situation in the Party as a result of the factional activity by the leaders of the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc.

On October 26 it approved the theses "On the Opposition Bloc in the CPSU(B)", which were to be submitted for consideration by the Fifteenth Party Conference. p. 258

153 The *Fifteenth Conference of the CPSU(B)* was held in Moscow on October 26-November 3, 1926. It was attended by 194 delegates with a casting vote and 640 delegates with a consultative voice. The questions discussed were: the international situation; the economic situation in the country and the Party's tasks; results of the work and immediate tasks of the trade unions; the opposition and the situation in the Party. The Conference lucidly characterised the international situation and the situation in the USSR, analysed the Party's work in restoring the national economy, summed up the main results of the rehabilitation period, and defined

the new tasks in the building of socialism. It unanimously adopted the theses "On the Opposition Bloc in the CPSU(B)" and characterised the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc as a Social-Democratic deviation in the Party, as an auxiliary detachment of the Second International in the world working-class movement. Wholly and completely approving the policy pursued by the CC, the Conference called for a determined drive for Party unity and for the exposure of the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc, which had lapsed into Menshevik views. On November 3, 1926, a joint plenary meeting of the CC and Central Control Commission endorsed all the resolutions adopted at this Conference. At its Seventh Extended Plenary Meeting in December 1926 the Comintern Executive passed a resolution approving the Fifteenth Party Conference's decisions on the opposition bloc. p. 259

154 *The CC and Central Control Commission of the CPSU(B) held a joint plenary meeting* in Moscow from July 29 to August 9, 1927. This meeting was attended by members of the Central Auditing Commission.

A number of major questions related to the international situation, economic development and inner-Party life were discussed. They included: (1) the international situation; (2) the targets for economic development in 1927/28; (3) the report of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection on improving the state and economic apparatus, and on the policy of economy; (4) the latest pronouncements of the opposition and violations of Party discipline by Zinoviev and Trotsky; (5) the Party Congress. Resolutions were adopted on all these points. p. 272

155 At a *joint plenary meeting* on October 21-23, 1927 in Moscow, the CC and Central Control Commission, with the participation of members of the Central Auditing Commission, discussed and approved, with the amendments introduced by special commissions, the draft theses proposed by the CC Political Bureau for the agenda of the Fifteenth Party Conference: (a) the directives on the state five-year plan of economic development and (b) the work in the countryside.

Moreover, the plenary meeting heard a report of the Presidium of the Central Control Commission on the factional activities of Trotsky and Zinoviev after the August plenary meeting of the CC and the CCC and passed a decision to expel Trotsky and Zinoviev from the Central Committee.

In addition, the plenary meeting passed a decision on the Party discussion and approved the rapporteurs on the agenda of the Fifteenth Party Congress. p. 280

156 *The Fifteenth Congress of the CPSU(B)* was held in Moscow on December 2-19, 1927. It was attended by 898 delegates with a casting vote and 771 delegates with a consultative voice, representing 887,233 members and 348,957 probationary members of the Party.

The Congress discussed the report of the CC, the report of the Central Auditing Commission, the report of the CCC-Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, the report of the CPSU(B) delegation to

the Comintern, the directives for the five-year plan of economic development and the report "On the Work in the Countryside", and elected the central bodies of the Party.

It approved the political and organisational work of the Central Committee and instructed the CC to continue promoting socialist industrialisation at an unflagging rate and keep up the offensive against capitalist elements with the ultimate object of abolishing them. The immediate task set by this Congress was that of gradually transferring the scattered small peasant economies to large-scale socialist production. A decision was adopted to start nation-wide collectivisation. The Congress mapped out a plan for enlarging and strengthening the collective and state farms and clearly defined the ways and means of collectivising agriculture. It was found necessary to draw up a five-year plan of economic development.

This Congress completed the ideological and organisational defeat of the anti-Party Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc, finding that "the opposition has severed its ideological ties with Leninism, degenerated into a Menshevik group, taken the road of capitulation to the forces of the international and internal bourgeoisie and objectively become a third force acting against the proletarian dictatorship" (see p. 283 of the present volume).

The Congress found that the divergences between the Party and the opposition had come to a point where they put the Party Programme at stake, that the Trotskyite opposition had taken the road of an anti-Soviet struggle. It therefore declared that membership of the Trotskyite opposition and the propagation of its views were incompatible with membership of the Bolshevik Party. It approved the decision of the CC and CCC of November 14, 1927 expelling Trotsky and Zinoviev from the Party, and expelled from the Party all the active members of the Trotskyite opposition and the entire Sapronov Democratic Centralism group. p. 282

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

БОРЬБА В. И. ЛЕНИНА,
КОММУНИСТИЧЕСКОЙ ПАРТИИ СОВЕТСКОГО СОЮЗА
ПРОТИВ ТРОЦКИЗМА

На английском языке