




LENIN





WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

LENIN

COLLECTED WORKS

24



THE RUSSIAN EDITION WAS PRINTED
IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DECISION
OF THE NINTH CONGRESS OF THE R.C.P.(B.)
AND THE SECOND CONGRESS OF SOVIETS
OF THE U.S.S.R.

ИНСТИТУТ МАРКСИЗМА—ЛЕНИНИЗМА при ЦК КПСС

В. И. ЛЕНИН

СОЧИНЕНИЯ

Издание четвертое

ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО
ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ
МОСКВА

V. I. L E N I N

COLLECTED WORKS

VOLUME

24

April - June 1917

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
M O S C O W

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN
EDITED BY BERNARD ISAACS

From Marx to Mao



© Digital Reprints

2011

www.marx2mao.com

First printing 1964
Second printing 1974

Л $\frac{10102-036}{014(01)-74}$ 164-74

CONTENTS

Preface	17
-------------------	----

April-June 1917

THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT IN THE PRESENT REVOLUTION	19
Theses	21
HOW WE ARRIVED	27
TWO WORLDS	30
NOTES FOR AN ARTICLE OR SPEECH IN DEFENCE OF THE APRIL THESES	32
BLANCISM.	34
THE DUAL POWER	38
LETTERS ON TACTICS	42
Foreword.	42
<i>First Letter. Assessment of the Present Situation.</i>	43
THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT IN OUR REVOLUTION. <i>Draft Platform for the Proletarian Party.</i>	55
The Class Character of the Revolution That Has Taken Place	57
The Foreign Policy of the New Government.	58
The Peculiar Nature of the Dual Power and Its Class Significance.	60
The Peculiar Nature of the Tactics Which Follow from the Above	62

Revolutionary Defencism and Its Class Significance . . .	64
How Can the War Be Ended?	66
A New Type of State Emerging from Our Revolution . .	67
The Agrarian and National Programmes	71
Nationalisation of the Banks and Capitalist Syndicates	73
The Situation Within the Socialist International	74
The Collapse of the Zimmerwald International.—The Need for Founding a Third International	80
What Should Be the Name of Our Party—One That Will Be Correct Scientifically and Help to Clarify the Mind of the Proletariat Politically?	84
Postscript	89
POLITICAL PARTIES IN RUSSIA AND THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT	93
Preface to the Second Edition	95
SPEECH DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF SOLDIERS OF THE IZMAILOVSKY REGIMENT, APRIL 10 (23), 1917	107
A SHAMELESS LIE OF THE CAPITALISTS	110
THE WAR AND THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT	112
IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF <i>RUSSKAYA VOLYA</i>	115
A PARTNERSHIP OF LIES	118
BANKS AND MINISTERS	122
AN IMPORTANT EXPOSURE	123
TO THE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.	124
AGAINST THE RIOT-MONGERS. <i>To the Workers, Soldiers, and the Whole Population of Petrograd</i>	127
CITIZENS! SEE WHAT METHODS THE CAPITALISTS OF ALL COUNTRIES ARE USING!	131
A “VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT” BETWEEN LANDOWNERS AND PEASANTS?	134
AN HONEST VOICE IN A CHORUS OF SLANDERERS	135
THE SOLDIERS AND THE LAND	137
<i>THE PETROGRAD CITY CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS), April 14-22 (April 27-May 5), 1917</i>	139

1. REPORT ON THE PRESENT SITUATION AND THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT. APRIL 14 (27)	141
2. CONCLUDING REMARKS IN THE DEBATE CONCERNING THE REPORT ON THE PRESENT SITUATION. APRIL 14 (27)	148
3. TWO REMARKS DURING THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT. APRIL 15 (28)	152
4. RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PROVI- SIONAL GOVERNMENT.	154
5. TWO REMARKS DURING THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF THE MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS. APRIL 22 (MAY 5)	156
6. RESOLUTION ON THE MUNICIPAL QUESTION	158
7. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PARTIES OF THE SOCIALIST-REVOLUTIONARIES. THE MENSHEVIK SOCIAL DEMOCRATS, THE "NON-FACTIONAL" SO- CIAL-DEMOCRATS AND OTHER KINDRED POLITICAL TRENDS	159
8. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE WAR	161
I	161
II	162
III	163
CONGRESS OF PEASANTS' DEPUTIES	167
ON THE RETURN OF THE EMIGRANTS	171
OUR VIEWS. <i>A Reply to the Resolution of the Executive Com- mission of the Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies</i>	172
HOW THEY TIED THEMSELVES TO THE CAPITALISTS	176
A PROLETARIAN MILITIA	179
BANKRUPTCY?	183
RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS) OF APRIL 20 (MAY 3), 1917 ON THE CRISIS CAUSED BY THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT'S NOTE OF APRIL 18 (MAY 1), 1917.	184
APPEAL TO THE SOLDIERS OF ALL THE BELLIGERENT COUNTRIES	186
THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT'S NOTE	189
A BASIC QUESTION <i>A Line of Argument Used by Socialists Who Have Gone Over to the Bourgeoisie.</i>	192

ICONS VERSUS CANNONS, PHRASES VERSUS CAPITAL	196
THE LOGIC OF CITIZEN V. CHERNOV	198
MR. PLEKHANOV'S FUTILE ATTEMPTS TO EXTRICATE HIMSELF	199
RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS) ADOPTED APRIL 21 (MAY 4), 1917	201
HONEST DEFENCISM REVEALS ITSELF	204
MAD CAPITALISTS OR WEAK-MINDED SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS? . . .	207
THE ADVICE OR ORDER OF SHINGARYOV, AND THE ADVICE OF A LOCAL SOVIET	209
RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS) ADOPTED IN THE MORNING OF APRIL 22 (MAY 5), 1917	210
LESSONS OF THE CRISIS	213
HOW A SIMPLE QUESTION CAN BE CONFUSED	217
"DISGRACE" AS THE CAPITALISTS AND THE PROLETARIANS UNDERSTAND IT	220
INTERVIEW GIVEN TO E. TORNTAINEN. APRIL 28 (MAY 6), 1917	222
FOOLISH GLOATING	223
<i>THE SEVENTH (APRIL) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.). April 24-29 (May 7-12), 1917</i>	<i>225</i>
1. SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE OPENING OF THE CONFER- ENCE. APRIL 24 (MAY 7)	227
2. REPORT ON THE CURRENT SITUATION. APRIL 24 (MAY 7)	228
3. SPEECH WINDING UP THE DEBATE ON THE REPORT ON THE CURRENT SITUATION. APRIL 24 (MAY 7).	244
4. SPEECH ON THE PROPOSAL TO CALL AN INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE. APRIL 25 (MAY 8)	247
5. RESOLUTION ON BORGBJERG'S PROPOSAL	251
6. SPEECH ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE SOVIETS. APRIL 26 (MAY 8). <i>Brief Press Report</i>	254
7. DRAFT THESES TO THE RESOLUTION ON THE SOVIETS	255
8. SPEECH IN FAVOUR OF THE RESOLUTION ON THE WAR. APRIL 27 (MAY 10)	257

9. RESOLUTION ON THE WAR	270
I	270
II	271
III	272
10. RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PROVI- SIONAL GOVERNMENT	274
11. REPORT ON THE QUESTION OF REVISING THE PARTY PROGRAMME. APRIL 28 (MAY 11).	277
12. RESOLUTION ON THE QUESTION OF REVISING THE PARTY PROGRAMME	280
13. REPORT ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION. APRIL 28 (MAY 11)	282
14. REJOINDER TO N. S. ANGARSKY DURING THE DEBATE ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION. APRIL 28 (MAY 11).	288
15. RESOLUTION ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION	290
16. RESOLUTION ON UNITING THE INTERNATIONALISTS AGAINST THE PETTY-BOURGEOIS DEFENCIST BLOC	294
17. RESOLUTION ON THE SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOL- DIERS' DEPUTIES	295
18. SPEECH ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION. APRIL 29 (MAY 12)	297
19. RESOLUTION ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION	302
20. SPEECH ON THE SITUATION WITHIN THE INTERNA- TIONAL AND THE TASKS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.). APRIL 29 (MAY 12)	304
21. SPEECH IN FAVOUR OF THE RESOLUTION ON THE CURRENT SITUATION. APRIL 29 (MAY 12)	305
22. RESOLUTION ON THE CURRENT SITUATION	309
23. CONCLUDING SPEECH AT THE CLOSING OF THE CONFER- ENCE. APRIL 29 (MAY 12)	313
INTRODUCTION TO THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE SEVENTH (APRIL) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.)	314
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FRATERNISATION	318
WHAT THE COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY STEPS OF THE PROVI- SIONAL GOVERNMENT LEAD TO	321
SOCIAL-CHAUVINISTS AND INTERNATIONALISTS	324

I. G. TSERETELI AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE	326
ANXIETY	330
THE "CRISIS OF POWER"	332
FINLAND AND RUSSIA	335
A LETTER TO THE EDITORS	339
DEFENCE OF IMPERIALISM CLOAKED WITH SPECIOUS PHRASES	340
AN UNFORTUNATE DOCUMENT	343
FRIGHTENING THE PEOPLE WITH BOURGEOIS TERRORS	346
ON THE EVE	349
THEY HAVE FORGOTTEN THE MAIN THING. <i>The Municipal Platform of the Proletarian Party</i>	350
MANDATE TO DEPUTIES OF THE SOVIET ELECTED AT FACTO- RIES AND REGIMENTS	354
CLASS COLLABORATION WITH CAPITAL, OR CLASS STRUGGLE AGAINST CAPITAL?	357
A STRONG REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT	360
TITBITS FOR THE NEWBORN GOVERNMENT	362
ALREADY THE NEW GOVERNMENT IS LAGGING BEHIND EVEN THE PEASANT MASS, LEAVE ALONE THE REVO- LUTIONARY WORKERS	365
STEALING A MARCH ON THE WORKERS	367
AN OPEN LETTER TO THE DELEGATES TO THE ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF PEASANTS' DEPUTIES	370
THE "VIRTUAL ARMISTICE"	375
SECRETS OF FOREIGN POLICY	378
ONE OF THE SECRET TREATIES	380
MINISTERIAL TONE	382
IN SEARCH OF A NAPOLEON	383
NOTHING HAS CHANGED	384

A REGRETTABLE DEVIATION FROM THE PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY	385
ON THE QUESTION OF CONVENING AN INTERNATIONAL, SO-CALLED SOCIALIST CONFERENCE JOINTLY WITH THE SOCIAL-CHAUVINISTS	388
SPEECH AT A MEETING AT THE PUTILOV WORKS. MAY 12 (25) 1917. <i>Brief Newspaper Report.</i>	389
THE PROLETARIAN PARTY AT THE DISTRICT COUNCIL ELECTIONS	390
STATEMENTS ABOUT THE WAR MADE BY OUR PARTY BEFORE THE REVOLUTION	393
IMPENDING DEBACLE	395
WAR AND REVOLUTION. <i>A Lecture Delivered May 14 (27), 1917</i>	398
DESPICABLE METHODS.	422
INEVITABLE CATASTROPHE AND EXTRAVAGANT PROMISES	424
(Article One)	424
(Article Two)	427
THE QUESTION OF UNITING THE INTERNATIONALISTS	431
MUDDLEHEADEDNESS. <i>More on the Subject of Annexations</i>	433
COMBATING ECONOMIC CHAOS BY A SPATE OF COMMISSIONS	436
ONE MORE DEPARTURE FROM DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES	437
HOW THE CAPITALISTS ARE TRYING TO SCARE THE PEOPLE	439
ONE MORE CRIME OF THE CAPITALISTS	441
STILL MORE LIES	443
LETTER TO THE EDITORS	444
HAS DUAL POWER DISAPPEARED?	445
ON THE UNAUTHORISED SEIZURE OF LAND. <i>Flimsy Arguments of the Socialist-Revolutionaries</i>	449
MATERIALS RELATING TO THE REVISION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME	455
1. PREFACE TO THE PAMPHLET MATERIALS RELATING TO THE REVISION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME	457

2. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE DOCTRINAL, POLITICAL AND OTHER SECTIONS OF THE PROGRAMME	459
3. COMMENTS ON THE REMARKS MADE BY THE COMMITTEE OF THE APRIL ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE	464
4. DRAFT OF REVISED PROGRAMME	466
<i>FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF PEASANTS' DEPUTIES, May 4-28 (May 17-June 10), 1917</i>	<i>481</i>
1. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION	483
2. SPEECH ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION. MAY 22 (JUNE 4), 1917	486
PARTIES IN THE PETROGRAD DISTRICT COUNCIL ELECTIONS	506
TWO SHORTCOMINGS	512
RESOLUTION ON MEASURES TO COPE WITH ECONOMIC DISORGANISATION	513
A DEAL WITH THE CAPITALISTS OR OVERTHROW OF THE CAPITALISTS? <i>How to End the War.</i>	516
THE CHAIN IS NO STRONGER THAN ITS WEAKEST LINK	519
THE CAPITALISTS MUST BE EXPOSED	521
REPORTS ON THE ECONOMIC DEBACLE	523
"SLEIGHT OF HAND" AND UNPRINCIPLED POLITICIANS	527
THE DARK FORCES ARE FOR THE CADETS, THE MENSHEVIKS AND NARODNIKS ARE IN ONE GOVERNMENT WITH THE CADETS	529
THE SHAMEFUL MENSHEVIK-NARODNIK BLOC WITH <i>YEDINSTVO</i>	531
COUNTER-REVOLUTION TAKES THE OFFENSIVE. " <i>Jacobins Without the People</i> "	533
A QUESTION OF PRINCIPLE. " <i>Forgotten Words</i> " of Democracy	536
FOR LACK OF A CLEAN PRINCIPLED WEAPON THEY SNATCH AT A DIRTY ONE	539
<i>MEETING OF THE PETROGRAD COMMITTEE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS). May 30 (June 12), 1917</i>	<i>541</i>
1. SPEECH CONCERNING AN ORGAN OF THE PRESS FOR THE PETROGRAD COMMITTEE	543

2. DRAFT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AT THE MEETING OF THE PETROGRAD COMMITTEE	545
THE HARM OF PHRASE-MONGERING	546
CAPITALIST MOCKERY OF THE PEOPLE	549
LETTER TO THE DISTRICT COMMITTEES OF THE PETROGRAD ORGANISATION OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS).	552
SPEECH MADE AT THE FIRST PETROGRAD CONFERENCE OF SHOP COMMITTEES. MAY 31 (JUNE 13), 1917. <i>Brief Newspaper Report</i>	556
INFAMY JUSTIFIED	558
THE PETTY-BOURGEOIS STAND ON THE QUESTION OF ECO- NOMIC DISORGANISATION	562
A MOTE IN THE EYE	565
IT IS UNDEMOCRATIC, CITIZEN KERENSKY.	568
BOLSHEVISM AND "DEMORALISATION" OF THE ARMY	570
THE LAUGH IS ON YOU!	573
<i>Notes</i>	575
<i>The Life and Work of V. I. Lenin. Outstanding Dates</i>	609

 ILLUSTRATIONS

The cover of Lenin's pamphlet <i>The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution</i> . 1917	66-67
The first page of Lenin's manuscript "Draft Resolution on the Agrarian Question". May 1917	482-483
The front page of <i>Pravda</i> No. 64, for June 6 (May 24), 1917 featuring Lenin's article "Parties in the Petrograd District Council Elections"	507

PREFACE

Volume 24 contains the works of Lenin written between April 3 and June 3, 1917.

It includes the famous April Theses, in which Lenin gave the Party and the proletariat a concrete, theoretically elaborated plan of struggle for transition from the bourgeois-democratic to the socialist revolution, and put forward the slogan of setting up a republic of the Soviets as the best political form of proletarian dictatorship.

The ideas set forth in the April Theses are elaborated in the articles: "Letters on Tactics", "The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution" and "Political Parties in Russia and the Tasks of the Proletariat".

The materials of the Petrograd City and Seventh (April) All-Russia conferences of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) contain Lenin's speeches and resolutions on all the cardinal issues affecting the war and the revolution—the current situation, the war, the attitude towards the Provisional Government, the Soviets and the agrarian and national questions.

Lenin's articles and paragraphs in *Pravda* ("The Dual Power", "The War and the Provisional Government", "The Significance of Fraternisation", "Frightening the People with Bourgeois Terrors", "On the 'Unauthorised Seizure' of Land", and others) aim at bringing home to the masses the significance of the momentous events in the country's political life and the class struggle, at rallying the masses behind the Bolshevik Party and preparing them for the socialist revolution.

The volume contains material concerning the revision of the Party Programme, in which Lenin elaborated the basic principles of the Party's new programme.

Nineteen documents never before included in the *Collected Works* of Lenin have been given in this volume. The bulk of these documents consists of materials of the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), namely: nine resolutions (on the war, on the attitude towards the Provisional Government, on the agrarian question, on the revision of the Party Programme, on the Soviets, on the national question, on the current situation, on the question of Borgbjerg's proposal, on uniting the internationalists against the petty-bourgeois defencist bloc), and "Introduction to the Resolutions of the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.)".

The materials of the Petrograd City Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) published in previous collections of Lenin's works have been supplemented by "A Draft Resolution on the Attitude Towards the Parties of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Menshevik Social-Democrats, the 'Non-Factional' Social-Democrats and Other Kindred Political Trends".

The "Notes for an Article or Speech in Defence of the April Theses" is another document belonging to the series of articles in which the ideas of the April Theses are expounded and elaborated.

The leaflet "Appeal to the Soldiers of All the Belligerent Countries" and the "Speech at a Meeting at the Putilov Works. May 12 (25), 1917" deal with the causes and aims of the continuing imperialist war and set forth the Bolsheviks' views on the revolutionary ways and means of stopping it.

The "Resolution of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) of April 20 (May 3), 1917 on the Crisis Caused by the Provisional Government's Note of April 18 (May 1), 1917" exposes the imperialist nature of the policy pursued by the Provisional Government.

The volume also includes "A Letter to the Editors" and three articles published in *Pravda*: "Still More Lies", "The Chain Is No Stronger Than Its Weakest Link", "The Laugh Is on You!" in which Lenin exposes the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries as hirelings of imperialism.

THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT IN THE PRESENT REVOLUTION¹

Published April 7, 1917
in *Pravda* No. 26,
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according
to the newspaper text

I did not arrive in Petrograd until the night of April 3, and therefore at the meeting on April 4 I could, of course, deliver the report on the tasks of the revolutionary proletariat only on my own behalf, and with reservations as to insufficient preparation.

The only thing I could do to make things easier for myself—and for *honest* opponents—was to prepare the theses *in writing*. I read them out, and gave the text to Comrade Tsereteli. I read them *twice* very slowly: first at a meeting of Bolsheviks and then at a meeting of both Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

I publish these personal theses of mine with only the briefest explanatory notes, which were developed in far greater detail in the report.

THESES

1) In our attitude towards the war, which under the new government of Lvov and Co. unquestionably remains on Russia's part a predatory imperialist war owing to the capitalist nature of that government, not the slightest concession to "revolutionary defencism" is permissible.

The class-conscious proletariat can give its consent to a revolutionary war, which would really justify revolutionary defencism, only on condition: (a) that the power pass to the proletariat and the poorest sections of the peasants aligned with the proletariat; (b) that all annexations be renounced in deed and not in word; (c) that a complete break be effected in actual fact with all capitalist interests.

In view of the undoubted honesty of those broad sections of the mass believers in revolutionary defencism who accept the war only as a necessity, and not as a means of con-

quest, in view of the fact that they are being deceived by the bourgeoisie, it is necessary with particular thoroughness, persistence and patience to explain their error to them, to explain the inseparable connection existing between capital and the imperialist war, and to prove that without overthrowing capital *it is impossible* to end the war by a truly democratic peace, a peace not imposed by violence.

The most widespread campaign for this view must be organised in the army at the front.

Fraternisation.

2) The specific feature of the present situation in Russia is that the country is *passing* from the first stage of the revolution—which, owing to the insufficient class-consciousness and organisation of the proletariat, placed power in the hands of the bourgeoisie—to its *second* stage, which must place power in the hands of the proletariat and the poorest sections of the peasants.

This transition is characterised, on the one hand, by a maximum of legally recognised rights (Russia is *now* the freest of all the belligerent countries in the world); on the other, by the absence of violence towards the masses, and, finally, by their unreasoning trust in the government of capitalists, those worst enemies of peace and socialism.

This peculiar situation demands of us an ability to adapt ourselves to the *special* conditions of Party work among unprecedentedly large masses of proletarians who have just awakened to political life.

3) No support for the Provisional Government; the utter falsity of all its promises should be made clear, particularly of those relating to the renunciation of annexations. Exposure in place of the impermissible, illusion-breeding “demand” that *this* government, a government of capitalists, should *cease* to be an imperialist government.

4) Recognition of the fact that in most of the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies our Party is in a minority, so far a small minority, as against *a bloc of all* the petty-bourgeois opportunist elements, from the Popular Socialists and the Socialist-Revolutionaries down to the Organising Committee² (Chkheidze, Tsereteli, etc.), Steklov, etc., etc., who have yielded to the influence of the bourgeoisie and spread that influence among the proletariat.

The masses must be made to see that the Soviets of Workers' Deputies are the *only possible* form of revolutionary government, and that therefore our task is, as long as *this* government yields to the influence of the bourgeoisie, to present a patient, systematic, and persistent *explanation* of the errors of their tactics, an explanation especially adapted to the practical needs of the masses.

As long as we are in the minority we carry on the work of criticising and exposing errors and at the same time we preach the necessity of transferring the entire state power to the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, so that the people may overcome their mistakes by experience.

5) Not a parliamentary republic—to return to a parliamentary republic from the Soviets of Workers' Deputies would be a retrograde step—but a republic of Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers' and Peasants' Deputies throughout the country, from top to bottom.

Abolition of the police, the army and the bureaucracy.*

The salaries of all officials, all of whom are elective and displaceable at any time, not to exceed the average wage of a competent worker.

6) The weight of emphasis in the agrarian programme to be shifted to the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies.

Confiscation of all landed estates.

Nationalisation of *all* lands in the country, the land to be disposed of by the local Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' and Peasants' Deputies. The organisation of separate Soviets of Deputies of Poor Peasants. The setting up of a model farm on each of the large estates (ranging in size from 100 to 300 dessiatines, according to local and other conditions, and to the decisions of the local bodies) under the control of the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies and for the public account.

7) The immediate amalgamation of all banks in the country into a single national bank, and the institution of control over it by the Soviet of Workers' Deputies.

* I.e., the standing army to be replaced by the arming of the whole people.

8) It is not our *immediate* task to “introduce” socialism, but only to bring social production and the distribution of products at once under the *control* of the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies.

9) Party tasks:

(a) Immediate convocation of a Party congress;

(b) Alteration of the Party Programme, mainly:

(1) On the question of imperialism and the imperialist war;

(2) On our attitude towards the state and *our* demand for a “commune state”^{*};

(3) Amendment of our out-of-date minimum programme;

(c) Change of the Party’s name.^{**}

10) A new International.

We must take the initiative in creating a revolutionary International, an International against the *social-chauvinists* and against the “Centre”.^{***}

In order that the reader may understand why I had especially to emphasise as a rare exception the “case” of honest opponents, I invite him to compare the above theses with the following objection by Mr. Goldenberg: Lenin, he said, “has planted the banner of civil war in the midst of revolutionary democracy” (quoted in No. 5 of Mr. Plekhanov’s *Yedinstvo*³).

Isn’t it a gem?

I write, announce and elaborately explain: “In view of the undoubted honesty of those *broad* sections of the *mass* believers in revolutionary defencism ... in view of the fact that they are being deceived by the bourgeoisie, it is necessary with *particular* thoroughness, persistence and *patience* to explain their error to them....”

^{*} I.e., a state of which the Paris Commune was the prototype.

^{**} Instead of “Social-Democracy”, whose official leaders *throughout* the world have betrayed socialism and deserted to the bourgeoisie (the “defencists” and the vacillating “Kautskyites”), we must call ourselves the *Communist Party*.

^{***} The “Centre” in the international Social-Democratic movement is the trend which vacillates between the chauvinists (= “defencists”) and internationalists, i.e., Kautsky and Co. in Germany, Longuet and Co. in France, Chkheidze and Co. in Russia, Turati and Co. in Italy, MacDonald and Co. in Britain, etc.

Yet the bourgeois gentlemen who call themselves Social-Democrats, who *do not* belong either to the *broad* sections or to the *mass* believers in defencism, with serene brow present my views thus: "The banner [!]* of civil war" (of which there is not a word in the theses and not a word in my speech!) has been planted (!) "in the midst [!!] of revolutionary democracy...".

What does this mean? In what way does this differ from riot-inciting agitation, from *Russkaya Volya*⁴?

I write, announce and elaborately explain: "The Soviets of Workers' Deputies are the *only possible* form of revolutionary government, and therefore our task is to present a patient, systematic, and persistent *explanation* of the errors of their tactics, an explanation especially adapted to the practical needs of the masses."

Yet opponents of a certain brand present my views as a call to "civil war in the midst of revolutionary democracy!

I attacked the Provisional Government for *not* having appointed an early date, or any date at all, for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, and for confining itself to promises. I argued that *without* the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies the convocation of the Constituent Assembly is not guaranteed and its success is impossible.

And the view is attributed to me that I am opposed to the speedy convocation of the Constituent Assembly!

I would call this "raving", had not decades of political struggle taught me to regard honesty in opponents as a rare exception.

Mr. Plekhanov in his paper called my speech "raving". Very good, Mr. Plekhanov! But look how awkward, uncouth, and slow-witted you are in your polemics. If I delivered a raving speech for two hours, how is it that an audience of hundreds tolerated this "raving"? Further, why does your paper devote a whole column to an account of the "raving"? Inconsistent, highly inconsistent!

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

It is, of course, much easier to shout, abuse, and howl than to attempt to relate, to explain, to recall *what* Marx and Engels said in 1871, 1872 and 1875 about the experience of the Paris Commune⁵ and about the *kind* of state the proletariat needs.

Ex-Marxist Mr. Plekhanov evidently does not care to recall Marxism.

I quoted the words of Rosa Luxemburg, who on August 4, 1914,⁶ called *German* Social-Democracy a “stinking corpse”. And the Plekhanovs, Goldenbergs and Co. feel “offended”. On whose behalf? On behalf of the *German* chauvinists, because they were called chauvinists!

They have got themselves in a mess, these poor Russian social-chauvinists—socialists in word and chauvinists in deed.

HOW WE ARRIVED⁷

The news that the British and French governments have refused to grant the emigrant internationalists passage to Russia has already made its way into the socialist press.

The thirty-two political emigrants of various party affiliations (among them 19 Bolsheviks, 6 Bundists,⁸ 3 adherents of the Paris internationalist paper *Nashe Slovo*⁹) who have arrived here consider it their duty to make known the following:

We are in possession of a number of documents which we shall publish as soon as we receive them from Stockholm (we left them behind because the Swedish-Russian border is under the full control of agents of the British Government), and which will give everyone a clear picture of the deplorable role the above-named "Allied" governments are playing in this connection. On this point we shall add only the following: The Zurich Emigrants' Repatriation Committee, which consists of representatives of twenty-three groups (including the Central Committee, the Organising Committee, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, and the Bund), unanimously passed a resolution stating publicly that the British Government decided to prevent the emigrant internationalists from returning to their native land and taking part in the struggle against the imperialist war.

From the first days of the revolution this intention on the part of the British Government had become quite clear to the emigrants. At a conference of representatives of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party (M. A. Natanson), the Organising Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. (L. Martov), and the Bund (Kosovsky), a plan was conceived (it was proposed

by L. Martov) to obtain for these emigrants passage through Germany in exchange for German and Austrian prisoners interned in Russia.

A number of telegrams to this effect were sent to Russia, while steps were taken through the Swiss socialists to get this plan put through.

The telegrams sent to Russia were held up, apparently by our Provisional "Revolutionary Government" (or its supporters).

After waiting two weeks for an answer from Russia, we decided to carry out the above-mentioned plan by ourselves (other emigrants decided to wait a little longer, being still unconvinced that the Provisional Government would do nothing to ensure the passage of all emigrants).

The whole business was handled by Fritz Platten, a Swiss internationalist socialist. He concluded a carefully worded agreement with the German Ambassador in Switzerland. The text of this agreement will be published later. Its main points are: (1) All emigrants, regardless of their opinions on the war, shall be allowed passage. (2) The railway coach in which the emigrants will travel shall have the privileges of extraterritoriality; no one shall have the right to enter the coach without Platten's permission; there shall be no control either of passports or luggage. (3) The travellers agree to agitate in Russia that the emigrants who have been granted passage be exchanged for a corresponding number of Austro-German interneees.

All attempts on the part of the German Social-Democratic majority to communicate with the travellers were firmly repelled by the latter. The coach was accompanied by Platten all the way. He had decided to travel with us to Petrograd but he has been detained at the Russian border (Tornio)—let us hope, only temporarily. All negotiations were conducted with the participation of and in complete accord with a number of foreign internationalist socialists. The protocol of the journey was signed by two French socialists, Lorient and Guilbeaux, and by a socialist from the Liebknecht group (Hartstein), by the Swiss socialist Platten, the Polish Social-Democrat Broński, the Swedish Social-Democrat deputies Lindhagen, Carleson, Ström, Ture Nerman and others.

“Were Karl Liebknecht in Russia now, the Milyukovs would readily let him out to go to Germany; the Bethmann-Hollwegs let you Russian internationalists out to go to Russia. Your business is to go to Russia and fight there against both German and Russian imperialism.” That is what these internationalist comrades told us. We think they were right. We shall make a report of our journey to the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies. We hope that the latter will obtain the release of a corresponding number of internees, first and foremost the prominent Austrian socialist, Otto Bauer, and that it will obtain a permit for all emigrants, not only the social-patriots, to return to Russia. We hope that the Executive Committee will put an end also to the unheard-of state of affairs, where no newspapers left of *Rech*¹⁰ are allowed to be sent out of the country, and even the Manifesto of the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies¹¹ to the workers of the world is not allowed to get into the foreign press.

Written April 4 (17), 1917

Published April 5, 1917
in the newspapers *Pravda*
No. 24, and *Izvestia* No. 32

Published according
to the text in *Pravda* verified
with that in *Izvestia*

TWO WORLDS

Capitalist newspapers like *Rech* and *Novoye Vremya*¹² have published articles attacking our passage through Germany and insinuating that the new arrivals were aiding the German imperialists.*

*Izvestia of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies*¹³ reprints in full the report published in yesterday's *Pravda***¹⁴ which was presented to the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies on the very first day after our arrival. In addition to the report, *Izvestia* publishes the resolution of the Executive Committee, which it gives in the following words:

“Having heard the report of Comrades Zurabov and Zinoviev, the Executive Committee decided to take the matter up immediately with the Provisional Government and to take steps towards securing the immediate return to Russia of all emigrants, irrespective of their political views and their attitude towards the war. The results of the negotiations with the government will be published in the near future.—*Editors.*”

Here you have a small—a very small, but very characteristic—picture of two worlds. One, the world of the capitalists, *Rech*, *Russkaya Volya*, *Novoye Vremya*, dark hints, vile insinuations against the socialists; the other, the world of the revolutionary democrats, of the workers' and soldiers' deputies, who in a calm, consistent, and dignified manner have decided to “take steps”. Steps leading to what? Steps leading to what was *not* done by the Provisional Government!

* The famous—notoriously famous—*Russkaya Volya* in its article against us provides “incriminating” material quite in the vein of *Rech*. Won't Milyukov and Co. be ashamed of such a neighbour?

** Will *Rech* dare to publish it?

Is this not tantamount to a censure of the Provisional Government?

And is not this censure warranted?

Mind you, the Executive Committee, in passing this resolution was fully aware of the *political* dissensions that existed between it and the Bolsheviks. For capitalists this would be a pretext for insinuations. Human dignity is something one need not look for in the world of capitalists.

Pravda No. 25, April 6, 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

NOTES FOR AN ARTICLE OR SPEECH IN DEFENCE OF THE APRIL THESES

(1) Economic debacle is imminent. *Therefore* removal of the bourgeoisie is a mistake.

(This is the conclusion of the bourgeoisie. The more imminent the debacle, the more essential is it that the bourgeoisie be removed.)

(2) Proletariat is unorganised, weak, lacking class-consciousness.

(True. Therefore, the whole task is to fight those *petty-bourgeois* leaders, the so-called Social-Democrats—Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov—who lull the masses, encourage them to put their trust in the bourgeoisie.

Not unity with these petty bourgeois—Chkheidze, Steklov, Tsereteli—but *utter defeat* of these Social-Democrats, who are *ruining* the revolution of the proletariat.)

(3) Revolution is bourgeois at the present stage. Therefore no need for “socialist experiment”.

(This argument is an out-and-out bourgeois argument. No one talks about a “socialist experiment” The concrete Marxist proposition requires that institutions now as well as classes be taken into account.)

Stranglers of the revolution, by honeyed phrases—Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov—are dragging the revolution back, *away from* the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies *towards* the undivided sway of the bourgeoisie, towards the usual bourgeois parliamentary republic.

We must ably, carefully, clear people’s minds and lead the proletariat and poor peasantry *forward*, away from “dual power” *towards the full power* of the Soviets of

Workers' Deputies, and this is the commune in Marx's sense, in the sense of the experience of 1871.

The question is not how fast to move, but where to move.

The question is not whether the workers are prepared, but *how* and *for what* they should be prepared.

Since the manifestos and appeals of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies on the war, etc., are sheer petty-bourgeois humbug designed merely to lull the people to sleep, it is our business above all, as I have said, to clear people's minds, to rid the masses of the *bourgeois* influence of Chkheidze, Steklov, Tsereteli and Co.

The "revolutionary defencism" of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, i.e., of Chkheidze, Tsereteli and Steklov, is a chauvinist trend a hundred times more harmful for being cloaked in honeyed phrases, an *attempt* to reconcile the masses with the Provisional Revolutionary Government.

The dull, unenlightened masses duped by Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov and Co. do not realise that the war is a continuation of policy, that wars are waged by *governments*.

It must be made clear that the "people" can stop the war or change its character only by changing the *class character* of the government.

Written between April 4
and 12 (17 and 25), 1917

First published on January 21,
1933 in *Pravda* No. 21

Published according
to the manuscript

BLANCISM

Louis Blanc, the French socialist, won unenviable notoriety during the revolution of 1848 by changing his stand from that of the class struggle to that of petty-bourgeois illusions, illusions adorned with would-be “socialist” phraseology, but in reality tending to strengthen the influence of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat. Louis Blanc looked to the bourgeoisie for assistance, hoped, and inspired hopes in others, that the bourgeoisie *could* help the workers in the matter of “labour organisation”—this vague term purporting to express “socialist” tendencies.

Blancism has now gained the upper hand in Right-wing “Social-Democracy”, in the Organising Committee party in Russia. Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov, and many others, who are now leaders of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies and were also leaders of the recent All-Russia Conference of Soviets,¹⁵ have taken the same stand as Louis Blanc.

On all major issues of present-day political life these leaders, who occupy approximately the position of the international Centrist trend represented by Kautsky, Longuet, Turati, and many others, have embraced the petty-bourgeois views of Louis Blanc. Take, for instance, the question of war.

The proletarian standpoint in this matter consists of a definite *class* characterisation of war, and of an irreconcilable hostility to imperialist war—that is, to a war *between* groups of capitalist countries (*no matter* whether monarchies or *republics*) for a division of capitalist spoils.

The petty-bourgeois viewpoint differs from the bourgeois one (outright justification of the war, outright “defence of

the fatherland", i.e., defence of the *interests* of *one's own* capitalists, defence of *their* "right" to annexations) in that the petty bourgeois "renounces" annexations, "condemns" imperialism, "demands" from the bourgeoisie that it cease to be imperialistic while keeping within the framework of world-imperialist relations and the capitalist system of economy. Confining himself to this mild, innocuous, wishy-washy declamation, the petty bourgeois, *in practice*, trails helplessly *behind* the bourgeoisie, "sympathising" in some things with the proletariat in words, remaining dependent on the bourgeoisie in deeds, unable or unwilling to understand the path leading to the overthrow of the capitalist yoke, the only path that can rid the world of imperialism.

To "demand" of the bourgeois governments that they make a "*solemn declaration*" in the spirit of renouncing annexations is the height of audacity on the part of the petty bourgeois, and an example of anti-imperialist "Zimmerwaldist" consistency. It is not difficult to see that this is Blancism of the worst type. For one thing, no bourgeois politician with any experience will ever have difficulty in mouthing any number of glib, "brilliant", high-sounding phrases against annexations "in general", as meaningless as they are non-committal. But when it comes to *deeds*, one can always do a conjuring trick after the manner of *Rech*, which had the deplorable courage to declare that Kurland¹⁶ (now annexed by the imperialist predators of bourgeois Germany) was *not* annexed by Russia!

This is trickery of the most disgusting kind, the most shameless deception of the workers by the bourgeoisie, for anybody the least familiar with politics must know that Kurland *had always been annexed* to Russia.

We openly and directly challenge *Rech*: (1) to present to the people such a political definition of the concept "annexation" as would apply equally to *all* annexations in the world, German, British, and Russian, past and present, to all without exception; (2) to state clearly and definitely what, in its opinion, is meant by *renunciation of annexations*, not in word, but in deed. To give such a political definition of the concept "renunciation of annexations in deed" as would apply not only to the Germans, but also to the English and all other nations who have ever practised annexations.

We maintain that *Rech* will either decline to accept our challenge or it will be exposed by us before the whole nation. And it is precisely because of this question of Kurland touched upon by *Rech* that our dispute is not a theoretical one but a practical one of the greatest urgency and vital interest.

Second, let us assume, if only for a moment, that the bourgeois ministers are the ideal of honesty, that the Guchkovs, Lvovs, Milyukovs and Co. sincerely *believe* in the possibility of renouncing annexations, while preserving capitalism, and that they really *want* to renounce them.

Let us, for a moment, assume even this, let us make this Blancist assumption.

One is entitled to ask: Can a grown-up person be content with what people *think* of themselves, without comparing it with what they *do*? Is it possible for a Marxist *not* to distinguish good wishes and declarations from objective realities?

No. It is not.

Annexations are maintained by the bonds of finance capital, banking capital, imperialist capital. *Herein* is the modern, the economic foundation of annexations. From this angle, annexations are politically guaranteed *profits* on thousands of millions of capital "invested" in thousands upon thousands of enterprises in the annexed countries.

It is *impossible*, even given the wish to do so, to renounce annexations *without taking* decisive steps towards throwing off the yoke of capitalism.

Does that mean, as *Yedinstvo*, *Rabochaya Gazeta*,¹⁷ and the other "Louis Blancs" of our petty bourgeoisie are ready to conclude and actually do conclude, that we must *not* take any decisive steps towards overthrowing capitalism, that we must accept at least a modicum of annexations?

No. Decisive steps *must* be taken towards the overthrow of capitalism. They must be taken ably and gradually, relying *only* on the class-consciousness and organised activity of the overwhelming majority of the workers and poor peasants. But taken they must be. The Soviets of Workers' Deputies have *already* started to take them in a number of places in Russia.

The order of the day now is a decisive and irrevocable parting of the ways with the Louis Blancs—the Chkheidzes, Tseretelis, Steklovs, the party of the O.C., the Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc., etc. The masses must be made to see that Blancism is ruining and will utterly ruin the further success of the revolution, even the success of freedom, unless the masses realise how harmful these petty-bourgeois illusions are and join the class-conscious workers in their cautious, gradual, well-considered, yet firm and direct steps towards socialism.

Outside of socialism there is *no* deliverance of humanity from wars, from hunger, from the destruction of still more millions and millions of human beings.

Pravda No. 27, April 8, 1917
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

THE DUAL POWER

The basic question of every revolution is that of state power. Unless this question is understood, there can be no intelligent participation in the revolution, not to speak of guidance of the revolution.

The highly remarkable feature of our revolution is that it has brought about a *dual power*. This fact must be grasped first and foremost: unless it is understood, we cannot advance. We must know how to supplement and amend old "formulas", for example, those of Bolshevism, for while they have been found to be correct on the whole, their concrete realisation *has turned out to be* different. *Nobody* previously thought, or could have thought, of a dual power.

What is this dual power? Alongside the Provisional Government, the government of the *bourgeoisie*, *another government* has arisen, so far weak and incipient; but undoubtedly a government that actually exists and is growing—the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

What is the class composition of this other government? It consists of the proletariat and the peasants (in soldiers' uniforms). What is the political nature of this government? It is a revolutionary dictatorship, i.e., a power directly based on revolutionary seizure, on the direct initiative of the people from below, and *not on a law* enacted by a centralised state power. It is an entirely different kind of power from the one that generally exists in the parliamentary bourgeois-democratic republics of the usual type still prevailing in the advanced countries of Europe and America. This circumstance is often overlooked, often not given enough thought, yet it is the crux of the matter. *This* power is of *the same type* as the Paris Commune of 1871. The funda-

mental characteristics of this type are: (1) the source of power is not a law previously discussed and enacted by parliament, but the direct initiative of the people from below, in their local areas—direct “seizure”, to use a current expression; (2) the replacement of the police and the army, which are institutions divorced from the people and set against the people, by the direct arming of the whole people; order in the state under such a power is maintained by the armed workers and peasants *themselves*, by the armed people *themselves*; (3) officialdom, the bureaucracy, are either similarly replaced by the direct rule of the people themselves or at least placed under special control; they not only become elected officials, but are also *subject to recall* at the people’s first demand; they are reduced to the position of simple agents; from a privileged group holding “jobs” remunerated on a high, bourgeois scale, they become workers of a special “arm of the service”, whose remuneration *does not exceed* the ordinary pay of a competent worker.

This, and this *alone*, constitutes the *essence* of the Paris Commune as a special type of state. This essence has been forgotten or perverted by the Plekhanovs (downright chauvinists who have betrayed Marxism), the Kautskys (the men of the “Centre”, i.e., those who vacillate between chauvinism and Marxism), and generally by all those Social-Democrats, Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc., etc., who now rule the roost.

They are trying to get away with empty phrases, evasions, subterfuges; they congratulate each other a thousand times upon the revolution, but refuse to *consider what* the Soviets of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies *are*. They refuse to recognise the obvious truth that inasmuch as these Soviets exist, *inasmuch* as they are a power, we have in Russia a state of the *type* of the Paris Commune.

I have emphasised the words “inasmuch as”, for it is only an incipient power. By direct agreement with the bourgeois Provisional Government and by a series of actual concessions, it has itself *surrendered and is surrendering* its positions to the bourgeoisie.

Why? Is it because Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov and Co. are making a “mistake”? Nonsense. Only a philistine can think so—not a Marxist. The reason is *insufficient class-*

consciousness and organisation of the proletarians and peasants. The "mistake" of the leaders I have named lies in their petty-bourgeois position, in the fact that instead of clarifying the minds of the workers, they are *befogging* them; instead of dispelling petty-bourgeois illusions, they are *instilling* them; instead of freeing the people from bourgeois influence, they are *strengthening* that influence.

It should be clear from this why our comrades, too, make so many mistakes when putting the question "simply": Should the Provisional Government be overthrown immediately?

My answer is: (1) it should be overthrown, for it is an oligarchic, bourgeois, and not a people's government, and *is unable* to provide peace, bread, or full freedom; (2) it cannot be overthrown just now, for it is being kept in power by a direct and indirect, a formal and actual *agreement* with the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, and primarily with the chief Soviet, the Petrograd Soviet; (3) generally, it cannot be "overthrown" in the ordinary way, for it rests on the "*support*" given to the bourgeoisie by the *second* government—the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, and that government is the only possible revolutionary government, which directly expresses the mind and will of the majority of the workers and peasants. Humanity has not yet evolved and we do not as yet know a type of government superior to and better than the Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers', Peasants', and Soldiers' Deputies.

To become a power the class-conscious workers must win the majority to their side. *As long as* no violence is used against the people there is no other road to power. We are not Blancists, we do not stand for the seizure of power by a minority. We are Marxists, we stand for proletarian class struggle against petty-bourgeois intoxication, against chauvinism-defencism, phrase-mongering and dependence on the bourgeoisie.

Let us create a proletarian Communist Party; its elements have already been created by the best adherents of Bolshevism; let us rally our ranks for proletarian class work; and larger and larger numbers from among the proletarians, from among the *poorest* peasants will range themselves on our side. For *actual experience* will from day to day shatter the petty-bourgeois illusions of those "Social-Democrats",

the Chkheidzes, Tseretelis, Steklovs and others, the “Socialist-Revolutionaries”, the petty bourgeois of an even purer water, and so on and so forth.

The bourgeoisie stands for the undivided power of the bourgeoisie.

The class-conscious workers stand for the undivided power of the Soviets of Workers’, Agricultural Labourers’, Peasants’, and Soldiers’ Deputies—for undivided power made possible not by adventurist acts, but by *clarifying* proletarian minds, by *emancipating* them from the influence of the bourgeoisie.

The petty bourgeoisie—“Social-Democrats”, Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc., etc.—vacillate and, thereby, *hinder* this clarification and emancipation.

This is the actual, the *class* alignment of forces that determines our tasks.

Pravda No. 28, April 9, 1917
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

LETTERS ON TACTICS¹⁸

FOREWORD

On April 4, 1917, I had occasion to make a report on the subject indicated in the title, first, at a meeting of Bolsheviki in Petrograd. These were delegates to the All-Russia Conference of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, who had to leave for their homes and therefore could not allow me to postpone it. After the meeting, the chairman, Comrade G. Zinoviev, asked me on behalf of the whole assembly to repeat my report immediately at a joint meeting of Bolshevik and Menshevik delegates, who wished to discuss the question of unifying the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

Difficult though it was for me immediately to repeat my report I felt that I had no right to refuse once this was demanded of me by *my comrades-in-ideas* as well as by the Mensheviks, who, because of their impending departure, really could not grant me a delay.

In making my report, I read the theses which were published in No. 26 of *Pravda*, on April 7, 1917.*

Both the theses and my report gave rise to differences of opinion among the Bolsheviks themselves and the editors of *Pravda*. After a number of consultations, we unanimously concluded that it would be advisable *openly* to discuss our differences, and thus provide material for the All-Russia Conference of our Party (the Russian Social-Democratic

* I reprint these theses together with the brief comment from the same issue of *Pravda* as an appendix to this letter. (See pp. 21-24 of this volume.—*Ed.*)

Labour Party, united under the Central Committee) which is to meet in Petrograd on April 20, 1917.

Complying with this decision concerning a discussion, I am publishing the following *letters* in which I do not claim to have made an *exhaustive* study of the question, but wish merely to outline the principal arguments, which are especially essential for the *practical* tasks of the working-class movement.

FIRST LETTER

ASSESSMENT OF THE PRESENT SITUATION

Marxism requires of us a strictly exact and objectively verifiable analysis of the relations of classes and of the concrete features peculiar to each historical situation. We Bolsheviks have always tried to meet this requirement, which is absolutely essential for giving a scientific foundation to policy.

“Our theory is not a dogma, but a guide to action,”¹⁹ Marx and Engels always said, rightly ridiculing the mere memorising and repetition of “formulas”, that at best are capable only of marking out *general* tasks, which are necessarily modifiable by the *concrete* economic and political conditions of each particular *period* of the historical process.

What, then, are the clearly established objective *facts* which the party of the revolutionary proletariat must now be guided by in defining the tasks and forms of its activity?

Both in my first *Letter from Afar* (“The First Stage of the First Revolution”) published in *Pravda* Nos. 14 and 15, March 21 and 22, 1917, and in my theses, I define “the specific feature of the present situation in Russia” as a period of *transition* from the first stage of the revolution to the second. I therefore considered the basic slogan, the “task of the day” at *this* moment to be: “Workers, you have performed miracles of proletarian heroism, the heroism of the people, in the civil war against tsarism. You must perform miracles of organisation, organisation of the proletariat and of the whole people, to prepare the way for your

victory in the second stage of the revolution” (*Pravda* No. 15).*

What, then, is the first stage?

It is the passing of state power to the bourgeoisie.

Before the February-March revolution of 1917, state power in Russia was in the hands of one old class, namely, the feudal landed nobility, headed by Nicholas Romanov.

After the revolution, the power is in the hands of a *different* class, a new class, namely, the *bourgeoisie*.

The passing of state power from one *class* to another is the first, the principal, the basic sign of a *revolution*, both in the strictly scientific and in the practical political meaning of that term.

To this extent, the bourgeois, or the bourgeois-democratic, revolution in Russia is *completed*.

But at this point we hear a clamour of protest from people who readily call themselves “old Bolsheviks”. Didn’t we always maintain, they say, that the bourgeois-democratic revolution is completed only by the “revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry”? Is the agrarian revolution, which is also a bourgeois-democratic revolution, completed? Is it not a fact, on the contrary, that it has *not even* started?

My answer is: The Bolshevik slogans and ideas *on the whole* have been confirmed by history; but *concretely* things have worked out *differently*; they are more original, more peculiar, more variegated than anyone could have expected.

To ignore or overlook this fact would mean taking after those “old Bolsheviks” who more than once already have played so regrettable a role in the history of our Party by reiterating formulas senselessly *learned by rote* instead of *studying* the specific features of the new and living reality.

“The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry” has *already* become a reality** in the Russian revolution, for this “formula” envisages only a *relation of classes*, and not a *concrete political institution implementing* this relation, this co-operation. “The Soviet

* See present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 306-07.—*Ed.*

** In a certain form and to a certain extent.

of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies"—there you have the "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" already accomplished in reality.

This formula is already antiquated. Events have moved it from the realm of formulas into the realm of reality, clothed it with flesh and bone, concretised it and *thereby* modified it.

A new and different task now faces us: to effect a split *within* this dictatorship between the proletarian elements (the anti-defencist, internationalist, "Communist" elements, who stand for a transition to the commune) and the *small-proprietor* or *petty-bourgeois* elements (Chkheidze, Tsere-teli, Steklov, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the other revolutionary defencists, who are opposed to moving towards the commune and are in favour of "supporting" the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois government).

The person who *now* speaks only of a "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" is behind the times, consequently, he has in effect *gone over* to the petty bourgeoisie against the proletarian class struggle; that person should be consigned to the archive of "Bolshevik" pre-revolutionary antiques (it may be called the archive of "old Bolsheviks").

The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry has already been realised, but in a highly original manner, and with a number of extremely important modifications. I shall deal with them separately in one of my next letters. For the present, it is essential to grasp the incontestable truth that a Marxist must take cognisance of real life, of the true facts of *reality*, and not cling to a theory of yesterday, which, like all theories, at best only outlines the main and the general, only *comes near* to embracing life in all its complexity.

"Theory, my friend, is grey, but green is the eternal tree of life."²⁰

To deal with the question of "completion" of the bourgeois revolution *in the old way* is to sacrifice living Marxism to the dead letter.

According to the old way of thinking, the rule of the bourgeoisie could and should be *followed* by the rule of the proletariat and the peasantry, by their dictatorship.

In real life, however, things have *already* turned out *differently*; there has been an extremely original, novel and unprecedented *interlacing of the one with the other*. We have side by side, existing together, simultaneously, *both* the rule of the bourgeoisie (the government of Lvov and Guchkov) and a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, which is *voluntarily* ceding power to the bourgeoisie, voluntarily making itself an appendage of the bourgeoisie.

For it must not be forgotten that actually, in Petrograd, the power is in the hands of the workers and soldiers; the new government is *not* using and cannot use violence against them, because *there is no police, no army standing apart from the people, no officialdom standing all-powerful above the people*. This is a fact, the kind of fact that is characteristic of a state of the Paris Commune type. This fact does not fit into the old schemes. One must know how to adapt schemes to facts, instead of reiterating the now meaningless words about a "dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" *in general*.

To throw more light on this question let us approach it from another angle.

A Marxist must not abandon the ground of careful analysis of class relations. The bourgeoisie is in power. But is not the mass of the peasants *also* a bourgeoisie, only of a different social stratum, of a different kind, of a different character? Whence does it follow that *this* stratum *cannot* come to power, thus "completing" the bourgeois-democratic revolution? Why should this be impossible?

This is how the old Bolsheviki often argue.

My reply is that it is quite possible. But, in assessing a given situation, a Marxist must proceed *not* from what is possible, but from what is real.

And the reality reveals the *fact* that freely elected soldiers' and peasants' deputies are freely joining the second, parallel government, and are freely supplementing, developing and completing it. And, just as freely, they are *surrendering* power to the bourgeoisie—a fact which does not in the least "contravene" the theory of Marxism, for we have always known and repeatedly pointed out that the bourgeoisie maintains itself in power *not* only by force but

also by virtue of the lack of class-consciousness and organisation, the routinism and downtrodden state of the masses.

In view of this present-day reality, it is simply ridiculous to turn one's back on the fact and talk about "possibilities".

Possibly the peasantry may seize all the land and all the power. Far from forgetting this possibility, far from confining myself to the present, I definitely and clearly formulate the agrarian programme, taking into account the *new* phenomenon, i.e., the deeper cleavage between the agricultural labourers and the poor peasants on the one hand, and the peasant proprietors on the other.

But there is also another possibility; it is possible that the peasants will take the advice of the petty-bourgeois party of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, which has yielded to the influence of the bourgeoisie, has adopted a defencist stand, and which advises waiting for the Constituent Assembly, although not even the date of its convocation has yet been fixed.*

It is possible that the peasants will *maintain* and prolong their deal with the bourgeoisie, a deal which they have now concluded through the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies not only in form, but in fact.

Many things are possible. It would be a great mistake to forget the agrarian movement and the agrarian programme. But it would be no less a mistake to forget the *reality*, which reveals the *fact* that an *agreement*, or—to use a more exact, less legal, but more class-economic term—*class collaboration* exists between the bourgeoisie and the peasantry.

When this fact ceases to be a fact, when the peasantry separates from the bourgeoisie, seizes the land and power despite the bourgeoisie, that will be a new stage in the bourgeois-democratic revolution; and that matter will be dealt with separately.

* Lest my words be misinterpreted, I shall say at once that I am positively in favour of the *Soviets* of Agricultural Labourers and Peasants *immediately* taking over *all* the land, but they should *themselves* observe the strictest order and discipline, not permit the slightest damage to machines, structures, or livestock, and in no case disorganise agriculture and grain production, but rather *develop* them, for the soldiers need *twice* as much bread, and the people must not be allowed to starve.

A Marxist who, in view of the possibility of such a future stage, were to forget his duties in *the present*, when the peasantry is *in agreement* with the bourgeoisie, would turn petty bourgeois. For he would in practice be preaching to the proletariat *confidence* in the petty bourgeoisie (“this petty bourgeoisie, this peasantry, must separate from the bourgeoisie while the bourgeois-democratic revolution is still on”). Because of the “possibility” of so pleasing and sweet a future, in which the peasantry would *not* be the tail of the bourgeoisie, in which the Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Chkheidzes, Tseretelis, and Steklovs would *not* be an appendage of the bourgeois government—because of the “possibility” of so pleasing a future, he would be forgetting *the unpleasant present*, in which the peasantry still forms the tail of the bourgeoisie, and in which the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Social-Democrats have not yet given up their role as an appendage of the bourgeois government, as “His Majesty” Lvov’s Opposition.²¹

This hypothetical person would resemble a sweetish Louis Blanc, or a sugary Kautskyite, but certainly not a revolutionary Marxist.

But are we not in danger of falling into subjectivism, of wanting to arrive at the socialist revolution by “skipping” the bourgeois-democratic revolution—which is not yet completed and has not yet exhausted the peasant movement?

I might be incurring this danger if I said: “No Tsar, but a *workers’* government.”²² But I did *not* say that, I said something else. I said that there *can be no* government (barring a bourgeois government) in Russia *other than* that of the Soviets of Workers’, Agricultural Labourers’, Soldiers’, and Peasants’ Deputies. I said that power in Russia now can pass from Guchkov and Lvov *only* to these Soviets. And in these Soviets, as it happens, it is the peasants, the soldiers, i.e., petty bourgeoisie, who preponderate, to use a scientific, Marxist term, a class characterisation, and not a common, man-in-the-street, professional characterisation.

In my theses, I absolutely ensured myself against skipping over the peasant movement, which has not outlived itself, or the petty-bourgeois movement in general, against any *playing* at “seizure of power” by a workers’ government, against any kind of Blanquist adventurism; for I pointedly

referred to the experience of the Paris Commune. And this experience, as we know, and as Marx proved at length in 1871 and Engels in 1891,²³ absolutely excludes Blanquism, absolutely ensures the direct, immediate and unquestionable rule of the *majority* and the activity of the masses only to the extent that the majority itself acts *consciously*.

In the theses, I very definitely reduced the question to one of a *struggle for influence within* the Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers', Peasants', and Soldiers' Deputies. To leave no shadow of doubt on this score, I *twice* emphasised in the theses the need for patient and persistent "explanatory" work "adapted to the *practical* needs of the *masses*".

Ignorant persons or renegades from Marxism, like Mr. Plekhanov, may shout about anarchism, Blanquism, and so forth. But those who want to think and learn cannot fail to understand that Blanquism means the seizure of power by a minority, whereas the Soviets are *admittedly* the direct and immediate organisation of the *majority* of the people. Work confined to a struggle for influence *within* these Soviets cannot, simply *cannot*, stray into the swamp of Blanquism. Nor can it stray into the swamp of anarchism, for anarchism denies *the need for a state and state power* in the period of *transition* from the rule of the bourgeoisie to the rule of the proletariat, whereas I, with a precision that precludes any possibility of misinterpretation, *advocate* the need for a state in this period, although, in accordance with Marx and the lessons of the Paris Commune, I advocate not the usual parliamentary bourgeois state, but a state *without* a standing army, *without* a police opposed to the people, *without* an officialdom placed above the people.

When Mr. Plekhanov, in his newspaper *Yedinstvo*, shouts with all his might that this is anarchism, he is merely giving further proof of his break with Marxism. Challenged by me in *Pravda* (No. 26) to tell us what Marx and Engels taught on the subject in 1871, 1872 and 1875,* Mr. Plekhanov can only preserve silence on the question at issue and shout out abuse after the manner of the enraged bourgeoisie.

Mr. Plekhanov, the ex-Marxist, has *absolutely* failed to understand the Marxist doctrine of the state. Incidentally,

* See p. 26 of this volume.—*Ed.*

the germs of this lack of understanding are also to be found in his German pamphlet on anarchism.²⁴

* * *

Now let us see how Comrade Y. Kamenev, in *Pravda* No. 27, formulates his “disagreements” with my theses and with the views expressed above. This will help us to grasp them more clearly.

“As for Comrade Lenin’s general scheme,” writes Comrade Kamenev, “it appears to us unacceptable, inasmuch as it proceeds from the assumption that the bourgeois-democratic revolution is *completed*, and builds on the immediate transformation of this revolution into a socialist revolution.”

There are two big mistakes here.

First. The question of “completion” of the bourgeois-democratic revolution is *stated* wrongly. The question is put in an abstract, simple, so to speak one-colour, way, which does *not* correspond to the objective reality. To put the question *this way*, to ask *now* “whether the bourgeois-democratic revolution is completed” and say *no more*, is to prevent oneself from seeing the exceedingly complex reality, which is at least two-coloured. This is in theory. In practice, it means surrendering helplessly to *petty-bourgeois revolutionism*.

Indeed, reality shows us *both* the passing of power into the hands of the bourgeoisie (a “completed” bourgeois-democratic revolution of the usual type) and, side by side with the real government, the existence of a parallel government which represents the “revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry”. This “second-government” has *itself* ceded the power to the bourgeoisie, has chained *itself* to the bourgeois government.

Is this reality covered by Comrade Kamenev’s old-Bolshevik formula, which says that “the bourgeois-democratic revolution is not completed”?

It is not. The formula is obsolete. It is no good at all. It is dead. And it is no use trying to revive it.

Second. A practical question. Who knows whether it is still possible at present for a *special* “revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry”, *de-*

tached from the bourgeois government, to emerge in Russia? Marxist tactics cannot be based on the unknown.

But *if* this is still possible, then there is one, and only one, way towards it, namely, an immediate, resolute, and irrevocable separation of the proletarian Communist elements from the petty-bourgeois elements.

Why?

Because the entire petty bourgeoisie has, not by chance but of necessity, turned towards chauvinism (= defencism), towards "support" of the bourgeoisie, towards dependence on it, towards the *fear* of having to do without it, etc., etc.

How can the petty bourgeoisie be "pushed" into power, if even now it can take the power, but *does not want to*?

This can be done only by separating the proletarian, the Communist, party, by waging a proletarian class struggle *free from* the timidity of those petty bourgeois. Only the consolidation of the proletarians who are free from the influence of the petty bourgeoisie in deed and not only in word can make the ground so hot under the feet of the petty bourgeoisie that it will be *obliged* under certain circumstances to take the power; it is even within the bounds of possibility that Guchkov and Milyukov—again under certain circumstances—will be for giving full and sole power to Chkheidze, Tsereteli, the S.R.s, and Steklov, since, after all, these are "*defencists*".

To separate the proletarian elements of the Soviets (i.e., the proletarian, Communist, party) from the petty-bourgeois elements right now, immediately and irrevocably, is to give correct expression to the interests of the movement in *either* of two possible events: in the event that Russia will yet experience a special "dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" independent of the bourgeoisie, and in the event that the petty bourgeoisie will not be able to tear itself away from the bourgeoisie and will oscillate eternally (that is, until socialism is established) between us and it.

To be guided in one's activities merely by the simple formula, "the bourgeois-democratic revolution is not completed", is like taking it upon oneself to guarantee that the petty bourgeoisie is definitely capable of being independent of the bourgeoisie. To do so is to throw oneself at the given moment on the mercy of the petty bourgeoisie.

Incidentally, in connection with the "formula" of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, it is worth mentioning that, in *Two Tactics* (July 1905), I made a point of emphasising (*Twelve Years*, p. 435²⁵) this:

"Like everything else in the world, the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry has a past and a future. Its past is autocracy, serfdom, monarchy, and privilege.... Its future is the struggle against private property, the struggle of the wage-worker against the employer, the struggle for socialism...."*

Comrade Kamenev's mistake is that even in 1917 he sees only *the past* of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. As a matter of fact its *future* has already begun, for the interests and policies of the wage-worker and the petty proprietor have *actually* diverged already, even in such an important question as that of "defencism", that of the attitude towards the imperialist war.

This brings me to the second mistake in Comrade Kamenev's argument quoted above. He criticises me, saying that my scheme "builds" on "the immediate transformation of this [bourgeois-democratic] revolution into a socialist revolution".

This is incorrect. I not only do not "build" on the "immediate transformation" of our revolution into a *socialist* one, but I actually warn against it, when in Thesis No. 8, I state: "It is *not* our *immediate* task to 'introduce' socialism...".**

Is it not clear that no person who builds on the immediate transformation of our revolution into a socialist revolution could be opposed to the immediate task of introducing socialism?

Moreover, even a "commune state" (i.e., a state organised along the lines of the Paris Commune) *cannot* be introduced in Russia "immediately", because to do that it would be necessary for the *majority* of the deputies in all (or in most) Soviets to clearly recognise all the erroneousness and harm of the tactics and policy pursued by the S.R.s, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov, etc. As for me, I declared unmistakably that in this respect I "build" only on "patient" explaining

* See present edition, Vol. 9, pp. 84-85.—*Ed.*

** See p. 24 of this volume.—*Ed.*

(does one have to be patient to bring about a change which can be effected "immediately"?).

Comrade Kamenev has somewhat overreached himself in his eagerness, and has repeated the bourgeois prejudice about the Paris Commune having wanted to introduce socialism "immediately". This is not so. The Commune, unfortunately, was too slow in introducing socialism. The real essence of the Commune is not where the bourgeois usually looks for it, but in the creation of a *state* of a special type. Such a state has *already* arisen in Russia, it is the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies!

Comrade Kamenev has not pondered on the *fact*, the significance, of the *existing* Soviets, their identity, in point of type and socio-political character, with the commune state, and instead of studying the *fact*, he began to talk about something I was supposed to be "building" on for the "immediate" future. The result is, unfortunately, a repetition of the method used by many bourgeois: from the question as to *what are* the Soviets, whether they are of a *higher* type than a parliamentary republic, whether they are *more useful* for the people, *more democratic*, *more convenient* for the struggle, for combating, for instance, the grain shortage, etc.—from this real, urgent, vital issue, attention is diverted to the empty, would-be scientific, but actually hollow, professorially dead question of "building on an immediate transformation".

An idle question falsely presented. I "build" *only* on this, *exclusively* on this—that the workers, soldiers and peasants will deal better than the officials, better than the police, with the difficult *practical*, problems of producing more grain, distributing it better and keeping the soldiers better supplied, etc., etc.

I am deeply convinced that the Soviets will make the independent activity of the *masses* a reality more quickly and effectively than will a parliamentary republic (I shall compare the two types of state in greater detail in another letter) They will more effectively, more practically and more correctly decide what *steps* can be taken towards socialism and how these steps should be taken. Control over a bank, the merging of all banks into one, is *not yet* socialism, but it is a *step towards* socialism. Today such steps are being

taken in Germany by the Junkers and the bourgeoisie against the people. Tomorrow the Soviet will be able to take these steps more effectively for the benefit of the people if the whole state power is in its hands.

What *compels* such steps?

Famine. Economic disorganisation. Imminent collapse. The horrors of war. The horrors of the wounds inflicted on mankind by the war.

Comrade Kamenev concludes his article with the remark that "in a broad discussion he hopes to carry his point of view, which is the only possible one for revolutionary Social-Democracy if it wishes to and should remain to the very end the party of the revolutionary masses of the proletariat and not turn into a group of Communist propagandists".

It seems to me that these words betray a completely erroneous estimate of the situation. Comrade Kamenev contraposes to a "party of the masses" a "group of propagandists". But the "masses" have now succumbed to the craze of "revolutionary" defencism. Is it not more becoming for internationalists at this moment to show that they can resist "mass" intoxication rather than to "wish to remain" with the masses, i.e., to succumb to the general epidemic? Have we not seen how in all the belligerent countries of Europe the chauvinists tried to justify themselves on the grounds that they wished to "remain with the masses"? Must we not be able to remain for a time in the minority against the "mass" intoxication? Is it not the work of the propagandists at the present moment that forms the key point for *disentangling* the proletarian line from the defencist and petty-bourgeois "mass" intoxication? It was this fusion of the masses, proletarian and non-proletarian, regardless of class differences within the masses, that formed one of the conditions for the defencist epidemic. To speak contemptuously of a "group of propagandists" advocating a *proletarian* line does not seem to be very becoming.

Written between April 8 and 13
(21 and 26), 1917

Published as a pamphlet
in April 1917 by Priboi Publishers

Published according
to the pamphlet text

**THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT
IN OUR REVOLUTION**

DRAFT PLATFORM FOR THE PROLETARIAN PARTY

First published September 1917
as a pamphlet by Priboi
Publishers
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according to
the pamphlet text

The moment of history through which Russia is now passing is marked by the following main characteristics:

THE CLASS CHARACTER OF THE REVOLUTION
THAT HAS TAKEN PLACE

1. The old tsarist power, which represented only a handful of feudalist landowners who commanded the entire state machinery (the army, the police, and the bureaucracy), has been overthrown and removed, but not completely destroyed. The monarchy has not been formally abolished; the Romanov gang continues to hatch monarchist intrigues. The vast landed possessions of the feudalist squirearchy have not been abolished.

2. State power in Russia has passed into the hands of a new *class*, namely, the bourgeoisie and landowners who had become bourgeois. *To this extent* the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia is completed.

Having come to power, the bourgeoisie has formed a bloc (an alliance) with the overt monarchists, who are notorious for their exceptionally ardent support of Nicholas the Bloody and Stolypin the Hangman in 1906-14 (Guchkov and other politicians to the right of the Cadets²⁶). The new bourgeois government of Lvov and Co. has attempted and has begun to negotiate with the Romanovs for the restoration of the monarchy in Russia. Behind a screen of revolutionary phrases, this government is appointing partisans of the old regime to key positions. It is striving to reform the whole machinery of state (the army, the police, and the bureaucracy) as little as possible, and has turned it over to the bourgeoisie. The new government has already begun to hinder

in every way the revolutionary initiative of mass action and the seizure of power by the people *from below*, which is the *sole* guarantee of the real success of the revolution.

Up to now this government has not even fixed a date for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. It is not laying a finger on the landed estates, which form the material foundation of feudal tsarism. This government does not even contemplate starting an investigation into, and making public, the activities of the monopolist financial organisations, the big banks, the syndicates and cartels of the capitalists, etc., or instituting control over them.

The key positions, the decisive ministerial posts in the new government (the Ministry of the Interior and the War Ministry, i.e., the command over the army, the police, the bureaucracy—the entire apparatus for oppressing the people) are held by outright monarchists and supporters of the system of big landed estates. The Cadets, those day-old republicans, republicans against their own will, have been assigned minor posts, having no direct relation to the *command* over the people or to the apparatus of state power. A. Kerensky, a Trudovik²⁷ and “would-be socialist”, has no function whatsoever, except to lull the vigilance and attention of the people with sonorous phrases.

For all these reasons, the new bourgeois government does not deserve the confidence of the proletariat even in the sphere of internal policy, and no support of this government by the proletariat is admissible.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE NEW GOVERNMENT

3. In the field of foreign policy, which has now been brought to the forefront by objective circumstances, the new government is a government for the continuation of the imperialist war, a war that is being waged in alliance with the imperialist powers—Britain, France, and others—for division of the capitalist spoils and for subjugating small and weak nations.

Subordinated to the interests of Russian capitalism and its powerful protector and master—Anglo-French imperialist capitalism, the wealthiest in the world, the new govern-

ment, notwithstanding the wishes expressed in no uncertain fashion on behalf of the obvious majority of the peoples of Russia through the Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies, has taken no real steps to put an end to the slaughter of peoples for the interests of the capitalists. It has not even published the secret treaties of an obviously predatory character (for the partition of Persia, the plunder of China, the plunder of Turkey, the partition of Austria, the annexation of Eastern Prussia, the annexation of the German colonies, etc.), which, as everybody knows, bind Russia to Anglo-French predatory imperialist capital. It has *confirmed* these treaties concluded by tsarism, which for centuries robbed and oppressed more nations than other tyrants and despots, and which not only oppressed, but also disgraced and demoralised the Great-Russian nation by making it an executioner of other nations.

The new government has confirmed these shameful predatory treaties and has not proposed an immediate armistice to all the belligerent nations, in spite of the clearly expressed demand of the majority of the peoples of Russia, voiced through the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. It has evaded the issue with the help of solemn, sonorous, bombastic, but absolutely empty declarations and phrases, which, in the mouths of bourgeois diplomats, have always served, and still serve, to deceive the trustful and naïve masses of the oppressed people.

4. Not only, therefore, is the new government unworthy of the slightest confidence in the field of foreign policy, but to go on demanding that it should proclaim the will of the peoples of Russia for peace, that it should renounce annexations, and so on and so forth, is in practice merely to deceive the people, to inspire them with false hopes and to retard the clarification of their minds. It is indirectly to reconcile them to the continuation of a war the true social character of which is determined not by pious wishes, but by the class character of the government that wages the war, by the connection between the class represented by this government and the imperialist finance capital of Russia, Britain, France, etc., by *the real and actual policy* which that class is pursuing.

THE PECULIAR NATURE OF THE DUAL POWER AND ITS CLASS SIGNIFICANCE

5. The main feature of our revolution, a feature that most imperatively demands thoughtful consideration, is the *dual power* which arose in the very first days after the triumph of the revolution.

This dual power is evident in the existence of *two* governments: one is the main, the real, the actual government of the bourgeoisie, the "Provisional Government" of Lvov and Co., which holds in its hands all the organs of power; the other is a supplementary and parallel government, a "controlling" government in the shape of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which holds no organs of state power, but directly rests on the support of an obvious and indisputable majority of the people, on the armed workers and soldiers.

The class origin and the class significance of this dual power is the following: the Russian revolution of March 1917 not only swept away the whole tsarist monarchy, not only transferred the entire power to the bourgeoisie, but also *moved close towards* a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. The Petrograd and the other, the local, Soviets constitute precisely such a dictatorship (that is, a power resting not on the law but directly on the force of armed masses of the population), a dictatorship precisely of the above-mentioned classes.

6. The second highly important feature of the Russian revolution is the fact that the Petrograd Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies, which, as everything goes to show, enjoys the confidence of most of the local Soviets, is *voluntarily* transferring state power to the bourgeoisie and *its* Provisional Government, is voluntarily *ceding* supremacy to the latter, having entered into an agreement to support it, and is limiting its own role to that of an observer, a supervisor of the convocation of the Constituent Assembly (the date for which has not even been announced as yet by the Provisional Government).

This remarkable feature, unparalleled in history in such a form, has led to the *interlocking of two* dictatorships: the

dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (for the government of Lvov and Co. is a dictatorship, i.e., a power based not on the law, not on the previously expressed will of the people, but on seizure by force, accomplished by a definite class, namely, the bourgeoisie) and the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry (the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies).

There is not the slightest doubt that such an "interlocking" *cannot* last long. Two powers *cannot exist* in a state. One of them is bound to pass away; and the entire Russian bourgeoisie is already trying its hardest everywhere and in every way to keep out and weaken the Soviets, to reduce them to nought, and to establish the undivided power of the bourgeoisie.

The dual power merely expresses a *transitional* phase in the revolution's development, when it has gone farther than the ordinary bourgeois-democratic revolution, *but has not yet reached* a "pure" dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.

The class significance (and the class explanation) of this transitional and unstable situation is this: like all revolutions, our revolution required the greatest heroism and self-sacrifice on the part of the people for the struggle against tsarism; it also immediately *drew* unprecedentedly vast numbers of ordinary citizens *into the movement*.

From the point of view of science and practical politics, one of the chief symptoms of *every* real revolution is the unusually rapid, sudden, and abrupt increase in the number of "ordinary citizens" who begin to participate actively, independently and effectively in political life and in the *organisation of the state*.

Such is the case in Russia. Russia at present is seething. Millions and tens of millions of people, who had been politically dormant for ten years and politically crushed by the terrible oppression of tsarism and by inhuman toil for the landowners and capitalists, *have awakened and taken eagerly* to politics. And who are these millions and tens of millions? For the most part small proprietors, petty bourgeois, people standing midway between the capitalists and the wage-workers Russia is the most petty-bourgeois of all European countries.

A gigantic petty-bourgeois wave has swept over everything and overwhelmed the class-conscious proletariat, not only by force of numbers but also ideologically; that is, it has infected and imbued very wide circles of workers with the petty-bourgeois political outlook.

The petty bourgeoisie are in real life dependent upon the bourgeoisie, for they live like masters and not like proletarians (from the point of view of their *place* in social *production*) and follow the bourgeoisie in their outlook.

An attitude of unreasoning trust in the capitalists—the worst foes of peace and socialism—characterises the politics of the *popular masses* in Russia at the present moment; this is the fruit that has *grown* with revolutionary rapidity on the social and economic soil of the most petty-bourgeois of all European countries. This is the *class* basis for the “*agreement*” between the Provisional Government and the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies (I emphasise that I am referring not so much to the formal agreement as to *actual* support, a tacit agreement, the surrender of power inspired by unreasoning trust), an agreement which has given the Guchkovs a fat piece—real power—and the Soviet merely promises and honours (for the time being), flattery, phrases, assurances, and the bowings and scrapings of the Kerenskys.

On the other side we have the inadequate numerical strength of the proletariat in Russia and its insufficient class-consciousness and organisation.

All the Narodnik parties, including the Socialist-Revolutionaries, have always been petty-bourgeois. This is also true of the party of the Organising Committee (Chkheidze, Tsereteli, etc.). The non-party revolutionaries (Steklov and others) have similarly yielded to the tide, or have not been able to stand up to it, have not had the time to do it.

THE PECULIAR NATURE OF THE TACTICS WHICH FOLLOW FROM THE ABOVE

7. For the Marxist, who must reckon with objective facts, with the masses and classes, and not with individuals and so on, the peculiar nature of the actual situation as

described above must determine the peculiar nature of the tactics for the *present* moment.

This peculiarity of the situation calls, in the first place, for the pouring of vinegar and bile into the sweet water of revolutionary-democratic phraseology" (as my fellow member on the Central Committee of our Party, Teodorovich, so aptly put it at yesterday's session of the All-Russia Congress of Railwaymen in Petrograd). Our work must be one of criticism, of *explaining* the mistakes of the petty-bourgeois Socialist-Revolutionary and Social-Democratic parties, of preparing and welding the elements of a *consciously* proletarian, Communist Party, and of *curing* the proletariat of the "general" petty-bourgeois intoxication.

This *seems* to be "nothing more" than propaganda work, but in reality it is most *practical revolutionary* work; for there is no advancing a revolution that has come to a standstill, that has choked itself with phrases, and that keeps 'marking time", *not because* of external obstacles, *not because of the violence* of the bourgeoisie (Guchkov is still only threatening to employ violence against the soldier mass), but *because* of the unreasoning trust of the people.

Only by overcoming this unreasoning trust (and we can and should overcome it only ideologically, by comradely persuasion, by pointing to the *lessons of experience*) can we set ourselves free from the prevailing *orgy of revolutionary phrase-mongering* and really stimulate the consciousness both of the proletariat and of the mass in general, as well as their bold and determined initiative *in the localities*—the independent realisation, development and consolidation of liberties, democracy, and the principle of people's ownership of all the land.

8. The world-wide experience of bourgeois and landowner governments has evolved *two* methods of keeping the people in subjection. The first is violence. Nicholas Romanov I, nicknamed Nicholas of the Big Stick, and Nicholas II, the Bloody, demonstrated to the Russian people the maximum of what can and cannot be done in the way of these hangmen's practices. But there is another method, best developed by the British and French bourgeoisie, who "learned their lesson" in a series of great revolutions and revolutionary movements of the masses. It is the method of deception,

flattery, fine phrases, promises by the million, petty sops, and concessions of the unessential while retaining the essential.

The peculiar feature of the present situation in Russia is the transition at a dizzy speed from the first method to the second, from violent oppression of the people to *flattering* and deceiving the people by promises. Vaska the Cat listens, but goes on eating.²⁸ Milyukov and Guchkov are holding power, they are protecting the profits of the capitalists, conducting an imperialist war in the interests of Russian and Anglo-French capital, and trying to get away with promises, declamation and bombastic statements in reply to the speeches of "cooks" like Chkheidze, Tsereteli and Steklov, who threaten, exhort, conjure, beseech, demand and proclaim.... Vaska the Cat listens, but goes on eating.

But from day to day trustful lack of reasoning and unreasoning trust will be falling away, especially among the proletarians and *poor* peasants, who are being taught by experience (by their social and economic position) to distrust the capitalists.

The leaders of the petty bourgeoisie "must" teach the people to trust the bourgeoisie. The proletarians must teach the people to distrust the bourgeoisie.

REVOLUTIONARY DEFENCISM AND ITS CLASS SIGNIFICANCE

9. *Revolutionary defencism* must be regarded as the most important, the most striking manifestation of the petty-bourgeois wave that has swept over "nearly everything". It is the worst enemy of the further progress and success of the Russian revolution.

Those who have yielded on this point and have been unable to extricate themselves are lost to the revolution. But the masses yield in a different way from the leaders, and they extricate themselves *differently*, by a different course of development, by different means.

Revolutionary defencism is, on the one hand, a result of the deception of the masses by the bourgeoisie, a result of the trustful lack of reasoning on the part of the peasants

and a section of the workers; it is, on the other, an expression of the interests and point of view of the small proprietor, who is to some extent interested in annexations and bank profits, and who "sacredly" guards the traditions of tsarism, which demoralised the Great Russians by making them do a hangman's work against the other peoples.

The bourgeoisie deceives the people by working on their noble pride in the revolution and by pretending that the *social and political* character of the war, as far as Russia is concerned, underwent a change because of this stage of the revolution, because of the substitution of the near-republic of Guchkov and Milyukov for the tsarist monarchy. And the people believed it—for a time—largely owing to age-old prejudices, which made them look upon the other peoples of Russia, i.e., the non-Great Russians, as something in the nature of a property and private estate of the Great Russians. This vile demoralisation of the Great-Russian people by tsarism which taught them to regard the other peoples as something inferior, something belonging "by right" to Great Russia, could not disappear *instantly*.

What is required of us is the *ability* to explain to the masses that the social and political character of the war is determined not by the "good will" of individuals or groups, or even of nations, but by the position of the *class* which conducts the war, by the *class policy* of which the war is a continuation, by the *ties* of capital, which is the dominant economic force in modern society, by the *imperialist character* of international capital, by Russia's dependence in finance, banking and diplomacy upon Britain, France, and so on. To explain this skilfully in a way the people would understand *is not easy*; none of us would be able to do it at once without committing errors.

But this, and only this, must be the aim or, rather, the message of our propaganda. The slightest concession to revolutionary defencism is a *betrayal of socialism*, a complete renunciation of *internationalism*, no matter by what fine phrases and "practical" considerations it may be justified.

The slogan "Down with the War!" is, of course, correct. But it fails to take into account the specific nature of the tasks of the present moment and the necessity of *approach-*

ing the broad mass of the people *in a different way*. It reminds me of the slogan "Down with the Tsar!" with which the inexperienced agitator of the "good old days" went simply and directly to the countryside—and got a beating for his pains. The mass believers in revolutionary defencism are *honest*, not in the personal, but in the class sense, i.e., they belong to *classes* (workers and the peasant poor) which *in actual fact* have nothing to gain from annexations and the subjugation of other peoples. This is nothing like the bourgeois and the "intellectual" fraternity, who know very well that you *cannot* renounce annexations without renouncing the rule of capital, and who unscrupulously deceive the people with fine phrases, with unlimited promises and endless assurances.

The rank-and-file believer in defencism regards the matter in the simple way of the man in the street: "I don't want annexations, but the Germans are 'going for' *me*, therefore I'm defending a just cause and not any kind of imperialist interests at all." To a man like this it must be explained again and again that it is not a question of his personal wishes, but of mass, *class*, political relations and conditions, of the connection between the war and the interests of capital and the international network of banks, and so forth. Only such a struggle against defencism will be serious and will promise success—perhaps not a very rapid success, but one that will be real and enduring.

HOW CAN THE WAR BE ENDED?

10. The war cannot be ended "at will". It cannot be ended by the decision of one of the belligerents. It cannot be ended by "sticking your bayonet into the ground", as one soldier, a defencist, expressed it.

The war cannot be ended by an "agreement" among the socialists of the various countries, by the "action" of the proletarians of all countries, by the "will" of the peoples, and so forth. All the phrases of this kind, which fill the articles of the defencist, semi-defencist, and semi-internationalist papers as well as innumerable resolutions, appeals, manifestos, and the resolutions of the Soviet of Soldiers.'

Россійская Соціалъ-Демократическая Рабочая Партія.

Пролетаріи всѣхъ странъ, соединяйтесь!

Н. Ленинъ.

Задачи пролетаріата въ нашей революціи.

(ПРОЕКТЪ ПЛАТФОРМЫ ПРОЛЕТАРСКОЙ ПАРТІИ).



**Петербургъ.
1917.—Сентябрь.**

Типографія „Трудъ“, Т-во „Рабочая Печать“. Кавалергардская, 40.

The cover of Lenin's pamphlet
The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution, 1917
Reduced

and Workers' Deputies—all such phrases are nothing but idle, innocent and pious wishes of the petty bourgeois. There is nothing more harmful than phrases like “ascertaining the will of the peoples for peace”, like the *sequence* of revolutionary actions of the proletariat (after the Russian proletariat comes the turn of the German), etc. All this is Blancism, fond dreams, a playing at “political campaigning”, and in reality just a repetition of the fable of Vaska the Cat.

The war is not a product of the evil will of rapacious capitalists, although it is undoubtedly being fought *only* in their interests and they alone are being enriched by it. The war is a product of half a century of development of world capitalism and of its billions of threads and connections. It is *impossible* to slip out of the imperialist war and achieve a democratic, non-coercive peace without overthrowing the power of capital and transferring state power to *another* class, the proletariat.

The Russian revolution of February-March 1917 was the beginning of the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war. This revolution took the *first* step towards ending the war; but it requires a *second* step, namely, the transfer of state power to the proletariat, to make the end of the war a *certainty*. This will be the beginning of a “break-through” on a world-wide scale, a break-through in the front of capitalist interests; and only by breaking through *this* front *can* the proletariat save mankind from the horrors of war and endow it with the blessings of peace.

It is directly to such a “break-through” in the front of capitalism that the Russian revolution has *already* brought the Russian proletariat by creating the Soviets of Workers' Deputies.

A NEW TYPE OF STATE EMERGING FROM OUR REVOLUTION

11. The Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants' and other Deputies are not understood, not only in the sense that their class significance, their role in the *Russian* revolution, is not clear to the majority. They are not understood also in the sense that they constitute a new form or rather a new *type of state*.

The most perfect, the most advanced type of bourgeois state is the *parliamentary democratic republic*: power is vested in parliament; the state machine, the apparatus and organ of administration, is of the customary kind: the standing army, the police, and the bureaucracy—which in practice is undisplaceable, is privileged and stands *above* the people.

Since the end of the nineteenth century, however, revolutionary epochs have advanced a *higher* type of democratic state, a state which in certain respects, as Engels put it, ceases to be a state, is “no longer a state in the proper sense of the word”.²⁹ This is a state of the Paris Commune type, one in which a standing army and police divorced from the people are *replaced* by the direct arming of the people themselves. It is *this feature* that constitutes the very essence of the Commune, which has been so misrepresented and slandered by the bourgeois writers, and to which has been erroneously ascribed, among other things, the intention of immediately “introducing” socialism.

This is the type of state which the Russian revolution *began* to create in 1905 and in 1917. A Republic of Soviets of Workers’, Soldiers’, Peasants’, and other Deputies, united in an All-Russia Constituent Assembly of people’s representatives or in a Council of Soviets, etc., is what is *already being realised* in our country now, at this juncture. It is being realised by the initiative of the nation’s millions, who are creating a democracy on their own, *in their own way*, without waiting until the Cadet professors draft their legislative bills for a parliamentary bourgeois republic, or until the pedants and routine-worshippers of petty-bourgeois “Social-Democracy”, like Mr. Plekhanov or Kautsky, stop distorting the Marxist teaching on the state.

Marxism differs from anarchism in that it recognises the *need* for a state and for state power in the period of revolution in general, and in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism in particular.

Marxism differs from the petty-bourgeois, opportunist “Social-Democratism” of Plekhanov, Kautsky and Co. in that it recognises that what is required during these two periods is *not* a state of the usual parliamentary bourgeois republican type, but a state of the Paris Commune type.

The main distinctions between a state of the latter type and the old state are as follows.

It is quite easy (as history proves) to revert from a parliamentary bourgeois republic to a monarchy, for all the machinery of oppression—the army, the police, and the bureaucracy—is left intact. The Commune and the Soviet *smash* that machinery and do away with it.

The parliamentary bourgeois republic hampers and stifles the independent political life of the *masses*, their direct participation in the *democratic* organisation of the life of the state from the bottom up. The opposite is the case with the Soviets.

The latter reproduce the type of state which was being evolved by the Paris Commune and which Marx described as “the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labour”.³⁰

We are usually told that the Russian people are not yet prepared for the “introduction” of the Commune. This was the argument of the serf-owners when they claimed that the peasants were not prepared for emancipation. The Commune, i.e., the Soviets, does not “introduce”, does not intend to “introduce”, and must not introduce *any* reforms which have not absolutely matured both in economic reality and in the minds of the overwhelming majority of the people. The deeper the economic collapse and the crisis produced by the war, the more urgent becomes the need for the most perfect political form, which will *facilitate* the healing of the terrible wounds inflicted on mankind by the war. The less the organisational experience of the Russian people, the more resolutely must we *proceed* to organisational development by the *people themselves* and not merely by the bourgeois politicians and “well-placed” bureaucrats.

The sooner we shed the old prejudices of pseudo-Marxism, a Marxism falsified by Plekhanov, Kautsky and Co., the more actively we set about helping the people to organise Soviets of Workers’ and Peasants’ Deputies everywhere and immediately, and helping the latter to take life *in its entirety* under their control, and the longer Lvov and Co. delay the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the easier will it be for the people (through the medium of the Constituent

Assembly, or independently of it, if Lvov delays its convocation too long) to cast their decision in favour of a republic of Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies. Errors in the new work of organisational development by the people themselves are at first inevitable; but it is better to make mistakes and go forward than to *wait* until the professors of law summoned by Mr. Lvov draft their laws for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, for the perpetuation of the parliamentary bourgeois republic and for the strangling of the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies.

If we organise ourselves and conduct our propaganda skilfully, not only the proletarians, but nine-tenths of the peasants will be opposed to the restoration of the police, will be opposed to an undisplaceable and privileged bureaucracy and to an army divorced from the people. And that is all the new type of state stands for.

12. The substitution of a people's militia for the police is a reform that follows from the entire course of the revolution and that is now being introduced in most parts of Russia. We must explain to the people that in most of the bourgeois revolutions of the usual type, this reform was always extremely short-lived, and that the bourgeoisie—even the most democratic and republican—restored the police of the old, tsarist type, a police divorced from the people, commanded by the bourgeoisie and capable of oppressing the people in every way.

There is only one way to *prevent* the restoration of the police, and that is to create a people's militia and to fuse it with the army (the standing army to be replaced by the arming of the entire people). Service in this militia should extend to all citizens of both sexes between the ages of fifteen and sixty-five without exception, if these tentatively suggested age limits may be taken as indicating the participation of adolescents and old people. Capitalists must pay their workers, servants, etc., for days devoted to public service in the militia. Unless women are brought to take an independent part not only in political life generally, but also in daily and universal public service, it is no use talking about full and stable democracy, let alone socialism. And such "police" functions as care of the sick and of

homeless children, food inspection, etc., will never be satisfactorily discharged until women are on an equal footing with men, not merely nominally but in reality.

The tasks which the proletariat must put before the people in order to safeguard, consolidate and develop the revolution are prevention of the restoration of the police and enlistment of the organisational forces of the entire people in forming a people's militia.

THE AGRARIAN AND NATIONAL PROGRAMMES

13. At the present moment we cannot say for certain whether a mighty agrarian revolution will develop in the Russian countryside in the near future. We cannot say exactly how profound the class cleavage is among the peasants, which has undoubtedly grown more profound of late as a division into agricultural labourers, wage-workers and poor peasants ("semi-proletarians"), on the one hand, and wealthy and middle peasants (capitalists and petty capitalists), on the other. Such questions will be, and can be, decided only by experience.

Being the party of the proletariat, however, we are unquestionably in duty bound not only immediately to advance an agrarian (land) programme but also to advocate practical measures which can be immediately realised *in the interests* of the peasant agrarian revolution in Russia.

We must demand the nationalisation of *all* the land, i.e., that all the land in the state should become the property of the central state power. This power must fix the size, etc., of the resettlement land fund, pass legislation for the conservation of forests, for land improvement, etc., and absolutely prohibit any middlemen to interpose themselves between the owner of the land, i.e., the state, and the tenant, i.e., the tiller (prohibit all subletting of land). However, the *disposal* of the land, the determination of the *local regulations* governing ownership and tenure of land, must in no case be placed in the hands of bureaucrats and officials, but wholly and exclusively in the hands of the regional and local *Soviets of Peasants' Deputies*.

In order to improve grain production techniques and increase output, and in order to develop rational cultivation on a large scale under public control, we must strive within the peasants' committees to secure the transformation of every confiscated landed estate into a large model farm controlled by the *Soviet of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies*.

In order to counteract the petty-bourgeois phrase-mongering and the policy prevailing among the Socialist-Revolutionaries, particularly the idle talk about "subsistence" standards or "labour" standards, "socialisation of the land", etc., the party of the proletariat must make it clear that small-scale farming under commodity production *cannot* save mankind from poverty and oppression.

Without necessarily splitting the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies at once, the party of the proletariat must explain the need for organising separate Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies and separate Soviets of deputies from the poor (semi-proletarian) peasants, or, at least, for holding regular separate conferences of deputies of *this class status* in the shape of separate groups or parties within the general Soviets of Peasants' Deputies. Otherwise all the honeyed petty-bourgeois talk of the Narodniks³¹ regarding the peasants in general will serve as a shield for the deception of the propertyless mass by the wealthy peasants, who are merely a variety of *capitalists*.

To counteract the bourgeois-liberal or purely bureaucratic sermons preached by many Socialist-Revolutionaries and Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, who advise the peasants not to seize the landed estates and not to start the agrarian reform pending the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the party of the proletariat must urge the peasants to carry out the agrarian reform at once on their own, and to confiscate the landed estates immediately, upon the decisions of the peasants' deputies in the localities.

At the same time, it is most important to insist on the necessity of *increasing* food production for the soldiers at the front and for the towns, and on the absolute inadmissibility of causing any damage or injury to livestock, implements, machinery, buildings, etc.

14. As regards the national question, the proletarian party first of all must advocate the proclamation and immediate realisation of complete freedom of secession from Russia for all the nations and peoples who were oppressed by tsarism, or who were forcibly joined to, or forcibly kept within the boundaries of, the state, i.e., annexed.

All statements, declarations and manifestos concerning renunciation of annexations that are not accompanied by the realisation of the right of secession in practice, are nothing but bourgeois deception of the people, or else pious petty-bourgeois wishes.

The proletarian party strives to create as large a state as possible, for this is to the advantage of the working people; it strives to *draw* nations *closer together*, and bring about their *further fusion*; but it desires to achieve this aim not by violence, but exclusively through a free fraternal union of the workers and the working people of all nations.

The more democratic the Russian republic, and the more successfully it organises itself into a Republic of Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies, the more powerful will be the force of *voluntary* attraction to such a republic on the part of the working people of *all* nations.

Complete freedom of secession, the broadest local (and national) autonomy, and elaborate guarantees of the rights of national minorities—this is the programme of the revolutionary proletariat.

NATIONALISATION OF THE BANKS AND CAPITALIST SYNDICATES

15. Under no circumstances can the party of the proletariat set itself the aim of “introducing” socialism in a country of small peasants so long as the overwhelming majority of the population has not come to realise the need for a socialist revolution.

But only bourgeois sophists, hiding behind “near-Marxist” catchwords, can deduce from this truth a justification of the policy of postponing immediate revolutionary measures, the time for which is fully ripe; measures which

have been frequently resorted to during the war by a number of bourgeois states, and which are absolutely indispensable in order to combat impending total economic disorganisation and famine.

Such measures as the nationalisation of the land, of all the banks and capitalist syndicates, or, at least, the *immediate* establishment of the *control* of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, etc., over them—measures which do not in any way constitute the “introduction” of socialism—must be absolutely insisted on, and, whenever possible, carried out in a revolutionary way. Without such measures, which are only steps towards socialism, and which are perfectly feasible economically, it will be impossible to heal the wounds caused by the war and to avert the impending collapse; and the party of the revolutionary proletariat will never hesitate to lay hands on the fabulous profits of the capitalists and bankers, who are enriching themselves on the war in a particularly scandalous manner.

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, Tsere-teli 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.³²

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 Fabians³³ 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.

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 soft 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 group³⁴ in the Reichstag; in France it includes Longuet, Pressemane and the so-called *minoritaires*³⁵ (Mensheviks) in general; in Britain, Philip Snowden, Ramsay MacDonald and many other leaders of the Independent Labour Party,³⁶ and some leaders of the British Socialist Party³⁷; 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”.³⁸ (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,³⁹ 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*; in Britain, the newspaper *The Trade Unionist*, 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 school-teacher *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 Party⁴⁰ and those within the opportunist Socialist Party⁴¹ who in January 1917 began publication of the paper, *The Internationalist*; in Holland, the Party of the "Tribunists"⁴² which publishes the paper *De Tribune* (Pannekoek, Herman Gorter, Wijnkoop, and Henriette Roland-Holst, who, although Centrist at Zimmerwald, has now joined our ranks); in Sweden, the Party of the Young, or the Left,⁴³ 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"⁴⁴; in Italy, the nearest are Constantino Lazzari, secretary of the party, and Serrati, editor of the central organ, *Avanti!*⁴⁵; 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"⁴⁶; 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 a 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 revolutionaries, 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.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE ZIMMERWALD INTERNATIONAL.— THE NEED FOR FOUNDING A THIRD INTERNATIONAL

17. From the very outset, the Zimmerwald International adopted a vacillating, "Kautskyite", "Centrist" position, which immediately compelled the *Zimmerwald Left* to dissociate itself, to separate itself from the rest, and to

issue *its own* manifesto (published in Switzerland in Russian, German and French).

The chief shortcoming of the Zimmerwald International, and the cause of its *collapse* (for politically and ideologically it has already collapsed), was its vacillation and indecision on such a momentous issue of *crucial* practical significance as that of breaking completely with social-chauvinism and the old social-chauvinist International, headed by Vandervelde and Huysmans at The Hague (Holland), etc.

It is not as yet known in Russia that the Zimmerwald majority are *nothing but Kautskyites*. Yet this is the fundamental fact, one which cannot be ignored, and which is now generally known in Western Europe. Even that chauvinist, that extreme German chauvinist, Heilmann, editor of the ultra-chauvinistic *Chemnitzer Volksstimme* and contributor to Parvus's ultra-chauvinistic *Glocke*⁴⁷ (a "Social-Democrat", of course, and an ardent partisan of Social-Democratic "unity"), was compelled to acknowledge in the press that the Centre, or "Kautskyism", and the *Zimmerwald majority* were one and the same thing.

This fact was definitely established at the end of 1916 and the beginning of 1917. Although social-pacifism was condemned by the Kienthal Manifesto,⁴⁸ the *whole* Zimmerwald Right, the *entire* Zimmerwald majority, sank to social-pacifism: Kautsky and Co. in a series of utterances in January and February 1917; Bourderon and Merrheim in France, who cast their votes *in unanimity* with the social-chauvinists for the pacifist resolutions of the Socialist Party (December 1916) and of the Confédération Générale du Travail (the national organisation of the French trade unions, also in December 1916); Turati and Co. in Italy, where the entire party took up a social-pacifist position, while Turati himself, in a speech delivered on December 17, 1916, "slipped" (not by accident, of course) into *nationalist* phrases whitewashing the imperialist war.

In January 1917, the chairman of the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences, Robert Grimm, joined the social-chauvinists in *his own* party (Greulich, Pflüger, Gustav Müller and others) *against* the internationalists in deed.

At two conferences of *Zimmerwaldists* from various countries in January and February 1917, this equivocal, double-

faced behaviour of the Zimmerwald majority was formally stigmatised by the Left internationalists of several countries: by Münzenberg, secretary of the international youth organisation and editor of the excellent internationalist publication *Die Jugendinternationale*⁴⁹; by Zinoviev, representative of the Central Committee of our Party; by K. Radek of the Polish Social-Democratic Party (the "Regional Executive"), and by Hartstein, a German Social-Democrat and member of the Spartacus group.

Much is given to the Russian proletariat; nowhere in the world has the working class yet succeeded in developing so much revolutionary energy as in Russia. But to whom much is given, of him much is required.

The Zimmerwald bog can no longer be tolerated. We must not, for the sake of the Zimmerwald "Kautskyites", continue the semi-alliance with the chauvinist International of the Plekhanovs and Scheidemanns. We must break with this International immediately. We must remain in Zimmerwald *only* for purposes of information.

It is we who must found, and right now, without delay, a *new*, revolutionary, proletarian International, or rather, we must not fear to acknowledge publicly that this new International is *already established* and operating.

This is the International of those "internationalists in deed" whom I precisely listed above. They and they alone are representatives of the revolutionary, internationalist mass, and not their corrupters.

And if socialists *of that type* are few, let every Russian worker ask himself whether there were many really class-conscious revolutionaries in Russia *on the eve* of the February-March revolution of 1917.

It is not a question of numbers, but of giving correct expression to the ideas and policies of the truly revolutionary proletariat. The thing is not to "proclaim" internationalism, but to be able to be an internationalist in deed, even when times are most trying.

Let us not deceive ourselves with hopes of agreements and international congresses. As long as the imperialist war is on, international intercourse is held in the iron vise of the military dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie. If even the "republican" Milyukov, who is obliged to

tolerate the parallel government of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, *did not allow Fritz Platten*, the Swiss socialist, secretary of the party, an internationalist and participant in the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences, to enter Russia in April 1917, in spite of the fact that Platten has a Russian wife and was on his way to visit his wife's relatives, and in spite of the fact that he had taken part in the revolution of 1905 in Riga, for which he had been confined in a Russian prison, had given bail to the tsarist government for his release and wished to recover that bail—if the “republican” Milyukov could *do* such a thing in April 1917 in Russia, one can judge what value can be put on the promises and assurances, the phrases and declarations of the bourgeoisie on the subject of peace without annexations, and so on.

And the arrest of Trotsky by the British Government? And the refusal to allow Martov to leave Switzerland, and the attempt to lure him to Britain, where Trotsky's fate awaits him?

Let us harbour no illusions. We must not deceive ourselves.

To “wait” for international congresses or conferences is simply to *betray* internationalism, since it has been shown that even from Stockholm neither socialists loyal to internationalism *nor even their letters* are allowed to come here, although this is quite possible and although a ferocious military censorship exists.

Our Party must not “wait”, but must immediately *found* a Third International. Hundreds of socialists imprisoned in Germany and Britain will then heave a sigh of relief, thousands and thousands of German workers who are now holding strikes and demonstrations that are frightening that scoundrel and brigand, Wilhelm, will learn from *illegal* leaflets of our decision, of our fraternal confidence in Karl Liebknecht, and in him alone, of *our* decision to fight “revolutionary defencism” *even now*; they will read this and be strengthened in their revolutionary internationalism.

To whom much is given, of him much is required. No other country in the world is as free as Russia is *now*. Let us make use of this freedom, not to advocate support for the bourgeoisie, or bourgeois “revolutionary defencism”, but in a bold, honest, proletarian, Liebknecht way *to*

found the *Third International*, an International uncompromisingly hostile both to the social-chauvinist traitors and to the vacillating "Centrists".

18. After what has been said, there is no need to waste many words explaining that the amalgamation of Social-Democrats in Russia is out of the question.

It is better to remain with one friend only, like Liebknecht, and *that means remaining with the revolutionary proletariat*, than to entertain even for a moment any thought of amalgamation with the party of the Organising Committee, with Chkheidze and Tsereteli, who can tolerate a bloc with Potresov in *Rabochaya Gazeta*, who voted for the loan in the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies,⁵⁰ and who have sunk to "defencism".

Let the dead bury their dead.

Whoever wants to *help* the waverers must first stop wavering himself.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE NAME OF OUR PARTY—ONE
THAT WILL BE CORRECT SCIENTIFICALLY
AND HELP TO CLARIFY THE MIND
OF THE PROLETARIAT POLITICALLY?

19. I now come to the final point, the name of our Party. We must call ourselves the *Communist Party*—just as Marx and Engels called themselves.

We must repeat that we are Marxists and that we take as our basis the *Communist Manifesto*, which has been distorted and betrayed by the Social-Democrats on two main points: (1) the working men have no country: "defence of the fatherland" in an imperialist war is a betrayal of socialism; and (2) the Marxist doctrine of the state has been distorted by the Second International.

The name "Social-Democracy" is *scientifically* incorrect, as Marx frequently pointed out, in particular, in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* in 1875, and as Engels reaffirmed in a more popular form in 1894.⁵¹ From capitalism mankind can pass directly only to socialism, i.e., to the social ownership of the means of production and the distribution of products according to the amount of work

performed by each individual. Our Party looks farther ahead: socialism must inevitably evolve gradually into communism, upon the banner of which is inscribed the motto, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs".

That is my first argument.

Here is the second: the second part of the name of our Party (*Social-Democrats*) is also scientifically incorrect. Democracy is a form of *state*, whereas we Marxists are opposed to *every kind* of state.

The leaders of the Second International (1889-1914), Plekhanov, Kautsky and their like, have vulgarised and distorted Marxism.

Marxism differs from anarchism in that it recognises *the need for a state* for the purpose of the transition to socialism; but (and here is where we differ from Kautsky and Co.) *not a state of the type* of the usual parliamentary bourgeois-democratic republic, but a state like the Paris Commune of 1871 and the Soviets of Workers' Deputies of 1905 and 1917.

My third argument: *living reality*, the revolution, has *already actually* established in our country, albeit in a weak and embryonic form, precisely this new type of "state", which is not a state in the proper sense of the word.

This is *already* a matter of the practical action of the people, and not merely a theory of the leaders.

The state in the proper sense of the term is domination over the people by contingents of armed men divorced from the people.

Our *emergent*, new state is also a state, for we too need contingents of armed men, we too need the *strictest* order, and must *ruthlessly* crush by force all attempts at either a tsarist or a Guchkov-bourgeois counter-revolution.

But our *emergent*, new state is *no longer* a state in the proper sense of the term, for in some parts of Russia these contingents of armed men are *the masses themselves*, the entire people, and not certain privileged persons placed over the people, and divorced from the people, and for all practical purposes undisplaceable.

We must look forward, and not backward to the usual bourgeois type of democracy, which consolidated the rule of the bourgeoisie with the aid of the old, *monarchist*

organs of administration, the police, the army and the bureaucracy.

We must look forward to the emergent new democracy, which is already ceasing to be a democracy, for democracy means the domination of the people, and the armed people cannot dominate themselves.

The term democracy is not only scientifically incorrect when applied to a Communist Party; it has now, since March 1917, simply become *blinkers* put on the eyes of the revolutionary people and *preventing* them from boldly and freely, on their own initiative, building up the new: the Soviets of Workers', Peasants', and all other Deputies, as *the sole power* in the "state" and as the harbinger of the "withering away" of the state *in every form*.

My fourth argument: we must reckon with the actual situation in which socialism finds itself internationally.

It is not what it was during the years 1871 to 1914, when Marx and Engels knowingly put up with the inaccurate, opportunist term "Social-Democracy". For *in those days*, after the defeat of the Paris Commune, history made slow organisational and educational work the task of the day. Nothing else was possible. The anarchists were then (as they are now) fundamentally wrong not only theoretically, but also economically and politically. The anarchists misjudged the character of the times, for they failed to understand the world situation: the worker of Britain corrupted by imperialist profits, the Commune defeated in Paris, the recent (1871) triumph of the bourgeois national movement in Germany, the age-long sleep of semi-feudal Russia.

Marx and Engels gauged the times accurately; they understood the international situation; they understood that the approach to the beginning of the social revolution must be *slow*.

We, in our turn, must also understand the specific features and tasks of the new era. Let us not imitate those sorry Marxists of whom Marx said: "I have sown dragon's teeth and harvested fleas."⁵²

The objective inevitability of capitalism which grew into imperialism brought about the imperialist war. The war has brought mankind to the *brink of a precipice*, to the brink of the destruction of civilisation, of the brutalisation

and destruction of more millions, countless millions, of human beings.

The *only* way out is through a proletarian revolution.

At the very moment when such a revolution is beginning, when it is taking its first hesitant, groping steps, steps betraying too great a confidence in the bourgeoisie, at such a moment the majority (that is the truth, that is a fact) of the "Social-Democratic" leaders, of the "Social-Democratic" parliamentarians, of the "Social-Democratic" newspapers—and these are precisely the *organs* that influence the people—have *deserted* socialism, have *betrayed* socialism and have gone over to the side of "their own" national bourgeoisie.

The people have been confused, led astray and deceived by *these* leaders.

And we shall aid and abet that deception if we retain the old and out-of-date Party name, which is as decayed as the Second International!

Granted that "many" workers *understand* Social-Democracy in an honest way; but it is time to learn how to distinguish the subjective from the objective.

Subjectively, such Social-Democratic workers are most loyal leaders of the proletarians.

Objectively, however, the world situation is such that the old name of our Party *makes it easier* to fool the people and *impedes* the onward march; for at every step, in every paper, in every parliamentary group, the masses see *leaders*, i.e., people whose voices carry farthest and whose actions are most conspicuous; yet they are all "would-be Social-Democrats", they are all "for unity" with the betrayers of socialism, with the social-chauvinists; and they are all presenting for payment the old bills issued by "Social-Democracy"....

And what are the arguments against?... We'll be confused with the Anarchist-Communists, they say....

Why are we not afraid of being confused with the Social-Nationalists, the Social-Liberals, or the Radical-Socialists, the foremost bourgeois party in the French Republic and the most adroit in the bourgeois deception of the people?... We are told: The people are used to it, the workers have come to "love" *their* Social-Democratic Party.

That is the only argument. But it is an argument that dismisses the science of Marxism, the tasks of the morrow in the revolution, the objective position of world socialism, the shameful collapse of the Second International, and the harm done to the practical cause by the packs of "would-be Social-Democrats" who surround the proletarians.

It is an argument of routinism, an argument of inertia, an argument of stagnation.

But we are out to rebuild the world. We are out to put an end to the imperialist world war into which hundreds of millions of people have been drawn and in which the interests of billions and billions of capital are involved, a war which cannot end in a truly democratic peace without the greatest proletarian revolution in the history of mankind.

Yet we are afraid of our own selves. We are loth to cast off the "dear old" soiled shirt....

But it is time to cast off the soiled shirt and to put on clean linen.

Petrograd, April 10, 1917

POSTSCRIPT

My pamphlet has become out of date owing to the general economic disorganisation and the inefficiency of the St. Petersburg presses. The pamphlet was written on April 10, 1917, today is May 28, and it has not come out yet!

It was written as a *draft* platform to propagandise my views *before* the All-Russia Conference of our Party, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party of Bolsheviks. The pamphlet was typed in several copies and handed out to Party members before and during the Conference so that it did its job in part. But the Conference took place from April 24 to April 29, 1917, its resolutions have long since been published (see supplement to *Soldatskaya Pravda* No. 13⁵³) and the attentive reader will have noticed that my pamphlet often served as the original draft of those resolutions.

It is left for me to express the hope that the pamphlet will still be of some value because of its connection with those resolutions and because it explains them, and to deal here with two points.

I suggested on page 27 that we remain in Zimmerwald only for purposes of information.* The Conference did not agree with me on this point, and I had to vote against the resolution on the International. It is now becoming obvious that the Conference made a mistake and that the course taken by events will soon correct it. By remaining in Zimmerwald we (even against our will) are helping delay the creation of the Third International; we are indirectly hampering its foundation, being burdened with the dead ballast of the ideologically and politically dead Zimmerwald.

* See p. 82 of this volume.—*Ed.*

In the eyes of the working-class parties of the whole world, our Party's position is now such that it is our *duty* to *found* a Third International without delay. *Today* there is nobody but us to do it, and procrastination can only do harm. If we remain in Zimmerwald for information only, we shall have our hands freed to establish the new International (and at the same time be able to *use* Zimmerwald should circumstances make it possible).

Because of the mistake made by the Conference, we must now wait passively, at least until July 5, 1917 (the date set for the Zimmerwald Conference, provided it is not postponed *again!* It has already been postponed once...).

The decision unanimously adopted by the Central Committee of our Party after the Conference and published in *Pravda* No. 55, on May 12, has, however, gone half-way towards correcting the mistake; it has been resolved that we shall walk out of Zimmerwald if they decide to confer with ministers.* I express the hope that the other half of the mistake will be speedily remedied, as soon as we convene the first international conference of Lefts (the "third trend", the "internationalists in deed", see above, pp. 23-25**).

The second point I must deal with is the formation of the "coalition cabinet" on May 6, 1917.⁵⁴ On this point the pamphlet may *seem* to be particularly out of date.

But actually on this of all points it is not out of date at all. It is based *wholly* on the *class* analysis, a thing that the Mensheviks and Narodniks, who have provided six ministers as hostages to the ten capitalist ministers, stand in deadly fear of. And it is because the pamphlet is based wholly on a class analysis that it is not out of date—the only change made by Tsereteli, Chernov and Co. joining the cabinet was an *insignificant* one in the *form* of the agreement between the Petrograd Soviet and the capitalist government, and I deliberately stressed in my pamphlet (on page 8) that "I am referring not so much to the formal agreement as to actual support".***

With each passing day it is becoming clearer that Tsereteli, Chernov and Co. are nothing more than hostages to

* See p. 388 of this volume.—*Ed.*

** See pp. 77-80 of this volume.—*Ed.*

*** See p. 62 of this volume.—*Ed.*

the capitalists, that the “renewed” government is neither willing nor able to carry out any of its abundant promises either in foreign or domestic policies. Chernov, Tsereteli and Co. have committed political suicide by turning into assistants of the capitalists, into people who are actually strangling the revolution; Kerensky has come so low as to use force against the masses (cf. p. 9 of the pamphlet: “Guchkov is still only threatening to employ violence against the mass”* but Kerensky *had* to carry out those threats⁵⁵). Chernov, Tsereteli and Co. have killed themselves and their parties—the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries—politically. The people will realise this more and more clearly as the days go by.

The coalition cabinet is only a passing moment in the development of the fundamental class contradictions of our revolution briefly analysed in the pamphlet. This situation cannot last long—we must either go backward to counter-revolution all along the line or forward to the transfer of state power to other classes. At a time of revolution, when the imperialist world war is in progress, we cannot stand still.

N. Lenin

St. Petersburg, May 28, 1917

* See p. 63 of this volume.—*Ed.*

**POLITICAL PARTIES IN RUSSIA
AND THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT** ⁵⁶

Published May 6, 9 and 10
(April 23, 26 and 27), 1917
in the newspaper *Volna*
Nos. 20, 22 and 23

Published in pamphlet form
in July 1917 by Zhizn
Znaniye Publishers.

Published according
to the pamphlet text, 1917
edition, verified with
the 1918 edition

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

This pamphlet was written at the beginning of April 1917, before the coalition cabinet was formed. Since then much water has flown under the bridge, but the principal characteristics of the major political parties have held true in the course of all subsequent stages of the revolution—both during the coalition cabinet, which came into being on May 6, 1917, during the union between the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries in June (and July) 1917 against the Bolsheviks, during the Kornilov events, and during the October Revolution of 1917 and after it.

The Correctness of the characteristic given to the principal parties and their *class foundations* has been borne out by the whole course of the Russian revolution. Today the progress of the revolution in Western Europe shows that there, too, the line-up of the principal parties is the same. The role of Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries is being played by the social-chauvinists of all countries (socialists in word and chauvinists in deed) as well as by the Kautskyites in Germany, the Longuetists in France, and so on.

N. Lenin

Moscow, October 22, 1918

Published in 1918 in the pamphlet:
N. Lenin, *Political Parties in Russia
and the Tasks of the Proletariat*,
Kommunist Publishing House, Moscow

Published according
to the pamphlet text

The following is an attempt to formulate, first, the more important and then the less important questions and answers characterising the present political situation in Russia and the way it is understood by the various parties.

QUESTIONS:

- 1) WHAT ARE THE CHIEF POLITICAL PARTY GROUPINGS IN RUSSIA?

ANSWERS:

A. (to the right of the C.D.). Parties and groups to the right of the Constitutional-Democrats.

B. (C.D.). The Constitutional-Democratic Party (Cadets, or the people's freedom party) and kindred groups.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). The Social-Democrats, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and kindred groups.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). The party which properly should be called the Communist Party, but which at present is named the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party united under the Central Committee or, popularly, the "Bolsheviks".

- 2) WHAT CLASSES DO THESE PARTIES REPRESENT?
WHAT CLASS STANDPOINT DO THEY EXPRESS?

A. (to the right of the C.D.). The feudal landowners and the most backward sections of the bourgeoisie (capitalists).

B. (C.D.). The bourgeoisie as a whole, that is, the capitalist class, and the landowners who have become bourgeois, i.e., who have become capitalists.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). Small proprietors, small and middle peasants, the petty bourgeoisie, and that section of the workers which has come under the influence of the bourgeoisie.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). Class-conscious proletarians, wage-workers and the poor peasantry (semi-proletarians) standing close to them.

3) WHAT IS THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARDS SOCIALISM?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). Decidedly hostile, since it threatens the profits of the capitalists and landowners.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). For socialism, but it is too early to think of it or to take any immediate practical steps for its realisation.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). For socialism. The Soviets must immediately take all possible practicable steps for its realisation.*

4) WHAT FORM OF GOVERNMENT DO THEY WANT AT PRESENT?

A. (to the right of the C.D.). A constitutional monarchy, the absolute power of the bureaucracy and the police.

B. (C.D.). A bourgeois parliamentary republic, i.e., the consolidation of the rule of the capitalists, while retaining the old bureaucracy and the police.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). A bourgeois parliamentary republic, with reforms for the workers and peasants.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). A republic of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', and other Deputies. Abolition of the standing army and the police, who are to be replaced by the arming of the whole people; officials to be not only elective, but also displaceable; their pay not to exceed that of a competent worker.

5) WHAT IS THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARDS RESTORATION OF THE ROMANOV MONARCHY?

A. (to the right of the C.D.). They are for it, but act covertly and cautiously, for they are afraid of the people.

* For the nature of these steps, see questions 20 and 22.

B. (C.D.). When the Guchkovs seemed to be a power, the Cadets were for putting a brother or the son of Nicholas on the throne; but when the people began to seem a power, the Cadets became anti-monarchist.

C. (S.D. and S.R.) and D. ("Bolsheviks"). Decidedly opposed to restoration of the monarchy in any form.

6) WHAT IS THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE SEIZURE OF POWER?
WHAT DO THEY REGARD AS ORDER, AND WHAT AS ANARCHY?

A. (to the right of the C.D.). If a tsar or some gallant general seizes power, that is God-given, that is order. All else is anarchy.

B. (C.D.). If the capitalists seize power, even by force, that is order; to seize power against the capitalists would be anarchy.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). If the Soviets alone seize all the power, that means a threat of anarchy. Let the capitalists keep the power for the time being, and the Soviets keep the "Contact Commission".⁵⁷

D. ("Bolsheviks"). All power must be in the hands of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', Agricultural Labourers' and other Deputies. All propaganda, agitation and the organisation of the millions must immediately be *directed* towards this end.*

7) SHOULD THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT BE SUPPORTED?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B, (C.D.). Unquestionably, since it is the only government capable at this moment of safeguarding the interests of the capitalists.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). It should, but on condition that it carries out its agreement with the Soviet and attends the meetings of the Contact Commission.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). No; let the capitalists support it. Our job is to *prepare* the people for full and undivided power wielded by the Soviets.

* Anarchy is the complete negation of state power, whereas the Soviets are *themselves* a state power.

8) FOR UNDIVIDED POWER OR DUAL POWER?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). For the undivided power of the capitalists and landowners.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). For dual power. The Soviets to exercise "control" over the Provisional Government. It is bad to reflect whether control can be effective without power.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). For the undivided power of the Soviets from the bottom up all over the country.

9) SHOULD A CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY BE CONVENED?

A. (to the right of the C.D.). No, for it might prejudice the landowners. You never know—the peasants in the Constituent Assembly may decide that the landowners ought to have their estates taken away from them.

B. (C.D.). Yes, but without fixing a date. As much time as possible should be spent consulting professors of law; first, because, as Bebel said, jurists are the most reactionary people in the world; and, second, because the experience of all revolutions has shown that the cause of popular freedom is lost when it is entrusted to professors.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). Yes, and as quickly as possible. A date must be fixed; we have already said so two hundred times at the meetings of the Contact Commission, and shall say so again tomorrow, for the last and two-hundred-and-first time.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). Yes, and as soon as possible. But there is only one way to assure its convocation and success, and that is by increasing the number and *strength* of the Soviets and organising and *arming* the working-class masses. That is the only guarantee.

10) DOES THE STATE NEED THE USUAL TYPE OF POLICE AND A STANDING ARMY?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). It certainly does, for they are the only firm guarantee of the rule of the capitalists; in case of need, as the experience of all countries has shown, the return from a republic to a monarchy is thus greatly facilitated.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). On the one hand, they are perhaps not necessary. On the other hand, is not so radical a change premature? However, we shall raise the matter in the Contact Commission.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). It definitely does not. The arming of the entire people must be proceeded with everywhere immediately and unreservedly, and they must be merged with the militia and the army. The capitalists must pay the workers for days served in the militia.

11) DOES THE STATE NEED A BUREAUCRACY OF THE USUAL TYPE?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). Most decidedly. Nine-tenths of them are the sons and brothers of landowners and capitalists. They must continue to remain a privileged and, in practice, permanent body of people.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). It is hardly fitting to raise so hastily a question that was raised practically by the Paris Commune.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). It certainly does not. All officials and all and every kind of deputy must not only be elective, but displaceable at any moment. Their pay must not exceed that of a competent worker. They must be replaced (gradually) by the people's militia and its detachments.

12) SHOULD OFFICERS BE ELECTED BY THE SOLDIERS?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). No. That would be detrimental to the landowners and capitalists. If the soldiers cannot be pacified otherwise, they must be temporarily promised this reform, but it must be withdrawn at the earliest possible moment.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). *Yes, they should.*

D. ("Bolsheviks"). Not only must they be elected, but every step of every officer and general must be supervised by persons specially elected for the purpose by the soldiers.

13) IS IT DESIRABLE FOR THE SOLDIERS
ON THEIR OWN DECISION,
TO DISPLACE THEIR SUPERIORS?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). It is distinctly harmful. Guchkov has already forbidden it. He has already threatened to use force. Guchkov must be supported.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). It is. But it is not clear whether they should be replaced before the matter is taken up with the Contact Commission, or vice versa.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). It is desirable and essential in every way. The soldiers will obey and *respect* only elected authorities.

14) FOR OR AGAINST THE PRESENT WAR?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). Decidedly for, because it yields the capitalists untold profits and promises to consolidate their rule by disuniting the workers and setting them against one another. We shall fool the workers by calling the war a war for national defence, the real object of which is to dethrone Wilhelm.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). In general we are opposed to imperialist wars, but we are willing to be fooled, and are prepared to call the support given to the imperialist war waged by the imperialist government of Guchkov, Milyukov and Co. "revolutionary defencism".

D. ("Bolsheviks"). We are decidedly against all imperialist wars and *all* bourgeois governments waging such wars, including our own Provisional Government; we are decidedly against "revolutionary defencism" in Russia.

15) FOR OR AGAINST THE PREDATORY INTERNATIONAL TREATIES BETWEEN THE TSAR, GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, ETC. (FOR THE SUBJUGATION OF PERSIA, THE PARTITION OF CHINA, TURKEY, AUSTRIA, ETC.)?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). Absolutely and entirely *for*. At the same time, we must not publish these treaties, both because Anglo-French imperialist capital and its governments will not permit it, and because Russian capital cannot afford to reveal its shady affairs to the public.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). Against, but we still hope that with the aid of the Contact Commission and a series of "campaigns" among the masses, it may be possible to "influence" the capitalist government.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). Against. The whole point is to enlighten the masses as to the utter hopelessness of expecting any-

thing in this respect from capitalist governments, and as to the necessity of the power being transferred to the proletariat and the poor peasants.

16) FOR OR AGAINST ANNEXATIONS?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). If it is a question of annexations by the German capitalists and their robber chieftain, Wilhelm, we are against. If by the British, we are not against, for they are "our" Allies. If by our capitalists, who are forcibly keeping within the boundaries of Russia the peoples who were oppressed by the tsar, we are *in favour*; we do *not* call that annexation.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). Against annexations, but we still hope it will be possible to secure even from the capitalist government a promise to renounce annexations.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). Against annexations. All promises on the part of capitalist governments to renounce annexations are a sheer fraud. There is only one method of exposing it, namely, to demand the liberation of the peoples oppressed by *their own capitalists*.

17) FOR OR AGAINST THE LIBERTY LOAN?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). Decidedly for, since it facilitates the conduct of the imperialist war, that is, a war to *determine* which group of capitalists shall rule the world.

C. (S.D. and S.R.); *For*, since the incorrect stand of "revolutionary defencism" forces us into this obvious departure from internationalism.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). Against, since the war remains an imperialist war, waged by the capitalists in alliance with the capitalists and in the interests of the capitalists.

18) FOR OR AGAINST THE CAPITALIST GOVERNMENTS
ASCERTAINING THE PEOPLES' WILL TO PEACE?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). For, since the experience of the French republican social-chauvinists was excellent proof that the people can be fooled in this way; we can say anything we like, but in practice we shall keep the

spoils seized from the Germans (their colonies), while depriving the German robbers of the spoils *they* have seized.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). *For*, since we have not yet relinquished a good many of the unfounded hopes placed by the petty bourgeoisie in the capitalists.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). Against, since the class-conscious workers place *no hopes whatever* in the capitalists, and it is our task to open the eyes of the masses to the futility of such hopes.

19) MUST ALL MONARCHIES BE ABOLISHED?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). No; the British, Italian and Allied monarchies generally must not be abolished, but only the German, Austrian, Turkish, and Bulgarian, since victory over them will multiply our profits.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). A certain "sequence" must be observed, and in any case we should begin with Wilhelm; as to the Allied monarchies, we had perhaps better wait a bit.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). No sequence can be established for revolutions. We must help *only* the revolutionaries *in deed* to abolish *all* monarchies in all countries without exception.

20) SHALL THE PEASANTS TAKE ALL
THE LANDED ESTATES IMMEDIATELY?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.) By no means. We must wait for the Constituent Assembly. Shingaryov has already explained that when the capitalists seize power from the tsar, that is a great and glorious revolution; but when the peasants take the land away from the landowners, that is arbitrary action.⁵⁸ Conciliation commissions must be appointed on which landowners and peasants shall be equally represented, while the chairmen shall be officials, that is, people drawn from among the capitalists and landowners.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). Better the peasants waited for the Constituent Assembly.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). All the land must be taken over immediately. Order must be strictly maintained by the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies. More grain and meat must be produced,

and the soldiers better fed. Injury and damage to livestock, implements, etc., must in no case be permitted.

21) CAN WE LEAVE LAND DISPOSAL
AND ALL RURAL AFFAIRS IN THE HANDS
OF THE SOVIETS OF PEASANTS' DEPUTIES ALONE?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). The landowners and capitalists are generally opposed to full and undivided power being vested in the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies in the countryside; but if these Soviets are unavoidable, then we had better confine ourselves to them alone, for the rich peasants are also capitalists.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). For the present, perhaps, yes, although Social-Democrats "in principle" do not deny the necessity of a separate organisation for the agricultural wage-workers.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). We cannot confine ourselves to the general Soviets of Peasants' Deputies alone, for the wealthy peasants are also capitalists and are always liable to wrong or cheat the agricultural labourers, day-labourers, and poor peasants. Therefore separate organisations for these groups of the rural population must be set up immediately both within the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies and as separate Soviets of deputies from the agricultural labourers.

22) SHALL THE PEOPLE TAKE OVER THE LARGEST
AND MOST POWERFUL CAPITALIST MONOPOLIES,
THE BANKS, THE SYNDICATES OF MANUFACTURERS, ETC.?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). On no account, as this might injure the landowners and capitalists.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). Generally speaking, we are in favour of transferring such organisations to the entire people, but it is too early just now to think of this or prepare for it.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). We must at once start *preparing* the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, the Councils of Bank Employees' Deputies, etc., for taking practical and practicable steps towards merging all banks into a single national bank, to be followed by the establishment of control by the Soviets of Workers' Deputies over the banks and syndicates, and then by their nationalisation, i.e., their transfer to the possession of the whole people.

23) WHAT KIND OF SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL
 IMPLEMENTING A FRATERNAL UNION
 OF THE WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES
 DO THE PEOPLES NOW NEED?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). Generally speaking, any kind of Socialist International is harmful and dangerous to the capitalists and landowners; but if the German Plekhanov, that is, Scheidemann, comes to an agreement and understanding with the Russian Scheidemann, that is, Plekhanov, and if they discover in each other vestiges of a socialist conscience, then it were perhaps better for us capitalists to welcome *such* an International of *such* socialists who take the side of *their own* respective governments.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). We need a Socialist International that will unite everybody: the Scheidemanns, the Plekhanovs and the "Centrists", i.e., those who vacillate between social-chauvinism and internationalism. The greater the hotchpotch, the greater the "unity". Long live the great socialist unity!

D. ("Bolsheviks"). The peoples need only such an International as will unite the really revolutionary workers, who are capable of putting an end to this frightful, criminal slaughter of the peoples and of delivering humanity from the yoke of capital. Only people (groups, parties, etc.) like the German Socialist Karl Liebknecht, who is now in a convict prison, only people who are resolutely fighting their *own* government, their *own* bourgeoisie, their *own* social-chauvinists, their *own* "Centre", can and must establish immediately the International which the peoples need.

24) SHOULD FRATERNISATION AT THE FRONT BETWEEN SOLDIERS
 OF THE BELLIGERENT COUNTRIES BE ENCOURAGED?

A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). No, it is bad for the interests of the landowners and capitalists, as it is likely to hasten the liberation of humanity from their yoke.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). Yes, it is desirable. But we are not all fully convinced that such an encouragement of fraternisation should be started immediately in all the belligerent countries.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). Yes, it is desirable and essential. It is absolutely essential to encourage immediately in all the belligerent countries attempts at fraternisation between the soldiers of *both* warring groups.

25) WHAT COLOUR BANNER WOULD BE IN CHARACTER WITH
THE VARIOUS POLITICAL PARTIES?

A. (to the right of the C.D.). Black, for they are the real Black Hundreds.⁵⁹

B. (C.D.). Yellow, for that is the international banner of workers who serve capitalism willingly, heart and soul.

C. (S.D. and S.R.). Pink, for their whole policy is a rose-water one.

D. ("Bolsheviks"). Red, for this is the banner of the international proletarian revolution.

This pamphlet was written at the beginning of April 1917. To the question whether it is out of date now, after May 6, 1917, after the formation of the "new", coalition, government, my answer is: No, for the Contact Commission has not really disappeared, it has merely moved to another room, which it shares with the gentlemen of the cabinet. The fact that the Chernovs and the Tseretelis have moved to another room has not changed their policy, nor the policy of their parties.

**SPEECH DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF SOLDIERS
OF THE IZMAILOVSKY REGIMENT
APRIL 10 (23), 1917**

Comrade soldiers! The question of the state system is now on the order of the day. The capitalists, in whose hands the state power now rests, desire a parliamentary bourgeois republic, that is, a state system where there is no tsar, but where power remains in the hands of the capitalists who govern the country by means of the old institutions, namely: the police, the bureaucracy, and the standing army.

We desire a different republic, one more in keeping with the interests of the people, more democratic. The revolutionary workers and soldiers of Petrograd have overthrown tsarism, and have cleaned out all the police from the capital. The workers of all the world look with pride and hope to the revolutionary workers and soldiers of Russia as the vanguard of the world's liberating army of the working class. The revolution, once begun, must be strengthened and carried on. We shall not allow the police to be re-established! All power in the state, from the bottom up, from the remotest little village to every street block of Petrograd, must belong to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Agricultural Labourers', Peasants' and other Deputies. The central state power uniting these local Soviets must be the Constituent Assembly, National Assembly, or Council of Soviets—no matter by what name you call it.

Not the police, not the bureaucracy, who are unanswerable to the people and placed above the people, not the standing army, separated from the people, but *the people themselves, universally armed* and united in the Soviets,

must run the state. It is they who will establish the necessary order, it is they whose authority will not only be obeyed, but *also respected*, by the workers and peasants.

Only this power, only the Soviets of Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, can solve the great question of the land in a non-bureaucratic way and not in the interests of the landowners. The land must not belong to the landowners. The peasant committees must take the land away at once from the landowners, while carefully guarding all the property against damage, and seeing to it that grain production is *increased* in order that the soldiers at the front be better supplied. All the land must belong to the whole nation, and its disposal must be the concern of the local Soviets of Peasants' Deputies. In order that the rich peasants—who are themselves capitalists—may not wrong and deceive the agricultural labourers and the poor peasants, it will be necessary for the latter either to confer, to combine, to unite separately, or to set up Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies of their own.

Do not allow the police to be re-established, do not let the state power or the administration of the state pass into the hands of the bureaucracy, who are non-elective, undisplaceable, and paid on a bourgeois scale; get together, unite, organise yourselves, trusting no one, depending only on your own intelligence and experience—and Russia will be able to move with a firm, measured, unerring tread toward the liberation of both our own country and of all humanity from the yoke of capital as well as from the horrors of war.

Our government, a government of the capitalists, is continuing the war in the interests of the capitalists. Like the German capitalists, headed by their crowned brigand Wilhelm, the capitalists of *all* the other countries are carrying on the war only for a division of capitalist profits, for domination over the world. Hundreds of millions of people, almost all the countries in the world, have been dragged into this criminal war. Hundreds of billions of capital have been invested in "profitable" undertakings, bringing death, hunger, ruin, and barbarism to the peoples and staggering, scandalously high profits to the capitalists. There is only one way to get out of this frightful war and conclude a truly democratic peace not imposed by force, and that is

by transferring all the state power to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The workers and poor peasants, who are not interested in preserving the profits of the capitalists and robbing the weaker nations, will be able to do effectively what the capitalists only promise, namely, end the war by concluding a lasting peace that will assure liberty to all peoples without exception.

Pravda No. 30, April 12, 1917
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

A SHAMELESS LIE OF THE CAPITALISTS

It is not enough that the capitalist newspapers lie and carry on a riot-mongering campaign against *Pravda*, that *Rech* vies in this respect with *Russkaya Volya*—a paper which it cannot but despise.

Now the ministers of the capitalist government, too, have begun to speak in the language of *Russkaya Volya*. *Rech* quotes today Minister Nekrasov's statement made before a meeting of the Cadet Party in Moscow on April 9:

"The preaching of violence that comes from the Kamennostrovsky Prospekt is a terrible thing."

Re-echoing *Russkaya Volya*, the worthy Minister lies shamelessly, deceives the people, and aids the riot-mongers while hiding behind their backs. He dares not name directly a single person, a single newspaper, a single orator, or a single party.

The worthy Minister prefers dark hints—hoping that someone will fall for it!

But all politically minded people will understand that the worthy Minister is referring to the organ of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., *Pravda*, and its followers.

You are lying, Mr. Minister, worthy member of the "people's freedom" party. It is Mr. Guchkov who is preaching violence when he threatens to punish the soldiers for dismissing the authorities. It is *Russkaya Volya*, the riot-mongering newspaper of the riot-mongering "republicans", a paper that is friendly to you, that preaches violence.

Pravda and its followers do not preach violence. On the contrary, they declare most clearly, precisely, and definitely that our main efforts should now be concentrated on

explaining to the proletarian masses their proletarian problems, as distinguished from the petty bourgeoisie which has succumbed to chauvinist intoxication.

So long as *you*, capitalist gentlemen, Guchkov and Co., confine yourselves only to threats of violence, so long as you have not yet resorted to violence, so long as the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies exist, *so long as* you have not yet carried out your threats against the Soviets (such threats, for example, have actually been printed by Mr. Milyukov's associate, Mr. Wilson, the *Times* correspondent), so long as you have not yet perpetrated violence upon the masses, we Pravdists declare and reiterate that we regard the Soviets as the *only possible* form of government.

So long as *you*, capitalist gentlemen, who are in control of the army command, *have not yet begun to use violence*, it is our tactics, the tactics of all Pravdists and of all our Party, to fight for influence among the proletarian masses, to fight for influence among the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, to *show up* the errors in their tactics, to show up all the falsity of the chauvinist (=revolutionary-defencist) intoxication.

The worthy Minister Nekrasov knows this perfectly well, if only from the quotations which *Rech* itself was forced to print. The worthy Minister re-echoes *Russkaya Volya*; he is bent on *preventing* a calm demonstration of the truth by resorting to lies, slander, baiting, and threats.

It won't work, Messrs. Nekrasovs!

The workers and soldiers want to know the truth, they want to clear up for themselves the questions of war and peace, and state systems, and they will certainly do so.

Written April 11 (24), 1917

Published April 12, 1917
in *Pravda* No. 30

Published according
to the newspaper text

THE WAR AND THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

“We have nevertheless compelled the Provisional Government to renounce annexations.”—From a speech by Y. Steklov, delivered at the Taurida Palace on April 4.

“Whatever our attitude towards the slogan ‘peace without annexations’ may be, the principles accepted by all the Allies cannot be ignored.”—From a speech by P. Milyukov (*Rech*, April 11).

Step by step the leaders of the Provisional Government are revealing the true nature of their policy in regard to the war. The notorious declaration of the Provisional Government contained, along with a verbal “renunciation” of annexations, a statement to the effect that “our” treaties with the British and the French governments remain valid. A couple of weeks later *Rech*, the organ of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Milyukov, prints the following:

MILYUKOV’S STATEMENT

While in Moscow, P. N. Milyukov, the Minister of Foreign Affairs made the following statement at a meeting of members of the people’s freedom party:

The declaration of the Provisional Government concerning the aims of the war contains not peace terms, but merely general principles which have already been repeatedly enunciated by various statesmen of our Allies. The peace terms can be worked out only with the consent of our Allies and in accordance with the London Convention. Whatever our attitude towards the slogan “peace without annexations” may be, the principles accepted by all the Allies concerning the reunifica-

tion of Poland and Armenia and the gratification of the national aspirations of the Austrian Slavs, cannot be ignored. (*Rech* No. 83, April 11 (24), 1917.)

This statement by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Milyukov, will, without doubt, make the round of the whole foreign press and *intensify* the military spirit in Germany. Milyukov is helping the German imperialists to work up chauvinist feeling in Germany; *Milyukov is helping Wilhelm II to go through with this predatory war "to the end"*.

Let us examine Mr. Milyukov's statement. The Provisional Government's declaration concerning the aims of the war (the same declaration which Y. Steklov, by a deplorable misunderstanding, calls renunciation of annexations) contains, says Milyukov, not peace terms, but "merely *general principles* which have already been repeatedly enunciated by various statesmen of our Allies". In plain language, this means that renunciation of annexations is merely a fine phrase, "general principles", words, words, words. These words have also been repeated any number of times by "our" Allies. The actual "peace" terms, however, are a different matter entirely.

A statesman—Bismarck, if I am not mistaken—once said that to accept a thing "*in principle*" means, in the language of diplomacy, to reject it *in effect*. The same with Milyukov. "In principle" he is against annexations, in effect he is for annexations. That is why he stands for war "to the end".

Fine phrases are not yet peace terms, Mr. Milyukov tells us.

What, then, are his peace terms?

These terms are covered by the London Convention. Mr. Milyukov refers us to it.

But who concluded that Convention? Tsar Nicholas II concluded it with the British and French capitalists! That means that the treaties concluded by the tsarist clique still remain in force. That means we are fighting for the sake of these predatory treaties concluded by the tsarist clique and the "Allied" bankers.

Seizure of Polish, Armenian, and Austrian territories (this time Mr. Milyukov makes no mention of Constantinople)—this is what Mr. Milyukov's peace programme amounts to.

What will the leaders of the majority of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies say regarding this latest statement of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Milyukov? All they will do is "reprove" Milyukov for this statement of his in the name of the "Contact" Commission.... What has become of the "Provisional Governments renunciation of annexations", which Y. Steklov and N. Chkheidze claim to have obtained from it?

There is no dual power in Russia. The Soviet of Workers' Deputies merely exercises a benevolent control over the Provisional Government. This, if we are to believe the newspaper reports, is what N. Chkheidze said at the military conference in Minsk.⁶⁰

This is what we have come to with this benevolent control! People who fan the flames of war are continuing to speak in the name of Russia. The workers and soldiers are being fed with platitudes about peace without annexations, while on the quiet a policy is being pursued which benefits only a small clique of millionaires who thrive on war.

Comrades, workers and soldiers! Read this statement of Milyukov and expose it at all your meetings! Make it understood that you do not wish to die for the sake of secret conventions concluded by Tsar Nicholas II, and which are still sacred to Milyukov!

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF *RUSSKAYA VOLYA*

The methods of *Russkaya Volya*, a paper from which even the Cadets turn away in disgust, find an increasing number of imitators. Look at Mr. Plekhanov's *Yedinstvo*. Intent on "exposing" *Pravda*, Mr. Plekhanov takes Lenin's first thesis, quotes the words saying that the war on Russia's part remains a predatory imperialist war, and then triumphantly asks:

"And how about Germany? Lenin says nothing about that."

This, literally, is what he writes. The reader can scarcely believe the evidence of his own eyes. Can it be that Mr. Plekhanov has sunk to the level of *Novoye Vremya* and *Russkaya Volya*? Believe it or not, but the fact stares you in the face.

Mr. Plekhanov's shamelessness knows no bounds. He is perfectly familiar with the Bolshevik literature published abroad. He knows perfectly well that all Bolsheviks, times without number, in their speeches, articles, and resolutions, have always declared that the war on the part of Germany was *just as* predatory and imperialist as it was on the part of the other belligerent "Great" Powers. The German capitalists, and their chieftain, the crowned brigand Wilhelm, are the same imperialist predators as the capitalists of other countries are.

We repeat: no intelligent person who knows anything at all about the Bolsheviks can help knowing that this is our point of view. Mr. Plekhanov, too, knows this perfectly well. He knows that Zinoviev's and Lenin's pamphlet, *Socialism and War*.^{*} was published in Switzerland also in the German

^{*} See present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 295-338.—*Ed.*

language, and smuggled into Germany. And that pamphlet states as blunt as blunt can be that Germany is carrying on a predatory war for the purpose of "plundering competitor countries", that Germany is "*a young and strong robber*", that "*the German imperialists have brazenly violated the neutrality of Belgium*, as belligerent states have done always and everywhere, trampling upon all treaties and obligations if necessary"; that "Kautsky reconciles in an unprincipled way the fundamental idea of social-chauvinism—recognition of defence of the fatherland in the present war—with a sham concession to the Lefts"; that "opportunistic-chauvinists have *nowhere* sunk to such foul apostasy as in Germany".

Mr. Plekhanov knows all this perfectly well, yet he sinks to the methods of *Novoye Vremya* and *Russkaya Volya*, and tries to paint the followers of *Pravda* as Germanophiles.

Making a mockery of Marxism, Mr. Plekhanov further quibbles over the question as to who *declared* war on whom.

Mr. Plekhanov has forgotten that Marxists regard war as a *continuation of the policies* pursued by definite governments representing definite classes.

That both Nicholas II and Wilhelm II represented the reactionary and capitalist classes of their respective countries, that during the last few decades both had been pursuing a policy of plundering foreign countries, plundering China, subjugating Persia, carving up and partitioning Turkey, is a well-known fact. Had Mr. Plekhanov touched, however lightly, upon the history of diplomacy and foreign policies during the last few decades, he could not have failed to see this, and would not have dared to deny it.

The war waged by Nicholas II and Wilhelm II has been just the *continuation* of this predatory imperialist policy, which is so closely bound up with the banking capital of the two countries.

And when war is waged between two groups of predators and oppressors merely for division of the spoils of plunder, merely to see *who* will strangle *more* peoples, *who* will grab *more*, the question as to who began this war, who was the first to declare it and so forth, is of no economic or political significance.

Mr. Plekhanov, just like the German Plekhanovs, the Scheidemanns and Co., has descended to the level of the

most vulgar and ordinary bourgeois chauvinist who refuses to see (if he ever did see) that war is a continuation of policy, that war and policy are bound up with the interests of definite classes, and that one must be able to understand who these classes are and what they are fighting for.

A vicious, shameless lie, a screen for the predatory policy of Nicholas II—a policy which has not been abandoned by Lvov and Co. (they have even confirmed the tsar's treaties!)—that is what Mr. Plekhanov's great wisdom amounts to.

This lie will mislead neither the class-conscious workers nor the class-conscious soldiers.

Pravda No. 31, April 13, 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

A PARTNERSHIP OF LIES

A popular method always used by the bourgeois press in every country with unerring effect is to lie, scream, raise a hullabaloo, and keep on reiterating lies on the off-chance that "something may stick".

"Lenin makes a great noise in the Kshesinskaya mansion," writes *Rech*. "Lenin addresses a meeting from the roof of the Modern," a number of newspapers report.

All this is untrue. Lenin was not present at the Modern meeting. Lenin made no noise at all; he delivered only *one* report to a gathering of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks,⁶¹ and published a number of short articles in the small newspaper *Pravda*.

It is the capitalists and the capitalist press who are making a great noise, who are trying to *shout down* the truth, to prevent it from being heard, to drown it in a torrent of invective and shouts, to *prevent* an earnest *elucidation* of the facts.

This is what the efforts of the capitalists add up to at the present moment, as do also the efforts of those so-called socialists who, like Mr. Plekhanov, have completely deserted to the capitalist side.

In an editorial of special "national importance", today's *Rech* again fulminates against the "preaching of anarchy", and while doing so, most strikingly confutes itself. This is clear to anyone who ponders what he has read or heard.

"The great revolution has swept away all the old organisation of power...." This is not true. Not all of it, far from it. "It can be restored only by a change in the national psychology (in a broad sense of the word)—or rather, by the new psychology which recognises the need for authority and the duty of submission."

We have here a patent lie, a patent partnership of lies contracted by the capitalists, on the one hand, and the Plekhanovs, Cherevanins and Co., who are shouting about anarchy, on the other.

In conversational usage as well as in science it is accepted without question that anarchism means the *negation of the state* in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism.

That socialism leads to the “withering away” of the state is one of the tenets of Marxism. The Milyukovs, Plekhanovs, Cherevanins and others, who are partners in lies, know this very well.

Do the Pravdists or Lenin deny the need for *the state now*? Do they deny the need for an “organisation of power”, the “duty of submission” to it?

Anybody who knows his politics, anybody except the partnership of liars, is perfectly well aware that they do not.

Both *Pravda* and Lenin have stated and repeated as clear as clear can be that all of us unreservedly recognise the need for the state and for an organisation of power not only for the present, but also for the later historical period when the transition from capitalism to socialism will be taking place.

Only the partnership of lies can deny this, or fail to see it.

The question is *what* “organisation of power” we *propose to the nation*.

Not the old organisation of power, not the police, not the bureaucracy, not the standing army, but a new organisation—the *Soviets of Workers’, Soldiers’, Peasants’ and other Deputies*.

Such Soviets already exist; they have been brought forth by the revolution; they are already *recognised* by everyone, even by the capitalist government, as a *semi-government*.

And we have stated as clear as clear can be that *these* Soviets are the *only possible* form of a revolutionary government.

Can there be anything less ambiguous?

Since it is the “only possible” form, that means we must act *only* through propaganda, unless someone begins to practise violence upon the masses.

“The need for authority and the duty of submission” has

been recognised by *all* the Pravdists, who are preaching it to the people.

The Milyukovs, Plekhanovs, Cherevanins and Co. lie in order to conceal the truth from the people; they lie in order to suppress the *most important thing of all*—the question of the class character of *any given* organisation of power.

That is the crux of the matter.

The capitalist calls the Soviets *anarchy*, because *such* an organisation of power does not commit the people beforehand and unconditionally to capitalist subjection, but provides liberty and order together with the possibility of a peaceful and gradual transition to socialism.

This and this alone is what rouses the displeasure, the indignation and resentment of the capitalists. Hence the partnership of lies. Hence the torrent of slander and the howl of rage.

Hence, the underhand *riot-mongering* which *Rech* resorts to in the above-mentioned editorial when it calls for “counteraction”, for “renunciation of passivity, indifference”, and so on.

If you have the majority of the nation behind you, if your alliance with the Soviet is a lasting one (and we frankly admit that at the present moment the majority in the Soviet is not with us), then what do you fear, gentlemen, why do you lie?

All we want is to *make clear* to the workers and to the poor peasants the errors of their tactics. We recognise the *Soviets* as the only possible authority. We advocate the need for authority and the duty of submitting to it.

Why, then, are you afraid? Why do you lie?

It is the truth that you fear. You lie in order to *prevent* this truth from *emerging*, prevent it by means of riot-mongering, slander, violence, and filth.

Even some of our opponents now see this. Read today’s *Dyelo Naroda*,⁶² organ of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, an organ to which Minister Kerensky contributes.

This is what that organ says about Plekhanov, the most faithful ally of *Russkaya Volya* and *Rech*:

“We are accustomed to see such words and such a method of struggle in the columns of *Russkaya Volya*. But to see

them employed in articles written by socialists is, frankly speaking, painful and depressing....”

Thus write our opponents.

Thus write democrats whose democratic conscience has been awakened.

It is hopeless trying to put the Milyukovs, Plekhanovs and Cherevanins to shame. But when even a newspaper to which Minister Kerensky is a contributor turns away in disgust from the madly chauvinistic, infamously slanderous, riot-mongering methods employed by Plekhanov, then we may safely say:

They are dead people, the heroes of such methods.

Written April 13 (26), 1917

Published April 14, 1917
in *Pravda* No. 32

Published according
to the newspaper text

BANKS AND MINISTERS

N. N. Pokrovsky, the former Minister of Foreign Affairs and the present Vice-Chairman of the Central War Industries Committee, has become a member of the Board of the Russian Bank for Foreign Commerce. Count V. N. Kokovtsov, the former Chairman of the Council of Ministers, has also become a member of the Board.

These happy tidings were brought to us by last night's papers.

A minister today, a banker tomorrow; a banker today, a minister tomorrow. It is "war to the end"—both today and tomorrow.

This state of affairs prevails not only in Russia, but in every other country where Capital rules. A handful of bankers, who have the whole world in their grip, are making a fortune out of the war.

But Pokrovsky and Kokovtsov, we may be told, were ministers during the old regime, and we are now living in a regenerated Russia.

We will answer with a question:

In how many banks do the present ministers, Guchkov, Tereshchenko, and Konovalov—have an interest (in the capacity of directors, shareholders, or actual owners)?

Our Comrades, the bank employees (who, by the way, should organise a union of their own as soon as possible), would do well to gather material on this subject and publish it in the labour press.

AN IMPORTANT EXPOSURE

Today's editorial in *Dyelo Naroda*, a newspaper which lists Minister Kerensky among its most active contributors, contains a forthright statement to the effect that "according to information this paper has received from people whom we consider quite competent in this matter, the above-mentioned note [namely, the diplomatic note proclaiming renunciation of the policy of annexations and indemnities] has not yet been forwarded".

And so those members and supporters of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies who say and think that "we have made the government renounce annexations" are mistaken.

Comrades and citizens! Read and reread this statement by *Dyelo Naroda*, ponder its meaning!

The editorial goes on to say:

"And here Mr. Guchkov, echoing his bellicose Palace Square colleague who covets and lusts after Constantinople and the Straits, in his appeal to the army on the Rumanian front throws out slogans calling for the utter defeat of Germany and Austria...."

If *Dyelo Naroda* knows that Milyukov covets and lusts after annexations, then why not tell us more about it? Does not the people's cause require that *Dyelo Naroda** speak out more clearly and frankly?

The editorial ends by calling attention to the "bellicose members of our Provisional Government".

Once more: Does not the people's cause require that the paper bearing that title make known names and facts, facts and names?

Written April 13 (26), 1917

Published April 14, 1917
in *Pravda* No. 32

Published according
to the newspaper text

* A play on words: *Dyelo Naroda* means the people's cause.—*Ed.*

TO THE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS

Comrades, soldiers! Comrades, sailors!

The capitalist newspapers, from *Rech* down to *Russkaya Volya*, are carrying on a most shameless campaign of lies and slander concerning the passage through Germany of myself and thirty other emigrants.

The capitalist newspapers shamelessly lie when they assert or insinuate that we enjoyed certain inadmissible or unusual favours from the German Government, a government which we consider just as predatory, just as criminal, as all the other capitalist governments who are carrying on the present war.

Rich men having "connections" with high-ranking officials of the tsarist monarchy, men like the liberal professor Kovalevsky, friend of Milyukov and Co., have been constantly negotiating with the German Government through the agency of the tsarist Russian Government with a view to arranging for an exchange of Russians captured by the Germans, and Germans captured by the Russians.

Why then should emigrants, who have been compelled to live abroad because of their struggle against the tsar, not have the right to arrange for an exchange of Russians for Germans *without* the government's aid?

Why has the government of Milyukov and Co. not admitted into Russia Fritz Platten, the Swiss socialist, who travelled with us and who had negotiated the agreement with the German Government concerning the exchange?

The government lies when it spreads rumours that Platten is a friend of the Germans. This is sheer slander. Platten is the friend of the workers and the enemy of the capitalists of *all* countries.

The capitalists lie when they circulate rumours that we are for a separate peace with the Germans, that we conferred or wanted to confer in Stockholm with those German socialists who sided with *their own* government.

This is a libellous lie. We did not participate and shall not participate in any conferences with such socialists. We look upon the socialists of all countries who are helping *their own* respective capitalists to carry on this criminal war as traitors to the cause of socialism.

Only those socialists are our friends who, like Karl Liebknecht, condemned to hard labour by the predatory German Government, rise against *their own* capitalists.

We do not want a separate peace with Germany, we want peace for *all* nations, we want the victory of the workers of *all* countries over the capitalists of *all* countries.

The Russian capitalists are lying about us and slandering us, just as the German capitalists are slandering Liebknecht. The capitalists lie when they say that we want discord and enmity between the workers and the soldiers.

It is not true! We want the workers and the soldiers to *unite*. We want to *make it clear* to the members of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies that it is *these* Soviets that must wield *full* state power.

The capitalists are slandering us. They have sunk so low in their shamelessness that not a single bourgeois newspaper has reprinted from *Izvestia* our report concerning our journey and the decision of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

Every worker and every soldier knows *his* Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. It was to the Executive Committee of this Soviet that we made our report the day after our arrival. The report appeared in *Izvestia*.^{*} Why is it that *not a single* capitalist paper has reprinted this report?

Because these papers are spreading lies and slander and are afraid that our report to the Executive Committee will expose the deceivers.

Why is it that not a single paper has reprinted the *decision* of the Executive Committee concerning our report, a decision which was published in the same issue of *Izvestia*?

^{*} See pp. 27-29 of this volume.—*Ed.*

Because this decision nails the lies of the capitalists and their newspapers, in that it demands that the government take steps for the return of the emigrants.

Izvestia has published a protest against Trotsky's arrest by the English; it has published a letter by Zurabov exposing Milyukov's lies; it has also published a telegram from Martov on the same subject.

Soldiers and sailors! Do not believe the lies and slander of the capitalists! Expose the deceivers, who are trying to suppress the truth published in *Izvestia*!

Written between April 11 and 14
(24 and 27), 1917

First published in 1925
in *Lenin Miscellany IV*

Published according
to the manuscript

AGAINST THE RIOT-MONGERS⁶³

TO THE WORKERS, SOLDIERS,
AND THE WHOLE POPULATION OF PETROGRAD

Citizens! The paper *Russkaya Volya*, founded by the tsar's Minister Protopopov and despised even by the Cadets, is carrying a riot-provoking campaign against our Party, against the paper *Pravda*, against our Comrades Lenin and Zinoviev, against the Petrograd Committee of our Party housed in the Kshesinskaya mansion. We have received a number of reports, written as well as oral, concerning threats of violence, bomb threats, etc.

From the very first days of the revolution, the capitalists, masking as "republicans", have been trying to sow enmity between the workers and the soldiers. First they lied about the workers wanting to leave the army without bread. Now they are trying to inflame feeling against *Pravda*.

We appeal to the sense of honour of the revolutionary workers and soldiers of Petrograd, and declare:

We not only have not been guilty, directly or indirectly, of any threats of violence against individuals, but, on the contrary, we have always maintained that our task is to *explain* our views to all the people, that we regard the *Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies*, elected by all the workers and the soldiers, as *the only possible* revolutionary government.

On the very next day after their arrival the comrades, members of *different* parties, who passed through Germany, made a *report* to the trusted representatives of *all* the workers and soldiers, namely, to the *Executive Committee* of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. On this Executive Committee were Chkheidze, Tsereteli. Skobelev, Steklov, and others.

Comrades! These leaders of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies differ with us on many questions pertaining to the organisation of the state. They could be anything but biased in our favour.

Now what did the Executive Committee do?

In its *Izvestia* No. 32, for April 5, 1917, it *published* the *full* report dealing with the passage through Germany.

This report gives all the facts, and the *names* of the foreign socialists from two neutral countries, Switzerland and Sweden, who *checked* our protocols.

And what was the decision of the Executive Committee? Did it express condemnation or even disapproval of the fact that Lenin and others travelled through Germany?

It did not. This is how the editors of *Izvestia*, in the same issue, reported the resolution of the Executive Committee:

“Having heard the report of Comrades Zurabov and Zinoviev, the Executive Committee decided to take the matter up immediately with the Provisional Government and to take steps towards securing the immediate return to Russia of all emigrants, irrespective of their political views and their attitude towards the war. The results of the negotiations with the government will be published in the near future.—*Editors.*”

As anyone can see, *not* a single word is said here against Lenin and his comrades. What we have is a *warning* to the Provisional Government, a decision to *take steps* to prevent it from hindering return to Russia.

Following this, *Martov's* telegram and *Trotsky's* arrest in Britain have shown that Milyukov is either powerless against Britain and France, who keep their own internationalist socialists imprisoned, or that he *does not want* to take serious measures.

The Germans and Russians have made exchanges dozens of times throughout the war. Kovalevsky member of the Council of State, was exchanged for an Austrian, etc. For wealthy people such exchanges have been arranged by the governments many a time. Then why doesn't the present government want to arrange such an exchange for the emigrants? Because it wants to prevent a number of fighters from taking part in the revolutionary struggle.

What does *Russkaya Volya* do, and papers like *Rech* and *Yedinstvo* that follow in its footsteps?

They continue their hounding campaign, thereby inciting ignorant people to acts of violence against individuals. They *refuse to publish* either the report or the resolution of the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies has been given the names of various socialists who verified and approved every step taken by the emigrants in connection with their journey. They are the *French* socialists Lorient and Guilbeaux, the *Swiss* socialist Platten, the *Swedish* socialists Lindhagen (Mayor of Stockholm), Carleson, Ström, Nerman, the *German* socialist Hartstein of *Karl Liebknecht's* group, the *Polish* socialist Broński.

By acting this way *Russkaya Volya*, *Rech* and *Yedinstvo* are aiding and abetting the dark forces which threaten violence, bombs, and riots.

Comrades, soldiers and workers!

We warn you against these gentlemen of *Russkaya Volya*, *Rech* and *Yedinstvo*, and declare over and over again that we stand for *explaining* to the whole nation the views of *all* the parties, we stand for *respecting* the Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies.

If the Provisional Government, if *Rech*, if Mr. Plekhanov are displeased with the way the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies has acted, *why do they not say so openly? Why do they not demand a re-examination of the case?* Why are they afraid to reprint what was published in *Izvestia* No. 32? Why? Because they are out to sow discord!

If violence in any form is resorted to, we shall place the responsibility on the editors and contributors of *Russkaya Volya*, *Rech*, *Yedinstvo*, and others, who have dared to keep the report and the resolution of the Executive Committee out of the press, and to carry on an insidious propaganda.

The paper *Dyelo Naroda*, to which Minister A. F. Kerensky is an active contributor, has already pointed out that the methods used by these newspapers are helping the riot-mongers (*Dyelo Naroda* No. 23).

We want the Milyukovs, Amfiteatovs, Plekhanovs and Co. to know that if their baiting leads to violence they will be the first to suffer the consequences.

Down with riot-mongering! Down with the heroes of

baiting and deception, who suppress the resolution of the Executive Committee!

Comrades, soldiers and workers! You will not allow the people's freedom to be marred by riots! You will see to it that the decisions of *your* Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies are *respected*.

*Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.
Petrograd Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.*

Written before April 14 (27), 1917

Published April 15, 1917
in *Pravda* No. 33

Published according
to the newspaper text

CITIZENS! SEE WHAT METHODS THE CAPITALISTS OF ALL COUNTRIES ARE USING!

Today's *Rech* concludes its editorial with the following words:

“The German Government is endeavouring to preserve the inner unity of Germany and sow discord among the Allies. Our ‘Pravdists’ are making every effort to undermine unity in revolutionary Russia and to set the Russian Government upon the governments of our Allies, Britain and France. Are we not entitled to say that the Lenin crew is working for von Bethmann-Hollweg and Wilhelm II?”

No, gentlemen of the capitalist fold, you are not entitled to say it. It is we Pravdists, and we alone, who, far from preserving the inner unity of Germany, are, *on the contrary, actually engaged in destroying it.*

This is a fact which no lies of the Russian capitalists can ever obliterate.

It is a fact that we Pravdists, and we alone, demand that the German socialists should unconditionally and immediately break with the German Plekhanovs, i.e., the Scheidemanns, and with the German “Centre”, i.e., those vacillating people who cannot make up their minds to break away, definitely, on principle, from the Scheidemanns.

It is a fact that we Pravdists, and we alone, stand for unity with *only* two German socialist groups (the Spartacus and the Arbeiterpolitik) which support the policy of Karl Liebknecht, i.e., *the policy of destroying the inner unity of Germany.* The policy of Karl Liebknecht, a policy of *deeds*, not words, is to destroy the “inner unity” of the capitalists and workers in *Germany.*

Clearly realising that the German capitalists and their Wilhelm are imperialists, i.e., brigands, Karl Liebknecht

as far back as September 1915 sent a letter to the Zimmerwald Conference, which was not published, because Liebknecht was then still a legal person. But everyone who was at Zimmerwald knew about this letter.

The letter called, not for a civil truce, but for a civil war.

That was how *our* comrade-in-idea, Karl Liebknecht, preached "inner unity" in Germany. That is what we ourselves have preached in the German translation of our Pravdist pamphlet *Socialism and War* (by Zinoviev and Lenin).*

Karl Liebknecht not only spoke this way, he acted this way. From the platform of the German parliament, he called upon the German soldiers to turn their guns against *their own* German Government. Then he joined a street demonstration with revolutionary proclamations reading: "Down with the Government."

That is how Karl Liebknecht, an adherent of our Pravdist policy, has been "endeavouring to preserve the inner unity of Germany". That is why he has been thrown into a convict prison.

And Karl Liebknecht is denounced as a Judas and a traitor not only by the entire press of the German capitalists, but by all the papers of the German Plekhanovs, who accuse him more or less directly of treason or anarchism.

In *all* countries the capitalists are spewing out a torrent of lies, slander, abuse and accusations of treason against those socialists who are behaving the way Karl Liebknecht is behaving in Germany, or the way the Pravdists are behaving in Russia, i.e., who are *destroying* the "inner unity" between the workers and the capitalists, the workers and the Plekhanovs, the workers and the "Centrists" in *every* country, and who are *creating unity among the workers of all countries* in order to put an end to the predatory, murderous imperialist war, in order to rid mankind of the yoke of capitalism.

In Germany the capitalists are hounding Karl Liebknecht and his friends as traitors. In Germany, too, our comrade Karl Liebknecht has been repeatedly threatened with mob violence. This has been mentioned even by that German Plekhanov, the social-chauvinist David. In Russia the

* See present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 313-16.—*Ed.*

capitalists hound the Pravdists as traitors. In Britain the capitalists hound the Scotch public school-teacher MacLean as a traitor. He, too, has been thrown into a convict prison for the *same* kind of crime, for the same kind of "treason" as that which Karl Liebknecht and we Pravdists are guilty of.

In France the republican capitalist government is keeping in prison the Frenchman Content and the Russian Rayev for issuing a proclamation entitled "Impose peace".

Gentlemen of *Rech*, ministers, members of the revolutionary government, put us Pravdists in a convict prison, or tell the Russian people to shut us up in a convict prison! Then you will be actually following in the footsteps of capitalist Britain, our "Ally" (the ally of Tsar Nicholas II, for it was *he* who concluded the treaty with the Allies), which is keeping the British Pravdists in a convict prison.

Down with the "inner unity" of the workers and capitalists in *all* countries, for this "unity" has condemned and is still condemning humanity to the horrors of the predatory imperialist war waged in the interests of the capitalists!

Long live unity among *those* socialists and workers in *all* countries who not only sympathise with Karl Liebknecht in words, but actually pursue the Liebknecht policy against *their own* capitalists!

Written April 14 (27), 1917

Published April 15, 1917
in *Pravda* No. 33

Published according
to the newspaper text

A "VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT" BETWEEN LANDOWNERS AND PEASANTS?

Here is the text of the telegram from Minister Shingaryov, mentioned in yesterday's editorial of our paper, and printed in today's *Dyen*⁶⁴:

"On acquainting myself with the decision of the Ranenburg Committee relating to the grain sowing, I deem it my duty to declare that an independent solution of the land question in the absence of a general state law is inadmissible. Arbitrary action will lead to a national calamity and will jeopardise the cause of freedom by provoking discord. The lawful solution of the land question is the business of the Constituent Assembly. At the present time agricultural conciliation chambers will be set up in each local area under the rural supply committees for the purpose of effecting voluntary agreements between the tillers of the land and the landowners. The question of leaseholds on vacant lands is also being urgently considered. For the sake of general order I request that everybody be guided by the decisions of the Provisional Government and refrain from establishing self-made laws."

Can you call it "democracy", "people's freedom", when the peasants, who clearly constitute the overwhelming *majority* of the population, have no right to adopt and carry out their own decision, but must wait for a "*voluntary agreement*" between the tillers of the land and the landowners?

One landowner having two thousand dessiatines of land—and *three hundred* peasant families having two thousand dessiatines. That, on the average, is how things stand in Russia. Three hundred peasants must wait for the "voluntary" consent of *one* landowner!

Is this right, comrade soldiers?

Written April 14 (27), 1917

Published April 15, 1917
in *Pravda* No. 33

Published according
to the newspaper text

AN HONEST VOICE IN A CHORUS OF SLANDERERS

Today's *Malenkaya Gazeta*⁶⁵ publishes an appeal by a group of soldiers of the Fourth Motor Ambulance Unit to all comrades in the army, demanding an investigation into the circumstances connected with the passage through Germany of Lenin and others.

Here we have an honest voice standing out from the torrent of filthy lies, foul slander, and riot-mongering agitation. Indeed, it is the right and *duty* of every citizen to demand an investigation into any fact that is of social importance.

Here we have an honest method of honest people, not of riot-mongers.

And it is this method that Lenin and *all the adherents of various parties* who had come with him adopted *immediately* upon their arrival. They made a *report* of their passage to the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies,* giving the *names* of the socialists from two neutral countries, Switzerland and Sweden, who had signed the official protocol of the journey, and had examined *all* the documents. The Executive Committee had Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Skobelev, Steklov, and others on it. They decided to publish in *Izvestia* both the report and the resolution of the Executive Committee.

Following the consideration of the report it was resolved: "Having heard the report of Comrades Zurabov and Zinoviev, the Executive Committee decided to take the matter up immediately with the Provisional Government and to take steps towards securing the immediate return to Russia

* See pp. 27-29 of this volume.—*Ed.*

of all emigrants, irrespective of their political views and their attitude towards the war.”

Both documents were published in *Izvestia* No. 32, for April 5, 1917.

Is it fair, is it sensible *not* to reprint the report and the resolution, and to conduct a riot-mongering agitation?

Have the comrades of the Fourth Motor Ambulance Unit acted rightly in hastening to “brand” and denounce the newly arrived comrades as “traitors”, to heap “curses” upon them, and to revile them *without having discussed* the documents printed in *Izvestia*?

What is this if not anarchism, if not an *appeal to defy* the members of the Executive Committee elected by the workers and soldiers?

Written April 14 (27), 1917

Published April 15, 1917
in *Pravda* No. 33
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according
to the newspaper text

THE SOLDIERS AND THE LAND

Most of the soldiers come from the peasantry. Every peasant knows how the landowners have been oppressing the people. But wherein lies the power of the landowners?

In the land.

The landowners have tens of millions of dessiatines of land. That is why millions of peasant families have no choice but to enslave themselves to the landowners.

No "liberties" can help the peasants so long as the landowners are in possession of tens of millions of dessiatines of land.

All the landed estates must be taken over by the people. All the land in the country must become the property of the whole people, and be disposed of by the local Soviets of Peasants' and Agricultural Labourers' Deputies.

How is this to be accomplished? We must immediately set up all over Russia, in every village without exception, Soviets of Peasants' and Agricultural Labourers' Deputies modelled after the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in the cities. Unless the peasants and agricultural labourers *themselves* unite, unless they *themselves* take their fate into their own hands, no one in the world will help them, no one will free them from their bondage to the landowners.

To enable the peasants to take over all the land from the landowners in their own districts immediately and to dispose of it properly, while preserving perfect order and guarding against any damage to property, the peasants must be supported by the soldiers.

The peasants, soldiers, and workers constitute the overwhelming majority of the population. This majority *wants*

all the land to pass immediately into the hands of the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies. No one can stop the majority, *if* it is well organised (solidly united), *if* it is class-conscious, *if* it is armed.

Soldiers! Help to unite and arm all the workers and the peasants!

Soldiers! You, too, unite more solidly, and form closer ties with the workers and the peasants! Do not allow your armed power to be taken away from you!

Then, and only then, will the people get all the land, and free themselves from their bondage to the landowners.

Soldatskaya Pravda No. 1,
April 15, 1917
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according
to the text in *Soldatskaya Pravda*

***THE PETROGRAD CITY CONFERENCE
OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks)⁶⁶***

APRIL 14-22 (APRIL 27-MAY 5), 1917

1

REPORT ON THE PRESENT SITUATION
AND THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PROVISIONAL
GOVERNMENT
APRIL 14 (21)

Our political line, embodied in resolutions, was worked out in advance with far greater precision than that of any other party. Events, however, have created an entirely new situation. The chief mistake made by revolutionaries is that they look backward at the old revolutions, whereas life gives us too many new things that have to be fitted into the general pattern of events.

The motive forces of the revolution were defined by us quite correctly. Events have justified our old Bolshevik premises, but the trouble with us is that comrades have wished to remain "old" Bolsheviks. Mass movement had been confined to the proletariat and the peasantry. The West-European bourgeoisie had always been opposed to revolution. Such was the situation to which we had been accustomed. But things turned out differently. The imperialist war split the European bourgeoisie, and this created a situation where the Anglo-French capitalists, for imperialist reasons, became supporters of a Russian revolution. The British capitalists actually entered into a conspiracy with Guchkov, Milyukov, and the high commanding officers of the army. The Anglo-French capitalists sided with the revolution. The European newspapers report many instances of British and French emissaries making trips to have talks with "revolutionaries" like Guchkov. The revolution has thus gained an unexpected ally. As a result, the revolution has turned out to be different from what anyone expected. We have found allies not only

in the Russian bourgeoisie but also among the Anglo-French capitalists. When I mentioned this in a lecture delivered abroad,* I was told by a Menshevik that we had been wrong, for events had proved that the bourgeoisie was necessary for the success of the revolution. I replied that it was “necessary” only insofar as it helped the revolution triumph in eight days. Did not Milyukov declare before the revolution that if victory lay through revolution, then he was against victory? We must not forget these words of Milyukov.

And so, the revolution in its first stage developed in a way that no one had expected. The Bolsheviks’ reply to the question as to the possibility of “defending the fatherland” was this: if a bourgeois-chauvinist revolution triumphed (*Sotsial-Demokrat*⁶⁷ No. 47), then defence of the fatherland would be impossible.** The situation is unique in that we now have a dual power. Abroad, where no paper more Left than *Rech* ever penetrates, and where the English and French bourgeois papers speak of an all-powerful Provisional Government and the “chaos” represented by the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies, nobody has any clear idea of this dual power. Only here on the spot did we learn that the Soviet had surrendered power to the Provisional Government. The Soviet is the implementation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the soldiers; among the latter the majority are peasants. It is therefore a dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. But this “dictatorship” has entered into an agreement with the bourgeoisie. And this is where the “old” Bolshevism needs revising. The situation that has arisen shows that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry is interlocked with the power of the bourgeoisie. An amazingly unique situation. The past contains no instances of a revolution where the representatives of the revolutionary proletariat and peasantry, though fully armed, concluded an alliance with the bourgeoisie, and though having the power, ceded it to the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie wields the power of capital and the power of organisation. It is a wonder the workers have shown themselves to be as well organised as they are. The bour-

* See present edition, Vol. 23, p. 355.—*Ed.*

** *Ibid.*, Vol. 21, p. 403.—*Ed.*

geois revolution in Russia is completed insofar as power has come into the hands of the bourgeoisie. Here the "old Bolsheviks" argue: "It is not completed—for there is no dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry." But the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is that very dictatorship.

The agrarian movement can go two ways. The peasants may take the land, but no struggle may develop between the rural proletariat and the prosperous peasants. This is unlikely, however, for the class struggle does not wait. To repeat now what we said in 1905, and omit mention of the class struggle in the countryside, is a betrayal of the proletarian cause.

Already we can discern in the decisions of a number of peasant congresses a tendency to wait with the solution of the agrarian question until the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. This is a victory for the well-to-do peasants who lean towards the Cadets. The peasants are already taking possession of the land. The Socialist-Revolutionaries are trying to hold them back, suggesting that they wait until the Constituent Assembly meets. We must combine the demand for the immediate seizure of the land with propaganda for the setting up of Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies. The bourgeois-democratic revolution is completed. The agrarian programme must be carried out in a new way. The same struggle for power that is going on here between the large and small proprietors will take place in the village too. The peasants will not be content with land alone. The number of horseless peasants has increased greatly. We alone are at present developing the agrarian revolution, when we tell the peasants to take the land immediately. The land must be taken in an organised manner. Property must not be damaged. The agrarian movement, consequently, is only a prevision, and not a fact. It is the task of Marxists to make the question of an agrarian programme clear to the peasants; the weight of emphasis on this issue must be shifted to the Soviet of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies. We must be prepared, however, for the peasantry uniting with the bourgeoisie, just as the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies has done. It follows that the agrarian movement still has to be developed. The well-to-do peasantry will, naturally, gravitate towards the bourgeoisie,

towards the Provisional Government. It may prove even more Right than Guchkov.

For the time being, the victory of bourgeois power is an accomplished fact. The economic position of the peasants separates them from the landowners. What the peasants need is not a legal right to the land. They need Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies. Those who advise the peasants to wait until the Constituent Assembly meets are deceiving them.

Our task is to separate the class line from this petty-bourgeois bog. The bourgeoisie does its job splendidly; it makes all sorts of promises, but in effect pursues only its class policy.

In the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies the alignment of forces is such that power is passed to the Provisional Government, while the socialists content themselves with "contact commissions". True, this government is composed of the most trusted and best people of their class, but still of a definite class. The petty bourgeoisie has surrendered to them completely. Unless we mark out a proletarian line, we shall be betraying the cause of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie rules either by deception or by violence. Just now flattery and deception prevail, and this lulls the revolution. The bourgeoisie makes concessions on minor issues, but in matters of primary importance (the agrarian revolution, for example) they make none. One must be blind to the facts not to see that in Russia, apart from the Bolsheviks, there is nothing but revolutionary defencism, and that it has triumphed everywhere. Revolutionary defencism means the surrender of all socialist principles in the predatory interests of capitalism, interests which are screened behind the phrase "defence of the fatherland"; it means surrendering one's positions to the petty bourgeoisie. When I spoke of the "honest" mass of revolutionary defencists, I had in mind not a moral category, but a class definition. The classes represented in the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies have no interest in the predatory war. In Europe it is different. There the people are oppressed, and the most opportunistic pacifists are often hounded worse than we Pravdists are. In our country the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies pursues its policy of revolutionary defencism, not by

violence, but because the masses trust it. Europe is one vast military prison. Capitalism rules cruelly there. All over Europe the bourgeoisie should be overthrown, and not argued with. In Russia the soldiers are armed; by agreeing only to "defend themselves" against Wilhelm they allowed themselves to be peacefully deceived. In Europe, there is no "honest" revolutionary defencism like we have in Russia, where the people have handed over the power to the bourgeoisie through ignorance, inertia, tradition, and the habit of suffering the rod. Steklov and Chkheidze are leaders in word, but tailpieces of the bourgeoisie in deed; for all their virtues, their knowledge of Marxism, etc., they are politically dead. Here in Russia the power is in the hands of the soldiers, who are defencist-minded. The objective class position of the capitalists is one thing. They are conducting the war in their own interests. The soldiers are proletarians and peasants. This is another thing. Are they interested in seizing Constantinople? No, their class interests are opposed to war! That is why they can be made to see light, made to change their minds. The crux of the political situation at this moment is to be able to make the masses see the truth. We cannot talk about having the "backing" of the revolutionary mass, etc., until we have brought home to the soldiers or to the uneducated masses the meaning of the slogan "Down with war".

What is the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies? Its class meaning is direct power. We do not have complete political liberty, of course. But nowhere else is there such freedom as exists in Russia today. "Down with war" does not mean flinging the bayonet away. It means the transfer of power to another class. Everything must now be focused on making that clear. Blanquism was a striving to seize power with the backing of a minority. With us it is quite different. We are still a minority and realise the need for winning a majority. Unlike the anarchists, we need the state for the transition to socialism. The Paris Commune furnished an example of a state of the Soviet type, an example of direct power wielded by the organised and armed workers, an example of the dictatorship of workers and peasants. The role of the Soviets, the significance of such a dictatorship, is that they apply organised force against the counter-revolution,

safeguard the gains of the revolution for the benefit of the majority and with the support of the majority. There can be no dual power in a state. The Soviets are a type of state where the existence of a police is impossible. Here the people are their own rulers, and there can be no return to the monarchy. The army and the people must merge into one—therein lies the triumph of liberty! Everyone must learn to use arms. To safeguard freedom, all the people to a man must be armed. This is the essence of the commune. We are not anarchists who deny the need for an organised state, i.e., for force in general, particularly a state maintained by the organised and armed workers themselves through the Soviets. Events have led to the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry being interlocked with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The next stage is the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the proletariat is not yet sufficiently organised and enlightened; it must be enlightened. Such Soviets of Workers' and other Deputies should be organised all over the country—life itself demands it. There is no other way. This is the Paris Commune! The Soviet of Workers' Deputies is not an organisation of the trade union type, as the bourgeoisie would like it to be. The people see it differently and more correctly—they see it as a government power. They see that the way out of the war lies through the victory of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. This is the type of state under which it is possible to advance towards socialism. Should a group seize power, it would not mean much. The Russian revolution has risen higher: any government other than the Soviet is impossible, and this is what the bourgeoisie fears. So long as the Soviets have not seized power, we shall not take it. A living force, however, must impel the Soviets to seize power. Otherwise we shall never get out of the war which the capitalists are carrying on by deceiving the people. All countries are on the brink of ruin; people must realise this; there is no way out except through a socialist revolution. The government must be overthrown, but not everybody understands this correctly. So long as the Provisional Government has the backing of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, you cannot “simply” overthrow it. The only way it can and must be overthrown is by winning over the majority in the Soviets. It is either forward towards

the undivided power of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, or back to the imperialist war—there is no other alternative. Kautsky denied that a revolution was possible in time of war. Events have shown him to be wrong.

As regards nationalisation of the banks and control over them—economically this is feasible, economically nothing can interfere with it, once the power is in the hands of the workers. Obviously, in viewing the tasks of the proletariat as we do, there can be no question of any alliance with the “defencists”.

Concerning a new name for the Party: the word “Social-Democracy” is incorrect; it is scientifically wrong. Marx and Engels said as much on many occasions. If they “put up with” the word, it was because after the year 1871 a special situation was created: a *slow* preparation of the masses was needed, revolution was not on the order of the day. Democracy, too, means a form of state, but the Paris Commune had risen above it. Now the whole world is faced with the practical issue—that of the transition to socialism. The Social-Democrat Plekhanov and the rest of the social-chauvinists throughout the world have betrayed socialism. We should call ourselves the “Communist Party”.

A brief report published
May 8 (April 25),
1917 in *Pravda* No. 40

First published in full in 1925
in the book *The Petrograd City
and the All-Russia Conferences
of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks)*,
April 1917

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

2

CONCLUDING REMARKS IN THE DEBATE
CONCERNING THE REPORT ON THE PRESENT SITUATION
APRIL 14 (27)

The discussion has shown that opinion is divided. I cannot answer all the questions.

The question of old Bolshevism. Kalinin defended old Bolshevism. But he also came to the conclusion that our present tactics were correct. Another opinion is that there is a marked tendency towards the tactics of the petty bourgeoisie.

There is a time-honoured expression: to go through with the revolution. But which revolution? The objective situation in 1905 was this: the proletariat and the peasantry were the only revolutionary element, while the Cadets stood for the monarchy. Now defencism represents the adoption by the peasants of petty-bourgeois tactics. Going through with the revolution under these circumstances has no meaning. The revolution has united the petty bourgeoisie with other revolutionary elements upon the ground of defencism.

The future of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. A petty-bourgeois peasantry holding defencist views may even be in favour of a monarchy.

A new line follows from the policy of Bolshevism. The petty bourgeoisie and the big bourgeoisie have united. We take as our point of departure conflicting class interests. The labourer peasants ought to be against the imperialist war. The proprietor peasants are for defencism.

Defencism has shown that the petty bourgeoisie has moved away from the working class and gone over to the big bour-

geoisie. The poor peasant who earns a part of his living in the city has no need for this war. This class ought to be opposed to the war.

Old Bolshevism should be discarded. The line of the petty bourgeoisie must be separated from that of the wage-earning proletariat. Fine phrases about the revolutionary people are suitable to a man like Kerensky, but not to the revolutionary proletariat. To be revolutionaries, even democrats, with Nicholas removed, is no great merit. Revolutionary democracy is no good at all; it is a mere phrase. It covers up rather than lays bare the antagonisms of class interests. A Bolshevik must open the eyes of the workers and peasants to the existence of these antagonisms, not gloss them over. If the imperialist war hits the proletariat and the peasants economically, these classes will have to rise against it.

To create a network of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies—that is our task today. The whole of Russia is already being covered with a network of organs of local self-government. A commune may exist also in the form of organs of self-government. The abolition of the police and the standing army, and the arming of the whole people—all this can be accomplished through the organs of local self-government. I have taken the Soviet of Workers' Deputies simply because it already exists.

It is said, we must “interest” the proletariat. This is what Chkheidze, the Provisional Government and others are doing when they use high-sounding words about revolutionary democracy. A Bolshevik must differentiate between the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, and leave such words as “revolutionary democracy” and “revolutionary people” to Kerensky. Democracy in Russia is imperialistic. It is argued that we are reducing our activities to cultural work. That is not true. Passing resolutions about the Constituent Assembly, etc., would mean “interesting” the proletariat.

The real work is to bring about the abolition of the standing army, the bureaucracy, and the police, and to arm the whole people.

The Constituent Assembly will not kill the revolution, for nothing is heard of it now, and no one is planning to

convene it. We leave it to the Socialist-Revolutionaries to "demand" its convocation.

This war is a world war. It is waged by definite classes, and was brought on by banking capital. It can be stopped by transferring power to another class. So long as the power remains in the hands of the ruling classes, peace can alter nothing.

The proletariat must be shown how the revolution can be carried forward by concrete measures. To carry the revolution forward means to achieve self-government by independent action. The growth of democracy does not stand in the way of self-government, it helps us to realise our aims. The war can be terminated only by the transfer of power to another class—and Russia has come closest of all to that—but never by a truce among the capitalists of all countries on the basis of an exchange of subjugated nationalities. A commune is quite suitable to the peasantry. A commune means complete self-government, the absence of any supervision from above. Nine-tenths of the peasantry should be for it.

The bourgeoisie may reconcile itself to the nationalisation of the land, should the peasants take over the land. As a proletarian party, we must declare that the land alone will not feed people. To cultivate it one will therefore have to set up the commune. We must be for centralisation, but there are times when things can best be done locally; we should allow a maximum of initiative in the local areas. The Cadets are already acting like officials. They tell the peasants: "Wait for the Constituent Assembly." Our Party alone provides slogans that really carry the revolution forward. The Soviets of Workers' Deputies are fully capable of establishing communes in the local areas. The question is whether the proletariat will be well enough organised for the task, but this is a thing we cannot estimate in advance, we must learn by doing.

Trotskyism: "No tsar, but a workers' government." This is wrong. A petty bourgeoisie exists, and it cannot be dismissed. But it is in two parts. The poorer of the two is with the working class.

War. To end the war by pacifist means is utopia. It may be terminated by an imperialist peace. But the masses do

not want such a peace. War is a continuation of the policies of a class; to change the character of the war one must change the class in power.

The name Communist Party is theoretically sound. The Left socialists of other countries are too weak. We must take the initiative.

First published in 1925
in the book *The Petrograd City
and the All-Russia Conferences
of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks),
April 1917*

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

3

TWO REMARKS DURING THE DEBATE
ON THE RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE ATTITUDE
TOWARDS THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT
APRIL 15 (28)

I

After yesterday's debate I can confine myself to brief remarks. The resolution shows a way out. The situation is determined not only by the fact that definite classes are represented in the Provisional Government, but also by the fact that the latter leans upon the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. The inference is not that we must yield to this petty bourgeoisie, but that we must form independent groups, not in order to separate ourselves from the petty bourgeoisie, but in order to impel it to go forward. The seizure of all the land is a step forward on the part of the revolutionary people. The replacement of the standing army by a militia is a step forward.

II

Comrade Kamenev is shifting to the policy of Chkheidze and Steklov. Of course, no one will say that the Provisional Government is putting off the Constituent Assembly, if we do not say it. Everybody wants to carry on the war. The point at issue is the organisation of counter-revolution. In revolutionary times control means deception. The date for the elections could be arranged in three days. By

listing “sins”, we provide ammunition for propaganda. To seek the truth in the Contact Commission is impossible. There can be no control without power. To control by means of resolutions, etc., is sheer nonsense. Control means dispelling the petty-bourgeois illusions, fog.

First published in 1925
in the book *The Petrograd City
and the All-Russia Conferences
of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks),
April 1917*

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

4

RESOLUTION
ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS
THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

Considering:

(1) that the Provisional Government, by its class character, is the organ of landowner and bourgeois domination;

(2) that the Provisional Government and the classes it represents are bound with indissoluble economic and political ties to Russian and Anglo-French imperialism;

(3) that the Provisional Government is carrying out its proclaimed programme only partially, and only under pressure of the revolutionary proletariat and, to some extent, of the petty bourgeoisie;

(4) that the forces of bourgeois and landowner counter-revolution, now being organised, have already, under cover of the Provisional Government and with the latter's obvious connivance, launched an attack on revolutionary democracy;

(5) that the Provisional Government is avoiding fixing the date for the elections to the Constituent Assembly, preventing the arming of the people as a whole, opposing the transfer of all the land to the people, foisting upon it the landowners' way of settling the agrarian question, obstructing the introduction of an eight-hour workday, condoning counter-revolutionary propaganda in the army (by Guchkov and Co.), rallying the high-ranking officers against the soldiers, etc.;

(6) that this government, at the same time, is relying at present on the confidence of, and, to a certain extent, on an actual agreement with, the Petrograd Soviet of Workers'

and Soldiers' Deputies, which now unites an obvious majority of workers and soldiers, i.e., peasants;

(7) that every step of the Provisional Government, in both its domestic and foreign policies, is bound to open the eyes, not only of the proletarians in town and country and semi-proletarians, but also of the broad sections of the petty bourgeoisie, to the real nature of this government,

the Conference resolves that:

(1) in order to ensure all the state power passing into the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies or other bodies directly expressing the will of the people, prolonged work is necessary to develop proletarian class-consciousness and to unite the urban and rural proletarians against the vacillations of the petty bourgeoisie, for only work of this nature can guarantee real advance on the part of the whole revolutionary people;

(2) this calls for many-sided activity within the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, for work aimed at increasing the number of these Soviets, consolidating their power, and welding together our Party's proletarian internationalist groups in the Soviets;

(3) we must organise our Social-Democratic forces more effectively, so as to be able to direct the new wave of the revolutionary movement under the banner of revolutionary Social-Democracy.

Pravda No. 35,
May 1 (April 18), 1917

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes verified with
the text of *Pravda*

5

TWO REMARKS DURING THE DEBATE
ON THE QUESTION OF THE MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS
APRIL 22 (MAY 5)

I

Since we have proportional representation, there is no need for a bloc; the minority is protected. I emphatically disagree with Comrade Kalinin, because a bloc with the petty bourgeoisie, with the chauvinists, is unthinkable. The very idea of a bloc with the petty bourgeoisie, who are supported by the capitalists, is a betrayal of socialism. With whom are we to form blocs, with the editors of *Internatsional*⁶⁸? But this paper has not been published yet, and therefore we do not know them. Chkheidze is defencism's worst mask. Trotsky, when editing his paper in Paris, never made it clear whether he was for or against Chkheidze. We have always spoken against Chkheidze, because he is a subtle mask for chauvinism. Trotsky has never made himself clear. How do we know that Larin, the editor of *International*, does not follow the same tactics?

We must come forward with a definite programme. A struggle is now on among three parties: the first is the party of robbers and killers; the second is the party that shields these robbers with fine words, and finally, the third party, the party that refuses to support the robbers and stands for exposing the mistakes made by everybody, the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies included.

The fault of the Soviet is not that it didn't assume power, but that it teaches the people the wrong things, it shouts about its victory over the government.

II

I am decidedly in favour of placing on our tickets the names of the Menshevik candidates who are breaking with chauvinism. This is no bloc. As far as parties are concerned, Russia is remarkably well organised. About a programme: the question of a paid militia, the question of food supply, the question of taxes—all these are important.

First published in 1925
in the book *The Petrograd City
and the All-Russia Conferences
of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks),
April 1917*

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

6

RESOLUTION ON THE MUNICIPAL QUESTION

Under no circumstances can the municipal platform, particularly at the present revolutionary time, be reduced only to communal questions.

It must also contain a definite answer to all present-day key issues, especially those concerning the war and the tasks of the proletariat in regard to the central power.

Even in municipal questions, such as that of the militia, food supply, housing, and taxes, we cannot expect the petty-bourgeois parties to agree to revolutionary measures necessary to combat war and its consequences.

For all these reasons we must go to the elections without blocs, upon a straight issue of principles announced in the programme of the proletarian party, and explain to the people the fundamental differences between the three main party divisions, namely, (1) the Cadets and those to the right of them; (2) the parties of the petty bourgeoisie (Narodniks) and a section of workers who have fallen under the influence of the bourgeoisie (the Menshevik defencists); (3) the party of the revolutionary proletariat (the Bolsheviks).

The technical arrangements for the elections based on the system of proportional representation make blocs technically unnecessary.

It is advisable in every way to encourage closer relations and mutual exchange of opinions, on the basis of practical work, with those Mensheviks who are really breaking with revolutionary defencism and with support of the Provisional Government. With such comrades it is permissible to run a joint ticket, on condition that there be sufficient agreement on fundamentals. A concrete municipal programme should be worked out, particularly on the question of a proletarian militia to be paid for by the capitalists.

7

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE
PARTIES OF THE SOCIALIST-REVOLUTIONARIES,
THE MENSHEVIK SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS,
THE "NON-FACTION" SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS
AND OTHER KINDRED POLITICAL TRENDS

Taking into consideration:

(1) that the parties of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, Menshevik Social-Democrats, etc., have, in the great majority of cases, adopted the stand of "revolutionary defencism" and voted for the loan, that is, in support of the imperialist war waged by the imperialist government of the capitalists—Guchkov, Lvov and Co.;

(2) that these parties are *supporting* the Provisional Government, which represents the interests of Capital and which has taken a counter-revolutionary stand in domestic as well as foreign policy;

(3) that these parties have allowed themselves to be deceived by the capitalists, and, in their turn, are deceiving the people with false hopes of being able, by means of "demands" and "control" of the Provisional Government, and without wielding state power, to change the class nature of the government of the capitalists and wean it away from the imperialist policy now needed by the capitalists and from counter-revolutionary attempts against liberty;

(4) that the resultant attempt to obscure the class-consciousness of the proletarians and semi-proletarians, which these parties are encouraging, is, in view of the general attitude of unreasoning trust on the part of the masses towards the capitalists, who are now acting chiefly by deception and flattery, the principal reason for the revolution

hanging fire and for its possible defeat by the forces of the landowner and bourgeois counter-revolution,

the Conference resolves that:

(1) the voting in favour of the loan and advocacy of revolutionary defencism in general be considered a gross betrayal of socialism, of the proletarian class struggle and of the principles of internationalism, i.e., the fraternal union of the workers of all countries against the capitalists of all countries;

(2) the above-named parties be considered as acting in the interests and upholding the point of view of the petty bourgeoisie and corrupting the proletariat with bourgeois influence;

(3) unity with parties, as a whole, which are pursuing a policy of support for the Provisional Government, are advocating revolutionary defencism, etc., be considered absolutely impossible in view of the fact that these parties have abandoned the proletarian class position for a petty-bourgeois position;

(4) in regard to certain local groups of workers who are aligned with the Mensheviks, etc., but who strive to uphold the position of internationalism against "revolutionary defencism" and against voting for the loan, etc., the policy of our Party should be to support such workers and groups, to seek closer relations with them, and support unity with them on the basis of a definite break with the petty-bourgeois betrayal of socialism.

First published in 1925
in the book *The Petrograd City*
and the *All-Russia Conferences*
of the *R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks)*, April 1917

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

8

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE WAR

I
TO MAO

The present war is, on the part of both groups of the belligerent powers, an imperialist war, i.e., one waged by the capitalists for world domination, for division of the capitalists' spoils, for profitable markets for finance and banking capital, and for the subjugation of the weaker nationalities.

The transfer of state power in Russia from Nicholas II to the government of Guchkov, Lvov, and others, to the government of the landowners and capitalists, did not and could not alter the class character and meaning of the war as far as Russia is concerned.

The fact that the new government is carrying on the same imperialist war, i.e., an aggressive war of conquest, became glaringly apparent when the government not only failed to publish the secret treaties between ex-Tsar Nicholas II and the capitalist governments of Britain, France, etc., but even formally confirmed these treaties. This was done without consulting the will of the people and with the express purpose of deceiving them, for it is well known that the secret treaties concluded by the ex-tsar are outrageously predatory treaties that give the Russian capitalists a free hand to rob China, Persia, Turkey, Austria, etc.

For this reason no proletarian party that does not wish to break completely with internationalism, i.e., with the fraternal solidarity of the workers of all countries in their struggle against the yoke of Capital, can support the

present war, or the present government, or its loans, no matter in what glowing terms these loans may be described.

Nor can any trust be placed in the present government's promise to renounce annexations, i.e., the conquest of foreign countries or the forcible retention of any nationality within the confines of Russia. For, in the first place, the capitalists, bound together by the thousand threads of Russian and Anglo-French banking capital, and intent on protecting the interests of capital, cannot renounce annexations in this war without at the same time ceasing to be capitalists, without renouncing the profits from the thousands of millions invested in loans, concessions, war industries, etc. And secondly, the new government, after renouncing annexations to mislead the people, declared through Milyukov (Moscow, April 9, 1917) that it had no intention of renouncing them. Finally, as revealed by *Dyelo Naroda*, a newspaper in which Minister Kerensky co-operates, Milyukov has not even sent his statement on the renunciation of annexations to other countries.

Therefore, in warning the people against the capitalists' empty promises, the Conference declares that it is necessary to make a clear distinction between a renunciation of annexations in word and a renunciation of annexations in deed, i.e., the immediate publication of all the secret predatory treaties, of all acts of foreign policy, and the taking of immediate steps to fully liberate all peoples who are being oppressed, kept bound to Russia by force or kept in a state of subjection by the capitalist class, which is continuing the policy of ex-Tsar Nicholas II, a policy that is a disgrace to our nation.

II

The "revolutionary defencism", which in Russia has now permeated almost all the Narodnik parties (the Popular Socialists, Trudoviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries), the opportunist party of the Menshevik Social-Democrats (the Organising Committee, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, etc.), and the majority of the non-party revolutionaries, reflects, in point of class significance, the interests and point of view of the petty bourgeoisie, the small proprietors, and the well-to-

do peasants, who, like the capitalists, profit by oppressing weak peoples. On the other hand, it is a result of the deception of the masses by the capitalists, who instead of publishing the secret treaties confine themselves to promises and glib talk.

It must be admitted that the great mass of "revolutionary defencists" are honest, i.e., they are *really* opposed to annexations, to conquests, to oppressing weak peoples; they are *really* working for a democratic non-coercive peace among *all* the belligerents. This must be admitted for the reason that the class position of the urban and rural proletarians and semi-proletarians (i.e., of the people who earn their living, wholly or partly, by selling their labour-power to the capitalists) makes these classes uninterested in capitalist profits.

Therefore, while recognising that any concessions to "revolutionary defencism" are absolutely impermissible and virtually signify a complete break with internationalism and socialism, the Conference declares that our Party will preach abstention from violence as long as the Russian capitalists and their Provisional Government confine themselves to threats of violence against the people (for example, Guchkov's unhappily notorious decree threatening the soldiers with punishment for arbitrary displacement of superiors), as long as the capitalists have *not* started using violence against the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', Agricultural Labourers', and other Deputies, which organise themselves freely, and freely elect and dismiss *all* public officers. Our Party will fight against the profound and fatal error of "revolutionary defencism" solely by means of comradely persuasion, bringing home the truth that the attitude of unreasoning trust of the broad masses in the government of the capitalists, who are the worst enemies of peace and socialism, is, in present-day Russia, the chief obstacle to a speedy termination of the war.

III

As for that most important issue of all, namely, how to end the war—a criminal, predatory capitalist war that has brought mankind to the brink of ruin, famine and destruc-

tion—as quickly as possible, by a truly democratic, non-coercive peace, the Conference recognises and declares the following:

It is utterly senseless to suppose that this war can be ended by a unilateral refusal of the soldiers of *any one* country to continue the war, by a unilateral cessation of military operations, by the mere act of “sticking the bayonet into the ground”.

Our Party will patiently but persistently explain to the people the truth that wars are waged by *governments*, that wars are always indissolubly bound up with the policies of definite classes, and, therefore, this war, started by crowned brigands, by monarchs like Nicholas II, and by uncrowned brigands—the capitalists, can be terminated by a truly democratic, non-coercive peace *only* when the entire state power passes to a *class* that is really not interested in safeguarding capitalist profits, to the class of the proletarians and semi-proletarians, which is really capable of putting an end to the oppressive rule of Capital.

This class alone is capable of *really* renouncing annexations, of breaking free from the meshes of finance and banking capital, and, under certain circumstances, not merely in word but *in deed*, converting this predatory war into a revolutionary proletarian war, a war aimed, not at crushing weak peoples, but to free the workers and peasants of the *whole world* from the yoke of Capital.

The Conference reiterates its protests against the base slander spread by the capitalists against our Party to the effect that we are in favour of a separate peace with Germany. We consider the German capitalists to be as predatory as the Russian, British, French, and other capitalists, and Emperor Wilhelm II to be as bad a crowned brigand as Nicholas II or the British, Italian, Rumanian, and all other monarchs. We have proclaimed this view of our Party not only in Russian but also in German, in the translation of Zinoviev's and Lenin's pamphlet *Socialism and War*.*

Moreover, as editors of the Central Organ of our Party, and in the name of the Party, the above-named comrades had declared (*Sotsial-Demokrat*, Geneva, October 13, 1915,

* See present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 301-06.—*Ed.*

No. 47) that if the revolution placed our Party in power while the war was still on, we would forthwith propose openly to Germany, *together with all the other nations*, a non-coercive, i.e., democratic, peace, *and that in the event of the German, British, French and other capitalists declining such a peace, we would ourselves start a revolutionary war, and call upon the workers of all countries to join us.**

The Conference fully endorses this declaration.

The Conference takes cognisance of the fact that in no other belligerent country in the world is there such freedom as there now is in Russia, or such revolutionary mass organisations as the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', and other Deputies; and that nowhere else in the world, therefore, can the transfer of the entire state power to the *actual* majority of the people, i.e., to the workers and poor peasants, be achieved so easily and *so peacefully*.

The Conference declares that the money for the soldiers' upkeep should be raised not by loans, which only enrich the capitalists, but by imposing high income and property taxes on the capitalists.

The Conference declares that so long as the majority of the people, though enjoying complete freedom of agitation and propaganda, have not yet come to realise how closely this war is bound up with capitalist interests, there is only one practical means of bringing this butchery of peoples to a speedy end.

This means is fraternisation at the front.

The Conference calls attention to the fact that even *Novoye Vremya*, that servile mouthpiece of the capitalist interests, admits in a telegram from Kiev dated April 12 that fraternisation has started at the front. Numerous reports from soldier delegates to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in Petrograd confirm this.

By starting to fraternise, the Russian and German soldiers, the proletarians and peasants of both countries dressed in soldiers' uniforms, have proved to the whole world that intuitively the classes oppressed by the capitalists have discovered the right road to the cessation of the butchery of peoples.

* See present edition, Vol. 21, p. 404.—*Ed.*

By fraternisation we understand, first, the publication of proclamations in the Russian and the German languages for distribution at the front; second, the holding of meetings between the Russian and the German soldiers at the front with the aid of interpreters, these to be arranged in such a way that the capitalists, and the generals and officers of *both* countries, who for the most part are of the capitalist class, will not dare to interfere with these meetings, will not dare even to attend them without the direct and special permission of the soldiers.

These proclamations and meetings must make clear the above-stated views on war and peace, must bring home the fact that if the state power in the two countries, Germany and Russia, were to pass wholly and exclusively into the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the whole of humanity would heave a sigh of relief, for then we would really be assured of a speedy termination of the war, of a really lasting, truly democratic peace among all the nations, and, at the same time, the transition of all countries to socialism.

Written between April 15 and 22
(April 28 and May 5), 1917

First published in 1927
in the second and third editions
of Lenin's *Collected Works*,
Vol. XX

Published according
to the typewritten copy
with Lenin's corrections

CONGRESS OF PEASANTS' DEPUTIES⁶⁹

A Congress of representatives of peasants' organisations and Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, who have met to draw up regulations for the convocation of an All-Russia Soviet of Peasants' Deputies and to set up similar local Soviets, has been in session in the Taurida Palace since April 13.

According to *Dyelo Naroda*, representatives from more than 20 gubernias are attending the Congress.

Resolutions have been adopted urging the need for the speediest organisation of the "peasantry" from bottom to "top". "Soviets of Peasants' Deputies functioning in the various areas" have been declared to be the "best form of organisation of the peasantry".

Bykhovsky, a member of the provisional bureau for the convocation of the present Congress, has pointed out that a decision to organise the peasantry by setting up an All-Russia Soviet of Peasants' Deputies had been taken by the Moscow Co-operative Congress,⁷⁰ representing an organised membership of twelve million, or fifty million of the population.

This is an undertaking of tremendous importance, which must be given every support. If it is carried out without delay, if the peasantry, in spite of Shingaryov, takes over all the land immediately by a majority decision and not by "voluntary agreement" with the landowners as he would have it, then not only the soldiers, who would receive more bread and meat, but also the cause of freedom would gain by it.

For the organisation of the peasants, carried out from below without the officials and without the "control and supervision" of the landowners and their hangers-on, is the only reliable pledge of success for the revolution, for freedom,

for the liberation of Russia from the yoke and bondage of the landowners.

There is no doubt that all members of our Party, all class-conscious workers, will do their utmost to support the organisation of Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, will see to it that their numbers are increased and their strength consolidated, and will exert every effort to work inside these Soviets along consistent and strictly proletarian class lines.

To carry on this work, it is necessary to organise separately the proletarian elements (agricultural labourers, day-labourers, etc.) *within* the general peasant Soviets, or (sometimes *and*) set up separate Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies.

Our object is not to scatter forces; on the contrary, in order to strengthen and broaden the movement, we must arouse the "*lowest*"—to use the terminology of the landowners and capitalists—section of society, or, more correctly, class.

To build up the movement, we must free it from the influence of the bourgeoisie; we must try to rid it of the inevitable weaknesses, vacillations, and mistakes of the petty bourgeoisie.

This work must be done by means of friendly persuasion, without anticipating events, without hurrying to "consolidate" organisationally that which the representatives of the rural proletarians and semi-proletarians have not yet fully realised, thought out, and digested for *themselves*. But it must be done, and a start must be made at once everywhere.

The practical demands and slogans, or, more properly, the proposals that have to be made to gain the *attention*: of the peasants, should be based on vital and urgent issues.

The first issue is that of the land. The rural proletarians will be for the complete and immediate transfer of *all* the land without exception to the whole people, and for its being taken over immediately by the local committees. But you cannot eat land. The millions of households that have no horses, implements, or seeds will gain nothing from the transfer of the land to the "people".

The question of continuing to run the big farms, wherever at all possible large-scale enterprises, directed by agri-

cultural experts and the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies and using the best machines, seeds, and most efficient farming methods, must be discussed and practical measures taken without delay.

We cannot conceal from the peasants, least of all from the rural proletarians and semi-proletarians, that small-scale farming under commodity economy and capitalism *cannot* rid humanity of mass poverty, that it is necessary to *think* about going over to large-scale farming conducted on public lines and to *tackle this job at once* by teaching the masses, and in turn *learning from the masses*, the practical expedient measures for bringing about such a transition.

Another vital and pressing issue is that of the organisation and administration of the state. It is not enough to preach democracy, not enough to proclaim it and decree it, not enough to entrust the people's "representatives" in representative institutions with its implementation. Democracy must be *built* at once, from below, through the initiative of the masses themselves, through their effective participation *in all* fields of state activity, without "supervision" from above, without the bureaucracy.

Replacement of the police, the bureaucracy, and the standing army by the universal arming of the whole people, by a universal *militia* of the entire people, women included, is a practical job that can and should be tackled immediately. The more initiative, variety, daring, and creativeness the masses contribute to this, the better. Not only the rural proletarians and semi-proletarians, but nine-tenths of the peasantry probably will follow us if we explain our proposals clearly, simply, and intelligibly by demonstrating examples and lessons from real life. Our proposals are:

- not to allow the restoration of the police;
- not to allow the restoration of the absolute powers of officials who, in effect, are undisplaceable and who belong to the landowner or capitalist class;
- not to allow the restoration of a standing army separated from the people, for such an army is the surest guarantee that attempts of all kinds will be made to stamp out freedom and restore the monarchy;
- to teach the people, down to the very bottom, the art of government not only in theory but in practice, by begin-

ning to make immediate use everywhere of the experience of the masses.

Democracy from below, democracy without an officialdom, without a police, without a standing army; voluntary social duty by a *militia* formed from a universally armed people—this is a guarantee of freedom which no tsars, no swash-buckling generals, and no capitalists can take away.

Pravda No. 34, April 16, 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

ON THE RETURN OF THE EMIGRANTS

Today's papers have published a telegram over the signatures of P. B. Axelrod, L. Martov, Ryazanov, Lunacharsky, and Natanson, reading:

"We find it absolutely impossible to return to Russia via England."

Another telegram signed by Mandelberg, member of the Second Duma, Professor Reichesberg, Felix Kon, Ustinov, Balabanova, Andronnikov, and others, reads:

"We see a way out in an agreement between the Russian and German governments ... *for an exchange* of internees ... in return for the liberation of a corresponding number of *German civilians* interned in Russia."

Why shouldn't the gentlemen of *Russkaya Volya* and *Yedinstvo* declare these political emigrants, too, to be German agents?

Pravda No. 34, April 16, 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

OUR VIEWS

A REPLY TO THE RESOLUTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE SOVIET OF SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES

The newspapers for April 16 carried the following resolution:

“Having discussed comrades’ reports concerning the spread of disruptive propaganda carried on under a revolutionary and often even under a Social-Democratic banner, particularly propaganda by those who call themselves Leninists; regarding such propaganda to be no less harmful than any other counter-revolutionary propaganda from the right; and realising at the same time that it is impossible to take repressive measures against propaganda so long as it remains merely propaganda, the Executive Commission of the Soviet of Soldiers’ Deputies considers it essential that measures should be taken to counteract this propaganda by our own propaganda and agitation. We must make our organisations strong enough to be able at any moment to meet any counter-revolutionary action, no matter where it comes from, by effective actions of our own. We express our earnest wish that the Executive Committee launch a systematic campaign in the press, and especially in the army units, against the disruptive propaganda.”

If we compare this resolution with the statement made in *Izvestia*’s leading article (for April 17) against the “dishonourable and outrageous persecution”, we see at once the political division on the subject which has made itself manifest *in practice*, namely: *Russkaya Volya*, the chief hounding agency; Mr. Plekhanov’s *Yedinstvo*, which repeats “such a method of struggle”; both recognized as such by *Dyelo Naroda*.

A *different* stand is taken by the Executive Commission of the Soviet of Soldiers’ Deputies, which simply declares that “it is impossible to take repressive measures against propaganda so long as it remains merely propaganda”.

That is why we reprint the resolution of the Executive Commission in full and consider it useful to examine it on its merits.

The resolution declares Lenin's propaganda to be "no less harmful than any other counter-revolutionary propaganda from the right".

Let us examine the gist of the differences between (1) counter-revolutionary propaganda from the right, (2) the propaganda *for* and in support of the Provisional Government, and (3) our own propaganda.

The Rights are out for the overthrow of the Provisional Government and the restoration of the monarchy.

The Provisional Government has *promised* to act in agreement with the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

Our propaganda is: all power in the state to be turned over to the Soviets *alone*, because the Soviets unquestionably represent the overwhelming majority of the nation. To achieve this, we want by "explanation" (as Lenin distinctly stated in his theses* the very first day) to make the majority of the nation see the necessity for such a transfer of power.

The Rights, then, are for a monarchic government. The capitalists are for a capitalist government (for that is what the Provisional Government is); they promise to act in agreement with the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

We want to convince the majority of the people that power must reside *solely* in the Soviets.

It is perfectly obvious that *even* from the point of view of those who advocate an agreement with the Provisional Government, our propaganda cannot be regarded as "no less harmful than any other counter-revolutionary propaganda from the right". The advocates of an agreement now have the backing of the majority of the people! How then can they maintain that our propaganda *urging* the majority to take over all the power is "no less harmful than propaganda from the right"?

This is a glaring inconsistency.

* See p. 23 of this volume.—*Ed.*

The Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies can hardly uphold this view of its Executive Commission for long.

To proceed.

What essentially are our differences?

We differ mainly on three points:

1. On the question of the land. We are for the peasants taking *all* the land immediately by a decision of their own majority in each locality, thus increasing production of grain and meat for the soldiers.

The Provisional Government is for an "agreement" between the peasants and the landowners, i.e., an "agreement" between three hundred peasants and one landowner.

The future will show whether the majority of the people are with us or with the Provisional Government on this question.

2. We are for a republic where, from the bottom up, there will be no police, no standing army (instead of a standing army, we believe, there should be a universal arming of the whole people), no bureaucracy, who, in effect, are undisplaceable and privileged by high bourgeois, salaries. We want all public officers to be elective and displaceable at any time, and their pay to be on a proletarian scale.

The Provisional Government is for restoring the police of the usual type; it is for a standing army, for the usual kind of officials.

3. The Provisional Government is for continuing *the war* and *the kind* of war which Nicholas the Bloody started. The Provisional Government is for confirming the secret, predatory treaties concluded by him *without consulting the will of the people* and even without making them public.

We are against such a war, we are against the confirmation of the treaties, against their non-publication.

We urge all nations, without exception, to put an end to the war by concluding, not a coercive, but a truly democratic peace, that would give freedom to all nations and nationalities. We want to show the people that in order to end the war by a truly non-coercive peace it is necessary that the state power be placed wholly and exclusively in the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. For so long as the capitalists and landowners (Guchkov, Lvov, Milyukov) are in power, the war will remain a capitalist-directed one, all promises of peace without annexations

will remain mere promises, and distrust of the capitalists' government on the part of the world's working masses will continue; and that means the war will drag on.

Question: What if the state power in Russia passed to the Soviets but Germany *failed* to effect a revolution that would rid it of both Wilhelm II and the *German Guchkovs and Milyukovs* (for if the German Nicholas II were replaced by the German Guchkovs and Milyukovs, there would be no change whatever as far as the war is concerned)?

Our answer is: Power in the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies would be the power of the majority of the people, and that majority consists of workers and poor peasants. They are *really* not interested in annexations, they will renounce them not in word, but *in deed*; they will *really* stop being watchdogs of the capitalists' profits.

Under such conditions *we too would agree* to a revolutionary war against the capitalists of any country, because that would really be a war against the interests of Capital in general, and not a war in the interest of the capitalists of one particular country.

Question: How can we advance the cause of peace right now, immediately and practically, if it is impossible to end the war by simply sticking the bayonets into the ground?

Our answer is: The war cannot be terminated by the simple expedient of sticking the bayonets into the ground, or generally by the unilateral withdrawal of any of the warring nations. There is, and can be, only one practical and immediate way of hastening peace (apart from the victory of the workers' revolution over the capitalists), and that is the fraternisation of the soldiers at the front.

We must immediately, in the most energetic manner, and by all the means at our disposal encourage fraternisation of the soldiers of *both* warring groups at the front.

This fraternisation has already begun. Let us help it along.

These are our views. We are firmly convinced that the majority of the people will *not* say that they are "no less harmful than any other counter-revolutionary propaganda from the right".

HOW THEY TIED THEMSELVES TO THE CAPITALISTS

In its editorial of April 17, *Finansovaya Gazeta*,⁷¹ organ of the big capitalists and banks, discloses a fact of stupendous importance, namely, how the parties of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Menshevik Social-Democrats, etc., have bound themselves hand and foot by tying themselves to the capitalists through their notorious "agreement" with the Provisional Government.

Here is the full text of the article:

THE LEFTS AND THE LOAN

The Liberty Loan issued by the Provisional Government has not evoked in Left-wing circles the enthusiasm that it has met with among the population at large.

The Left-wing press has split up into three groups. Lenin's *Pravda* has come out definitely against the Loan, expressing the point of view of the Bolsheviks. Plekhanov's *Yedinstvo* strongly supports the Loan. Finally, the other organs of the socialist press—*Rabochaya Gazeta*, *Zemlya i Volya*, and *Volya Naroda*—have taken a "middle" stand, neither here nor there; they are not exactly for the Loan, nor are they exactly against it. This is the position also of the Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies, which decided to support the Loan in principle, but is now having its doubts and is wavering. *Dyen* was right when it recently reproved this central and most powerful group, which includes the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, for its uncertain and ambiguous stand.

As if to confirm the justice of this reproof, the Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies yesterday again returned to the once settled question of the Loan and had a discussion about it. N. S. Chkheidze announced that the government was expected shortly to issue a new statement exhaustively explaining its stand on issues of foreign and domestic policy. Until then, N. S. Chkheidze proposed that consideration of the question of supporting the Loan be postponed.

This attitude of the Lefts is puzzling, to say the least. After all, someone has to run the government and carry out the reforms which suffering Russia has been craving for.

One of the two: either the present government enjoys the confidence of the Lefts, having so far done nothing to shirk the obligations it has assumed; or it does not enjoy such confidence. In the latter case, the Lefts, in withdrawing their support of the Provisional Government, must take upon themselves not only "control" over its activities, but the whole burden of government and responsibility before the people and history. If, however, they cannot blame the Provisional Government for anything that it has done up to now, then naturally, they have no right to wait for its future statements and should give it their full support. In any case, this equivocalness, this evasive reticence, these mental reservations on their part are quite intolerable. On the one hand, this does not in the least lighten the responsibility of the Provisional Government, which cannot even plead isolation against the verdict of history; on the other, this practically deprives the government of the support of the broad democratic masses and thus puts it in a difficult position.

Straightforwardness has always been a primary virtue of socialist trends. Socialist parties have always eschewed a policy of evasion, philistine spinelessness, and elastic opportunism. But now, in the question of the Loan, the central groups of Russian socialism have abandoned these traditional principles of theirs and taken to the path of Octobrist⁷² pussyfooting. Public opinion has a right to ask that they make their attitude on the question of the Loan perfectly clear, that they honestly and openly declare their participation or non-participation in it and thus fulfil their moral obligation to the Provisional Government, which means, either to give it the backing of the Left groups or to make known their disagreement with it.

The bank bosses are men of business. They take a sane view of politics: once you've promised to support the capitalist government (which is conducting an imperialist war), then come across with the Loan.

Correct! Having bound themselves hand and foot, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks have meekly surrendered to the capitalists. The government's promise "shortly to issue a new statement exhaustively [!] explaining [it has been by now explained more than enough!] its stand on issues of foreign and domestic policy" is nothing but an empty phrase.

No "statements" in the form of declarations, assurances, or pronouncements will alter the fact of the matter. And the fact of the matter is that the capitalist government of Lvov, Guchkov, Milyukov and Co. represents the interests of capitalism, is bound up with those interests, and cannot

(even if it wanted to) break free from the imperialist, annexationist policies of conquest.

To gain the “*backing*” of the “Lefts” by means of empty non-committal phrases, that is, to use the authority of the Lefts to bolster up its imperialist policy without receding a step from it—this is what our imperialist government is trying to do, this is what, objectively, Chkheidze and his friends are helping it to do.

“Octobrist pussyfooting”—what a winged little phrase! This is not only a practical, but also a correct evaluation of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik political line by people who really know what it’s all about.

Pravda No. 36, May 3
(April 20), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

A PROLETARIAN MILITIA

On April 14 our paper published a report from a correspondent in Kanavino, Nizhni-Novgorod Gubernia, to the effect that “*a workers’ militia paid for by the factory managements has been introduced at practically all the factories*”.

Kanavino district, our correspondent reports, has sixteen factories and about thirty thousand workers, not counting railway employees. The organisation of a workers’ militia paid for by the capitalists therefore embraces a considerable number of the largest enterprises in the locality.

The organisation of a workers’ militia to be paid for by the capitalists is a measure of tremendous—it will be no exaggeration to say, gigantic and decisive—importance, both practically and in principle. The revolution cannot be made safe, its gains cannot be assured, its further development is *impossible*, until this measure has become general, until it is carried through all over the country.

The bourgeois and landowner republicans, who turned republican after they saw that it was impossible to rule the people *otherwise*, are trying to establish a republic that would be as monarchical as possible; something like that in France, which Shchedrin called a republic without republicans.⁷³

At the present time, when the landowners and capitalists have come to realise the strength of the revolutionary masses, the most important thing for them is to *safeguard* the most essential institutions of the old regime, to safeguard the old instruments of oppression: the police, the bureaucracy, the standing army. They are trying to reduce the “civil militia” to an institution of the old type, i.e., to small detachments of armed men standing apart from the people

and as close as possible to the bourgeoisie and under the command of men from among the bourgeoisie.

The minimum programme of the Social-Democrats calls for the replacement of the standing army by a universal arming of the people. Most of the official Social-Democrats in Europe and most of our own Menshevik leaders, however, have "forgotten" or put aside the Party's programme, substituting chauvinism ("defencism") for internationalism, reformism for revolutionary tactics.

Yet now of all times, at the present revolutionary moment, it is most urgent and essential that there be a universal arming of the people. To assert that, while we have a revolutionary army, there is no need to arm the proletariat, or that there would "not be enough" arms to go round, is mere deception and trickery. The thing is to begin organising a universal militia straight away, so that everyone should learn the use of arms even if there is "not enough" to go round, for it is not at all necessary that the people have enough weapons to arm everybody. The people must learn, one and all, how to use arms, they must belong, one and all, to the militia which is to replace the police and the standing army.

The workers do not want an army standing apart from the people; what they want is that the workers and soldiers should *merge* into a single militia consisting of all the people.

Failing this, the apparatus of oppression will remain in force, ready today to serve Guchkov and his friends, the counter-revolutionary generals, and tomorrow Radko Dmitriev or some pretender to the throne and builder of a plebiscite monarchy.

The capitalists need a republic now, because they cannot "manage" the people otherwise. But what they need is a "parliamentary" republic, i.e., one where democracy would be limited to democratic *elections*, to the right of sending to parliament individuals who, as Marx aptly remarked, *represent* the people and *oppress* the people.⁷⁴

The opportunists of contemporary Social-Democracy, who have substituted Scheidemann for Marx, have memorised the rule that parliamentarism "should be utilised" (which is absolutely correct), but have forgotten what Marx taught concerning proletarian democracy as *distinguished* from bourgeois parliamentarism.

The people need a republic in order to educate the masses in the methods of democracy. We need *not only* representation along democratic lines, but the building of the entire state administration from the bottom up by the masses themselves, their effective participation in all of life's steps, their active role in the administration. *Replacement* of the old organs of oppression, the police, the bureaucracy, the standing army, by a universal arming of the people, by a really universal militia, is the only way to guarantee the country a maximum of security against the restoration of the monarchy and to *enable* it to go forward firmly, systematically and resolutely towards socialism, not by "introducing" it from above, but by raising the vast mass of proletarians and semi-proletarians to the art of state administration, to the use of the *whole* state power.

Public service through a police standing above the people, through bureaucrats, who are the most faithful servants of the bourgeoisie, and through a standing army under the command of landowners and capitalists—that is the ideal of the bourgeois parliamentary republic, which is out to perpetuate the rule of Capital.

Public service through a really universal people's militia, composed of men and women, a militia capable partly of replacing the bureaucrats—this, combined with the principle of elective office and displaceability of all public officers, with payment for their work according to proletarian, not "master-class", bourgeois standards, is the ideal of the working class.

This ideal has not only become a part of our programme, it has not only won a place in the history of the labour movement in the West, namely, in the experience of the Paris Commune; it has not only been evaluated, stressed, explained and recommended by Marx, but it was actually put into practice by the Russian workers in the years 1905 and 1917.

The Soviets of Workers' Deputies, in point of significance, in point of the type of government they create, are institutions of precisely that kind of democracy which does away with the old organs of oppression, and takes the road of a universal militia.

But how can the militia be made universal when the proletarians and semi-proletarians are herded in the factories,

crushed by unbearable labour for the landowners and the capitalists?

There is only one way: the workers' militia must be paid for by the capitalists.

The capitalists must pay the workers for the hours and days which they give to public service.

This reliable method is being adopted by the working masses themselves. The example of the Nizhni-Novgorod workers should become a model for all Russia.

Comrade workers, make the peasants and the rest of the people see the need for a universal militia in place of the police and the old bureaucracy! Introduce such and only such a militia! Introduce it through the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, through the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, through the organs of local self-government that fall into the hands of the working class. Do not under any circumstances be content with a bourgeois militia. Draw the women into public service on an equal footing with the men. See to it that the capitalists pay the workers for days devoted to public service in the militia!

Learn the methods of democracy by actual practice, right now, on your own, from the bottom up—rouse the masses to effective, immediate, universal participation in government—this and this alone will assure the full triumph of the revolution and its unswerving, purposeful and systematic advance.

BANKRUPTCY?

We have been informed that the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies has just received a Note which our Provisional Government forwarded to all its representatives abroad.

This Note, apparently, is that very "statement" which N. S. Chkheidze had expected to be issued within three days and which was to contain definite pronouncements against annexations.

But what do we find?

The Note contains a forthright declaration by the Provisional Government to the effect that Russia will fight to the end, that Russia remains true to her obligations to the Allies.

This Note has had the effect of a bombshell.

Among the majority of the Executive Committee, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, and others, there is complete bewilderment. The bankruptcy of the entire policy of "agreements" is obvious—and it has come much sooner than we expected.

Talk in the Contact Commission will not end the imperialist war.

**RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS)
OF APRIL 20 (MAY 3), 1917
ON THE CRISIS CAUSED
BY THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT'S NOTE
OF APRIL 18 (MAY 1), 1917**

The Provisional Government's Note has fully demonstrated the correctness of the position which our Party adopted in the resolution of the Petrograd City Conference, namely, (1) that the Provisional Government is an out-and-out imperialist government bound hand and foot by Anglo-French and Russian capital; (2) that all the promises it has made or may make (as to "ascertaining the will of the people for peace", etc.) are nothing but deceit; (3) that the Provisional Government, irrespective of its composition, *cannot* renounce annexations, because in this war, and especially at this moment, the capitalist class is tied by banking capital; (4) that the policy of the petty bourgeoisie pursued by the Narodniks, Mensheviks and most of the leaders of the present Soviet of Workers' Deputies, a policy of encouraging false hopes as to the possibility of "improving" the capitalists (i.e., the Provisional Government) by "corrective measures", has once again been exposed by this Note.

In view of this, the Central Committee finds:

1) that any change in the composition of the present government (the resignation of Milyukov, the recall of Kerensky, etc.) would only be imitating the worst methods of bourgeois parliamentary republicanism, which *substitutes* for the struggle of classes the rivalry of cliques and the reshuffling of individuals;

2) that the only means of salvation for the mass of the petty-bourgeois population, which vacillates between the capitalists and the working class, is to unreservedly join the revolutionary proletariat, which is the only class capable of really breaking the fetters of finance capital and the policy of annexation. Only by taking—with the support of the majority of the people—the whole power of state into its own hands, will the revolutionary proletariat, together with the revolutionary soldiers, create, in the shape of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, a government which will be trusted by the workers of all countries and which will alone be capable of quickly putting an end to the war by means of a truly democratic peace.

Pravda No. 37,
May 4 (April 21), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

APPEAL TO THE SOLDIERS OF ALL THE BELLIGERENT COUNTRIES

Brothers, soldiers!

We are all worn out by this frightful war, which has cost millions of lives, crippled millions of people and caused untold misery, ruin, and starvation.

And more and more people are beginning to ask themselves: What started this war, what is it being waged for?

Every day it is becoming clearer to us, the workers and peasants, who bear the brunt of the war, that it was started and is being waged by the capitalists of all countries for the sake of the capitalists' interests, for the sake of world supremacy, for the sake of markets for the manufacturers, factory owners and bankers, for the sake of plundering the weak nationalities. They are carving up colonies and seizing territories in the Balkans and in Turkey—and for this the European peoples must be ruined, for this we must die, for this we must witness the ruin, starvation and death of our families.

The capitalist class in all countries is deriving colossal, staggering, scandalously high profits from contracts and war supplies, from concessions in annexed countries, and from the rising price of goods. The capitalist class has imposed contribution on all the nations for decades ahead in the shape of high interest on the billions lent in war loans. And we, the workers and peasants, must die, suffer ruin, and starve, must patiently bear all this and strengthen our oppressors, the capitalists, by having the workers of the different countries exterminate each other and feel hatred for each other.

Are we going to continue submissively to bear our yoke, to put up with the war between the capitalist classes? Are we going to let this war drag on by taking the side of our own national governments, our own national bourgeoisies, our own national capitalists, and thereby destroying the international unity of the workers of all countries, of the whole world?

No, brother soldiers, it is time we opened our eyes, it is time we took our fate into our own hands. In all countries popular wrath against the capitalist class, which has drawn the people into the war, is growing, spreading, and gaining strength. Not only in Germany, but even in Britain, which before the war had the reputation of being one of the freest countries, hundreds and hundreds of true friends and representatives of the working class are languishing in prison for having spoken the honest truth against the war and against the capitalists. The revolution in Russia is only the first step of the first revolution; it should be followed and will be followed by others.

The new government in Russia—which has overthrown Nicholas II, who was as bad a crowned brigand as Wilhelm II—is a government of the capitalists. It is waging just as predatory and imperialist a war as the capitalists of Germany, Britain, and other countries. It has endorsed the predatory secret treaties concluded by Nicholas II with the capitalists of Britain, France, and other countries; it is not publishing these treaties for the world to know, just as the German Government is not publishing its secret and equally predatory treaties with Austria, Bulgaria, and so on.

On April 20 the Russian Provisional Government published a Note re-endorsing the old predatory treaties concluded by the tsar and declaring its readiness to fight the war to a victorious finish, thereby arousing the indignation even of those who have hitherto trusted and supported it.

But, in addition to the capitalist government, the Russian revolution has given rise to spontaneous revolutionary organisations representing the vast majority of the workers and peasants, namely, the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in Petrograd and in the majority of Russia's cities. Most of the soldiers and some of the workers in Russia—like very many workers and soldiers in Germany—still

preserve an unreasoning trust in the government of the capitalists and in their empty and lying talk of a peace without annexations, a war of defence, and so on.

But, unlike the capitalists, the workers and poor peasants have no interest in annexations or in protecting the profits of the capitalists. And, therefore, every day, every step taken by the capitalist government, both in Russia and in Germany, will expose the deceit of the capitalists, will expose the fact that as long as capitalist rule lasts there can be no really democratic, non-coercive peace based on a real renunciation of all annexations, i.e., on the liberation of all colonies without exception, of all oppressed, forcibly annexed or underprivileged nationalities without exception, and the war will in all likelihood become still more acute and protracted.

Only if state power in both the, at present, hostile countries, for example, in both Russia and Germany, passes wholly and exclusively into the hands of the revolutionary Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which are really capable of rending the whole mesh of capitalist relations and interests, will the workers of both the belligerent countries acquire confidence in each other and be able to put a speedy end to the war on the basis of a really democratic peace that will really liberate *all* the nations and nationalities of the world.

Brothers, soldiers!

Let us do everything we can to hasten this, to achieve this aim. Let us not fear sacrifices—any sacrifice for the workers' revolution will be less painful than the sacrifices of war. Every victorious step of the revolution will save hundreds of thousands and millions of people from death, ruin, and starvation.

Peace to the hovels, war on the palaces! Peace to the workers of all countries! Long live the fraternal unity of the revolutionary workers of all countries! Long live socialism!

*Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.
Petrograd Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.
Editorial Board of Pravda*

THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT'S NOTE

The cards are on the table. We have every reason to be grateful to Guchkov and Milyukov for their Note, printed today in all the newspapers.

The majority of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the Narodniks, Mensheviks, all those who until now have appealed for confidence in the Provisional Government, have received condign punishment. They hoped, expected, and believed that the Provisional Government, under the beneficent influence of "contact" with Chkheidze, Skobelev, and Steklov, would for ever repudiate annexations. Things have turned out somewhat differently....

In its Note of April 18, the Provisional Government speaks of "the desire of the whole nation [!] to fight the world war out *to a decisive victory*".

"Needless to say," the Note adds, "the Provisional Government ... will fully stand by its obligations towards our Allies."

Short and clear. War to a decisive victory. The alliance with the British and French bankers is sacred....

Who concluded this alliance with "our" Allies, i.e., with the British and French multimillionaires? The tsar, Rasputin, the tsar's gang, of course. But to Milyukov and Co. this treaty is sacred.

Why?

Some say: because Milyukov is insincere, he is a crafty person and so on.

But that is not the point. The point is that Guchkov, Milyukov, Tereshchenko, and Konovalov are spokesmen of the *capitalists*. And the seizure of foreign lands is necessary

to the capitalists. They will receive new markets, new places to export capital to, new opportunities to arrange profitable jobs for tens of thousands of their sons, etc. The point is that at the present moment the *interests* of the Russian capitalists are identical with those of the British and French capitalists. That, and that alone, is the reason why the tsar's treaties with the British and French capitalists are precious to the Provisional Government of the Russian capitalists.

The new Note of the Provisional Government will pour oil on the flames. It can only arouse a bellicose spirit in Germany. It will help Wilhelm the Brigand to go on deceiving "his own" workers and soldiers and drag them into a war "to a finish".

The new Note of the Provisional Government puts the issue squarely: what next?

From the very first moment of our revolution, the British and French capitalists have been assuring us that the Russian revolution was made solely and exclusively in order to fight the war out "to a finish". The capitalists want to plunder Turkey, Persia, and China. If this should entail the slaughter of another ten million or so Russian muzhiks—what of it? What we need is a "decisive victory".... And now the Provisional Government, with utter frankness, has adopted the same course.

"Fight—because we want to plunder."

"Die in your tens of thousands every day—because 'we' have not yet fought it out and have not yet got our share of the spoils!"

No class-conscious worker, no class-conscious soldier will support the policy of "confidence" in the Provisional Government any longer. The policy of confidence is bankrupt.

Our Social-Democratic City Conference stated in its resolution that the correctness of *our* view would be corroborated now every day*. But not even we had expected events to move so fast.

The present Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is faced with the alternative: either to swallow the pill offered

* See pp. 154-55 of this volume.—*Ed.*

by Guchkov and Milyukov, which would mean renouncing an independent political role once and for all, for tomorrow Milyukov would put his "feet on the table" and reduce the Soviet to a mere cipher; or to reject Milyukov's Note, which would mean breaking with the old policy of confidence and adopting the course proposed by *Pravda*.

Naturally, a middle-of-the-road course might be found. But would it be for long?

Workers and soldiers, you must now loudly declare that there must be only one power in the country—the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The Provisional Government, the government of a handful of capitalists, must make way for these Soviets.

Written April 20 (May 3), 1917

Published May 4 (April 21), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 37

Published according
to the newspaper text

A BASIC QUESTION

A LINE OF ARGUMENT USED BY SOCIALISTS WHO HAVE GONE OVER TO THE BOURGEOISIE

Mr. Plekhanov gives an excellent illustration of this. In his First of May letter to the Association of Socialist Students published in today's *Rech*, *Dyelo Naroda*, and *Yedinstvo*, he writes:

“It [the International Socialist Congress of 1889] understood that the social, or more exactly—the socialist, revolution presupposed prolonged educational and organisational work within the working class. This has now been forgotten here by people who call on the Russian working masses to seize political power, an act which would make sense only if the objective conditions necessary for a social revolution prevailed. These conditions do not exist yet....”

And so on in the same strain, ending with an appeal for “whole-hearted support” of the Provisional Government.

This argument of Mr. Plekhanov is the typical argument of a small group of “have-beens”, who call themselves Social-Democrats. And because it is typical it is worth dealing with at length.

First of all, is it reasonable and honest to quote the First Congress of the Second International, and not the last one?

The First Congress of the Second International (1889-1914) took place in 1889, the last, in Basle, in 1912. The Basle Manifesto, which was adopted *unanimously*, speaks precisely, definitely, directly, and clearly (so that not even the Plekhanovs can twist the sense of it) of a *proletarian revolution*, and one, moreover, which is considered in *connection* with the very war which subsequently broke out (in 1914).

It is not difficult to understand why those socialists who have gone over to the bourgeoisie are prone to "forget" the Basle Manifesto as a whole, or this most important part of it.

Secondly, the seizure of political power by "the Russian working masses", writes our author, "would make sense only if the objective conditions necessary for a social revolution prevailed".

This is a muddle, not a thought.

Assuming *even* that the word "social" here is a misprint for "socialist", this is not the only muddle. What classes do the Russian working masses consist of? Everybody knows that they consist of workers and peasants. Which of these classes is in the majority? The peasants. Who are these peasants as far as their class position is concerned? Petty proprietors. The question arises: if the petty proprietors constitute the majority of the population and if the objective conditions for socialism are lacking, then how *can* the majority of the population declare in favour of socialism? Who *can* say anything or who says anything about establishing socialism against the will of the majority?

Mr. Plekhanov has got mixed up in the most ludicrous fashion at the very outset.

To find himself in a ridiculous position is not the worst punishment a man can suffer, who, following the example of the capitalist press, creates an "enemy" of his own imagination instead of quoting the exact words of this or that political opponent.

Further. In whose hands should "political power" be, *even* from the point of view of a vulgar bourgeois democrat from *Rech*? In the hands of the majority of the population. Do the "Russian working masses", so inaptly referred to by the muddled social-chauvinist, constitute the majority of the population in Russia? Undoubtedly they do—the overwhelming majority!

How then, without betraying democracy—even democracy as understood by Milyukov—*can* one be opposed to the "seizure of political power" by the "Russian working masses"?

The deeper you go into the wood, the thicker the trees. Each step in our analysis opens up new abysses of confusion in Mr. Plekhanov's ideas.

The social-chauvinist is against political power passing to the majority of the population in Russia!

Mr. Plekhanov doesn't know what he is talking about. He has also confused—though Marx as far back as 1875 made a point of warning against such confusion—the “working masses” with the mass of proletarians and semi-proletarians.⁷⁵ We shall explain the difference to the ex-Marxist, Mr. Plekhanov.

Can the majority of the peasants in Russia demand and carry out the nationalisation of the land? Certainly it can. Would this be a socialist revolution? It would not. It would *still* be a bourgeois revolution, for the nationalisation of the land is a measure that is not incompatible with the existence of capitalism. It is, however, a *blow* to private ownership of the most important means of production. Such a blow would *strengthen* the proletarians and semi-proletarians far more than was the case during the revolutions of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Further. Can the majority of the peasants in Russia declare for the merging of all the banks into one, for having a branch of a single nation-wide state bank in each village?

It can, because the convenience and advantage for the people of such a measure are unquestionable. *Even* the “defencists” could be for such a measure, as it would heighten Russia's capacity for “defence” enormously.

Is it economically possible to immediately effect such a merger of all the banks? Without a doubt, it is quite possible.

Would this be a socialist measure? No, this would *not yet* be socialism.

Further. Can the majority of the peasants in Russia declare in favour of the Sugar Manufacturers' Syndicate passing into the hands of the government, to be controlled by the workers and peasants, and the price of sugar being lowered?

It certainly can, for that would benefit the majority of the people.

Is that possible economically? It is quite possible, since the Sugar Syndicate has not only developed economically into a single industrial organism on a national scale, but *had already* been subject to “state” control under tsarism

(i.e., control by government officials serving the capitalists).

Would the taking over of the syndicate by the democratic-bourgeois, peasant, state be a socialist measure?

No, that would not yet be socialism. Mr. Plekhanov could have easily convinced himself of that if he had recalled the commonly known axioms of Marxism.

The question is: Would such measures as the merging of the banks and turning over the Sugar Manufacturers' Syndicate to a democratic peasant government *enhance or diminish* the role, importance, and influence of the proletarians and semi-proletarians among the general mass of the population?

They would undoubtedly enhance them, for those measures *do not* grow out of a system of petty production; they were *not* made possible by those "objective conditions" which were *still* lacking in 1889, but which *already* exist now.

Such measures would inevitably enhance the role, importance, and influence upon the population of the workers, especially the city workers, who are the vanguard of the proletarians and semi-proletarians of town and country.

After these measures will have been put into effect, further *progress* towards socialism in Russia would become fully possible, and given the aid of the more advanced and experienced workers of Western Europe, who have broken with their West-European Plekhanovs, Russia's *real* transition to socialism would be *inevitable*, and the success of such a transition would be *assured*.

This is the line of argument which every Marxist and socialist who has not gone over to the side of "his own" national bourgeoisie should use.

Written April 20 (May 3), 1917

Published May 4 (April 21), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 37

Published according
to the newspaper text

ICONS VERSUS CANNONS, PHRASES VERSUS CAPITAL

The Note of the Provisional Government on war to a victorious finish has aroused indignation even among those who nourished illusory hopes for a possible renunciation of annexations on the part of the government of capitalists. The newspapers that have been acting as mouthpieces of this petty-bourgeois policy of illusory hopes are today either mumbling in dismay, like *Rabochaya Gazeta*, or are trying to turn this indignation against individuals.

*Novaya Zhizn*⁷⁶ writes: "There is no place in the government of democratic Russia for a champion of the interests of international capital! We are sure the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies will act promptly in taking the most energetic measures towards rendering Mr. Milyukov harmless." And *Dyelo Naroda* expresses the same piece of philistine wisdom in the following words. Milyukov's Note, it says, "tries to reduce to nought a statement of the greatest international importance approved by the entire cabinet".

Icons versus cannons. Phrases versus capital. The government's statement renouncing annexations was a piece of utterly worthless diplomatic verbiage, which might deceive an ignorant muzhik, but could not "confuse" the leaders of the petty-bourgeois Social-Democratic and Socialist-Revolutionary parties, the writers of *Novaya Zhizn* and *Dyelo Naroda*, unless they were willing to be deceived. What empty phrases are these about there being "no place in the government of democratic Russia for a champion of the interests of international capital!" Educated people ought to be ashamed of themselves, writing such piffle.

The whole Provisional Government is a government of the capitalist class. It is a matter of class, not of persons. To attack Milyukov personally, to demand, directly or indirectly, his dismissal, is a silly comedy, for *no* change of personalities can change anything so long as the *classes* in power are unchanged.

To draw a line between the “democracy” of Russia, Britain, France, etc., and the championing of capital is to sink to the level of the economic and political wisdom of a Gapon.⁷⁷

It is pardonable for ignorant muzhiks to demand of the capitalist a “promise” that he “live righteously” and not capitalistically, that he should *not* “champion the interests of capital”. But for the leaders of the Petrograd Soviet, for the writers of *Novaya Zhizn* and *Dyelo Naroda* to adopt such methods means to nourish the illusory hopes which the people place in the capitalists, hopes that are most harmful and ruinous to the cause of freedom, to the cause of the revolution.

Pravda No. 37,
May 4 (April 21), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

THE LOGIC OF CITIZEN V. CHERNOV

Citizen V. Chernov writes in *Dyelo Naroda* of April 16:

“He [Lenin] did not even think that, even from his own point of view, Britain’s consent to his journey would have been better in that it would have been due to the pressure of the Russian revolution, whereas Germany’s consent may appear more suspicious as to its motives.”

Conclusion: Lenin is something of a maniac.

Very well. But what about the thirty arrivals who belong to *different* parties, including the Bund? Are they all maniacs? Did none of them “even think”?

Further. How about the telegram from Martov, *Natanson* (the leader of the S.R. Party, mark you), Axelrod, and others, saying: “We find it *absolutely* impossible to return to Russia via England”? (See *Rabochaya Gazeta* for April 15.)

Does this mean that both Martov and Natanson are maniacs, that they too “did not even think”?

But these witnesses, who *do not* belong to our Party—Natanson is a witness *belonging to V. Chernov’s party*—confirm the *fact* that it was *absolutely* impossible to make the journey any other way!

What is the conclusion? It is this—either V. Chernov is a queer fellow who uses phrases to avoid the *facts*, or he has allowed himself to be so frightened by philistine-chauvinist gossip and slander that he has lost his head.

MR. PLEKHANOV'S FUTILE ATTEMPTS TO EXTRICATE HIMSELF

In No. 15 of *Yedinstvo*, Mr. Plekhanov, with an abundance of abuse unusual even for that abusive publication, attacks *Pravda* in an attempt to suppress two incontestably established facts.

You won't succeed in hushing them up, gentlemen!

Fact number one. Mr. Plekhanov *did not reprint* our report, published in *Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet No. 32, for April 5, 1917, or *the resolution* of the Executive Committee.

This is not only an expression of anarchist disrespect for the elected representatives of the *majority* of the soldiers? but the dishonest method of a riot-monger.

Fact number two. Mr. Plekhanov's hounding tactics has called forth a protest *not* from us, but from *Dyelo Naroda*, to which even such a colleague of Guchkov and Milyukov as Kerensky contributes. *Dyelo Naroda* for April 13, 1917, wrote of Mr. Plekhanov's *Yedinstvo* in black and white:

"We are accustomed to see such words and such a method of struggle in the columns of *Russkaya Volya*. But to see them employed in articles written by socialists is, frankly speaking, painful and depressing."

This is the testimony of defencist witnesses, who politically are a thousand times closer to Mr. Plekhanov than to us.

What sort of readers does Mr. Plekhanov count on when he *dismisses* the testimony of a *witness* by saying that *Dyelo Naroda* has made an "inept remark"?

The witness has exposed Mr. Plekhanov's riot-mongering methods.

There was a time when Mr. Plekhanov was a socialist, Now he has sunk to the level of *Russkaya Volya*.

No amount of abuse can do away with the fact that *even Dyelo Naroda* has exposed Mr. Plekhanov.

In an editorial reprinted in our issue for April 18 *Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet (No. 43, April 17) called this hounding campaign "dishonest and disgusting".

This witness states bluntly that this dishonest and disgusting hounding campaign on the part of the dark forces and their newspapers was and is a fact. Mr. Plekhanov, fallen to the level of *Russkaya Volya*, stands hopelessly condemned.

Pravda No. 37,
May 4 (April 21), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

**RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS)
ADOPTED APRIL 21 (MAY 4), 1917**

Having considered the situation which has arisen in Petrograd after the imperialist, annexationist, and predatory Note of the Provisional Government of April 18, 1917, and after a number of meetings and demonstrations of the people held in the streets of Petrograd on April 20, the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. resolves:

1. Party propagandists and speakers must refute the despicable lies of the capitalist papers and of the papers supporting the capitalists to the effect that we are holding out the threat of *civil war*. This is a despicable lie, for only at the present moment, as long as the capitalists and their government cannot and dare not use force against the masses, as long as the mass of soldiers and workers are freely expressing their will and freely electing and displacing *all* authorities—at *such a moment* any thought of civil war would be naïve, senseless, preposterous; at such a moment *there must be compliance with the will of the majority of the population* and free criticism of this will by the discontented minority; should violence be resorted to, the responsibility will fall on the Provisional Government and its supporters.

2. By their outcries against civil war the government of the capitalists and its newspapers are only trying to conceal the reluctance of the capitalists, who admittedly constitute an insignificant minority of the people, to submit to the will of the majority.

3. In order to learn the will of the majority of the population in Petrograd, where there is now an unusually large number of soldiers who are familiar with the sentiment of

the peasants and correctly express it, a popular vote must at once be arranged in all the districts of Petrograd and its suburbs to ascertain what the attitude is towards the government's Note, what support the various parties enjoy, and what kind of Provisional Government is desired.

4. All Party propagandists must advocate these views and this proposal at factories, in regiments, in the streets, etc., by means of *peaceful* discussion and peaceful demonstrations, as well as meetings everywhere; we must endeavour to organise regular voting in factories and regiments, taking care that order and comradely discipline are strictly observed.

5. Party propagandists must again and again protest against the despicable slander spread by the capitalists alleging that our Party stands for a separate peace with Germany. We consider Wilhelm II as bad a crowned brigand meriting execution as Nicholas II, and the German Guchkovs, i.e., the German capitalists, just as much annexationists, robbers, and imperialists as the Russian, British, and all other capitalists. *We are against* negotiating with the capitalists, we are for negotiating and fraternising *with the revolutionary workers and soldiers of all countries*. We are convinced that the reason why the Guchkov-Milyukov government is trying to aggravate the situation is because it knows that the workers' revolution in Germany is beginning, and that this revolution will be a blow to the capitalists of all countries.

6. When the Provisional Government spreads rumours about utter and unavoidable economic chaos, it is not only trying to frighten the people into leaving the power in the hands of this Provisional Government, but is also vaguely, fumblingly expressing the profound and indubitable truth that *all* the nations of the world have been led into a blind alley, that the war waged in the interests of the capitalists has driven them to the brink of an abyss, and that there is really no way out except through the transfer of power to the revolutionary class, i.e., to the revolutionary proletariat, which is capable of adopting revolutionary measures.

If there are any stocks of grain, etc., in the country, the new government of the workers and soldiers will know how to dispose of them too. But if the capitalist war has brought

economic ruin to a stage where there is no bread at all, the capitalist government will only aggravate the condition of the people instead of improving it.

7. We consider the policy of the present majority of leaders of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, of the Narodnik and Menshevik parties, to be profoundly erroneous, since confidence in the Provisional Government, attempts to compromise with it, dickering over amendments, etc., would in fact mean only so many more useless scraps of paper and useless delays; and besides, this policy threatens to create a divergence between the will of the Soviet on the one hand, and that of the majority of revolutionary soldiers at the front and in Petrograd and of the majority of workers, on the other.

8. We call upon those workers and soldiers who believe that the Soviet must change its policy and renounce the policy of confidence in and compromise with the capitalist government, to hold new elections of delegates to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and to send to that body only people who would steadfastly hold to a quite definite opinion consonant with the actual will of the majority.

Pravda No. 38,
May 5 (April 22), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

HONEST DEFENCISM REVEALS ITSELF

Events in Petrograd during the last few days, especially yesterday, illustrate how right we were in speaking of the "honest" defencism of the *mass* as distinguished from the defencism of the leaders and parties.

The mass of the population is made up of proletarians, semi-proletarians, and poor peasants. They are the vast majority of the nation. *These* classes are not at all interested in annexations. Imperialist policies, the profits of banking capital, incomes from railways in Persia, lucrative jobs in Galicia and Armenia, putting restraints on the freedom of Finland—all these are things in which these classes are not interested.

But all these things taken together just go to make up what is known in science and the press as imperialist, annexationist, predatory policy.

The crux of the matter is that the Guchkovs, Milyukovs, and Lvovs—be they even all paragons of virtue, disinterestedness, and love of their fellow-man—are the spokesmen, leaders, and chosen representatives of the capitalist *class*, a class which has a vested interest in a predatory, annexationist policy. This class invested billions "in the war", and is making hundreds of millions "out of the war" and annexations (i.e., out of the subjugation or forced *incorporation* of alien nationalities).

To believe that the capitalist *class* will "mend its ways", will cease to be a capitalist class, will give up its profits, is a fatuous hope, an idle dream, and in effect a deception of the people. Only petty-bourgeois politicians, fluctuating between capitalist and proletarian policies, can entertain or encourage such fatuous hopes. Herein lies the mistake of

the present leaders of the Narodnik parties and the Mensheviks, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Chernov, and the others.

The mass representatives of defencism are not at all versed in politics. They have not been able to learn politics from books, from participation in the Duma, or from close observation of people engaged in politics.

The mass representatives of defencism still do not know that wars are waged by *governments*, that governments represent the interests of certain *classes*, that the present war, on the part of both belligerent groups, is waged by the capitalists in the predatory interests of and for the predatory aims of the capitalists.

Unaware as they are of this, the mass representatives of defencism argue quite simply: we do not want annexations, we demand a democratic peace, we do not want to fight for Constantinople, for putting down Persia, for plundering Turkey, and so on; we “demand” that the Provisional Government give up its policy of annexations.

The mass representatives of defencism are *sincere* in wishing this, not in a personal but in a class sense, because they speak for classes that are *not interested* in annexations. But what these representatives of the masses do not know is that the capitalists and their government may throw over the policy of annexations in words, may dangle promises and mouth fine phrases, but cannot *really* abandon the idea of annexations.

That is why the mass representatives of defencism were so strongly and legitimately shocked by the Provisional Government’s Note of April 18.

People familiar with politics could not have been surprised by this Note, for they knew only too well that when the capitalists “renounce annexations” they do not really mean it. It is just the usual trick and phrase-mongering of diplomats.

But the “honest” mass representatives of defencism were surprised, shocked, indignant. They *felt*—they did not understand it quite clearly, but they felt that they had been tricked.

This is the *essence* of the crisis and it should be clearly distinguished from the opinions, expectations, and suppositions of single individuals and parties.

To patch up this crisis for a while with a new declaration, with a new Note (that is what Mr. Plekhanov's advice in *Yedinstvo* and the aspirations of Milyukov and Co., on the one hand, and those of Chkheidze and Tsereteli, on the other, amount to)—to paper over the cracks with a new promise is of course possible, but this can do nothing but harm. A new promise would inevitably mean a new deception of the masses; therefore a new outburst of indignation, and such an outburst, if lacking intelligent orientation, might easily become very harmful.

The masses should be told the whole truth. The government of the capitalists *cannot* abandon annexations; it is caught in its own meshes, and there is no escape. It feels, it realises, it sees that without revolutionary measures (of which only a revolutionary class is capable) *there is no way out*, and it is becoming panicky, losing its head; it promises one thing, but does another; at one minute it threatens the masses with violence (Guchkov and Shingaryov), at the next it proposes that the power be taken out of its hands.

Economic ruin, crisis, the horrors of war, an impasse from which there is no way out—this is what the capitalists have brought *all* the nations to.

Indeed there is no way out—*except* through the transfer of power to the revolutionary class, to the revolutionary proletariat, which alone, supported by the majority of the population, is capable of aiding the revolution to victory in *all* the belligerent countries and leading humanity to lasting peace and liberation from the yoke of capitalism.

MAD CAPITALISTS OR WEAK-MINDED SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS?

Rabochaya Gazeta writes today:

“We have been strongly opposed to the civil warmongering by Lenin’s followers. But now the signal for civil war no longer comes from Lenin’s followers, but from the Provisional Government, which has published a statement that makes, a mockery of democratic aspirations. This is truly a mad step, and immediate determined action by the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies is needed if we are to avert the dire consequences of this madness.”

What can be more absurd and ridiculous, than this fairy-tale about “civil warmongering” on our part, when we have declared in the clearest, most formal and unequivocal manner that all our work should be focused on *patiently explaining* the proletarian policy as opposed to the petty-bourgeois, defencist craze with its faith in the capitalists?

Does *Rabochaya Gazeta* really fail to understand that these outcries about civil war are now raised by the capitalists in order to break the will of the majority of the people?

Is there a grain of Marxism in proclaiming the conduct of the capitalists “madness”, when, caught in the vise of Russian and Anglo-French imperialist capital, they cannot act otherwise?

Mr. Plekhanov, in today’s *Yedinstvo*, is more forthright in expressing the policy of the entire petty-bourgeois-defencist bloc when he calls upon the Soviet to come “*to an agreement*” with the Provisional Government. An amusing appeal, this. It is like serving mustard after dinner.

Don’t we all know that an agreement was concluded long ago? That it has been in existence since the beginning of the revolution? The whole thing is that the present crisis

is due to the fact that the agreement has proved to be a scrap of paper, an empty promise! To answer the “accursed questions” with which the *failure* of the existing agreement has now squarely confronted the people by calling for an “agreement” in general, without saying a word about its terms or about *real* guarantees for it, to answer by sighing and crying “O ye Madmen!”—is this not a tragicomedy of the petty-bourgeois Louis Blancs? (Louis Blanc was a labour leader only in words, in reality he was the tail of the bourgeoisie.)

“Immediate determined action is needed,” *Rabochaya Gazeta* importantly declares. What kind of “action”, my dear fellow-citizens? You cannot say what, you do not know what yourselves. All you do know is to *declaim*, because, like Louis Blanc, you have forgotten about the class struggle, you have side-tracked the class struggle under cover of petty-bourgeois phraseology and declamation.

Written April 21 (May 4), 1917

Published May 5 (April 22), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 38

Published according
to the newspaper text

THE ADVICE OR ORDER OF SHINGARYOV, AND THE ADVICE OF A LOCAL SOVIET

The Petrograd *Gazeta-Kopeika*⁷⁸ in its issue of April 14 published the following report:

PRIVATELY-OWNED LANDS TO BE REQUISITIONED

Kishinev, April 13. In view of the fact that there are great tracts of uncultivated land in the uyezd that are not leased on account of the high rent, the Akkerman Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies has recommended all village and volost committees to requisition all unused privately-owned lands for crop cultivation through the Commissar in cases where voluntary agreements are impossible.

If this report is true, it is extremely important. Obviously, the Akkerman Soviet is guided by practical considerations, and is no doubt closely and intimately acquainted with local conditions. It considers correctly that the crops must be increased at all costs to the fullest possible extent. But how can this be done when the landowners have raised the rents scandalously?

By voluntary agreements with the landowners?

This is what Minister Shingaryov emphatically advises from Petrograd; he threatens the peasants, and protests vehemently against arbitrary action. It is all very well for Shingaryov to argue from Petrograd. It is all very well for him to defend the landowners in the name of the government of the capitalists.

But how about the situation of the peasants locally? Does not the Akkerman Soviet appraise the situation more correctly when it speaks of "voluntary agreements" being "impossible"?

**RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS)
ADOPTED IN THE MORNING,
OF APRIL 22 (MAY 5), 1917**

The political crisis that developed between April 19 and 21 must be regarded, at least in its initial stage, as having passed.

The petty-bourgeois mass, angered by the capitalists, first swung *away from* them *towards* the workers; but two days later they again followed the Menshevik and Narodnik leaders, who stand for "confidence" in and "compromise" with the capitalists.

These leaders have compromised, completely surrendered all their positions, contenting themselves with the empty and purely verbal reservations of the capitalists.

The causes of the crisis have not been removed, and the recurrence of such crises is unavoidable.

The nature of the crisis is that the petty-bourgeois mass is vacillating between its age-old faith in the capitalists and its resentment against them, a tendency to place its faith in the revolutionary proletariat.

The capitalists are dragging out the war and covering up the fact by phrase-mongering. Only the revolutionary proletariat can put an end to, and is working towards putting an end to the war by means of a world revolution of the workers, a revolution which is obviously mounting in our country, ripening in Germany, and drawing closer in a number of other countries.

The slogan "Down with the Provisional Government!" is an incorrect one at the present moment because, in the

absence of a solid (i.e., a class-conscious and organised) majority of the people on the side of the revolutionary proletariat, such a slogan is either an empty phrase, or, objectively, amounts to attempts of an adventurist character.⁷⁹

We shall favour the transfer of power to the proletarians and semi-proletarians only when the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies adopt our policy and are willing to take the power into their own hands.

The organisation of our Party, the consolidation of the proletarian forces, clearly proved inadequate at the time of the crisis.

The slogans of the moment are: (1) To *explain* the proletarian line and the proletarian way of ending the war; (2) To *criticise* the petty-bourgeois policy of placing trust in the government of the capitalists and compromising with it; (3) To carry on propaganda and agitation from group to group *in every regiment, in every factory, and, particularly, among the most backward masses, such as domestic servants, unskilled labourers, etc., since it was their backing in the first place that the bourgeoisie tried to gain during the crisis;* (4) To *organise, organise and once more organise* the proletariat, in every factory, in every district and in every city quarter.

The resolution of the Petrograd Soviet of April 21 banning all street meetings and demonstrations for two days must be unconditionally obeyed by every member of our Party. The Central Committee already distributed yesterday morning, and is today publishing in *Pravda*, a resolution which states that "at such a moment any thought of civil war would be senseless and preposterous", that all demonstrations must be peaceful ones, and that the responsibility for violence will fall on the Provisional Government and its supporters.* Our Party therefore considers that the above-mentioned resolution of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies as a whole (and especially the part banning armed demonstrations and shooting in the air) is entirely correct and must be *unconditionally obeyed*.

We call upon all the workers and soldiers to consider carefully the results of the crisis of the last two days and

* See p. 201 of this volume.—*Ed.*

to send as delegates to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and to the Executive Committee only such comrades as express the will of the majority. In all cases where a delegate does not express the opinion of the majority, new elections should be held in the factories and barracks.

Pravda No. 39,
May 6 (April 23), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

LESSONS OF THE CRISIS

Petrograd and the whole of Russia have passed through a serious political crisis, the first political crisis since the revolution.

On April 18 the Provisional Government issued its unhappily notorious Note, which confirmed the predatory aims of the war clearly enough to arouse the indignation of the masses, who had honestly believed in the desire (and ability) of the capitalists to "renounce annexations". On April 20-21 Petrograd was in a turmoil. The streets were crowded; day and night knots and groups of people stood about, and meetings of various sizes sprang up everywhere; big street processions and demonstrations went on without a break. Yesterday evening, April 21, the crisis, or, at any rate, the first stage of the crisis, apparently came to an end with the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, and later the Soviet itself, declaring themselves satisfied with the "explanations", the amendments to the Note and the "elucidations" made by the government (which in fact boil down to empty phrases, saying absolutely nothing, changing nothing and committing the government to nothing). They considered the "incident settled".

Whether the masses consider the "incident settled", the future will show. Our task now is to make a careful study of the *forces*, the classes, that revealed themselves in the crisis, and to draw the relevant lessons for our proletarian party. For it is the great significance of all crises that they make manifest what has been hidden; they cast aside all that is relative, superficial, and trivial; they sweep away the political litter and reveal the real mainsprings of the *class struggle*.

Strictly speaking, the capitalist government on April 18 merely reiterated its previous notes, in which the imperialist war was invested with diplomatic equivocations. The soldiers were angry because they had honestly believed in the sincerity and peaceful intentions of the capitalists. The demonstrations began as *soldiers'* demonstrations, under the contradictory, misguided and ineffectual slogan: "Down with Milyukov" (as though a change of persons or groups could change the *substance* of policy!).

This means that the broad, unstable, and vacillating mass, which is closest to the peasantry and which by its scientific class definition is petty-bourgeois, swung *away from* the capitalists *towards* the revolutionary workers. It was the swing or movement of this mass, strong enough to be a *decisive* factor, that caused the crisis.

It was at this point that other sections began to stir: *not* the middle but the extreme elements, *not* the intermediary petty bourgeoisie but the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, started to come out on to the streets and organise.

The bourgeoisie seized Nevsky Prospekt—or "Milyukov" Prospekt as one paper called it—and the adjacent quarters of prosperous Petrograd, the Petrograd of the capitalists and the government officials. Officers, students, and "the middle classes" demonstrated *in favour* of the Provisional Government. Among the slogans, "Down with Lenin" frequently appeared on the banners.

The proletariat rallied in *its own* centres, the working-class suburbs, around the slogans and appeals of our Party's Central Committee. On April 20-21 the Central Committee adopted resolutions, which were immediately passed on to the proletariat through the Party organisations. The workers poured through the *poor*, less central districts, and then in groups got through to Nevsky. By their mass character and solidarity, these demonstrations were very different from those of the bourgeoisie. Many banners carried the inscription "All Power to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies".

On Nevsky there were clashes. The "hostile" demonstrations tore down each other's banners. The Executive Committee received news by telephone from various places that there was shooting on both sides, that there were killed and

wounded; but the information was extremely contradictory and unconfirmed.

The bourgeoisie shouted about the "spectre of civil war", thus expressing its fear that the real masses, the actual majority of the nation, might seize power. The petty-bourgeois leaders of the Soviet, the Mensheviks and Narodniks—who since the revolution in general, and during the crisis in particular, have had no definite party policy—allowed themselves to be intimidated. In the Executive Committee almost half the votes were cast against the Provisional Government on the eve of the crisis, but now thirty-four votes (with nineteen against) are cast *in favour* of returning to a policy of confidence in and agreement with the capitalists.

And the "incident" was considered "settled".

What is the *essence* of the class struggle? The capitalists are *for* dragging out the war under cover of empty phrases and false promises. They are caught in the meshes of Russian, Anglo-French and *American* banking capital. The proletariat, as represented by its class-conscious vanguard, stands *for* the transfer of power to the revolutionary class, the working class and the semi-proletarians, *for* the development of a world workers' revolution, a revolution which is clearly developing also in Germany, and *for* terminating the war by means of *such* a revolution.

The vast mass of people, chiefly the petty bourgeoisie, who still believe the Menshevik and Narodnik leaders and who have been absolutely intimidated by the bourgeoisie and are carrying out *its* policy, although with reservations, are swinging now to the right, now to the left.

The war is terrible; it has hit the vast mass of the people hardest of all; it is these people who are becoming aware, albeit still very vaguely, that the war is criminal, that it is being carried on through the rivalry and scramble of the capitalists, for the division of *their* spoils. The world situation is growing more and more involved. *The only way out* is a world workers' revolution, a revolution which is *now* more advanced in Russia than in any other country, but which is clearly mounting (strikes, fraternisation) in Germany too. And the people are wavering: wavering between confidence in their old masters, the capitalists, and bitterness towards them; between confidence in the new class, the

only consistently revolutionary class, which opens up the prospect of a bright future for all the working people—the proletariat—and a vague awareness of its role in world history.

This is not the first time the petty bourgeoisie and semi-proletarians have wavered *and it will not be the last!*

The lesson is clear, comrade workers! There is no time to be lost. The first crisis will be followed by others. You must devote *all* your efforts to enlightening the backward, to making extensive, comradely and direct contact (not only by meetings) with every regiment and with every group of working people who have not had their eyes opened yet! *All* your efforts must be devoted to consolidating your own ranks, to organising the workers from the bottom upwards, including every district, every factory, every quarter of the capital and its suburbs! Do *not* be misled by those of the petty bourgeoisie who “compromise” with the capitalists, by the defencists and by the “supporters”, nor by individuals who are inclined to be in a hurry and to shout “Down with the Provisional Government!” before the majority of the people are solidly united. The crisis cannot be overcome by violence practised by individuals against individuals, by the local action of small groups of armed people, by Blanquist attempts to “seize power”, to “arrest” the Provisional Government, etc.

Today’s task is to explain more precisely, more clearly, more widely the proletariat’s policy, *its* way of terminating the war. Rally more resolutely, more widely, wherever you can, to the ranks and columns of the proletariat! Rally round your Soviets; and within them endeavour to rally behind you a majority by comradely persuasion and by reelection of individual members!

Written April 22 (May 5), 1917

Published May 6 (April 23),
1917 in *Pravda* No. 39

Published according
to the newspaper text

HOW A SIMPLE QUESTION CAN BE CONFUSED

Commenting on the resolution of the Central Committee of April 20 concerning the necessity of transferring power to the revolutionary proletariat "*with the support of the majority of the people*", today's *Dyen* writes:

"Very simple, then what's the hitch? Instead of passing resolutions, come and take the power."

We have here a typical example of the methods used by the bourgeois press. People pretend not to understand the simplest thing, and ensure themselves—on paper—an easy victory. Anybody who says "take the power" should not have to think long to realise that an attempt to do so *without as yet* having the backing of the majority of the people would be adventurism or Blanquism (*Pravda* has made a special point of warning against this in the clearest, most unmistakable and unequivocal terms).

There is a degree of freedom now in Russia that enables the will of the majority to be gauged by the make-up of the Soviets. Therefore, to make a serious, not a Blanquist, bid for power, the proletarian party must *fight for influence* within the Soviets.

All this has been gone over and hammered out by *Pravda* again and again, and only stupidity or malice can fail to grasp it. Let the reader judge for himself to which of these two unenviable categories *Rabochaya Gazeta* belongs when it describes the "recommendation" (made to the Soviet) "to take power into its own hands" as "irresponsible provocation", as "demagogy, devoid of all sense of political responsibility,

light-heartedly urging democrats towards civil strife and war, and inciting the workers and soldiers not only against the government but against the Soviet itself” and so on.

Can one imagine a worse muddle than this, when the blame on the question of demagoguery is laid at the wrong door?

Prime Minister Lvov is reported by the evening paper *Birzheviye Vedomosti*⁸⁰ for April 21 as having said literally the following:

“Up till now the Provisional Government has invariably met with the support of the Soviet’s leading organ. During the last fortnight these relations have changed. The Provisional Government is suspect. Under the circumstances it is in no position to administer the state, as it is difficult to do anything in an atmosphere of distrust and discontent. Under such circumstances it would be best for the Provisional Government to resign. It is fully alive to its responsibility towards the country, in whose interests it is prepared to resign immediately if need be.”

Is this not clear? Is it possible not to understand why, *after* such a speech, our Central Committee proposed that a public opinion poll be held?

What have “civil war”, “provocation”, “demagoguery” and similar frightening words to do with it, when the Prime Minister himself declares the government’s readiness “to resign” and recognises the Soviet as the “leading organ”?

One or the other: either *Rabochaya Gazeta* believes that in making such statements Lvov is misleading the people, in which case it should not urge confidence in and support of the government, but *no confidence and no support*; or *Rabochaya Gazeta* believes that Lvov is really “prepared to resign”, in which case, why all this outcry about civil war?

If *Rabochaya Gazeta* understands the situation correctly, understands that the *capitalists* are raising a hullabaloo about civil war in order to cover up *their* desire to flout the will of the majority by means of force, then why this outcry on the part of the newspaper?

Lvov is entitled to ask the Soviet to approve and accept his policy. Our Party is entitled to ask the Soviet to approve and accept our, proletarian, policy. To speak of “provocation”

and so on is to reveal an utter lack of understanding of what it is all about or to sink to base demagogy. We are entitled to fight for influence and for a majority in the Soviet and the Soviets, and we are going to fight for them. We repeat:

*“We shall favour the transfer of power to the proletarians and semi-proletarians only when the Soviets of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies adopt our policy and are willing to take the power into their own hands.”**

Written April 22 (May 5), 1917

Published May 6 (April 23), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 39

Published according
to the newspaper text

* See p. 211 of this volume.—*Ed.*

“DISGRACE” AS THE CAPITALISTS AND THE PROLETARIANS UNDERSTAND IT

Today's *Yedinstvo* prints on its front page in bold type a proclamation signed by Plekhanov, Deutsch, and Zasulich. We read:

“Every nation has a right freely to determine its own destiny. Wilhelm of Germany and Karl of Austria will never agree to this. In waging war against them, we are defending our own freedom, as well as the freedom of others. Russia cannot betray her Allies. That would bring disgrace upon her.”

That is how all capitalists argue. To them non-observance of treaties *between* capitalists is a disgrace, just as to monarchs non-observance of treaties between monarchs is a disgrace.

What about the workers? Do they regard non-observance of treaties concluded by monarchs and capitalists a disgrace?

Of course not! Class-conscious workers are *for* scrapping *all* such treaties, they are for recognising only such agreements *between the workers and soldiers of all* countries as would benefit the people, i.e., not the capitalists, but the workers and poor peasants.

The workers of the world *have* a treaty of their own, namely, the Basle Manifesto of 1912 (signed, among others, by Plekhanov and betrayed by him). This workers' “treaty” calls it a “crime” for workers of different countries to shoot at each other for the sake of the capitalists' profits.

The writers in *Yedinstvo* argue like capitalists (so do *Rech* and others), and not like workers.

It is quite true that neither the German monarch nor the Austrian will agree to freedom for every nation, as

both these monarchs are crowned brigands, and so was Nicholas II. Nor, for one thing, are the English, Italian, and other monarchs (the “Allies” of Nicholas II) any better. To forget this is to become a monarchist or a defender of the monarchists.

Secondly, the *uncrowned* brigands, i.e., the capitalists, have shown themselves in the present war to be no better than the monarchs. Has not American “democracy”, i.e., the democratic capitalists, robbed the Philippines, and does it not rob Mexico?

The German Guchkovs and Milyukovs, if they were to take the place of Wilhelm II, would be brigands, *too*, no better than the British and Russian capitalists.

Third, will the Russian capitalists “agree” to “freedom” for nations which they themselves oppress: Armenia, Khiva, Ukraine, Finland?

By evading this question the *Yedinstvo* writers are, in effect, turning into defenders of “our own” capitalists in their predatory war with other capitalists.

The internationalist workers of the world stand for the overthrow of *all* capitalist governments, for the rejection of all agreements and understandings with any capitalists, for *universal peace* concluded by *the revolutionary workers of all countries*, a peace capable of giving real freedom to “every” nation.

Written April 22 (May 5), 1917

Published May 6 (April 23), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 39

Published according
to the newspaper text

**INTERVIEW GIVEN TO E. TORNIAINEN
APRIL 23 (MAY 6), 1917⁸¹**

We believe the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies at the present moment represents the majority of the workers and soldiers. On our part, we (Bolsheviks) are working for influence and a majority in the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and in all the local Soviets. We advise the workers and soldiers to re-elect members of the Soviets who do not fully represent the will of the majority.

So far the majority of the Soviet follows the Narodnik and Menshevik leaders.

We have no doubt that the Soviet will be able to retain power so long as it is supported by a considerable and strong majority of workers and soldiers. The more so as that power, instead of dragging on the war, would bring it to a speedy end on terms most favourable to the masses. We also believe that the Soviet, being a body elected by the workers and soldiers, can definitely win over the overwhelming majority of workers and soldiers.

Whether or not the capitalist government will refuse to convoke the Constituent Assembly will depend upon the development and strength of the counter-revolution. The elements of such a counter-revolution without doubt already exist.

Ending the war by a truly democratic peace depends upon the course which the revolution of the world proletariat will take. This revolution has gained good ground now in Russia, and is undoubtedly gaining ground in Germany (mass strikes, fraternisation).

Työmies No. 122, May 8, 1917

First published in Russian
in 1926 in N. Lenin (V. Ulyanov), *Works*,
Vol. XX, Part 2

Published according
to the text in *Työmies*
Translated from the Finnish

FOOLISH GLOATING

Rabochaya Gazeta gloats and crows over the recent resolution of the Central Committee which has revealed (in connection, be it noted, with the now published declaration of the representatives of the Bolshevik group in the Soviet) certain disagreements within our Party.

The Mensheviks may gloat and crow as much as they like. It does not worry us in the least. The Mensheviks have no organisation. Chkheidze and Tsereteli are one thing—they are ministers without portfolios; the Organising Committee is another thing—they are Social-Democrats without a policy; the “defencists” are a third thing—they support Plekhanov. Martov is a fourth thing—he will not support the loan. Small wonder that people who have neither an organisation nor a party crow and caper light-heartedly at discovering a fault in somebody else’s organisation.

We have no reason to fear the truth. Yes, comrade workers, the crisis has revealed certain shortcomings in our organisation. We must set to work to correct them!

The crisis revealed a very feeble attempt to move “slightly leftward” of the Central Committee. Our Central Committee did not yield, and we do not doubt for a moment that harmony within our Party is already being restored, a harmony that is voluntary, intelligent, and complete.

Every day proves the soundness of our line. To put it through effectively, the proletarian masses must be *thrice* as well organised as they are now. Every district, every block, every factory, every military company must have a strong, close-knit organisation capable of acting *as one* man. Each such organisation must have direct ties with the centre, with the Central Committee, and those ties must be

strong, so that the enemy may not break them at the first blow; those ties must be permanent, must be strengthened and tested every day and every hour, *so that the enemy does not catch us unawares.*

Comrade workers! Let us build a strong proletarian mass organisation everywhere, from the bottom up, both among the working-class mass and in the army, and let us start it immediately. We shall not be put out by the malicious glee of our enemies, we shall not be daunted by occasional errors and shortcomings. We shall correct them. The future is working for us.

Pravda No. 40,
May 8 (April 25), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

***THE SEVENTH (APRIL)
ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE
OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.)***⁸²

APRIL 24-29 (MAY 7-12), 1917

1

SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE OPENING
OF THE CONFERENCE
APRIL 24 (MAY 7)

Comrades, we are assembled here as the first conference of the proletarian party, in conditions of the Russian revolution and a developing world revolution as well. The time is approaching when the assertion of the founders of scientific socialism, and the unanimous forecast of the socialists who gathered at the Basle Congress, that world war would inevitably lead to revolution, is being everywhere proved correct.

In the nineteenth century Marx and Engels, following the proletarian movements in various countries and analysing the possible prospects for a social revolution, repeatedly stated that the roles would, in general, be distributed among these countries in proportion to, and in accordance with, their historically conditioned national features. They expressed their idea briefly as: The French worker will begin, the German will finish it.

The great honour of beginning the revolution has fallen to the Russian proletariat. But the Russian proletariat must not forget that its movement and revolution are only part of a world revolutionary proletarian movement, which in Germany, for example, is gaining momentum with every passing day. Only from this angle can we define our tasks.

I declare the All-Russia Conference open. Please nominate your candidates for election to the Presiding Committee.

A brief report published
May 12 (April 29), 1917
in *Sotsial-Demokrat* No. 43

First published in full
in 1921 in N. Lenin
(V. Ulyanov), *Works*,
Vol. XIV, Part 2

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

2

REPORT ON THE CURRENT SITUATION
APRIL 24 (MAY 7)

Comrades, in evaluating the current situation I have to deal with an exceedingly broad subject, which, to my mind, falls into three parts. First, the estimate of the political situation proper here in Russia, our attitude towards the government and the dual power that has come into existence; second, our attitude towards the war; third, the international background to the working-class movement, a situation which has brought the workers of the world face to face with a socialist revolution.

I think, I shall have to deal only in brief with some of the points. Furthermore, I am going to submit to you a draft resolution on all these questions with this reservation, however, that, owing to the extreme lack of facilities and to the political crisis that has been created here in Petrograd, we were unable to have discussions of the resolution, or to communicate it in good time to the local comrades. I repeat, then, that these are only preliminary drafts, designed to make work easier in the committee and concentrate it on a few of the most essential questions.

I begin with the first question. If I am not mistaken, the Moscow Conference adopted the same resolution as the Petrograd City Conference. (*Interruption*: "With amendments.") I have not seen the amendments, and I cannot pass an opinion. But since the Petrograd resolution was published in *Pravda*, I shall take it for granted, if no one objects, that it is known to everybody here. I submit this as a draft resolution to the present All-Russia Conference.

Most of the parties in the petty-bourgeois bloc controlling the Petrograd Soviet represent our policy, in contrast

to their own, as a rash policy. What distinguishes our policy is our demand above all for a precise class analysis of current events. The chief sin of the petty-bourgeois bloc is that it resorts to empty phrases to conceal from the people the truth about the government's class character.

If the Moscow comrades have any amendments, they may present them now.

(Reads the resolution of the Petrograd City Conference on the attitude towards the Provisional Government.)

“Considering:

“(1) that the Provisional Government, by its class character, is the organ of landowner and bourgeois domination;

“(2) that the Provisional Government and the classes it represents are bound with indissoluble economic and political ties to Russian and Anglo-French imperialism;

“(3) that the Provisional Government is carrying out its proclaimed programme only partially, and only under pressure of the revolutionary proletariat and, to some extent, of the petty bourgeoisie;

“(4) that the forces of bourgeois and landowner counter-revolution, now being organised, have already, under cover of the Provisional Government and with the latter's obvious connivance, launched an attack on revolutionary democracy;

“(5) that the Provisional Government is avoiding fixing the date for the elections to the Constituent Assembly, preventing the arming of the people as a whole, opposing the transfer of all the land to the people, foisting upon it the landowners' way of settling the agrarian question, obstructing the introduction of an eight-hour workday, condoning counter-revolutionary propaganda in the army (by Guchkov and Co.), rallying the high-ranking officers against the soldiers, etc....”

I have read the first part of the resolution giving a class definition of the Provisional Government. There are scarcely any essential differences between this resolution and that of the Moscow comrades, as far as it is possible to judge from the latter's text alone. But the general definition of the government as counter-revolutionary is, in my opinion, incorrect. If we speak in general terms, we must specify which revolution we mean. As far as the bourgeois revolu-

tion is concerned, this cannot be said, because that revolution is already completed. As far as the proletarian and peasant revolution is concerned, such a statement is premature, for we cannot be sure that the peasants will necessarily go farther than the bourgeoisie. To express our confidence in the peasants, particularly now that they have turned to imperialism and defencism, i.e., to supporting the war, is, in my opinion, unsound. At the present moment the peasants have entered into a number of agreements with the Cadets. That is why I regard this clause in the Moscow resolution as politically incorrect. We want the peasants to go farther than the bourgeoisie, we want them to take the land from the landowners, but so far we can say nothing definite about their future conduct.

We studiously avoid the words "revolutionary democracy". We may use them when there is a question of an attack by the government, but at the present moment they are highly deceptive, for it is very difficult to distinguish the classes which have mingled in this chaos. Our task is to free those who are trailing behind. The Soviets are important to us not as a form; to us it is important what classes they represent. We must, therefore, do a great deal of work to develop the class-consciousness of the proletariat....

(Resumes reading the resolution.)

"(6) that this government, at the same time, is relying at present on the confidence of, and, to a certain extent, on an actual agreement with, the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which now unites an obvious majority of workers and soldiers, i.e., peasants;

"(7) that every step of the Provisional Government, in both its domestic and foreign policies, is bound to open the eyes, not only of the proletarians in town and country and the semi-proletarians, but also of the broad sections of the petty bourgeoisie, to the real nature of this government,

"the Conference resolves that:

"(1) in order to ensure all the state power passing into the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies or other bodies directly expressing the will of the people, prolonged work is necessary to develop proletarian class-consciousness and to unite the urban and rural proletarians

against the vacillations of the petty bourgeoisie, for only work of this nature can guarantee real advance on the part of the whole revolutionary people;

“(2) this calls for many-sided activity within the Soviets of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies, for work aimed at increasing the number of these Soviets, consolidating their power, and welding together our Party’s proletarian internationalist groups in the Soviets;

“(3) we must organise our Social-Democratic forces more effectively, so as to be able to direct the new wave of the revolutionary movement under the banner of revolutionary Social-Democracy.”

This is the sum and substance of our policy. The whole petty bourgeoisie is now wavering and trying to conceal this wavering behind the empty phrase about revolutionary democracy. We must contrapose these waverings with a proletarian line. The counter-revolutionaries wish to frustrate it by premature action. Our task is to increase the number of Soviets, to reinforce them and to consolidate the unity of our Party.

The Moscow comrades have added to Point 3 the demand for control. This control is represented by Chkheidze, Steklov, Tsereteli, and other leaders of the petty-bourgeois bloc. Control without power is an empty phrase. How can I control Britain? To control her, you would have to seize her fleet. I can understand the uneducated mass of workers and soldiers naïvely and unconsciously believing in control. You only have to think about the fundamental aspects of control, however, to realise that such a belief is a departure from the basic principles of the class struggle. What is control? If I write a paper, or a resolution, they will write a counter-resolution. To control, you must have power. If the broad mass of the petty-bourgeois bloc do not understand this, we must have the patience to explain it to them, but under no circumstances must we tell them a lie. If, however, I obscure this fundamental condition by speaking of control, then I am guilty of telling a lie and am playing into the hands of the capitalists and the imperialists. “You’re welcome to your control, but we’ll have the guns. Enjoy your control,” they say. They know that at the moment the people cannot be denied their demand. Control without

power is an empty petty-bourgeois phrase that hampers the progress of the Russian revolution. That is why I object to the Moscow comrades' third point.

As for this peculiar interlocking of two powers, in which the Provisional Government, lacking power, guns, soldiers, and the armed mass of people, leans on the Soviets that are relying so far on promises and are carrying out a policy of upholding those promises, if you want to play this game, you are doomed to failure. Our task is to keep out of this game. We shall carry on our work of explaining to the proletariat the unsoundness of this policy, and events, at every turn, will prove the correctness of our position. So far we are in the minority; the masses still do not believe us. We can wait; they will side with us when the government shows its face. The government's vacillations may repel them and they will swing over to our side; and then, taking into consideration the balance of forces, we shall say: Our time has come.

I now pass on to the question of the war. This question actually united us when we came out against the loan, the attitude towards which showed immediately and clearly the alignment of political forces. As *Rech* has stated, everybody, except *Yedinstvo*, is wavering; the entire petty bourgeoisie is for the loan—with reservations. The capitalists make a wry face and pocket the resolution with a smile, saying: "You may do the talking, but we shall do the acting." All those now voting for the loan are known as social-chauvinists the world over.

I shall now proceed to read the resolution on the war. It is in three parts: (1) a characterisation of the war from the point of view of its class significance; (2) the revolutionary defencism of the masses, something that cannot be found in any other country; (3) how to end the war.

Many of us, myself included, have had occasion to address the people, particularly the soldiers, and it seems to me that when everything is explained to them from the class point of view, there is one thing in our stand on which they are most unclear, namely, in what way we intend to end the war, in what way we think it possible to stop it. The masses are in a maze of misunderstanding, there is complete ignorance about our stand; that is why we must express ourselves most clearly on this.

(Reads the draft resolution on the war.)

“The present war is, on the part of both groups of the belligerent powers, an imperialist war, i.e., one waged by the capitalists for world domination, for division of the capitalists’ spoils, for profitable markets for finance and banking capital, and for the subjugation of the weaker nationalities.

“The transfer of state power in Russia from Nicholas II to the government of Guchkov, Lvov, and others, to the government of the landowners and capitalists, did not and could not alter the class character and meaning of the war as far as Russia is concerned.

“The fact that the new government is carrying on the same imperialist war, i.e., an aggressive war of conquest, became glaringly apparent when the government not only failed to publish the secret treaties between ex-Tsar Nicholas II and the capitalist governments of Britain, France, etc., but even formally confirmed these treaties. This was done without consulting the will of the people and with the express purpose of deceiving them, for it is well known that the secret treaties concluded by the ex-tsar are outrageously predatory treaties that give the Russian capitalists a free hand to rob China, Persia, Turkey, Austria, etc.

“For this reason no proletarian party that does not wish to break completely with internationalism, i.e., with the fraternal solidarity of the workers of all countries in their struggle against the yoke of Capital, can support the present war, or the present government, or its loans, no matter in what glowing terms these loans may be described.

“Nor can any trust be placed in the present government’s promise to renounce annexations, i.e., the conquest of foreign countries or the forcible retention of any nationality within the confines of Russia. For, in the first place, the capitalists, bound together by the thousand threads of Russian and Anglo-French banking capital, and intent on protecting the interests of capital, cannot renounce annexations in this war without at the same time ceasing to be capitalists, without renouncing the profits from the thousands of millions invested in loans, concessions, war industries, etc. And secondly, the new-government, after renounc-

ing annexations to mislead the people, declared through Milyukov (Moscow, April 9, 1917) that it had no intention of renouncing them. Finally, as revealed by *Dyelo Naroda*, a newspaper in which Minister Kerensky co-operates, Milyukov has not even sent his statement on the renunciation of annexations to other countries.

“Therefore, in warning the people against the capitalists’ empty promises, the Conference declares that it is necessary to make a clear distinction between a renunciation of annexations in word and a renunciation of annexations in deed, i.e., the immediate publication of all the secret predatory treaties, of all acts of foreign policy, and the taking of immediate steps to fully liberate all peoples who are being oppressed, kept bound to Russia by force or kept in a state of subjection by the capitalist class, which is continuing the policy of ex-Tsar Nicholas II, a policy that is a disgrace to our nation.”

The second half of this part of the resolution deals with the promises made by the government. For a Marxist, perhaps, this part is superfluous; for the people, however, it is important. That is why we must add the reasons why we do not believe those promises, why we must not trust the government. The present government’s promises to abandon its imperialist policy are not to be trusted. Our policy in this respect should not be in saying that we demand that the government publish the treaties. This would be a vain hope. To demand this of a capitalist government would be like demanding an exposure of commercial swindling. When we say that it is necessary to renounce annexations and indemnities, we should indicate how this can be done; and if we are asked who can do it, our answer will be that this step is by its very nature a revolutionary one, a step which only the revolutionary proletariat can make. Otherwise these promises will remain empty pledges and wishes used by the capitalists to keep the people in leading-strings.

(Continues reading the draft resolution.)

“The ‘revolutionary defencism’, which in Russia has now permeated almost all the Narodnik parties (the Popular Socialists, Trudoviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries), the opportunist party of the Menshevik Social-Democrats (the

Organising Committee, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, etc.), and the majority of the non-party revolutionaries, reflects, in point of class significance, the interests and point of view of the petty bourgeoisie, the small proprietors, and the well-to-do peasants, who, like the capitalists, profit by oppressing weak peoples. On the other hand, it is a result of the deception of the masses by the capitalists, who instead of publishing the secret treaties confine themselves to promises and glib talk.

“It must be admitted that the great mass of ‘revolutionary defencists’ are honest, i.e., they are *really* opposed to annexations, to conquests, to oppressing weak peoples; they are *really* working for a democratic, non-coercive peace among *all* the belligerents. This must be admitted for the reason that the class position of the urban and rural proletarians and semi-proletarians (i.e., of the people who earn their living, wholly or partly, by selling their labour-power to the capitalists) makes these classes uninterested in capitalist profits.

“Therefore, while recognising that any concessions to ‘revolutionary defencism’ are absolutely impermissible and virtually signify a complete break with internationalism and socialism, the Conference declares that our Party will preach abstention from violence as long as the Russian capitalists and their Provisional Government confine themselves to threats of violence against the people (for example, Guchkov’s unhappily notorious decree threatening the soldiers with punishment for arbitrary displacement of superiors), as long as the capitalists have *not* started using violence against the Soviets of Workers’, Soldiers’, Peasants’, Agricultural Labourers’, and other Deputies, which organise themselves freely, and freely elect and dismiss *all* public officers. Our Party will fight against the profound and fatal error of ‘revolutionary defencism’ solely by means of comradely persuasion, bringing home the truth that the attitude of unreasoning trust of the broad masses in the government of the capitalists, who are the worst enemies of peace and socialism, is, in present-day Russia, the chief obstacle to a speedy termination of the war.”

Some of the petty bourgeoisie have an interest in this policy of the capitalists—of that there can be no doubt. That

is why it would be wrong for the proletarian party at present to place any hopes in the community of interests of the proletariat and the peasantry. We are fighting to win the peasants over to our side, but they are, to a certain extent, consciously on the side of the capitalists.

There is not the slightest doubt that, as a class, the proletariat and semi-proletariat are not interested in the war. They are influenced by tradition and deception. They still lack political experience. Therefore, our task is one of patient explanation. We make no concessions to them on matters of principle; yet we cannot look upon them as social-chauvinists. This section of the population has never been socialist, nor has it the slightest idea about socialism, it is only just awakening to political life. Nevertheless, its class-consciousness is growing and broadening with extraordinary rapidity. We must be able to bring our views home to it, and this is now the most difficult task of all, particularly for a party that only yesterday worked underground.

Some may ask: Have we not gone back on our own principles? We were advocating the conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war, and now we are contradicting ourselves. But the first civil war in Russia has come to an end; we are now advancing towards the second war—the war between imperialism and the armed people. In this transitional period, as long as the armed force is in the hands of the soldiers, as long as Milyukov and Guchkov have not yet resorted to violence, this civil war, so far as we are concerned, turns into peaceful, prolonged, and patient class propaganda. To speak of civil war before people have come to realise the need for it is undoubtedly to lapse into Blanquism. We are for civil war, but only for civil war waged by a politically conscious class. He can be overthrown who is known to the people as an oppressor. There are no oppressors in Russia at present; it is the soldiers and not the capitalists who now have the guns and rifles; the capitalists are getting what they want now not by force but by deception, and to shout about violence now is senseless. One must be able to uphold the Marxist point of view, which says that this conversion of imperialist war into a civil war should be based on objective, and not subjective, conditions. For the time being we withdraw that slogan, but only for the time being. It is the

soldiers and the workers who possess the arms now, not the capitalists. So long as the government has not started war, our propaganda remains peaceful.

The government would like to see us make the first imprudent move towards revolutionary action, as this would be to its advantage. It is exasperated because our Party has put forward the slogan of peaceful demonstrations. We must not cede one iota of our principles to the petty bourgeoisie, which is now marking time. The proletarian party would be making a dangerous mistake if it based its tactics on subjective desires where organisation is required. We cannot say that the majority is with us; what we need in the present situation is caution, caution, caution. To base proletarian tactics on subjective desires means to condemn it to failure.

The third point deals with the question of how to end the war. The Marxist point of view is well known, but the difficulty is how to bring it home to the masses in the clearest form possible. We are not pacifists, and we cannot repudiate a revolutionary war. In what way does a revolutionary war differ from a capitalist war? The difference is, above all, a class difference: which class is interested in the war? What policy does the interested class pursue in that war?... In addressing the people we must give concrete answers to their questions. And so the first question is how to distinguish a revolutionary war from a capitalist war. The ordinary man in the street does not grasp the distinction, he does not understand that it is a matter of class distinction. We must not confine ourselves to theory alone, we must demonstrate in practice that we shall wage a really revolutionary war only when the proletariat is in power. I think that by presenting the question this way we are giving the clearest possible answer to the question as to what this war is about and who is waging it.

Pravda has published the draft of an appeal to the soldiers of all the belligerent countries.* We have received information that fraternisation is taking place at the front, but this fraternisation is as yet politically semi-conscious. What it lacks is a clear political idea. The soldiers have come to feel instinctively that action must come from below.

* See pp. 186-88 of this volume.—*Ed.*

The class instinct of these revolutionary-minded people has suggested this path to them as being the only correct path. For a revolution, however, this is insufficient. We want to give a clear-cut political answer. In order to put an end to this war, state power must pass to the revolutionary class. I suggest that an appeal to the soldiers of all the belligerent countries be drawn up in the name of the Conference and published in all the appropriate languages. If, instead of all these hard-worked phrases about peace conferences, half of whose members are secret or open agents of the imperialist governments, we send out this appeal, we shall achieve our purpose a thousand times quicker than we would by all those peace conferences. We refuse to have any dealings with the German Plekhanovs. When we were passing through Germany, those gentlemen, the social-chauvinists, the German Plekhanovs, tried to get into our carriage, but we told them that we would not allow a single one of them in and that if any of them did get in they would not get out again without our having a big row. Had a man like Karl Liebknecht been permitted to come to see us, we would certainly have talked matters over with him. When we issue our appeal to the working people of all countries, giving an answer to the question of how to end the war, and when the soldiers read our answer showing a political way out of the war, then fraternisation will make tremendous strides. This must be done in order to raise fraternisation from the level of an instinctive revulsion against war to a clear political understanding of how to get out of it.

I now pass on to the third question, namely, the analysis of the current situation with reference to the position of the international working-class movement and that of international capitalism. From the point of view of Marxism, in discussing imperialism it is absurd to restrict oneself to conditions in one country alone, since all capitalist countries are closely bound together. Now, in time of war, this bond has grown immeasurably stronger. All humanity is thrown into a tangled bloody heap from which no nation can extricate itself on its own. Though there are more and less advanced countries, this war has bound them all together by so many threads that escape from this tangle for any single country acting on its own is inconceivable.

We are all agreed that power must be wielded by the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. But what can and should they do if power passes to them, i.e., if power is in the hands of the proletarians and semi-proletarians? This is an involved and difficult situation. Speaking of the transfer of power, there is a danger—one that played a big part in previous revolutions, too—namely, the danger that the revolutionary class will not know what to do with state power when it has won it. The history of revolutions gives us examples of revolutions that failed for this very reason. The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which cover the whole of Russia with their network, now stand at the centre of the revolution; it seems to me, however, that we have not sufficiently studied or understood them. Should they take over the power, it will no longer be a state in the ordinary sense of the word. The world has seen no such state power functioning for any considerable length of time, but the whole world's labour movement has been approaching it. This would be a state of the Paris Commune type. Such power is a dictatorship, i.e., it rests not on law, not on the formal will of the majority, but on direct, open force. Force is the instrument of power. How, then, will the Soviets apply this power? Will they return to the old way of governing by means of the police? Will they govern by means of the old organs of power? In my opinion they cannot do this. At any rate, they will be faced with the immediate task of creating a state that is not bourgeois. Among Bolsheviki, I have compared this state to the Paris Commune in the sense that the latter destroyed the old administrative organs and replaced them by absolutely new ones that were the direct organs of the workers. I am accused of having now used a word which the capitalists fear most of all, as they have begun to interpret it as a desire for the immediate introduction of socialism. I have used it, however, only in the sense of replacing the old organs by new, proletarian ones. Marx saw in this the greatest advance of the entire world proletarian movement.⁸³ The question of the social tasks of the proletariat is of the greatest practical significance to us, first, because we are now tied up with all the other countries, and are unable to disentangle ourselves—the proletariat will either break free as a whole

or it will be crushed secondly, the existence of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is a fact. No one doubts that they cover the whole of Russia, that they are a state power and that there can be no other power. If that is so, we should form a clear idea as to what use they can make of that power. Some people say that it is the same type of power as in France or America, but they have nothing of the kind there; such a direct power does not exist there.

The resolution on the current situation is in three parts. The first defines the objective situation created by the imperialist war, the position in which world capitalism finds itself; the second deals with the state of the international proletarian movement; the third deals with the tasks of the Russian working class when power passes into its hands. In the first part I formulate the conclusion that during the war capitalism has developed even more than before the war. It has already taken over entire fields of production. Twenty-seven years ago, in 1891, when the Germans adopted their Erfurt Programme,⁸⁴ Engels said that one could not continue to define capitalism as a system of production lacking planning.⁸⁵ This is now out of date; once there are trusts there can no longer be lack of planning. Capitalism has made gigantic strides, particularly in the twentieth century, and the war has done more than was done for twenty-five years. State control of industry has made progress in Britain as well as in Germany. Monopoly, in general, has evolved into state monopoly. The objective state of affairs has shown that the war has stepped up capitalist development, which has moved forward from capitalism to imperialism, from monopoly to state control. All this has brought the socialist revolution nearer and has created the objective conditions for it. Thus the socialist revolution has been brought closer as a result of the war.

Before the war Britain enjoyed a greater degree of freedom than any other country in the world, a point which politicians of the Cadet type have always stressed. There was freedom there because there was no revolutionary movement there. The war wrought an instant change. In a country where for decades no attempt was ever made to encroach upon the freedom of the socialist press, a typically tsarist censorship was immediately established, and all the prisons were

filled with socialists. For centuries the capitalists there had learned to rule the people without the use of force, and if they have resorted to force, it means that they feel that the revolutionary movement is growing, that they cannot act otherwise. When we said that Liebknecht represented the masses, although he was one against a hundred German Plekhanovs, we were told that that was a utopian idea, an illusion. Yet, anyone who has, if only once, attended workers' meetings abroad knows that the sympathy of the masses for Liebknecht is an undeniable fact. His bitterest opponents had to manoeuvre when facing the public, and if they did not pretend to be his supporters, neither did they dare to come out against him. Now things have gone still farther. We now have mass strikes, we have fraternisation at the front. To attempt prophecy in this respect would be a great mistake, but we cannot get away from the fact that sympathy for the International is growing, that revolutionary unrest is beginning in the German army. This is a fact which shows that the revolution in Germany is mounting.

What, then, are the tasks of the revolutionary proletariat? The main flaw, the main error, in all the socialists' arguments is that this question is put in too general a form, as the question of the transition to socialism. What we should talk about, however, are concrete steps and measures. Some of them are ripe, and some are not. We are now at a transition stage. Clearly, we have brought to the fore new forms, unlike those in bourgeois states. The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies are a form of state which does not exist and never did exist in any country. This form represents the first steps towards socialism and is inevitable at the beginning of a socialist society. This is a fact of decisive importance. The Russian revolution has created the Soviets. No bourgeois country in the world has or can have such state institutions. No socialist revolution can be operative with any other state power than this. The Soviets must take power not for the purpose of building an ordinary bourgeois republic, nor for the purpose of making a direct transition to socialism. This cannot be. What, then, is the purpose? The Soviets must take power in order to make the first concrete steps towards this transition, steps that can and should be made. In this respect fear is the worst enemy. The

masses must be urged to take these steps immediately, otherwise the power of the Soviets will have no meaning and will give the people nothing.

I shall now attempt to answer the question as to what concrete measures we can suggest to the people without running counter to our Marxist convictions.

Why do we want the power to pass to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies?

The first measure the Soviets must carry out is the nationalisation of the land. All the peoples are talking about nationalisation. Some say it is a most utopian measure; nevertheless, everybody comes to accept it, because land-ownership in Russia is so complicated that the only way out is to remove all boundary lines dividing the land and make it the property of the state. Private ownership of land must be abolished. That is the task confronting us, because the majority of the people are in favour of it. To accomplish it we need the Soviets. This measure cannot be carried out with the help of the old government officials.

The second measure. We cannot be for "introducing" socialism—this would be the height of absurdity. We must preach socialism. The majority of the population in Russia are peasants, small farmers who can have no idea of socialism. But what objections can they have to a bank being set up in each village to enable them to improve their farming? They can say nothing against it. We must put over these practical measures to the peasants in our propaganda, and make the peasants realise that they are necessary.

Quite another thing is the Sugar Syndicate. This is a clear fact. Here our proposal must be direct and practical: these already fully developed syndicates must be taken over by the state. If the Soviets intend to assume power, it is only for such ends. There is no other reason why they should do so. The alternative is: either the Soviets develop further, or they die an ignominious death as in the case of the Paris Commune. If it is a bourgeois republic that is needed, this can very well be left to the Cadets.

I shall conclude by referring to a speech which impressed me most. I heard a coal miner deliver a remarkable speech. Without using a single bookish word, he told us how they had made the revolution. Those miners were not concerned with

the question as to whether or not they should have a president. They seized the mine, and the important question to them was how to keep the cables intact so that production might not be interrupted. Then came the question of bread, which was scarce, and the miners also agreed on the method of obtaining it. Now that is a real programme of the revolution, not derived from books. That is what I call really winning power locally.

Nowhere is the bourgeoisie so well established as in Petrograd. Here the capitalists have the power in their hands. But throughout the country, the peasants, without pursuing any socialist tasks, are carrying out purely practical measures. I think that only this programme of the revolutionary movement indicates the true path of the revolution. We are for these measures being started on with the greatest caution and circumspection. But it is only these measures that must be carried out; we should go ahead in this direction only. There is no other way out. Unless this is done the Soviets will be broken up and will die an ignominious death. But if the revolutionary proletariat should actually win power, it will only be for the sake of going forward. And to go forward means to take definite steps to get us out of the war—words alone won't do it. The complete success of these steps is only possible by world revolution, if the revolution kills the war, if the workers of the whole world support the revolution. Taking power is, therefore, the only practical measure and the only way out.

A brief report published
May 8 (April 25), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 40

First published in full
in 1921 in N. Lenin
(V. Ulyanov), *Works*,
Vol. XIV, Part 2

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

3

SPEECH WINDING UP THE DEBATE
ON THE REPORT ON THE CURRENT SITUATION
APRIL 24 (MAY 7)

Comrade Kamenev was quick to seize on the talk of adventurism. I shall have to dwell on this. Comrade Kamenev is convinced and asserts that in opposing the slogan "Down with the Provisional Government", we showed vacillation. I agree with him; there certainly has been vacillation away from revolutionary policy, and this vacillation must be avoided. I think that our differences with Comrade Kamenev are not very great, because by agreeing with us he has changed his position. In what did our adventurism consist? It was the attempt to resort to forcible measures. We did not know to what extent the masses had swung to our side during that anxious moment. If it had been a strong swing things would have been different. We advanced the slogan for peaceful demonstrations, but several comrades from the Petrograd Committee issued a different slogan. We cancelled it, but were too late to prevent the masses from following the slogan of the Petrograd Committee. We say that the slogan "Down with the Provisional Government" is an adventurist slogan, that the government cannot be overthrown now. That is why we have advanced the slogan for peaceful demonstrations. All we wanted was a peaceful reconnoitring of the enemy's forces; we did not want to give battle. But the Petrograd Committee turned a trifle more to the left, which in this case is certainly a very grave crime. Our organisational apparatus proved weak—our decisions are not being carried out by everyone. Together with the correct slogan "Long Live the Soviets of Workers' and

Soldiers' Deputies!" stood the incorrect slogan "Down with the Provisional Government". At the time of action, to go a "trifle more to the left" was wrong. We regard this as a very serious crime, as disorganisation. Had we deliberately allowed such an act, we would not have remained in the Central Committee for one moment. It happened because of the weakness of our organisational apparatus. Yes, there were shortcomings in our organisation. We have raised the question of improving our organisation.

The Mensheviks and Co. are working the word "adventurism" as hard as they can. But it is they, of all people, who had neither an organisation nor a policy. We have both an organisation and a policy.

At that moment the bourgeoisie mobilised all its forces; the centre hid itself, and we organised a peaceful demonstration. We were the only ones who had a political line. Did we make mistakes? We did. Only he who does nothing never errs. Perfect organisation is a difficult thing.

Now about control.

We are at one with Comrade Kamenev, except on the question of control. He views control as a political act. Subjectively, however, he understands this word better than Chkheidze and others. We will not accept control. People tell us that we have isolated ourselves, that, by uttering a lot of terrible words about communism, we have frightened the bourgeoisie into fits.... Maybe! But it was not this that isolated us. It was the question of the loan that caused our isolation. It was on this question that we found ourselves in the minority. Yes, we are in the minority. Well, what of it? To be a socialist while chauvinism is the craze means to be in the minority. To be in the majority means to be a chauvinist. At the moment the peasant, together with Milyukov, is hitting socialism by means of the loan. The peasant follows Milyukov and Guchkov. This is a fact. The bourgeois-democratic dictatorship of the peasantry is an old formula.

If we want to draw the peasantry into the revolution we must keep the proletariat apart from it in a separate proletarian party, because the peasantry is chauvinistic. To attract the peasant now means to surrender to the mercies of Milyukov.

The Provisional Government must be overthrown, but not now, and not in the usual way. We agree with Comrade Kamenev. But we must explain. It is this word that Comrade Kamenev has been harping on. Nevertheless, this is the only thing we can do.

Comrade Rykov says that socialism must come from other countries with a more developed industry. But that is not so. Nobody can say who will begin it and who will end it. That is not Marxism; it is a parody of Marxism.

Marx said that France would begin it and Germany would finish it. But the Russian proletariat has achieved more than anybody else.

If we had said, "No tsar, but a dictatorship of the proletariat", well, this would have meant skipping over the petty bourgeoisie. But what we are saying is—help the revolution through the Soviets. We must not lapse into reformism. We are fighting to win, not to lose. At the worst we count on partial success. Even if we suffer defeat we shall achieve partial success. We shall get reforms. Reforms are an auxiliary instrument of the class struggle.

Further, Comrade Rykov says that there is no period of transition from capitalism to socialism. That is not so. It is a break with Marxism.

The line we have marked out is correct, and in future we shall make every effort to achieve an organisation in which there will be no Petrograd Committee-men to disobey the Central Committee. We are growing, and that is as it should be with a real party.

First published in full in 1921
in N. Lenin (V. Ulyanov),
Works, Vol. XIV, Part 2

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

4

SPEECH ON THE PROPOSAL TO CALL AN INTERNATIONAL
SOCIALIST CONFERENCE
APRIL 25 (MAY 8)⁸⁶

I cannot agree with Comrade Nogin. We have here what I believe to be a fact of paramount political importance, and we are in duty bound to launch a vigorous campaign against the Russian and Anglo-French chauvinists who have turned down Borgbjerg's invitation to attend the conference. We must not forget the real issue, the motives underlying this whole affair. I am going to read to you Borgbjerg's proposal exactly as reported by *Rabochaya Gazeta*. I shall show you that behind this comedy of a so-called socialist congress we shall find the very real political manoeuvres of German imperialism. The German capitalists, through the medium of the German social-chauvinists, are inviting the social-chauvinists of all countries to the conference. That is why we must launch a big campaign.

Why do they do it through the socialists? Because they want to fool the working masses. These diplomats are subtle men; to say this thing openly would not do, so they send a Danish Plekhanov to do it for them. We have seen German social-chauvinists abroad hundreds of times; they must be exposed.

(Reads an excerpt from "Rabochaya Gazeta" No. 39, for May 8 [April 25], 1917.)

"On behalf of the joint committee of the three Scandinavian labour parties (the Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish), Borgbjerg, editor of *Social-demokraten*, the Central Organ of the Danish Social-Democratic Party, has passed on to the Executive Committee of the Soviet of

Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies a message inviting all the socialist parties in Russia to attend an international socialist conference. Owing to Denmark's proximity to Germany, Borgbjerg was able to communicate with the German Social-Democrats, mainly with the 'majority' faction, and the committee learned from him the peace terms which the official Social-Democratic Party of Germany would consider acceptable, and which its representatives would propose to the conference.

"These terms are:

"First of all they subscribe to the principles laid down by the Scandinavian and Dutch socialists at the 1915 conference, namely, the self-determination of nations, an obligatory international court of arbitration, and the demand for gradual disarmament. To this they add that the German Social-Democrats will urge that:

"1. all territories seized by Germany and her allies be restored;

"2. Russian Poland be granted full freedom to declare its independence or to remain a part of Russia;

"3. Belgium be restored as a fully independent state;

"4. similarly, Serbia, Montenegro and Rumania be restored to the status of independent states;

"5. Bulgaria be given the Bulgarian districts of Macedonia, and Serbia be given access to the Adriatic.

"As regards Alsace-Lorraine, a peaceful agreement could be envisaged to rectify Lorraine's frontiers; as far as the Poles of Poznan are concerned, the Germans will insist on their obtaining autonomy of national culture."

There is not a shadow of doubt that this proposal comes from the German Government, who does not act directly, but resorts to the services of the Danish Plekhanovs, since German agents are obviously no good for this purpose. That is what social-chauvinists are for—to carry out such commissions. Our job is, on behalf of the seventy thousand workers of the proletarian party represented at this conference, to show them up to the whole world and reveal the motives they are trying to conceal. We must publish a detailed resolution, have it translated into foreign languages, and thus give these gentlemen the rebuff they deserve for daring to approach a socialist party. (*Reads the draft resolution.*)

The socialist papers this morning are silent. They know what they are about. They know that silence is golden. Only *Rabochaya Gazeta* publishes an article, which manages to say nothing in many words.

The Russian Government, more than anyone else, may rest assured that we are dealing here with an agent of the German Government.

What with all this shouting about the liberation of Alsace-Lorraine, we should remind those gentlemen that the whole question is simply one of lucre, since there is immense wealth in Alsace-Lorraine, and the German capitalists are fighting the French capitalists for the division of the booty. It is good for them to have the Plekhanovs say that the liberation of Alsace-Lorraine is a sacred cause. When the German social-chauvinists therefore talk about a peaceful rectification of the frontiers of Alsace-Lorraine, they mean a peaceful division of the spoil between the French and the German imperialists.

One thing more I must add. I forgot to mention that the German representatives of the "Centre"—Kautsky, Haase, and Ledebour—have agreed to this conference. This is a most shameful thing. The British and French socialists have refused to attend the conference. This shows that the Anglo-French chauvinists, who call themselves socialists, are really agents of the bourgeoisie, because they are instrumental in continuing the imperialist war despite the tremendous efforts made by the German socialist majority through Borgbjerg; for, without a doubt, the German Government is saying through Borgbjerg: the situation is such that I am forced to return your booty to you (the German colonies in Africa). This is confirmed by the fact that the situation in Germany is desperate; the country is on the brink of ruin; to carry on the war now is a hopeless task. That is why they say they are ready to give up almost all the booty, for they still hope to be able to carve something out for themselves. The diplomats communicate freely with each other, and the bourgeois papers, when writing of foreign affairs, fool the people with phrase-mongering.

There is no doubt that when the British and French social-chauvinists said they were not going to the conference, they already knew all about it. They must have gone to their Foreign Offices where they were told: Such and such is the state of affairs, we don't want you to go there. That, I am sure, is how matters stood.

If the Russian soldiers receive this resolution—and that, I think, should be done in the name of the seventy thousand members of our Party—they will really begin to see through the whole shady affair which has been concealed from

them. They will see then that Germany is unable to carry on her war of conquest, and that the Allies only aim at utterly crushing and robbing Germany. It cannot be denied that Borgbjerg is an agent of the German Government.

This, comrades, is the reason why I think we must expose this socialist congress comedy. All these congresses are nothing but comedies designed to cover up the deals made by the diplomats behind the backs of the masses. Once and for all we must tell the truth for all the soldiers at the front and all the workers of the world to hear. Our campaign with regard to such proposals will serve, on the one hand, to explain our proletarian policy, and, on the other, it will be mass action on a scale never heard of before. I ask you, therefore, to adopt this declaration, forward it to the Executive Committee, translate it into foreign languages, and publish it in tomorrow's *Pravda*.

A brief report published
May 9 (April 26), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 41

First published in full
in 1921 in N. Lenin
(V. Ulyanov), *Works*,
Vol. XIV, Part 2

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

5

RESOLUTION ON BORGBJERG'S PROPOSAL

In connection with the arrival of the Danish "socialist" Borgbjerg and his invitation to attend a congress of socialists in support of peace, which the German socialists of the Scheidemann and Plekhanov orientation propose on the basis of Germany renouncing most of her annexed territories, the Conference resolves:

Borgbjerg speaks on behalf of three Scandinavian parties—the Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian. He received his mandate from the Swedish party headed by Branting, a socialist who has gone over to the side of "his own" bourgeoisie and betrayed the revolutionary union of the world's workers. We cannot recognise this Swedish party as a socialist party. The only socialist party in Sweden we recognise is the youth party headed by Höglund, Lindhagen, Ström, Carleson, and others.

Neither do we consider the Danish party, from which Borgbjerg has his mandate, a socialist party, because it is headed by Stauning, a member of the bourgeois cabinet. Stauning's joining the bourgeois cabinet evoked a protest on the part of a group headed by Comrade Trier, which left the party, declaring that the Danish Socialist Party had become a bourgeois party.

Borgbjerg, on his own admission, is acting in accord with Scheidemann and other German socialists who have defected to the German Government and the German bourgeoisie.

There can be no doubt, therefore, that Borgbjerg, directly or indirectly, is really an agent of the German imperialist government.

In view of this, the Conference considers the idea of our Party's attendance at a conference which includes Borgbjerg and Scheidemann to be unacceptable in principle, since

our task is to unite, not direct or indirect agents of the various imperialist governments, but the workers of all countries, who, already during the war, have begun a revolutionary fight against their own imperialist governments.

Only a meeting and closer contact with these parties and groups are capable of effectively promoting the cause of peace.

We warn the workers against placing their trust in the conference which is being organised by Borgbjerg, because this conference of pseudo-socialists will merely be a comedy to cover up the deals the diplomats are clinching behind its back, deals which involve an interchange of annexations by which Armenia, for example, will be "given" to the Russian capitalists, and Britain will be "given" the colonies she has robbed Germany of, while probably "ceding" to the German capitalists by way of compensation part of the Lorraine ore-bearing territories containing immense wealth in excellent iron ores, etc.

The socialists cannot, without betraying the proletarian cause, take part directly or indirectly in this dirty huckstering and haggling among the capitalists of various countries over the division of the loot.

At the same time the Conference considers that the German capitalists have not, even through the mouth of Borgbjerg, renounced all their annexations, not to mention the immediate withdrawal of their troops from the territories which they have seized. Germany's Danish regions, her Polish territories, and her French part of Alsace are as much annexations of the German capitalists as Kurland, Finland, Poland, Ukraine, etc., are of the Russian tsars and the Russian capitalists.

As to restoring Poland's independence, this is deception on the part of the German and Austrian capitalists as well as the Russian Provisional Government, which speaks of a so-called "free" military alliance between Poland and Russia. To ascertain the real will of the people in all the annexed territories it is necessary that all troops should be withdrawn and the opinion of the population be given free expression. Only such a measure applied to the whole of Poland (that is, not only to the part the Russians have seized, but also the part the Germans and Austrians have seized) and to the

whole of Armenia, etc., would be a step towards translating the governments' promises into deeds.

The Conference, further, takes note of the fact that the British and French socialists, who have gone over to the side of their capitalist governments, have refused to attend the conference sponsored by Borgbjerg. This fact clearly demonstrates that the Anglo-French imperialist bourgeoisie, whose agents these pseudo-socialists are, *wish to continue, wish to drag out this* imperialist war without even desiring to discuss the concessions which the German imperialist bourgeoisie, under pressure of growing exhaustion, hunger, economic ruin, and—most important of all—the impending workers' revolution in Germany, are compelled to promise through the medium of Borgbjerg.

The Conference resolves to give all these facts the widest possible publicity, and, in particular, to bring them to the notice of the Russian soldiers at the front in the fullest possible detail. The Russian soldiers must learn that the Anglo-French capitalists, followed by the Russian, *are dragging out the war*, ruling out even such a conference to discuss peace terms.

The Russian soldiers must learn that the watchword "War to a victorious finish" now serves as a screen for Britain's bid to strengthen her domination in Baghdad and in Germany's African colonies, for the striving of the Russian capitalists to plunder and subdue Armenia and Persia, etc., for the striving to bring about Germany's complete defeat.

The Russian soldiers at the front must arrange voting in every military unit, in every regiment, in every company, on the question whether they want the war to be dragged out like this by the capitalists, or whether they want it to be speedily terminated by having all power in the state pass wholly and exclusively into the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

The party of the proletariat in Russia will attend a conference and enter into a fraternal union with only such workers' parties of other countries as are waging a revolutionary struggle in their own countries for all state power passing to the proletariat.

6

SPEECH ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE SOVIETS
APRIL 25 (MAY 8)

BRIEF PRESS REPORT

Comrade Lenin pointed out that the French revolution passed through a phase of municipal revolution, that it drew its strength from the local organs of self-government, which became its mainstay. In the Russian revolution we observe a certain bureaucratism in the centres, and a greater exercise of power wielded by the Soviets locally, in the provinces. In the capital cities the Soviets are politically more dependent upon the bourgeois central authorities than those in the provinces. In the centres it is not so easy to take control of production; in the provinces this has already been carried out to some extent. The inference is—to strengthen the local Soviets. Progress in this respect is possible, coming primarily from the provinces.

Pravda No. 42,
May 10 (April 27), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

7

DRAFT THESES TO THE RESOLUTION ON THE SOVIETS

In a number of local, especially working-class, centres the role of the Soviets has proved to be a particularly important one. They hold undivided power. The bourgeoisie has been disarmed and reduced to complete submission; wages have been raised, and the hours of work reduced without lowering production; food supplies are ensured; control over production and distribution has been initiated; all the old authorities have been displaced; the revolutionary initiative of the peasants is encouraged both on the question of power (the dismissal of the old and setting up of new authorities) and on the question of the land.

In the capital and certain large centres a reverse tendency is to be observed. The Soviets are less proletarian in their make-up, the influence of the petty-bourgeois elements in the executive committees is incomparably wider, and there is—especially in the commissions—“co-operation with the bourgeoisie”, who curbs the revolutionary initiative of the masses, *bureaucratizes* the revolutionary movement of the masses and their revolutionary aims, and blocks all revolutionary measures that are liable to affect the capitalists.

It is quite natural and inevitable that after the fullest development of revolutionary energy in the capital, where the people and especially the workers had borne the greatest sacrifices in overthrowing tsarism—in the capital, where the central state power had been overthrown and the most centralised power of capital had given maximum power to the capitalists—the power of the Soviets (and the power of the proletariat) proved to be weak, the problem of developing the revolution very difficult, the transition to a new stage of the revolution extremely hard, and the resistance of the bourgeoisie stronger than anywhere else.

Hence: so long as the main effort in the capital cities and the large centres still has to be directed towards *building up* forces for *completing* the second stage of the revolution, in the local areas the revolution can and should be advanced by *direct* action, by the exercise of undivided power by the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, by developing the revolutionary energy of the worker and peasant mass, by establishing control over the production and distribution of products, and so on.

The following trend of the revolution can be traced: (1) removal of the old government in the centre; (2) seizure of power by the bourgeoisie in view of the proletariat's unpreparedness for tackling *colossal* tasks of nation-wide importance; (3) development of the revolution locally; (4) in local areas and particularly in the proletarian centres—communes and development of revolutionary energy of the masses; (5) the land—seizure of it, etc.; (6) factories; control over them; (7) undivided power; (8) local, municipal revolution going forward; (9) bureaucratisation, submission to the bourgeoisie in the centre.

Conclusions: (α) 1: build-up in the centre (build-up of forces for a new revolution); (β) 2: *advance* the revolution (power? land? factories?) in the local areas; (γ) 3: communes locally, i.e. ($\alpha\alpha$) complete local autonomy; self-established; ($\beta\beta$) without police, without government officials, full power by armed worker and peasant masses; (δ) 4: combat bureaucratising and bourgeois-placating influence of the petty-bourgeois elements; (ϵ) 5: gather local experience for *prodding* the centre: *local areas* become a *model*.

(σ) 6: bring home to the mass of workers, peasants, and soldiers that the reason for the revolution's success locally is undivided power and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

(η) 7: in the centre, of course, it is *more difficult*, takes more time.

+ (ι) 8: development of the revolution by way of *communes* formed out of suburbs and blocks in the large cities....

(χ) 9: transformation (in the capital cities, etc.) into "servants of the bourgeoisie".

Written April 25-26
(May 8-9), 1917

First published in 1925
Lenin Miscellany IV

Published according
to the manuscript

8

SPEECH IN FAVOUR OF THE RESOLUTION ON THE WAR
APRIL 27 (MAY 10)

Comrades, the original draft resolution on the war was read by me at the City Conference. Because of the crisis that absorbed the attention and energy of all our comrades in Petrograd, we were unable to amend the draft. Since yesterday, however, the committee working on it has made satisfactory progress: the draft has been changed, considerably shortened and, in our opinion, improved.

I wish to say a few words about the construction of this resolution. It consists of three parts. The first is devoted to a class analysis of the war; it also contains our statement of principles explaining why our Party warns against placing any trust in promises made by the Provisional Government, as well as against any support for that government. The second part of the resolution deals with the question of revolutionary defencism as an extremely broad mass movement which has now united against us the overwhelming majority of the nation. Our task is to define the class significance of this revolutionary defencism, its essence, and the real balance of forces, and find a way to fight this trend. The third part of the resolution deals with the question of how to end the war. This practical question, which is of supreme importance to our Party, required a detailed answer. We think that we have succeeded in meeting this requirement satisfactorily. The articles in *Pravda* and numerous articles on the war published in provincial newspapers (the latter reach us very irregularly) because the postal service is disorganised, and we have to take every convenient opportunity of getting them for the Central Committee) reveal a negative attitude

towards the war and the loan. I think that the vote against the loan settled the question as to our opposition to revolutionary defencism. I do not think it is possible to go into greater detail on this.

“The present war is, on the part of both groups of the belligerent powers, an imperialist war, i.e., one waged by the capitalists for the division of the profits obtained from world domination; for markets for finance (banking) capital, for the subjugation of the weaker nationalities, etc.”

The primary and basic issue is the meaning of the war, a question of a general and political character, a moot question which the capitalists and the social-chauvinists carefully evade. This is why we must put this question first, with this addition to it:

“Each day of war enriches the financial and industrial bourgeoisie and impoverishes and saps the strength of the proletariat and the peasantry of all the belligerents, as well as of the neutral countries. In Russia, moreover, prolongation of the war involves a grave danger to the revolution’s gains and its further development.

“The passing of state power in Russia to the Provisional Government, a government of the landowners and capitalists, did not and could not alter the character and meaning of the war as far as Russia is concerned.”

The words I have just read to you are of great importance in all our propaganda and agitation. Has the class character of the war changed now? Can it change? Our reply is based on the fact that power has passed to the landowners and capitalists, the same government that had engineered this war. We then pass on to one of the facts that reveal most clearly the character of the war. Class character as expressed by the entire policy carried on for decades by definite classes is one thing, the obvious class character of the war is another.

“This fact was most strikingly demonstrated when the new government not only failed to publish the secret treaties between Tsar Nicholas II and the capitalist governments of Britain, France, etc., but even formally and without consulting the nation confirmed these secret treaties, which promise the Russian capitalists a free hand to rob China, Persia, Turkey, Austria, etc. By concealing these treaties

from the people of Russia the latter are being deceived as to the true character of the war.”

And so, I emphasise again, we are pointing out one particularly striking confirmation of the character of the war. Even if there were no treaties at all, the character of the war would be the same because groups of capitalists can very often come to an agreement without any treaties. But the treaties exist and their implications are apparent. For the purpose of co-ordinating the work of our agitators and propagandists, we think this fact should be especially emphasised, and so we have made a special point of it. The people's attention is and should be called to this fact, all the more so as the treaties were concluded by the tsar, who has been overthrown. The people ought to be made aware that the present governments are carrying on the war on the basis of treaties concluded between the old governments. This, I feel, makes the contradictions between the capitalist interests and the will of the people stand out most strikingly, and it is for the propagandists to expose these contradictions, to draw the people's attention to them, to strive to explain them to the masses by appealing to their class-consciousness. The contents of these treaties leave no room for doubt that they promise enormous profits to the capitalists to be derived from robbing other countries. That is why they are always kept secret. There is not a republic in the world whose foreign policy is conducted in the open. It is fatuous, while the capitalist system exists, to expect the capitalists to open up their ledgers. While there is private ownership of the means of production, there is bound to be private ownership of shares and financial operations. The corner-stone of contemporary diplomacy is financial operations, which amount to robbing and strangling the weak nationalities. These, we believe, are the fundamental premises upon which the evaluation of the war rests. Proceeding from these premises we conclude that: “For this reason, no proletarian party that does not wish to break completely with internationalism, i.e., with the fraternal solidarity of the workers of all countries in their struggle against the yoke of capital, can support the present war, or the present government, or its loans.”

This is our chief and basic conclusion. It determines

our whole tactics and sets us apart from all the other parties, no matter how socialistic they claim to be. This proposition, which is irrefutable to all of us, predetermines our attitude towards all the other political parties.

The next point concerns the wide use which our government is making of promises. These promises are the object of a prolonged campaign by the Soviets, which have become muddled by these promises, and which are trying the people's patience. We, therefore, consider it necessary to add to our purely objective analysis of the class relations an analysis of those promises, promises which in themselves have, of course, no significance to a Marxist, but which mean a great deal to the people, and mean even more in politics. The Petrograd Soviet has become muddled by these promises, has given weight to them by promising its support. This is the reason why we add the following statement to this point:

"No trust can be placed in the present government's promises to renounce annexations, i.e., conquests of foreign countries or retention by force of any nationality within the confines of Russia."

"Annexation" being a foreign word, we give it an exact political definition, such as neither the Cadets nor the petty-bourgeois democratic parties (the Narodniks and Mensheviks) can give. Few words have been used so meaninglessly and slovenly.

"For, in the first place, the capitalists, bound together by the thousand threads of banking capital, cannot renounce annexations in this war without renouncing the profits from the thousands of millions invested in loans, concessions, war industries, etc. And secondly, the new government, after renouncing annexations to mislead the people, declared through Milyukov (Moscow, April 9, 1917) that it had no intention of renouncing them, and, in the Note of April 18 and its elucidation of April 22, confirmed the expansionist character of its policy.

"Therefore, in warning the people against the capitalists' empty promises, the Conference declares that it is necessary to make a clear distinction between a renunciation of annexations in word and a renunciation of annexations in deed, i.e., the immediate publication and abrogation of all the secret, predatory treaties and the immediate granting to

all nationalities of the right to determine by free voting whether they wish to be independent states or to be part of another state.”

We have found it necessary to mention this, because the question of peace without annexations is the basic issue in all these discussions of peace terms. All parties recognise that peace will become the alternative, and that peace with annexations will be an unheard-of catastrophe for all countries. In a country where there is political liberty, the question of peace cannot be placed before the people otherwise than in terms of peace without annexations. It is therefore necessary to declare for peace without annexations, and so the only thing to do is to lie by wrapping up the meaning of annexations or evading the question altogether. *Rech*, for instance, cries that the return of Kurland means renunciation of annexations. When I was addressing the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, a soldier handed me a slip of paper with the following question: "We have to fight to win back Kurland. Does winning back Kurland mean that you stand for annexations?" I had to reply in the affirmative. We are against Germany annexing Kurland, but we are also against Russia holding Kurland by force. For example, our government has issued a manifesto proclaiming the independence of Poland. This manifesto, chock-full of meaningless phrases, states that Poland must form a free military alliance with Russia. These three words contain the whole truth. A free military alliance of little Poland with huge Russia is, in point of fact, complete military subjection of Poland. Poland may be granted political freedom but her boundaries will be determined by the military alliance.

If we fight for the Russian capitalists keeping possession of the former annexed territories of Kurland and Poland, then the German capitalists have the right to rob Kurland. They may argue this way: we looted Poland together. At the end of the eighteenth century, when we began to tear Poland to pieces, Prussia was a very small and weak country while Russia was a giant, and therefore she grabbed more. Now we have grown and it is our intention, if you please, to snatch a larger share. You can say nothing against this capitalist logic. In 1863 Japan was a mere nothing in comparison with Russia,

but in 1905 Japan thrashed Russia. From 1863 to 1873 Germany was a mere nothing in comparison with Britain, but now Germany is stronger than Britain. The Germans may argue: we were weak when Kurland was taken from us, but we have now grown stronger than you, and we wish to take it back. Not to renounce annexations means to justify endless wars over the conquest of weaker nationalities. To renounce annexations means to let each nation determine freely whether it wants to live separately or together with others. Of course, for this purpose, armies must be withdrawn. To show the slightest hesitation on the question of annexations means to justify endless wars. It follows that we could allow no hesitation on this question. With regard to annexations, our answer is that nations must be free to make their own decisions. How can we secure economic freedom alongside this political freedom? To accomplish this, power must pass into the hands of the proletariat and the yoke of capital must be overthrown.

I now pass on to the second part of the resolution.

“The ‘revolutionary defencism’, which in Russia has now permeated all the Narodnik parties (the Popular Socialists, Trudoviks, and Socialist-Revolutionaries), the opportunist party of the Menshevik Social-Democrats (the Organising Committee, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, etc.), and the majority of the non-party revolutionaries, reflects, in point of class significance, the interests and point of view of the well-to-do peasants and a part of the small proprietors, who, like the capitalists, profit by oppressing weak peoples. On the other hand, revolutionary defencism is a result of the deception by the capitalists of a part of the urban and rural proletariat and semi-proletariat, who, by their class position, have no interest in the profits of the capitalists and in the imperialist war.”

Consequently, our task here is to determine from what sections of society this defencist tendency could emerge. Russia is the most petty-bourgeois country in the world, and the upper sections of the petty bourgeoisie are directly interested in continuing the war. The well-to-do peasants, like the capitalists, are profiting by the war. On the other hand, the mass of proletarians and semi-proletarians have no interest in annexations because they make no profit on

banking capital. How, then, have these classes come to adopt the position of revolutionary defencism? Their attitude towards revolutionary defencism is due to the influence of capitalist ideology, which the resolution designates by the word "deception". They are unable to differentiate between the interests of the capitalists and the interests of the country. Hence we conclude:

"The Conference recognises that any concessions to revolutionary defencism are absolutely impermissible and virtually signify a complete break with internationalism and socialism. As for the defencist tendencies among the broad masses, our Party will fight against these tendencies by ceaselessly explaining the truth that the attitude of unreasoning trust in the government of the capitalists, at the moment, is one of the chief obstacles to a speedy termination of the war."

The last words express the specific feature that sharply distinguishes Russia from the other Western capitalist countries and from all capitalist democratic republics. For it cannot be said of those countries that the trustfulness of the unenlightened masses there is the chief cause of the prolongation of the war. The masses there are now in the iron grip of military discipline. The more democratic the republic, the stronger discipline is, since law in a republic rests on "the will of the people". Owing to the revolution there is no such discipline in Russia. The masses freely elect representatives to the Soviets, which is something that does not exist now anywhere else in the world. But the masses have unreasoning trust, and are therefore used for the purposes of the struggle. So far we can do nothing but explain. Our explanations must deal with the immediate revolutionary tasks and methods of action. When the masses are free, any attempts to act in the name of a minority, without explaining things to the masses, would be senseless Blanquism, mere adventurism. Only by winning over the masses, if they can be won, can we lay a solid foundation for the victory of the proletarian class struggle.

I now pass on to the third part of the resolution:

"In regard to the most important question of all, namely, how to end the present capitalist war as soon as possible, not by a coercive peace, but by a truly democratic peace, the Conference recognises and declares the following:

“This war cannot be ended by a refusal of the soldiers of one side only to continue the war, by a simple cessation of hostilities by one of the belligerents.”

The idea of terminating the war in this way has been attributed to us over and over again by persons who wish to win an easy victory over their opponents by distorting the latter's views—a typical method used by the capitalists, who ascribe to us the absurd idea of wishing to end the war by a one-sided refusal to fight. They say “the war cannot be ended by sticking your bayonet in the ground”, to quote a soldier, a typical revolutionary defencist. This is no argument, I say. The idea that the war can be terminated without changing the classes in power is an anarchist idea. Either this idea is anarchistic, in which case it has no meaning, no state significance, or it is a hazy pacifist idea that fails completely to appreciate the connection between politics and the oppressing class. War is an evil, peace is a blessing.... Certainly this idea must be made clear to the people, must be popularised. Incidentally, all our resolutions are being written for leading Party members, for Marxists, and do not make reading matter for the masses. But they must serve as unifying and guiding political principles for every propagandist and agitator. To meet this requirement, one more paragraph was added to the resolution:

“The Conference reiterates its protest against the base slander spread by the capitalists against our Party to the effect that we are in favour of a separate peace with Germany. We consider the German capitalists to be as predatory as the Russian, British, French, and other capitalists, and Emperor Wilhelm as bad a crowned brigand as Nicholas II or the British, Italian, Rumanian, and all other monarchs.”

On this point there was some disagreement in the committee, some maintaining that in this passage our language became too popular, others, that the British, Italian, and Rumanian monarchs did not deserve the honour of being mentioned. After a detailed discussion, however, we all agreed that, since our present aim is to refute all the slanders which *Birzhevka** has tried to spread against us rather crudely,

* See Note No. 80.—*Ed.*

Rech more subtly, *Yedinstvo* by direct implication, we must, on a question of this nature, come out with a most sharp and trenchant criticism of these ideas, having in mind the broadest masses of the people. Asked why we do not help to overthrow Wilhelm if we consider him a brigand, we can say that the others, too, are brigands, that we ought to fight against them as well, that one must not forget the kings of Italy and Rumania, that brigands can also be found among our Allies. These two paragraphs are intended to combat the slander, which is meant to lead to riot-mongering and squabbling. This is the reason why we must now pass on to the serious practical question of how to terminate the war.

“Our Party will patiently but persistently explain to the people the truth that wars are waged by *governments*, that wars are always indissolubly bound up with the policies of definite *classes*, that this war can be terminated by a democratic peace *only* if the entire state power, in at least several of the belligerent countries, has passed to the class of the proletarians and semi-proletarians which is really capable of putting an end to the oppressive rule of capital.”

To a Marxist these truths—that wars are waged by the capitalists and are bound up with the capitalists’ class interests—are absolute truths. A Marxist need not dwell on that. But as far as the masses are concerned, skilful agitators and propagandists should be able to explain this truth simply, without using foreign words, for with us discussions usually degenerate into empty and futile squabbling. The explaining of this truth is what we have been trying to do in every part of the resolution. We say that in order to understand what the war is about, you must ask who gains by it; in order to understand how to put an end to the war, you must ask which classes do not gain by it. The connection here is clear, hence we conclude:

“In Russia, the revolutionary class, having taken state power, would adopt a series of measures that would lead to the destruction of the economic rule of the capitalists, as well as measures that would render them completely harmless politically, and would immediately and frankly offer to all nations a democratic peace on the basis of a complete renunciation of every possible form of annexation.”

Once we speak in the name of the revolutionary class, the people have the right to ask: and what about you, what would you do in their place to end the war? This is an inevitable question. The people are electing us now as their representatives, and we must give a very precise answer. The revolutionary class, having taken power, would set out to undermine the rule of the capitalists, and would then offer to all nations well-defined peace terms, because, unless the economic rule of the capitalists is undermined, all we can have are scraps of paper. Only a victorious class can accomplish this, can bring about a change in policy.

I repeat: to bring this truth home to the uneducated mass, we need intermediate links that would help to introduce this question to them. The mistake and falsehood of popular literature on the war is the evasion of this question; it ignores this question and presents the matter as if there had been no class struggle, as if two countries had lived amicably until one attacked the other, and the attacked has been defending itself. This is vulgar reasoning in which there is not a shadow of objective truth, and which is a deliberate deception of the people by educated persons. If we approach this question properly, anyone would be able to grasp the essential point; for the interests of the ruling classes are one thing, and the interests of the oppressed classes are another.

What would happen if the revolutionary class took power?

“Such measures and such a frank offer of peace would bring about complete confidence of the workers of the belligerent countries in each other...”

Such confidence is impossible now, and the words of manifestos will not create it. Where the philosopher once said that speech has been given to man to enable him to conceal his thoughts, the diplomats always say: “Conferences are held to deceive the people.” Not only the capitalists, but the socialists too reason this way. This particularly applies to the conference which Borgbjerg is calling.

“...and would inevitably lead to uprisings of the proletariat against those imperialist governments as might resist the offered peace.”

Nobody now believes the capitalist government when it says: “We are for peace without annexations.” The masses have the instinct of oppressed classes which tells them that

nothing has changed. Only if the policy were actually changed in one country, confidence would appear and attempts at uprisings would be made. We speak of "uprisings" because we are now discussing all countries. To say "a revolution has taken place in one country, so now it must take place in Germany"—is false reasoning. There is a tendency to form an order of sequence, but this cannot be done. We all went through the revolution of 1905. We all heard or witnessed how that revolution gave birth to revolutionary ideas throughout the world, a fact which Marx constantly referred to. Revolutions cannot be made, they cannot be taken in turns. A revolution cannot be made to order—it develops. This form of charlatanism is now frequently being practised in Russia. The people are told: You in Russia have made a revolution, now it is the Germans' turn. If the objective conditions change, then an uprising is inevitable, but we do not know whose turn it will be, when it will take place, and with what degree of success. We are asked: If the revolutionary class takes power in Russia, and if no uprisings break out in other countries, what will the revolutionary party do? What will happen then? This question is answered in the last paragraph of our resolution.

"Until the revolutionary class in Russia takes the entire state power, our Party will do all it can to support those proletarian parties and groups abroad that are in fact, already during the war, conducting a revolutionary struggle against their imperialist governments and their bourgeoisie."

This is all that we can promise and must do now. The revolution is mounting in every country, but no one knows to what extent it is mounting and when it will break out. In every country there are people who are carrying on a revolutionary struggle against their governments. They are the people, the only people, we must support. This is the real thing—all else is falsehood. And so we add:

"Our Party will particularly support the mass fraternisation of the soldiers of all the belligerent countries that has already begun at the front..."

This is to meet Plekhanov's argument: "What will come of it? Suppose you do fraternise, then what? Does this not suggest the possibility of a separate peace at the front?" This is jiggery-pokery, not a serious argument. We want

fraternisation on all fronts, and we are taking pains to encourage it. When we worked in Switzerland, we published an appeal in two languages, with French on one side and German on the other, urging those soldiers to do the same thing we are now urging the Russian soldiers to do. We do not confine ourselves to fraternisation between German and Russian soldiers, we call upon all to fraternise. This, then, is what we mean by fraternisation:

“...endeavouring to turn this instinctive expression of solidarity of the oppressed into a politically-conscious movement as well organised as possible for the transfer of all state power in all the belligerent countries to the revolutionary proletariat.”

Fraternisation, so far, is instinctive, and we must not deceive ourselves on this score. We must admit this in order not to delude the people. The fraternising soldiers are actuated not by a clear-cut political idea but by the instinct of oppressed people, who are tired, exhausted and begin to lose confidence in capitalist promises. They say: “While you keep on talking about peace—we have been hearing it now for two and a half years—we shall start things moving ourselves.” This is a true class instinct. Without this instinct the cause of the revolution would be hopeless. As you know, nobody would free the workers if they did not free themselves. But is instinct alone sufficient? You would not get far if you rely on instinct alone. This instinct must be transformed into political awareness.

In our “Appeal to the Soldiers of All the Belligerent Countries” we explain into what this fraternisation should develop—into the passing of political power to the Soviets of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies.* Naturally, the German workers will call their Soviets by a different name, but this does not matter. The point is that we undoubtedly recognise as correct that fraternisation is instinctive, that we do not simply confine ourselves to encouraging fraternisation, but set ourselves the task of turning this instinctive fraternisation of workers and peasants in soldiers’ uniforms into a politically-conscious movement, whose aim is the transfer

* See p. 188 of this volume.—*Ed.*

of power in all the belligerent countries into the hands of the revolutionary proletariat. This is a very difficult task, but the position in which humanity finds itself under capitalist rule is tremendously difficult, too, and leads to destruction. This is why it will call forth that explosion of discontent which is the guarantee of proletarian revolution.

This is our resolution, which we submit for consideration to the Conference.

A brief report published
May 12 (April 29), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 44

First published in full
in 1921 in N. Lenin
(V. Ulyanov), *Works*,
Vol. XIV, Part 2

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

9

RESOLUTION ON THE WAR

I

The present war is, on the part of both groups of the belligerent powers, an imperialist war, i.e., one waged by the capitalists for the division of the profits obtained from world domination, for markets for finance (banking) capital, for the subjugation of the weaker nationalities, etc. Each day of war enriches the financial and industrial bourgeoisie and impoverishes and saps the strength of the proletariat and the peasantry of all the belligerents, as well as of the neutral countries. In Russia, moreover, prolongation of the war involves a grave danger to the revolution's gains and its further development.

The passing of state power in Russia to the Provisional Government, a government of the landowners and capitalists, did not and could not alter the character and meaning of the war as far as Russia is concerned.

This fact was most strikingly demonstrated when the new government not only failed to publish the secret treaties between Tsar Nicholas II and the capitalist governments of Britain, France, etc., but even formally and without consulting the nation confirmed these secret treaties, which promise the Russian capitalists a free hand to rob China, Persia, Turkey, Austria, etc. By concealing these treaties from the people of Russia the latter are being deceived as to the true character of the war.

For this reason, no proletarian party that does not wish to break completely with internationalism, i.e., with the

fraternal solidarity of the workers of all countries in their struggle against the yoke of capital, can support the present war, or the present government, or its loans.

No trust can be placed in the present government's promises to renounce annexations, i.e., conquests of foreign countries or retention by force of any nationality within the confines of Russia. For, in the first place, the capitalists, bound together by the thousand threads of banking capital, cannot renounce annexations in this war without renouncing the profits from the thousands of millions invested in loans, concessions, war industries, etc. And secondly, the new government, after renouncing annexations to mislead the people, declared through Milyukov (Moscow, April 9, 1917) that it had no intention of renouncing them, and, in the Note of April 18 and its elucidation of April 22, confirmed the expansionist character of its policy. Therefore, in warning the people against the capitalists' empty promises, the Conference declares that it is necessary to make a clear distinction between a renunciation of annexations in word and a renunciation of annexations in deed, i.e., the immediate publication and abrogation of all the secret, predatory treaties and the immediate granting to all nationalities of the right to determine by free voting whether they wish to be independent states or to be part of another state.

II

The "revolutionary defencism", which in Russia has now permeated all the Narodnik parties (the Popular Socialists, Trudoviks, and Socialist-Revolutionaries), the opportunist party of the Menshevik Social-Democrats (the Organising Committee, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, etc.), and the majority of the non-party revolutionaries, reflects, in point of class significance, the interests and point of view of the well-to-do peasants and a part of the small proprietors, who, like the capitalists, profit by oppressing weak peoples. On the other hand, "revolutionary defencism" is a result of the deception by the capitalists of a part of the urban and rural proletariat and semi-proletariat, who, by their class position, have no interest in the profits of the capitalists and in the imperialist war.

The Conference recognises that any concessions to "revolutionary defencism" are absolutely impermissible and virtually signify a complete break with internationalism and socialism. As for the defencist tendencies among the broad masses, our Party will fight against these tendencies by ceaselessly explaining the truth that the attitude of unreasoning trust in the government of the capitalists, at the moment, is one of the chief obstacles to a speedy termination of the war.

III

In regard to the most important question of all, namely, how to end the present capitalist war as soon as possible, not by a coercive peace, but by a truly democratic peace, the Conference recognises and declares the following:

This war cannot be ended by a refusal of the soldiers of one side only to continue the war, by a simple cessation of hostilities by one of the belligerents.

The Conference reiterates its protest against the base slander spread by the capitalists against our Party to the effect that we are in favour of a separate peace with Germany. We consider the German capitalists to be as predatory as the Russian, British, French, and other capitalists, and Emperor Wilhelm as bad a crowned brigand as Nicholas II or the British, Italian, Rumanian, and all other monarchs.

Our Party will patiently but persistently explain to the people the truth that wars are waged by *governments*, that wars are always indissolubly bound up with the policies of definite *classes*, that this war can be terminated by a democratic peace *only* if the entire state power, in at least several of the belligerent countries, has passed to the class of the proletarians and semi-proletarians which is really capable of putting an end to the oppressive rule of capital.

In Russia, the revolutionary class, having taken state power, would adopt a series of measures that would undermine the economic rule of the capitalists, as well as measures that would render them completely harmless politically, and would immediately and frankly offer to all nations a democratic peace on the basis of a complete renunciation of every possible form of annexation and indemnity. Such

measures and such a frank offer of peace would bring about complete confidence of the workers of the belligerent countries in each other and would inevitably lead to uprisings of the proletariat against those imperialist governments as might resist the offered peace.

Until the revolutionary class in Russia takes the entire state power, our Party will do all it can to support those proletarian parties and groups abroad that are in fact, already during the war, conducting a revolutionary struggle against their imperialist governments and their bourgeoisie. Our Party will particularly support the mass fraternisation of the soldiers of all the belligerent countries that has already begun at the front, endeavouring to turn this instinctive expression of solidarity of the oppressed into a politically-conscious movement as well organised as possible for the transfer of all state power in all the belligerent countries to the revolutionary proletariat.

Pravda No. 44,
May 12 (April 29), 1917

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes verified with
the text in *Pravda*

10

RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE
TOWARDS THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

The All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. recognises that:

1. The Provisional Government, by its class character, is the organ of landowner and bourgeois domination;
2. The Provisional Government and the classes it represents are bound with indissoluble economic and political ties to Russian and Anglo-French imperialism;
3. The Provisional Government is carrying out its proclaimed programme only partially, and only under pressure of the revolutionary proletariat and, to some extent, of the petty bourgeoisie;
4. The forces of bourgeois and landowner counter-revolution, now being organised, have already, under cover of the Provisional Government and with the latter's obvious connivance, launched an attack on revolutionary democracy: thus the Provisional Government is avoiding fixing the date for the elections to the Constituent Assembly, preventing the arming of the people as a whole, opposing the transfer of all the land to the people, foisting upon it the landowners' way of settling the agrarian question, obstructing the introduction of an eight-hour workday, condoning counter-revolutionary propaganda in the army (by Guchkov and Co.), rallying the high-ranking officers against the soldiers, etc.;
5. The Provisional Government, protecting the profits of the capitalists and landowners, is incapable of taking a number of revolutionary economic measures (food supply, etc.)

which are absolutely and urgently necessary in view of the impending economic catastrophe;

6. This government, at the same time, is relying at present on the confidence of, and on an actual agreement with, the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which is still the leading organisation for the majority of workers and soldiers, i.e., peasants;

7. Every step of the Provisional Government, in both its domestic and foreign policies, is bound to open the eyes of the urban and rural proletarians and semi-proletarians and force various sections of the petty bourgeoisie to choose between one and the other political line.

Considering the above, the Conference resolves that:

1. Extensive work has to be done to develop proletarian class-consciousness and to unite the urban and rural proletarians against the vacillations of the petty bourgeoisie, for only work of this nature can serve as a sure guarantee of the successful transfer of the entire state power into the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies or other organs directly expressing the will of the majority of the people (organs of local self-government, the Constituent Assembly, etc.);

2. This calls for many-sided activity within the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, for work aimed at increasing the number of these Soviets, consolidating their power, and welding together our Party's proletarian internationalist groups in the Soviets;

3. In order immediately to consolidate and widen the gains of the revolution in the local areas, it is necessary, with the backing of a solid majority of the local population, in every way to develop, organise, and strengthen its independent actions aimed at implementing liberties, dismissing the counter-revolutionary authorities, introducing economic measures, such as control over production and distribution, etc.;

4. The political crisis of April 19-21 precipitated by the Note of the Provisional Government has shown that the government party of the Constitutional-Democrats, which is organising counter-revolutionary elements both in the army and in the streets, is now making attempts to shoot down the workers. In view of the unstable situation arising from the dual power, the repetition of such attempts is inevitable,

and it is the duty of the party of the proletariat to tell the people as forcibly as possible that, in order to avert the seriously threatening danger of such mass shootings of the proletariat as took place in Paris in the June days of 1848, it is necessary to organise and arm the proletariat, to establish the closest alliance between the proletariat and the revolutionary army, to break with the policy of confidence in the Provisional Government.

Pravda No. 42,
May 10 (April 27), 1917

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

11

REPORT ON THE QUESTION
OF REVISING THE PARTY PROGRAMME
APRIL 28 (MAY 11)⁸⁷

Comrades, this is how the question of revising the Party Programme now stands. The first draft of proposed changes in the doctrinal part of our programme and in a number of basic points in its political part was submitted to the committee. The whole programme must be revised as being utterly obsolete—a fact that was pointed out in Party circles long before the war. It appears, however, that there is not the slightest hope for discussing the proposed changes of the programme as a whole. On the other hand, the committee has come to the unanimous conclusion that a revision of the programme is absolutely essential, and that in a number of questions it is possible and necessary to indicate the direction in which such revision should be made. We have therefore agreed on the following draft resolution which I am going to read to you now, making brief comments as I go along. We have decided not to put forward precisely formulated theses at the present time, but merely to indicate along what lines this revision should be carried out.

(Reads the resolution.)

“The Conference considers it necessary to revise the Party Programme along the following lines:

“1. Evaluating imperialism and the epoch of imperialist wars in connection with the approaching socialist revolution; fighting against the distortion of Marxism by the ‘defencists’, who have forgotten Marx’s slogan—‘The working men have no country’.”⁸⁸

This is so clear that it requires no explanation. As a matter of fact our Party's policy has advanced considerably and, practically speaking, has already taken the stand proposed in this formulation.

"2. Amending the theses and clauses dealing with the state; such amendment is to be in the nature of a demand for a democratic proletarian-peasant republic (i.e., a type of state functioning without police, without a standing army, and without a privileged bureaucracy), and not for a bourgeois parliamentary republic."

Other formulations of this point had been proposed. One of them mentioned the experience of the Paris Commune and the experience of the period between the seventies and the eighties, but such a formulation is unsatisfactory and too general; another spoke about a republic of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies, but this formulation, too, was considered unsatisfactory by most of the comrades. A formulation, however, is needed; the point is not what an institution is called, but what its political character and structure is. By saying "proletarian-peasant republic", we indicate its social content and political character.

"3. Eliminating or amending what is out of date in the political programme."

Practically speaking, our general political activities in the Soviets have gone along these lines; therefore, there can hardly be room for doubt that the change in this particular point of the programme and the precise formulation of our estimate of the moment in which the revolution found our Party, is not likely to provoke any disagreements.

"4. Altering a number of points in the political minimum programme, so as to state more consistent democratic demands with greater precision.

"5. Completely changing the economic part of the minimum programme, which in very many places is out of date, and points relating to public education."

The main thing here is that these points have become out of date; the trade union movement has outstripped them.

"6. Revising the agrarian programme in accordance with the adopted resolution on the agrarian question.

"7. Inserting a demand for nationalisation of a number of syndicates, etc., now ripe for such a step."

A careful formulation has been chosen here, which can be narrowed or widened, depending upon what drafts will appear in print.

“8. Adding an analysis of the main trends in modern socialism.”

An addendum like this was made to the *Communist Manifesto*.

“The Conference instructs the Central Committee to work out, within two months, on the basis of the above suggestions, a draft for the Party Programme which is to be submitted for approval to the Party congress. The Conference calls upon all organisations and all Party members to consider drafts of the programme, to correct them, and to work out counterdrafts.”

It has been pointed out that it would be desirable to set up a scientific body and create a literature dealing with this subject, but we have neither the men nor the means for this. This is the resolution that should help in the speedy revision of our programme. This resolution will be forwarded abroad to enable our internationalist comrades to take part in revising the programme, which our Party has undertaken on the basis of the experience of the world war.

A brief report published
May 13 (April 30), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 45

First published in full in 1921
in N. Lenin (V. Ulyanov),
Works, Vol. XIV, Part 2

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

12

RESOLUTION ON THE QUESTION
OF REVISING THE PARTY PROGRAMME

The Conference considers it necessary to revise the Party Programme along the following lines:

1. Evaluating imperialism and the epoch of imperialist wars in connection with the approaching socialist revolution; fighting against the distortion of Marxism by the “defencists”, who have forgotten Marx’s slogan—“The working men have no country”;

2. Amending the theses and clauses dealing with the state; such amendment is to be in the nature of a demand for a democratic proletarian-peasant republic (i.e., a type of state functioning without police, without a standing army, and without a privileged bureaucracy), and not for a bourgeois parliamentary republic;

3. Eliminating or amending what is out of date in the political programme;

4. Altering a number of points in the political minimum programme, so as to state more consistent democratic demands with greater precision;

5. Completely changing the economic part of the minimum programme, which in very many places is out of date, and points relating to public education;

6. Revising the agrarian programme in accordance with the adopted resolution on the agrarian question;

7. Inserting a demand for nationalisation of a number of syndicates, etc., now ripe for such a step;

8. Adding an analysis of the main trends in modern socialism.

The Conference instructs the Central Committee to work out, within two months, on the basis of the above suggestions, a draft for the Party Programme which is to be submitted for approval to the Party congress. The Conference calls upon all organisations and all Party members to consider drafts of the programme, to correct them, and to work out counterdrafts.

Supplement to *Soldatskaya Pravda* No. 13,
May 16 (3), 1917

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

13

REPORT ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION
APRIL 28 (MAY 11)

Comrades, the agrarian question was threshed out so thoroughly by our Party during the first revolution that by this time, I think, our ideas on the subject are pretty well defined. Indirect proof of this is to be found in the fact that the committee of the Conference composed of comrades interested and fully versed in this subject have agreed on the proposed draft resolution without making any substantial corrections. I shall therefore confine myself to very brief remarks. And since all members have proof-sheets of the draft, there is no need to read it in full.

The present growth of the agrarian movement throughout Russia is perfectly obvious and undeniable. Our Party Programme, proposed by the Mensheviks and adopted by the Stockholm Congress in 1906, was refuted even in the course of the first Russian revolution. At that Congress the Mensheviks succeeded in getting their programme of municipalisation adopted. The essence of their programme was as follows: the peasant lands, communal and homestead, were to remain the property of the peasants while the landed estates were to be taken over by local self-government bodies. One of the Mensheviks' chief arguments in favour of such a programme was that the peasants would never understand the transfer of peasant land to anyone but themselves. Anyone acquainted with the Minutes of the Stockholm Congress will recollect that this argument was particularly stressed both by Maslov, who made the report, and by Kostrov. We should not forget, as is often done nowadays, that this happened before the First Duma, when there was no objec-

tive information about the character of the peasant movement and its strength. Everyone knew that Russia was aflame with the agrarian revolution, but no one knew how the agrarian movement would be organised, or in what direction the peasant revolution would develop. It was impossible to check whether the opinions expressed by the Congress were the real and practical views held by the peasants themselves. This was why the Mensheviks' argument had carried such weight. Soon after the Stockholm Congress, we received the first serious indication of how the peasants viewed this question. In both the First and the Second Dumas, the peasants themselves put forward the Trudovik "Bill of the 104".⁸⁹ I made a special study of the signatures to this bill, carefully studied the views of the various deputies, their class affiliations, and the extent to which they may be called peasants. I stated categorically in my book, which was burned by the tsarist censor but which I will republish,⁹⁰ that the overwhelming majority of these 104 signatories were peasants. That bill called for the nationalisation of the land. The peasants said that the entire land would become the property of the state.

How, then, are we to account for the fact that in both Dumas the deputies representing the peasants of all Russia preferred nationalisation to the measure proposed in both Dumas by the Mensheviks from the point of view of the peasants' interests? The Mensheviks proposed that the peasants retain the ownership of their own lands, and that only the landed estates should be given to the people; the peasants, however, maintained that the entire land should be given to the people. How are we to account for this? The Socialist-Revolutionaries say that owing to their commune organisation the Russian peasants favour socialisation, the labour principle. All this phraseology is absolutely devoid of common sense, it is nothing but words. But how are we to account for this? I think the peasants came to this conclusion because all landownership in Russia, both peasants' and landowners', communal and homestead, is permeated with old, semi-feudal relationships, and the peasants, considering market conditions, had to demand the transfer of the land to all the people. The peasants say that the tangle of old agrarian life can only be unraveled by nationalisation.

Their point of view is bourgeois; by equalitarian land tenure they mean the confiscation of the landed estates, but not the equalisation of individual proprietors. By nationalisation they mean an actual reallotment of all the land among the peasants. This is a grand bourgeois project. No peasant spoke about equalisation or socialisation; but they all said it was impossible to wait any longer, that all the land had to be cleared, in other words, that farming could not be carried on in the old way under twentieth-century conditions. The Stolypin Reform⁹¹ has since then confused the land question still more. That is what the peasants have in mind when they demand nationalisation. It means a reallotment of all the land. There are to be no varied forms of landownership. There is not the slightest suggestion of socialisation. This demand by the peasants is called equalitarian because, as a brief summary of the statistics relating to land holdings in 1905 shows, 300 peasant families held as much land (2,000 dessiatines) as one landowner's family. In this sense it is, of course, equalitarian, but it does not imply that all small farms are to be equalised. The Bill of the 104 shows the opposite.

These are the essential points that have to be made in order to give scientific support to the view that nationalisation in Russia, as far as bourgeois democracy is concerned, is necessary. But it is also necessary for another reason—it deals a mighty blow at private ownership of the means of production. It is simply absurd to imagine that after the abolition of private property in land everything in Russia will remain as before.

Then follow some practical conclusions and demands. Of the minor amendments in the draft I shall call attention to the following. The first point reads: "The party of the proletariat will support with all its might the immediate and complete confiscation of all landed estates...." Instead of "will support" we ought to say "will fight for".... Our point of view is not that the peasants have not enough land and that they need more. That is the current opinion. We say that the landed estates are the basis of oppression that crushes the peasants and keeps them backward. The question is not whether the peasants have or have not enough land. Down with serfdom!—this is the way the issue should be stated from the point of view of the revolutionary class

struggle, and not from the point of view of those officials who try to figure out how much land they have and by what norms it should be allotted. I suggest that the order of points 2 and 3 should be reversed, because, to us, the thing that matters is revolutionary initiative, and the law must be the result of it. *If you wait until the law is written, and yourselves do not develop revolutionary initiative, you will have neither the law nor the land.*

People very often object to nationalisation because, they say, it requires a colossal bureaucratic apparatus. That is true, but state landownership implies that every peasant is leasing the land from the state. The subletting of leaseholds is prohibited. But the question of how much and what kind of land the peasant shall lease must be entirely settled by the proper democratic, not bureaucratic, organ of authority.

For "farm-hands" we substitute "agricultural labourers". Several comrades declared that the word "farm-hand" was offensive; objections were raised to this word. It should be deleted.

We should not speak now of proletarian-peasant committees or Soviets in connection with the settlement of the land question, for, as we see, the peasants have set up Soviets of Soldiers' Deputies, thus creating a division between the proletariat and the peasantry.

The petty-bourgeois defencist parties, as we know, stand for the land question being put off until the Constituent Assembly meets. We are for the immediate transfer of the land to the peasants in a highly organised manner. We are emphatically against anarchic seizing of land. You propose that the peasants enter into agreements with the landowners. We say that the land should be taken over and cultivated right now if we wish to avert famine, to save the country from the debacle which is advancing upon it with incredible speed. One cannot now accept the prescriptions offered by Shingaryov and the Cadets, who suggest waiting for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the date of which has not been fixed yet, or making arrangements with the landowners for renting land. The peasants are already seizing the land without paying for it, or paying only a quarter of the rent.

One comrade has brought a local resolution, from Penza Gubernia, saying that the peasants are seizing the landowners' agricultural implements, which however they do not divide among the households, but convert into common property. They are establishing a definite order of sequence, a rule, for using these implements to cultivate all the land. In resorting to such measures, they are guided by the desire to increase agricultural production. This is a matter of principle of tremendous significance, for all that the landowners and capitalists shout about it being anarchy. But if you are going to chatter and shout about this being anarchy, while the peasants sit back and wait, then you will indeed have anarchy. The peasants have shown that they understand farming conditions and social control better than the government officials, and apply such control a hundred times more efficiently. Such a measure, which is doubtless quite practicable in a small village, inevitably leads to more sweeping measures. When the peasant comes to learn this—and he has already begun to learn it—the knowledge of bourgeois professors will not be needed; he will himself come to the conclusion that it is essential to utilise the agricultural implements, not only in the small farms, but for the cultivation of all the land. How they do this is unimportant. We do not know whether they combine their individual plots for common ploughing and sowing or not, and it does not matter if they do it differently. What does matter is that the peasants are fortunate in not having to face a large number of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, who style themselves Marxists and Social-Democrats, and with a grave mien lecture the people about the time not yet being ripe for a socialist revolution and that therefore the peasants must not take the land immediately. Fortunately there are few such gentlemen in the Russian countryside. If the peasants contented themselves merely with taking the land by arrangement with the landowners, and failed to apply their experience collectively, failure would be inevitable, and the peasant committees would become a mere toy, a meaningless game. This is why we propose to add Point 8* to the draft resolution.

* See p. 292 of this volume.—*Ed.*

Once we know that the local peasants have themselves taken this initiative, it is our duty to say that we approve and recommend this initiative. Only this can serve as a guarantee that the revolution will not be limited to formal measures, that the struggle against the crisis will not remain a mere subject for departmental discussion and Shingaryov's epistles, but that the peasants will actually go ahead in an organised way to combat famine and to increase production.

A brief report published
May 13 (April 30), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 45

First published in full in 1921
in N. Lenin (V. Ulyanov),
Works, Vol. XIV, Part 2

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

14

REJOINDER TO N. S. ANGARSKY
DURING THE DEBATE ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION
APRIL 28 (MAY 11)

Comrades, it seems to me that Comrade Angarsky is indulging in several contradictions. I speak about the *material* foundation of the urge towards nationalisation. The peasants have no idea of nationalisation. I say that the conditions of an all-Russia and international market exist, and this is expressed in the high prices of grain. Every peasant sees, knows, and feels the fluctuations of these prices, and farming has to conform to these conditions, to these prices. I say that the old landownership and the new farming system have absolutely diverged and this divergence explains why the peasants are pressing onward. The peasant is a proprietor, Comrade Angarsky says. Quite right. Stolypin wanted to use this as a basis for changing agrarian relations, he tried his hardest, but he failed, because such changes cannot be brought about without a revolutionary break-up. This, then, is the material foundation of the peasants' urge towards the nationalisation of the land, although they are completely ignorant as to the real meaning of nationalisation. The peasant proprietor is instinctively inclined to maintain that the land is God's, because it has become impossible to live under the old conditions of landownership. What Comrade Angarsky is proposing is a sheer misunderstanding. The second paragraph says that peasant landownership is fettered all round, from top to bottom, by old semi-feudal ties and relationships. But does it say anything about the landed estates? It does not. Comrade Angarsky's amendment is based on a misapprehension. He has ascribed to me things I never said,

things the peasants have no idea about. The peasants know the world situation by the prices of grain and consumer goods, and if a railway runs through his village, the peasant feels its effect through his own farm. To live the old way is impossible—that's what the peasant feels, and he expresses this feeling in a radical demand for the abolition of the old system of landownership. The peasant wants to be a proprietor, but he wants to be one on reallocated land; he wants to farm land the ownership of which is conditioned by his present requirements, and not by those which were prescribed for him by officials. The peasant knows this perfectly well, but expresses it differently, of course, and it is this that forms the material foundation of his urge towards the nationalisation of the land.

First published in full in 1921
in N. Lenin (V. Ulyanov),
Works, Vol. XIV, Part 2

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

15

RESOLUTION ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION

The existence of landed estates in Russia is the material mainstay of the power of the feudalist landowners and a guarantee of the possible restoration of the monarchy. This system of landownership necessarily condemns the great mass of Russia's population, the peasantry, to pauperism, bondage, and a downtrodden existence, and the entire country to backwardness in every sphere of life.

Peasant landownership in Russia, both of allotment land (communal and homestead) and private land (leased or purchased), is fettered all round, from top to bottom, by old semi-feudal ties and relationships, by the division of the peasants into categories inherited from the time of serfdom, by the open field system, and so on, and so forth. The need for breaking down all these antiquated and harmful restrictions, for "clearing" the land; and reconstructing and readjusting all the relations of landownership and agriculture to the new conditions of Russian and world economy, forms the material foundation of the peasants' urge towards the nationalisation of *all* the land in the state.

Whatever the petty-bourgeois utopias in which all Narodnik parties and groups array the struggle of the peasant masses against feudalist big landownership and all the feudal fetters of the entire system of landownership and land tenure in Russia, that struggle is itself an expression of a thoroughly bourgeois-democratic, undoubtedly progressive, and economically essential striving resolutely to break all those fetters.

Nationalisation of the land, though being a bourgeois measure, implies freedom for the class struggle and freedom of land tenure from all non-bourgeois adjuncts to the greatest

possible degree conceivable in a capitalist society. Moreover, nationalisation of the land, representing as it does the abolition of private ownership of land, would, in effect, deal such a powerful blow to private ownership of all the means of production in general that the party of the proletariat must facilitate such a reform in every possible way.

On the other hand, the well-to-do peasants of Russia long ago evolved the elements of a peasant bourgeoisie, and the Stolypin agrarian reform has undoubtedly strengthened, augmented, and reinforced these elements. At the other pole of the rural population, the agricultural wage-workers, the proletarians, and the mass of semi-proletarian peasantry, who stand close to the proletarians, have likewise gained in strength and numbers.

The more determined and consistent the break-up and elimination of the landed estates and the more determined and consistent the bourgeois-democratic agrarian reform in Russia in general, the more vigorous and speedy will be the development of the class struggle of the agricultural proletariat against the well-to-do peasants (the peasant bourgeoisie).

The fate and the outcome of the Russian revolution—unless the incipient proletarian revolution in Europe exercises a direct and powerful influence on our country—will depend on whether the urban proletariat succeeds in rallying the rural proletariat together with the mass of rural semi-proletarians behind it, or whether this mass follows the lead of the peasant bourgeoisie, which is gravitating towards an alliance with Guchkov and Milyukov, with the capitalists and landowners, and towards the counter-revolution in general.

In view of this class situation and balance of forces the Conference resolves that:

- 1) The party of the proletariat will fight with all its might for the immediate and complete confiscation of all landed estates in Russia (and also crown lands, church lands, etc., etc.);

- 2) The party will vigorously advocate the immediate transfer of all lands to the peasantry organised in Soviets of Peasants Deputies, or in other organs of local self-government elected in a really democratic way and entirely independent of the landowners and officials;

3) The party of the proletariat demands the nationalisation of all the land in the country; nationalisation, which signifies the transfer of the right of ownership of all land to the state, vests the right of administering the land in local democratic institutions;

4) The party must wage a determined struggle, on the one hand, against the Provisional Government, which, both through the mouth of Shingaryov and by its collective utterances, is trying to force the peasants to come to a "voluntary agreement with the landowners", i.e., is trying virtually to impose upon them a reform which suits the interests of the landowners, and is threatening the peasants with punishment for "arbitrary action", that is, with the use of violence by a minority of the population (the landowners and capitalists) against the majority; on the other hand, against the petty-bourgeois vacillations of the majority of the Narodniks and the Menshevik Social-Democrats, who are advising the peasants not to take all the land pending the convocation of the Constituent Assembly;

5) The party advises the peasants to take the land in an organised way, not allowing the slightest damage to property, and taking measures to increase production;

6) Agrarian reforms, by and large, can be successful and durable only provided the whole state is democratised, i.e., provided, on the one hand, the police, the standing army, and the privileged bureaucracy are abolished, and provided, on the other, there exists a system of broad local self-government completely free from supervision and tutelage from above;

7) The separate and independent organisation of the agricultural proletariat must be undertaken immediately and everywhere, both in the form of Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies (as well as of separate Soviets of deputies of the semi-proletarian peasantry) and in the form of proletarian groups or factions within the general Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, in all local and municipal government bodies, etc.,

8) The party must support the initiative of those peasant committees which in a number of localities in Russia are handing over the livestock and agricultural implements of the landowners to the peasants organised in those committees,

to be used in a socially regulated manner for the cultivation of all the land;

9) The party of the proletariat must advise the rural proletarians and semi-proletarians to strive to convert every landed estate into a fair-sized model farm to be run on public lines by the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies under the direction of agricultural experts and with the application of the best technique.

Pravda No. 45,
May 13 (April 30), 1917

Published according
to the text of the proof-sheets
with Lenin's corrections

16

RESOLUTION ON UNITING THE INTERNATIONALISTS
AGAINST THE PETTY-BOURGEOIS DEFENCIST BLOC*Taking into consideration:*

(1) that the parties of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, Menshevik Social-Democrats, etc., have, in the great majority of cases, adopted the stand of "revolutionary defencism", that is, support of the imperialist war (voting in favour of the loan and supporting the Provisional Government which represents the interests of Capital);

(2) that these parties in all their policies defend the interests and point of view of the petty bourgeoisie and corrupt the proletariat with bourgeois influence by trying to persuade it that it is possible, by means of agreements, "control", participation in the cabinet, etc., to change the government's imperialist policy and divert it from the path of counter-revolutionary encroachments on liberty;

(3) that this policy encourages and enhances the attitude of unreasoning trust on the part of the masses towards the capitalists, an attitude which constitutes the chief obstacle to the further development of the revolution, and a possible source of the revolution's defeat by the landowner and bourgeois counter-revolution,

the Conference resolves that:

(1) unity with parties and groups which are pursuing such a policy is absolutely impossible;

(2) closer relations and unity with groups and trends that have adopted a real internationalist stand are necessary on the basis of a definite break with the policy of petty-bourgeois betrayal of socialism.

17

RESOLUTION ON THE SOVIETS
OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES

The Conference has discussed the reports and communications of comrades working in the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in different parts of Russia and states that:

In many provincial areas the revolution is progressing in the following way: the proletariat and the peasantry, on their own initiative, are organising Soviets and dismissing the old authorities; a proletarian and peasant militia is being set up; all lands are being transferred to the peasants; workers' control over the factories and the eight-hour day have been introduced and wages have been increased; production is being maintained, and workers control the distribution of food, etc.

This growth of the revolution in the provinces in depth and scope is, on the one hand, the growth of a movement for transferring all power to the Soviets and putting the workers and peasants themselves in control of production. On the other hand, it serves as a guarantee for the build-up of forces, on a national scale, for the second stage of the revolution, which must transfer all state power to the Soviets or to other organs directly expressing the will of the majority of the nation (organs of local self-government, the Constituent Assembly, etc.).

In the capitals and in a few other large cities the task of transferring state power to the Soviets is particularly difficult and requires an especially long period of preparation of the proletariat's forces. This is where the largest forces of the bourgeoisie are concentrated, where a policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie is most strongly in evidence, a policy which often holds back the revolutionary initiative of the masses and

weakens their independence; this is particularly dangerous in view of the leading role of these Soviets for the provinces.

It is, therefore, the task of the proletarian party, on the one hand, to support in every possible way the indicated development of the revolution locally, and, on the other to conduct a systematic struggle within the Soviets (by means of propaganda and new elections) for the triumph of the proletarian line. The party must concentrate all its efforts and all its attention on winning over the mass of workers and soldiers, and must draw a line between the policy of the proletariat and that of the petty bourgeoisie, between the internationalist policy and the defencist policy, between the revolutionary and the opportunist policy. The party must organise and arm the workers and build up their forces for the next stage of the revolution.

The Conference repeats that it is necessary to carry out many-sided activity within the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, to increase the number of Soviets, to consolidate their power, and to weld together our Party's proletarian internationalist groups within the Soviets.

Pravda No. 46,
May 15 (2), 1917

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

NOT FOR
COMMERCIAL
DISTRIBUTION

18

SPEECH ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION
APRIL 29 (MAY 12)

Beginning from 1903, when our Party adopted its programme, we have been encountering violent opposition on the part of the Polish comrades. If you study the Minutes of the Second Congress you will see that they were using the same arguments then that they are using now, and that the Polish Social-Democrats walked out from that Congress because they held that recognition of the right of nations to self-determination was unacceptable to them. Ever since then we have been coming up against the same question. Though imperialism already existed in 1903, the Polish Social-Democrats made no mention of it in their arguments. They are making the same strange and monstrous error now as they were then. These people want to put our Party's stand on a par with that of the chauvinists.

Owing to long oppression by Russia Poland's policy is a wholly nationalist one, and the whole Polish nation is obsessed with one idea—revenge on the Muscovites. No one has oppressed the Poles more than the Russian people, who served in the hands of the tsars as the executioner of Polish freedom. In no nation does hatred of Russia sit so deep as with the Poles; no nation dislikes Russia so intensely as the Poles. As a result we have a strange thing. Because of the Polish bourgeoisie, Poland has become an obstacle to the socialist movement. The whole world could go to the devil so long as Poland was free. Of course, this way of putting the question is a mockery of internationalism. Of course, Poland is now a victim of violence, but for the Polish nationalists to count on Russia liberating Poland—that would be treason to the International. The Polish nationalists have

so imbued the Polish people with their views that this is how the situation is regarded in Poland.

The Polish Social-Democratic comrades have rendered a great historic service by advancing the slogan of internationalism and declaring that the fraternal union of the proletariat of all countries is of supreme importance to them and that they will never go to war for the liberation of Poland. This is to their credit, and this is why we have always regarded only these Polish Social-Democrats as socialists. The others are patriots, Polish Plekhanovs. But this peculiar position, when, in order to safeguard socialism, people were forced to struggle against a rabid and morbid nationalism, has produced a strange state of affairs: comrades come to us saying that we must give up the idea of Poland's freedom, her right to secession.

Why should we Great Russians, who have been oppressing more nations than any other people, deny the right to secession for Poland, Ukraine, or Finland? We are asked to become chauvinists, because by doing so we would make the position of Social-Democrats in Poland less difficult. We do not pretend to seek to liberate Poland, because the Polish people live between two states that are capable of fighting. Instead of telling the Polish workers that only those Social-Democrats are real democrats who maintain that the Polish people ought to be free, since there is no place for chauvinists in a socialist party, the Polish Social-Democrats argue that, just because they find the union with Russian workers advantageous, they are opposed to Poland's secession. They have a perfect right to do so. But people don't want to understand that to strengthen internationalism you do not have to repeat the same words. What you have to do is to stress, in Russia, the freedom of secession for oppressed nations and, in Poland, their freedom to unite. Freedom to unite implies freedom to secede. We Russians must emphasise freedom to secede, while the Poles must emphasise freedom to unite.

We notice here a number of sophisms involving a complete renunciation of Marxism. Comrade Pyatakov's stand repeats that of Rosa Luxemburg....* (Holland is an example.)

* A gap in the Minutes.—*Ed.*

This is how Comrade Pyatakof reasons, and this is how he refutes himself, for in theory he denies freedom of secession, but to the people he says that anyone opposing freedom of secession is not a socialist. Comrade Pyatakof has been saying things here that are hopelessly muddled. In Western Europe most countries settled their national questions long ago. It is Western Europe that is referred to when it is said that the national question has been settled. Comrade Pyatakof, however, puts this where it does not belong—to Eastern Europe, and we find ourselves in a ridiculous position.

Just think of the dreadful mess that results Finland is right next door to us. Comrade Pyatakof has no definite answer for Finland and gets all mixed up. In yesterday's *Rabochaya Gazeta* you read that the movement for separation is growing in Finland. Finns arriving here tell us that separatism is growing there because the Cadets refuse to grant the country complete autonomy. A crisis is approaching there, dissatisfaction with Governor-General Rodichev is rife, but *Rabochaya Gazeta* writes that the Finns should wait for the Constituent Assembly, because an agreement will there be reached between Finland and Russia. What do they mean by agreement? The Finns must declare that they are entitled to decide their destiny in their own way, and any Great Russian who denies this right is a chauvinist. It would be another thing if we said to the Finnish worker: Decide what is best for yourself....*

Comrade Pyatakof simply rejects our slogan, saying that it means giving no slogan for the socialist revolution, but he himself gives no appropriate slogan. The method of socialist revolution under the slogan "Down with frontiers" is all muddled up. We have not succeeded in publishing the article in which I called this view "imperialist Economism".** What does the "method" of socialist revolution under the slogan "Down with frontiers" mean? We maintain that the state is necessary, and a state presupposes frontiers. The state, of course, may hold a bourgeois government, but we need the Soviets. But even Soviets are confronted with the question of frontiers. What does "Down with frontiers"

* A gap in the Minutes.—*Ed.*

** See present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 28-76.—*Ed.*

mean? It is the beginning of anarchy.... The "method" of socialist revolution under the slogan "Down with frontiers" is simply a mess. When the time is ripe for socialist revolution, when it finally occurs, it will spread to other countries. We shall help it along, but in what manner, we do not know. "The method of socialist revolution" is just a meaningless phrase. We stand for the settlement of problems which the bourgeois revolution has left unsolved. Our attitude to the separatist movement is indifferent, neutral. If Finland, Poland or Ukraine secede from Russia, there is nothing bad in that. What is wrong with it? Anyone who says that is a chauvinist. One must be mad to continue Tsar Nicholas's policy. Didn't Norway secede from Sweden? Alexander I and Napoleon once bartered nations, the tsars once traded Poland. Are we to continue this policy of the tsars? This is repudiation of the tactics of internationalism, this is chauvinism at its worst. What is wrong with Finland seceding? After the secession of Norway from Sweden mutual trust increased between the two peoples, between the proletariat of these countries. The Swedish landowners wanted to start a war, but the Swedish workers refused to be drawn into such a war.

All the Finns want now is autonomy. We are for Finland receiving complete freedom, because then there will be greater trust in Russian democracy and the Finns will not separate. While Mr. Rodichev goes to Finland to haggle over autonomy, our Finnish comrades come here and say, "We want autonomy." But what they get is a broadside, and the answer: "Wait for the Constituent Assembly." But we say: "Any Russian socialist who denies Finland freedom is a chauvinist."

We say that frontiers are determined by the will of the population. Russia, don't you dare fight over Kurland! Germany, get your armies out of Kurland! That is how we solve the secession problem. The proletariat cannot use force, because it must not prevent the peoples from obtaining their freedom. Only when the socialist revolution has become a reality, and not a method, will the slogan "Down with frontiers" be a correct slogan. Then we shall say: Comrades, come to us....

War is a different matter entirely. If need be, we shall not draw the line at a revolutionary war. We are not pacifists....

When we have Milyukov sitting here and sending Rodichev to Finland to shamefully haggle with the Finnish people, we say to the Russian people: Don't you dare coerce Finland; no nation can be free that oppresses other nations.⁹² In the resolution concerning Borgbjerg we say: Withdraw your troops and let the nation settle the question itself. But, if the Soviet takes over power tomorrow, that will not be a "method of socialist revolution", and we shall then say: Germany, get your troops out of Poland, and Russia, get your troops out of Armenia. If we did otherwise we should be deceiving people.

Comrade Dzerzhinsky tells us that in his oppressed Poland everybody is a chauvinist. But not a single Pole has said a word about Finland or Ukraine. We have been arguing over this so much since 1903 that it is becoming difficult to talk about it. Do as you please.... Anyone who does not accept this point of view is an annexationist and a chauvinist. We are for a fraternal union of all nations. If there is a Ukrainian republic and a Russian republic, there will be closer contact and greater trust between the two. If the Ukrainians see that we have a Soviet republic, they will not secede, but if we have a Milyukov republic, they will. When Comrade Pyatakov said in self-contradiction that he is against the forcible retention of nations within the frontiers, he actually recognised the right of nations to self-determination. We certainly do not want the peasant in Khiva to live under the Khan of Khiva. By developing our revolution we shall influence the oppressed people. Propaganda among the oppressed mass must follow only this line.

Any Russian socialist who does not recognise Finland's and Ukraine's right to freedom will degenerate into a chauvinist. And no sophisms or references to his "method" will ever help him to justify himself.

A brief report published
May 15 (2), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 46

First published in full
in 1921 in N. Lenin
(V. Ulyanov), *Works*,
Vol. XIV, Part 2

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

RESOLUTION ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

The policy of national oppression, inherited from the autocracy and monarchy; is maintained by the landowners, capitalists, and petty bourgeoisie in order to protect their class privileges and to cause disunity among the workers of the various nationalities. Modern imperialism, which increases the tendency to subjugate weaker nations, is a new factor intensifying national oppression.

The elimination of national oppression, if at all achievable in capitalist society, is possible only under a consistently democratic republican system and state administration that guarantee complete equality for all nations and languages.

The right of all the nations forming part of Russia freely to secede and form independent states must be recognised. To deny them this right, or to fail to take measures guaranteeing its practical realisation, is equivalent to supporting a policy of seizure or annexation. Only the recognition by the proletariat of the right of nations to secede can ensure complete solidarity among the workers of the various nations and help to bring the nations closer together on truly democratic lines.

The conflict which has arisen at the present time between Finland and the Russian Provisional Government strikingly demonstrates that denial of the right to free secession leads to a direct continuation of the policy of tsarism.

The right of nations freely to secede must not be confused with the advisability of secession by a given nation at a given moment. The party of the proletariat must decide the latter question quite independently in each particular

case, having regard to the interests of social development as a whole and the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat for socialism.

The Party demands broad regional autonomy, the abolition of supervision from above, the abolition of a compulsory official language, and the fixing of the boundaries of the self-governing and autonomous regions in accordance with the economic and social conditions, the national composition of the population, and so forth, as assessed by the local population itself.

The party of the proletariat emphatically rejects what is known as "national cultural autonomy", under which education, etc., is removed from the control of the state and put in the control of some kind of national diets. National cultural autonomy artificially divides the workers living in one locality, and even working in the same industrial enterprise, according to their various "national cultures"; in other words, it strengthens the ties between the workers and the bourgeois culture of their nations, whereas the aim of the Social-Democrats is to develop the international culture of the world proletariat.

The party demands that a fundamental law be embodied in the constitution annulling all privileges enjoyed by any one nation and all infringements of the rights of national minorities.

The interests of the working class demand that the workers of all nationalities in Russia should have common proletarian organisations: political, trade union, co-operative educational institutions, and so forth. Only the merging of the workers of the various nationalities into such common organisations will make it possible for the proletariat to wage a successful struggle against international Capital and bourgeois nationalism.

20

SPEECH ON THE SITUATION WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL
AND THE TASKS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.)
APRIL 29 (MAY 12)

Comrade Zinoviev admitted that our visit to Stockholm would be the last one, and that we would only be there for the purpose of information.⁹³

When Grimm invited us to the conference, I refused to go, because I realised that it would be useless to talk to people who stood for social-chauvinism. We say: "No participation with social-chauvinists." We come and address ourselves to the Zimmerwald Left. Grimm had a moral and formal right to draw up today's resolution. His right was based on Kautsky in Germany, on Longuet in France. This is how the matter stands officially: Grimm has announced, "We will disband our bureau, as soon as Huysmans organises a bureau." When we said that such a solution was not acceptable to Zimmerwald, he agreed, but said "this is the opinion of the majority"—and that was true.

As to our visit. "We shall get information, we shall get in touch with the Zimmerwald Left," it is claimed. There is very little hope of our winning over anybody else. Let us have no illusions; first, the visit will not take place; second, if it does, it will be our last; third, we cannot, for technical reasons, win over the elements that wish to break with the social-chauvinists. But let Comrade Nogin make the first and Comrade Zinoviev the last visit to Stockholm. As for me, I express the very legitimate wish that this "last-visit" attempt should be made as quickly and successfully as possible.

A brief report published May 15 (2), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 46

First published in full
in 1925 in the book *The Petrograd
City and the All-Russia
Conferences of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.),
April 1917*

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

21

SPEECH
IN FAVOUR OF THE RESOLUTION
ON THE CURRENT SITUATION
APRIL 29 (MAY 12)

In the resolution on the current situation it would be wrong to speak only of Russian conditions. The war has bound us together so inseparably that it would be a great mistake on our part to ignore the sum total of international relations.

The main question dealt with in the resolution is this: what tasks will confront the Russian proletariat in the event of the world movement raising the issue of a social revolution?

“The objective conditions for a socialist revolution, which undoubtedly existed even before the war in the more developed and advanced countries, have been ripening with tremendous rapidity as a result of the war. Small and middle enterprises are being squeezed out and ruined at a faster rate than ever. The concentration and internationalisation of capital are making gigantic strides; monopoly capitalism is developing into state monopoly capitalism. In a number of countries regulation of production and distribution by society is being introduced by force of circumstances. Some countries are introducing universal labour conscription.”

Before the war we had the monopoly of trusts and syndicates; since the war we have had a state monopoly. Universal labour conscription is something new, something that constitutes part of a socialist whole—this is often overlooked by those who fear to examine the concrete situation.

The first part of the resolution concentrates on an analysis of the conditions of capitalist economy throughout the world. It is noteworthy that twenty-seven years ago Engels

pointed out that to describe capitalism as something that "is distinguished by its planlessness" and to overlook the role played by the trusts was unsatisfactory. Engels remarked that "when we come to the trust, then planlessness disappears", though there is capitalism. This remark is all the more pertinent today, when we have a military state, when we have state monopoly capitalism. Planning does not make the worker less of a slave, but it enables the capitalist to make his profits "according to plan". Capitalism is now evolving directly into its higher, regulated, form.

The second part of the resolution needs no explanations.

The third part requires more detailed comment. (*Reads the resolution.*)

"Operating as it does in one of the most backward countries of Europe amidst a vast population of small peasants, the proletariat of Russia cannot aim at immediately putting into effect socialist changes.

"But it would be a grave error, and in effect even a complete desertion to the bourgeoisie, to infer from this that the working class must support the bourgeoisie, or that it must keep its activities within limits acceptable to the petty bourgeoisie, or that the proletariat must renounce its leading role in the matter of explaining to the people the urgency of taking a number of practical steps towards socialism for which the time is now ripe."

From the first premise it is customary to make the conclusion that "Russia is a backward country, a peasant, petty-bourgeois country, therefore there can be no question of a social revolution". People forget, however, that the war has placed us in extraordinary circumstances, and that side by side with the petty bourgeoisie we have Big Capital. But what are the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies to do when they assume power? Should they go over to the bourgeoisie? Our answer is—the working class will continue its class struggle.

What is possible and what is necessary under the power of the Soviets?

First of all, the nationalisation of the land. Nationalisation of the land is a bourgeois measure, it does not exclude capitalism, nor does capitalism exclude it, but the blow it

will deal to private property will be a heavy one. Further (*reads on*):

“the establishment of state control over all banks, and their amalgamation into a single central bank; also control over the insurance agencies and big capitalist syndicates (for example, the Sugar Syndicate, the Coal Syndicate, the Metal Syndicate, etc.), and the gradual introduction of a more just progressive tax on incomes and properties. Economically, these measures are timely; technically, they can be carried out immediately; politically they are *likely* to receive the support of the overwhelming majority of the peasants, who have everything to gain by these reforms.”

This point evoked discussion. I already had occasion to speak of this in *Pravda* in connection with Plekhanov's articles. “When they talk about socialism being impossible,” I wrote, “they try to speak of the latter in a way most advantageous to themselves, they represent it vaguely, indefinitely, as some sort of a jump.” Kautsky himself wrote: “No socialist speaks of the abolition of private property in the case of the peasants.” But does that mean that existing large-scale capital must make it unnecessary for the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies to control production, to control the sugar and other syndicates? This measure is not socialism—it is a transitional measure, but the carrying out of such measures together with the existence of the Soviets will bring about a situation in which Russia will have one foot in socialism—we say one foot because the peasant majority controls the other part of the country's economy. It cannot be denied that economically we are ripe for a change. To effect that change politically, we must have a majority, and the majority are peasants who are naturally interested in such changes. Whether they will prove sufficiently organised is another matter; we cannot speak for them.

An old and oft-repeated objection to socialism is that socialism means “barracks for the masses” and “mass bureaucracy”. We must now put the issue of socialism differently; we must raise it from the level of the abstract to the level of the concrete, namely, the nationalisation of the land, control over the syndicates, etc. (*reads the resolution*).

“All these and other similar measures can and should be not only discussed and prepared for enforcement on a

national scale in the event of all power passing to the proletarians and semi-proletarians, but also implemented by the local revolutionary organs of power of the whole people when the opportunity arises.

“Great care and discretion should be exercised in carrying out the above measures; a solid majority of the population must be won over and this majority must be clearly convinced of the country’s practical preparedness for any particular measure. This is the direction in which the class-conscious vanguard of the workers must focus its attention and efforts, because it is the bounden duty of these workers to help the peasants find a way out of the present debacle.”

These last words are the crux of the whole resolution; we put the issue of socialism not as a jump, but as a practical way out of the present debacle.

“This is a bourgeois revolution, it is therefore useless to speak of socialism,” say our opponents. But we say just the opposite: “Since the bourgeoisie cannot find a way out of the present situation, the revolution is bound to go on.” We must not confine ourselves to democratic phrases; we must make the situation clear to the masses, and indicate a number of practical measures to them, namely, they must take over the syndicates—control them through the Soviets, etc. When all such measures are carried out, Russia will be standing with one foot in socialism. Our economic programme must show a way out of the debacle—this is what should guide our actions.

First published in 1925
in the book *The Petrograd City
and the All-Russia Conferences
of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.)*, April 1917

Published according
to the manuscript copy
of the Minutes

RESOLUTION ON THE CURRENT SITUATION

The world war, brought about by the struggle of world trusts and banking capital for domination over the world market, has already led to the mass destruction of material values, to exhaustion of productive forces, and to such a growth in the war industry that it is impossible to produce even the absolutely necessary minimum of consumer goods and means of production.

The present war, therefore, has brought humanity to an impasse and placed it on the brink of ruin.

The objective conditions for a socialist revolution, which undoubtedly existed even before the war in the more developed and advanced countries, have been ripening with tremendous rapidity as a result of the war. Small and middle enterprises are being squeezed out and ruined at a faster rate than ever. The concentration and internationalisation of capital are making gigantic strides; monopoly capitalism is developing into state monopoly capitalism. In a number of countries regulation of production and distribution by society is being introduced by force of circumstances. Some countries are introducing universal labour conscription.

Under private ownership of the means of production, all these steps towards greater monopolisation and control of production by the state are inevitably accompanied by intensified exploitation of the working people, by an increase in oppression; it becomes more difficult to resist the exploiters, and reaction and military despotism grow. At the same time these steps inevitably lead to a tremendous growth in the profits of the big capitalists at the expense of all other sections of the population. The working people for decades to come are forced to pay tribute to the capitalists in the form of

interest payments on war loans running into thousands of millions. But with private ownership of the means of production abolished and state power passing completely to the proletariat, these very conditions are a pledge of success for society's transformation that will do away with the exploitation of man by man and ensure the well-being of everyone.

* * *

On the other hand, the course of events is clearly confirming the forecast of the socialists of the whole world who, precisely in connection with the imperialist war, then impending and now raging unanimously declared in the 1912 Basle Manifesto that a *proletarian revolution* was inevitable.

The Russian revolution is only the first stage of the first of the proletarian revolutions which are the inevitable result of war.

In all countries a spirit of rebellion against the capitalist class is growing among the masses, and the proletariat is becoming aware that only the transfer of power to the proletariat and the abolition of private ownership of the means of production can save humanity from ruin.

In all countries, especially in the most advanced, Britain and Germany, hundreds of socialists who have not gone over to the side of "their own" national bourgeoisie have been thrown into prison by the capitalist governments. By this action the latter have clearly demonstrated their fear of the mounting proletarian revolution. In Germany the impending revolution is apparent both in the mass strikes, which have assumed particularly large proportions in recent weeks, and in the growth of fraternisation between the German and Russian soldiers at the front.

Fraternal trust and unity are gradually being restored among the workers of different countries, the very workers who are now killing each other in the interests of the capitalists. This, in turn, will create conditions for united revolutionary action by the workers of different countries. Only such action can guarantee the most systematic development and the most likely success of the world socialist revolution.

* * *

Operating as it does in one of the most backward countries of Europe amidst a vast population of small peasants, the proletariat of Russia cannot aim at immediately putting into effect socialist changes.

But it would be a grave error, and in effect even a complete desertion to the bourgeoisie, to infer from this that the working class must support the bourgeoisie, or that it must keep its activities within limits acceptable to the petty bourgeoisie, or that the proletariat must renounce its leading role in the matter of explaining to the people the urgency of taking a number of practical steps towards socialism for which the time is now ripe.

These steps are: first, nationalisation of the land. This measure, which does not directly go beyond the framework of the bourgeois system, would, at the same time, be a heavy blow at private ownership of the means of production, and as such would strengthen the influence of the socialist proletariat over the semi-proletariat in the countryside.

The next steps are the establishment of state control over all banks, and their amalgamation into a single central bank; also control over the insurance agencies and big capitalist syndicates (for example, the Sugar Syndicate, the Coal Syndicate, the Metal Syndicate, etc.), and the gradual introduction of a more just progressive tax on incomes and properties. Economically, these measures are timely; technically, they can be carried out immediately; politically they are *likely* to receive the support of the overwhelming majority of the peasants, who have everything to gain by these reforms.

The Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', and other Deputies, which now cover Russia with a dense and growing network, could also introduce, parallel with the above measures, universal labour conscription, for on the one hand the character of the Soviets guarantees that all these new reforms will be introduced only when an overwhelming majority of the people has clearly and firmly realised the practical need for them; on the other hand their character guarantees that the reforms will not be sponsored by the police and officials, but will be carried out by way of voluntary participation of the organised and armed masses of the proletariat and peasantry in the management of their own affairs.

All these and other similar measures can and should be not only discussed and prepared for enforcement on a national scale in the event of all power passing to the proletarians and semi-proletarians, but also implemented by the local revolutionary organs of power of the whole people when the opportunity arises.

Great care and discretion should be exercised in carrying out the above measures; a solid majority of the population must be won over and this majority must be clearly convinced of the country's practical preparedness for any particular measure. This is the direction in which the class-conscious vanguard of the workers must focus its attention and efforts, because it is the bounden duty of these workers to help the peasants find a way out of the present debacle.

Supplement to *Soldatskaya Pravda* No. 13,
May 16 (3), 1917

Published according
to the Supplement text
verified with the typewritten copy
of the Minutes corrected by
Lenin

23

INCLUDING SPEECH
AT THE CLOSING OF THE CONFERENCE
APRIL 29 (MAY 12)

Owing to lack of time Lenin made no speech in favour of changing the name of the Party, but referred the delegates to his newly written pamphlet *The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution*,* which will serve as material for discussion in the local Party organisations.

A word about the Conference.

We have had little time and a lot of work. The conditions in which our Party finds itself are difficult. The defencist parties are strong, but the proletarian masses look with disfavour upon defencism and the imperialist war. Our resolutions are not written with a view to the broad masses, but they will serve to unify the activities of our agitators and propagandists, and the reader will find in them guidance in his work. We have to speak to the millions; we must draw fresh forces from among the masses, we must call for more developed class-conscious workers who would popularise our theses in a way the masses would understand. We shall endeavour in our pamphlets to present our resolutions in a more popular form, and hope that our comrades will do the same thing locally. The proletariat will find in our resolutions material to guide it in its movement towards the second stage of our revolution.

First published in 1925
in the book *The Petrograd City
and the All-Russia Conferences
of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.)*, April 1917

Published according
to the manuscript copy
of the Minutes

* See pp. 84-88 of this volume.—*Ed.*

**INTRODUCTION TO THE RESOLUTIONS
OF THE SEVENTH (APRIL) ALL-RUSSIA
CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.)**

Workers, comrades!

The All-Russia Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, united by its Central Committee and known simply as the Bolshevik Party, is over

The Conference has adopted very important resolutions on all the fundamental issues of the revolution and the full text of them is published below.

The revolution is passing through a crisis. This could be seen in the streets of Petrograd and Moscow between April 19 and April 21. This has been admitted by the Provisional Government. It has been admitted by the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Still further confirmation of it has been given, as I pen these lines, by the resignation of Guchkov.

This crisis of state power, this crisis of the revolution, is no accident. The Provisional Government is a government of landowners and capitalists who are tied up with Russian and Anglo-French capital and compelled to continue the imperialist war. But the soldiers are worn out by the war, they are becoming more and more aware that the war is being fought in the interests of the capitalists; the soldiers do not want war. Furthermore, the grim spectre of an appalling debacle, of famine and complete economic ruin is advancing upon Russia and other countries.

The Petrograd Soviet has also got into a blind alley by entering into an agreement with the Provisional Government, by supporting it, by supporting the loan, and, consequently, supporting the war. The Soviet is responsible for the Provisional Government, and, seeing no way out of the situation, has also got itself into a muddle through this agreement with the capitalist government.

At this great historic moment, when the future of the revolution is at stake, when the capitalists are torn between despair and the thought of shooting down workers, our Party appeals to the people, saying in its Conference resolutions:

We must understand which *classes* are the motive force of the revolution. Their various aspirations must be soberly assessed. The capitalist cannot travel the same road as the worker. Petty proprietors can neither fully trust the capitalists nor all immediately agree on a close fraternal alliance with the workers. Only when we understand the difference between these classes shall we be able to find the correct road for the revolution.

The decisions of our Conference on all the basic issues of the people's life draw a clear line between the interests of the different classes and show that it is absolutely impossible to find a way out of the deadlock unless the policy of trust in and support of the capitalist government is abandoned.

The situation is one of unparalleled difficulty. There is one way out and only one—the transfer of all state power to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', and other Deputies throughout Russia, from the bottom up. Only if state power passes to the working class supported by most of the peasantry, will it be possible to count on speedily regaining the confidence of the workers of other countries, to count on a mighty European revolution that will throw off the yoke of Capital and put an end to the criminal bloodshed in which the peoples are embroiled. Only if the power passes to the working class supported by most of the peasants shall we be able to cherish the firm hope that the working people will show complete confidence in that power and all, without exception, work selflessly to bring about a transformation of the entire way of life of the people in the

interests of those who labour and not in the interests of the capitalists and landowners. Without such selfless work, without a gigantic effort on the part of each and every individual, without firmness and the determination to rebuild life in a new way, without the strict organisation and comradely discipline of all workers and all poor peasants—*without all this there is no way out.*

The war has brought all mankind to the brink of destruction. The capitalists have become deeply involved in the war and are unable to extricate themselves. The whole world faces disaster.

Workers, comrades! The time is drawing near when events will demand new and still greater heroism—the heroism of millions and tens of millions—than you displayed in the glorious days of the revolution of February and March. Prepare yourselves.

Prepare yourselves and remember that if, together with the capitalists, you were able to achieve victory in a few days by a simple outburst of popular wrath, you will need more than that for victory against the capitalists, for victory over the capitalists. To achieve such a victory, to have the workers and poor peasants take the power, keep that power and make proper use of it, you will need organisation, organisation, and organisation.

Our Party is helping you as much as it can, primarily by bringing home to you the different positions of the different classes and their different strength. The decisions of our Conference are devoted to this, and unless you realise this clearly, organisation does not mean anything. And without organisation action by the millions is impossible, success is impossible.

Don't put your trust in words. Don't be misled by promises. Don't overestimate your strength. Organise at every factory, in every regiment and every company, in every residential block. Work at your organising every day, every hour; do that work yourselves, for this is something you cannot entrust to anybody else. Work to steadily, soundly and indestructibly build up full confidence in the advanced workers on the part of the masses. Such is the main content of all the decisions of our Conference. Such is the main lesson taught by the entire

development of the revolution. Such is the one guarantee of success.

Workers, comrades! We call upon you to carry out the hard, serious, untiring work of consolidating the class-conscious, revolutionary proletariat of all countries. This is the one and only way out, the only way to save mankind from the horrors of war and the yoke of Capital.

Supplement to *Soldatskaya Pravda* No. 13,
May 16 (3), 1917

Published according
to the text
in the Supplement

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FRATERNISATION

The capitalists either sneer at the fraternisation of the soldiers at the front or savagely attack it. By lies and slander they try to make out that the whole thing is “deception” of the Russians by the Germans, and threaten—through *their* generals and officers—punishment for fraternisation.

From the point of view of safeguarding the “sacred right of property” in capital and the profits on capital, such policy of the capitalists is quite correct. Indeed, if the proletarian socialist revolution is to be *suppressed* at its inception it is *essential* that fraternisation be regarded the way the capitalists regard it.

The class-conscious workers, followed by the mass of semi-proletarians and poor peasants guided by the true instinct of oppressed classes, regard fraternisation with profound sympathy. Clearly, fraternisation is a path to peace. Clearly, this path does not run through the capitalist governments, through an alliance with them, but runs *against* them. Clearly, this path tends to develop, strengthen, and consolidate fraternal confidence between the workers of different countries. Clearly, this path is *beginning to wreck* the hateful discipline of the barrack prisons, the discipline of blind obedience of the soldier to “his” officers and generals, to his capitalists (for most of the officers and generals either belong to the capitalist class or protect its interests). Clearly, fraternisation is the revolutionary initiative of the masses, it is the awakening of the conscience, the mind, the courage of the oppressed classes; in other words, it is a rung in the ladder leading up to the socialist proletarian revolution.

Long live fraternisation! Long live the *rising* world-wide socialist revolution of the proletariat!

In order that fraternisation achieve the goal we set it more easily, surely and rapidly, we must see to it that it is well organised and has a clear political programme.

However much the enraged press of the capitalists and their friends may slander us, calling us anarchists, we shall never tire of repeating: we are not anarchists, we are ardent advocates of the best possible organisation of the masses and the firmest "state" power—only the state we want is not a bourgeois parliamentary republic, but a republic of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies.

We have always recommended that fraternisation be conducted in the most organised manner, taking care—with the help of the intelligence, experience and observation of the soldiers themselves—that there should be no catch in it, and that the officers and generals, who for the most part spread vicious slander against fraternisation, be kept away from the meetings.

Our aim is not to have fraternisation confine itself to talk about peace in general, but pass on to a discussion of a *clear* political programme, to a discussion of *how* to end the war, *how* to throw off the yoke of the capitalists, who started this war and are now dragging it out.

Our Party has therefore issued an appeal to the soldiers of all the belligerent countries (for the text of which see *Pravda* No. 37),* which gives a definite and precise answer to these questions and a clear political programme.

It is a good thing that the soldiers are cursing the war. It is a good thing that they are demanding peace. It is a good thing that they are beginning to realise that the war is advantageous to the capitalists. It is a good thing that they are wrecking the harsh discipline and beginning to fraternise on all the fronts. All this is good.

But it is not enough

The soldiers must now pass to a form of fraternisation in which a clear political programme is discussed. We are not anarchists. We do not think that the war can be ended by a simple "refusal", a refusal of individuals, groups or casual "crowds". We are for the war being ended, as it will be, by a *revolution* in a number of countries, i.e., by the conquest

* See pp. 186-88 of this volume.—*Ed.*

of *state* power by a new class, not the capitalists, not the small proprietors (who are always half-dependent on the capitalists), but by the proletarians and semi-proletarians.

And so, in our appeal to the soldiers of all the belligerent countries we have set forth our programme for a workers' revolution in all countries, namely, the transfer of all state power to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

Comrades, soldiers, discuss this programme among yourselves and with the German soldiers! Such a discussion will help you to find the true path, the most organised and shortest path, to end the war and overthrow the yoke of Capital.

* * *

A word about one of the servants of Capital, Plekhanov. It is pitiful to see how low this former socialist has sunk! He compares fraternisation to "treachery"! His argument is: will not fraternisation, if it succeeds, lead to a separate peace?

No, Mr. ex-socialist, fraternisation, which we have supported on *all* the fronts, will not lead to a "separate" peace between the capitalists of several countries, but to a universal peace between the revolutionary workers of all countries, *despite* the capitalists of all countries, *against* the capitalists, and for the overthrow of their yoke.

WHAT THE COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY STEPS OF THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT LEAD TO

We have received the following telegram:

“Yeniseisk. The Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies has taken cognisance of Minister Lvov’s telegram to the appointed Commissar of Yeniseisk Gubernia, Krutovsky, sent to Yeniseisk for guidance.

“We protest against the intention to reintroduce a bureaucracy. We declare, first, that we will not stand for being ruled by appointed officials. Second, there can be no return for officials who have been driven out by the peasants. Third, we recognise only such local bodies as have been set up in Yeniseisk Uyezd by the people themselves. Fourth, appointed officials can rule here only over our dead bodies.

“Yeniseisk Soviet of Deputies.”

And so the Provisional Government appoints “commissars” from Petrograd to “direct” the activities of the Yeniseisk Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies, or the Yeniseisk organ of self-government. What is more, this appointment is made in such a form as to evoke the protest of the Yeniseisk Soviet against “the intention to reintroduce a bureaucracy”.

Moreover, the Yeniseisk Soviet declares that “appointed officials can rule here only over our dead bodies”. The behaviour of the Provisional Government has brought this remote uyezd in Siberia, as represented by its popularly elected governing body, to a point when a direct threat of *armed resistance* is made against the Provisional Government.

The Provisional Government bosses have certainly asked for it!

Yet they will go on thundering denunciations against those mischievous people who “preach” “civil war”!

What was the idea of appointing “commissars” from Petrograd or from any other centre to “direct” the activities of the *elected* local body? Are we to believe that a man from

outside is more familiar with local needs, more capable of "directing" the local population? What cause did the people of Yeniseisk give for such an absurd measure? Even *if* the people of Yeniseisk did run counter to the decisions of a majority of citizens in other localities, would it not have been better to try, for a start, to obtain *some information* instead of giving occasion for talk about "bureaucracy", and provoking legitimate dissatisfaction and resentment on the part of the local population?

To all these questions there can be only one answer. The representatives of the landowners and capitalists sitting in the Provisional Government are determined to *preserve* the old tsarist *machinery* of government: officials "appointed" from above. That is what all bourgeois parliamentary republics in the world have nearly always been doing, except for brief periods of revolution in some countries. That is what was done to prepare the ground for the return *from* a republic to a monarchy, for a return to the Napoleons, to the military dictators. And that is what the Cadets are bent on doing when they copy those unhappy examples,

This is a very serious matter. We should not deceive ourselves. By such measures the Provisional Government, whether it means to or not, is *preparing the ground* for a restoration of the monarchy in Russia.

The entire responsibility for any possible—and to a certain extent inevitable—attempt to restore the monarchy in Russia rests with the Provisional Government, which is undertaking such counter-revolutionary measures. Officials "appointed" from above to "direct" the local population have always been a sure step towards the restoration of the monarchy, in the same way as the standing army and the police.

The Yeniseisk Soviet is a thousand times right, both practically and in principle. The return of local officials who have been driven out by the peasants should not be allowed. The introduction of "appointed" officials should not be tolerated. Only such bodies in the local areas should be recognised as have been set up by the people themselves.

The idea of "direction" by officials "appointed" from above is essentially false and undemocratic, it is Caesarism, Blanquist *adventurism*. Engels was quite right when, in criticis-

ing in 1891 the draft programme of the German Social-Democrats who were badly infected with bureaucratism, he pressed the demand for no supervision from above over local self-government. Engels was right when he quoted the experience of France, which, governed between 1792 and 1798 by local elective bodies without any supervision from above, did not "fall apart", did not "disintegrate", but, on the contrary, gained strength, became democratically consolidated and organised.⁹⁴

Foolish bureaucratic prejudices, tsarist red-tapism, reactionary professorial ideas as to the indispensability of bureaucratism, the counter-revolutionary tendencies and attempts of the landowners and capitalists—this is the soil which nourishes such measures of the Provisional Government as we have been discussing.

The healthy democratic feeling of the workers and peasants, roused by the insulting attempt of the Provisional Government to "appoint" officials from above to "direct" the activities of the adult local population, the overwhelming majority, who had elected their own representatives—this is what the Yeniseisk Soviet has revealed.

What the people need is a really democratic, workers' and peasants' republic, whose authorities have been elected by the people and are displaceable by the people any time they may wish it. And it is for *such* a republic that the workers and peasants should fight, resisting all attempts of the Provisional Government to restore the monarchist, tsarist methods and machinery of government.

SOCIAL-CHAUVINISTS AND INTERNATIONALISTS

By betraying socialism and going over to the side of “their own” capitalists, the social-chauvinists have naturally split up in conformity with the capitalist groupings in the war. The split itself just as naturally, is a temporary one. Plekhanov refuses to confer with Scheidemann, but that does not prevent him from defending the “International” of the social-chauvinists, which has betrayed socialism. In other words, Plekhanov is for a split with the Scheidemanns *during the time* the capitalists, whose agents they both are, are split up among themselves. Plekhanov is for unity with the Scheidemanns when the “masters” (i.e., the capitalists of both countries) are reconciled. There is no denying a certain consistency in Plekhanov’s position—the consistency of *betrayal* of socialism, the consistency of willing and faithful service to the capitalists.

No wonder the representatives of the international socialist “Centre” (Kautsky and others), being as they are in favour of “unity” with the social-chauvinists in general, agree to the conference organised by that agent of Scheidemann—Borgbjerg, or themselves organise (like the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet) an international “socialist” conference *together with* the Scheidemanns and Plekhanovs. No wonder our Russian representatives of the “Centre”, through their mouthpiece *Rabochaya Gazeta*, are so angered at our Party’s refusal to attend Borgbjerg’s conference.

Yesterday evening we received a telegram from our Stockholm correspondent:

“Haase, Longuet attending conference. ‘Spartacus’ refused.”

The name “Spartacus” or “Internationale” is used in Germany for the group to which Karl Liebknecht belongs.

There has been a great hullabaloo lately, raised by people who are particularly interested in upsetting the apple-cart, about the Liebknecht group having supposedly united with the Kautskyites in a new Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany.⁹⁵ As a matter of fact, the Liebknecht group is only affiliated to the Kautskyites as an independent organisation and merely entered into a temporary and qualified bloc against the social-chauvinists.

The telegram quoted above is one more confirmation of this fact. When things came to a practical point and a clear and definite answer had to be given immediately on the question of making common cause with Scheidemann and his agents, the alliance between Liebknecht's group and the Kautsky group *crumbled at once*.

Some comrades feared that our resolution concerning Borgbjerg would "isolate" us.

No, comrades! It isolates us from the *waverers*. There is only one way of helping waverers; and that is by ceasing to be a waverer yourself.

The correctness of our resolution against Borgbjerg has been strikingly, fully and speedily confirmed by events. The Kautskyites of Germany (Haase) and Franco (Longuet) are still wavering. They have agreed to confer with the social-chauvinists and cannot make up their minds to dissociate themselves from them.

In taking upon itself the initiative in bringing about such a cleavage, our Party *has already started* to rally the elements of a Third International. The fact that our tactics coincide with those of the Liebknecht group is no accident. It is a step towards the inchoate Third International.

I. G. TSERETELI AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

All the papers have published, in full or in part, the speech which I. G. Tsereteli delivered on April 27 at the ceremonial session of the deputies of all the Dumas, past and present.

It was quite a ministerial speech. The speech of a minister without a portfolio. Still, we think there is no harm, even when ministers without portfolios make ministerial speeches, in sparing a thought for socialism, Marxism and the class struggle. To each his own. It behooves the bourgeoisie to shun all talk about the class struggle, to avoid analysing it, studying it, and making it a basis for determining policies. It behooves the bourgeoisie to dismiss these "disagreeable" and "tactless" subjects—as they say in parlours—and to sing the praises of "unity" of "all friends of freedom". It behooves the proletarian party not to forget the class struggle.

To each his own.

Two basic political ideas underlie I. G. Tsereteli's speech. First, that a line can and should be drawn between two "sections" of the bourgeoisie. One section "has come to an agreement with the democrats"; the position of this bourgeoisie is "secure". The other consists of "irresponsible elements of the bourgeoisie who are provoking civil war", or, as Tsereteli describes them, "many people from among the moderate elements of the property-owners".

The speaker's second political idea is this: "Any attempt right now to proclaim [!?] the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" would be a "desperate" attempt, and he, Tsereteli, would agree to such a desperate attempt only if he could believe for one minute that Shulgin's ideas were really "shared by all the property-owning bourgeoisie".

Let us examine these two political ideas of I. G. Tsereteli, who, as befits a minister without a portfolio or a candidate

for the ministry, has taken a middle-of-the-road stand—neither for reaction nor for revolution, neither with Shulgin nor with the adherents of “desperate attempts”.

What class distinctions between the two indicated sections of the bourgeoisie did Tsereteli make? None at all. It did not even occur to Tsereteli that there would be no harm in shaping policies on the basis of the class struggle. Both “sections” of the bourgeoisie, in class substance, are landowners and capitalists. Tsereteli did not mention a word about Shulgin *not* representing the same classes or sub-classes as Guchkov represents—the latter a member of the Provisional Government and an important one at that. Tsereteli singles out the ideas of Shulgin from those of the “entire” property-owning bourgeoisie, but gives *no* reasons for doing so. Nor could he give any. Shulgin stands for the undivided power of the Provisional Government; he is against supervision of that government by the armed soldiers; he is against “anti-British propaganda”, against the soldiers being “set on” the “officer class”, against the propaganda of Petrogradskaya Storona,⁹⁶ etc. These ideas are to be found every day in the columns of *Rech*, in the speeches and manifestos of the ministers with portfolios, etc.

The only difference is that Shulgin speaks more “glibly”, while the Provisional Government, being a government, *speaks* more discreetly; Shulgin speaks in a deep voice, Milyukov in a falsetto. Milyukov is for an agreement with the Soviet, and Shulgin, too, has *nothing against* such an agreement. Both Shulgin and Milyukov are for “other methods of control” (not control by armed soldiers).

Tsereteli has thrown overboard all ideas of the class struggle. He has made *no* mention of class distinctions or any serious political distinctions between “the two sections” of the bourgeoisie, nor did he think of mentioning them.

By “democrats”, referred to in his speech, Tsereteli meant “the proletariat and the revolutionary peasantry”. Let us examine this class definition. The bourgeoisie has entered into an agreement with these democrats. One is entitled to ask, what forms the *basis* of this agreement, by what *class* interests is it upheld?

Not a word about this in Tsereteli’s speech. All he speaks about is a “common democratic platform which has now

proved acceptable to the whole country", i.e., evidently to the proletarians and the peasants, since the "country" is really the workers and peasants minus the property-owners.

Does this platform exclude, say, the question of the land? It does not. The platform side-steps it. Do class interests and their conflicts disappear by being side-stepped in diplomatic documents, deeds of "agreement", and the speeches and statements of ministers?

Tsereteli "forgot" to raise this question, forgot a 'trivial detail"—he "merely" forgot the class interests and the class struggle....

All the problems of the Russian revolution," expatiates I. G. Tsereteli, "the very crux of it [!?] depend on whether the propertied classes [i.e., the landowners and capitalists] will understand that this is a national platform and not a specially proletarian platform."

Poor landowners and capitalists! They are so slow-witted. They "do not understand". They need a special minister of the democracy to teach them what's what.

Maybe this spokesman of the "democrats" has forgotten the class struggle, has adopted the stand of Louis Blanc, and is dismissing the conflict of class interests with mere phrases?

Is it Shulgin and Guchkov with Milyukov who "do not understand" that the peasant *can* be reconciled with the landowner on a platform that side-steps the land question? Or is it I. G. Tsereteli who "does not understand" that this *cannot* be done?

The workers and peasants must confine themselves to what is "acceptable" to the landowners and capitalists—that is the real gist (the class, not the verbal, gist) of the Shulgin-Milyukov-Plekhanov position. And they "understand" it better than Tsereteli does.

This brings us to Tsereteli's second political idea—that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry (a dictatorship, by the way, is won, not "proclaimed") would be a desperate attempt. In the first place, to speak so simply of this dictatorship nowadays is likely to land Tsereteli in the archives of the "old Bolsheviks"* Secondly, and most

* See my "Letters on Tactics". (See pp. 45-46 of this volume.—*Ed.*)

important of all, the workers and peasants constitute the vast majority of the population. And does not "democracy," mean carrying out the will of the majority?

How then can one be a democrat, and yet be *opposed* to the "dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry"? How can one fear "civil war" from it? (What kind of civil war? That of a handful of landowners and capitalists *against* the workers and peasants? That of an insignificant minority against an overwhelming majority?)

I. G. Tsereteli is hopelessly muddled. He has even forgotten that if Lvov and Co. carry out their promise to convene the Constituent Assembly, the latter would become a "dictatorship" of the majority. Or must the workers and peasants, even in the Constituent Assembly, confine themselves to what is "acceptable" to the landowners and the capitalists?

The workers and peasants are the vast majority. All power to this majority is, if you please, a "desperate attempt"....

Tsereteli is in a muddle because he has completely overlooked the class struggle. He has abandoned the standpoint of Marxism for that of Louis Blanc, who talked himself out of the class struggle

The task of a proletarian leader is to clarify the difference in class interests and persuade certain sections of the petty bourgeoisie (namely, the poor peasants) to choose between the workers and the capitalists, to take sides with the workers.

The task of petty-bourgeois Louis Blancs is to play down the difference in class interests and persuade certain sections of the bourgeoisie (mainly the intellectuals and parliamentarians) to "agree with the workers, to persuade the workers to "agree" with the capitalists, and the peasants to "agree" with the landowners.

Louis Blanc tried hard to persuade the Paris bourgeoisie, and, as we know, all but persuaded it to refrain from the mass shootings of 1848 and 1871.

ANXIETY

In connection with the report that several ex-ministers had accepted directorships of big banks, *Pravda* asked:

“In how many banks do the present ministers, Guchkov, Tereshchenko, and Konovalov—have an interest (in the capacity of directors, shareholders, or actual owners)?”

And added:

“Our comrades, the bank employees (who, by the way, should organise a union of their own as soon as possible), would do well to gather material on this subject and publish it in the labour press.”*

Alarmed by this, *Birzheviye Vedomosti*, a paper which, as we know, savours strongly of banks, writes:

“The ‘comrades employees’ are asked to organise a detective service, to rummage about in the tills of the bourgeois ministers for the purpose of checking the cash in them. With the same effrontery the Bolsheviks are rummaging about in other people’s convictions. May we not soon see *Pravda* advising the comrades to set up a secret police department of their own. Room for it will be found in the Kshesinskaya mansion....”

Why are the gentlemen from *Birzheviye Vedomosti* so perturbed?

What has “detective service” got to do with it, gentlemen?

We have nothing whatever against the bank employees publishing lists of bank bosses of *all parties*. Why,

* See p. 122 of this volume.—*Ed.*

gentlemen, shouldn't the people have a right to know who are the chief owners of such institutions as the banks—those powerful institutions on which the country's whole economic life depends, and which have such a say in deciding the issues of war and peace?

What are you afraid of, gentlemen?

Pravda No. 44, May 12
(April 29), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

THE "CRISIS OF POWER"

The whole of Russia remembers the days of April 19-21, when civil war was about to break out in the streets of Petrograd.

On April 21 the Provisional Government penned a new reassuring missive⁹⁷ purporting to "explain" its predatory Note of the 18th.

After this the majority of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies decided to consider the "incident settled".

Another couple of days passed, and the question of a coalition cabinet cropped up. The Executive Committee was almost equally divided: 23 against a coalition cabinet, 22 for it. The incident had been "settled" only on paper.

Two more days passed, and we now have another "incident". War Minister Guchkov, one of the leaders of the Provisional Government, has resigned. There is talk of the whole Provisional Government having decided to resign. (At the time of writing, we still do not know for certain whether the government has resigned.) A new "incident" has occurred, one that throws all previous "incidents" into the shade.

Whence this spate of "incidents"? Is there no root cause which inevitably engenders "incident" upon "incident"?

There *is* such a cause. It is what we know as the dual power, that state of unstable equilibrium resulting from the agreement between the Soviet and the Provisional Government.

The Provisional Government is a government of the capitalists. It cannot give up its dreams of conquests (annexations), it cannot end the predatory war by a democratic peace, it cannot but protect the profits of its own class (the capital-

ist class), it cannot but protect the estates of the landowners.

The Soviet represents other classes. Most of the workers and soldiers in the Soviet do not want this predatory war, they are not interested in the profits of the capitalists or in preserving the privileges of the landowners. At the same time, however, they still have faith in the Provisional Government of the capitalists, they are for having agreements with it, for keeping in contact with it.

The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies are themselves a government in embryo. On some questions they attempt to exercise power parallel with the Provisional Government. We thus have an overlapping of power, or, as it is now called, a "crisis of power".

This cannot go on for long. Such a state of affairs is bound every day to cause new "incidents" and fresh complications. It is easy enough to inscribe on a bit of paper "the incident is settled". In real life, however, these incidents do not disappear. And this for the simple reason that they are not "incidents" at all, they are not chance happenings, not trifles. They are the outward signs of a deep-rooted inner crisis. They are a result of the impasse in which humanity now finds itself. There can be no way out of this predatory war unless we accept the measures proposed by the internationalist socialists.

The Russian people are offered three ways of ending this "crisis of power". Some say: Leave things as they are, put still greater trust in the Provisional Government. The threat to resign may be a trick calculated to make the Soviet say: We trust you still more. The Provisional Government wants the Soviet to beg it: Come and rule over us; what shall we do without you....

Others propose a coalition cabinet. Let us share the ministerial portfolios with Milyukov and Co., they say, let us get some of our own people into the cabinet; it will be quite another pair of shoes then.

We propose a third way: A complete change of the Soviets' policy, no confidence in the capitalists, and the *transfer of all power to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies*. A change of *personalities* will give nothing; the whole *policy* must be changed. Another class must assume power. A

government of workers and soldiers would be trusted by the whole world, for everyone knows that a worker and a poor peasant would want to rob no one. Only this can put a speedy end to the war, only this can help us through the economic debacle.

*All power to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies!
No confidence in the government of the capitalists!*

Every "incident", every day, every hour will confirm the *soundness* of this watchword.

Pravda No. 46,
May 15 (2), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

FINLAND AND RUSSIA

Finland's attitude to Russia has become the topic of the day. The Provisional Government has *failed* to meet the demand of the Finnish people, which, *so far*, is not for secession, but only for broad autonomy.

The Provisional Government's undemocratic, annexationist policy was formulated and "defended" the other day by *Rabochaya Gazeta*. It could not have made a more "damning" defence than it did. This is indeed a fundamental issue, an issue of state significance, which deserves the closest attention.

"The Organising Committee believes," writes *Rabochaya Gazeta* No. 42, "that the general problem of Finnish-Russian relations can and should be settled only by an agreement between the Finnish Diet and the Constituent Assembly. Pending this, the Finnish comrades [the Organising Committee has had talks with the Finnish Social-Democrats] should bear in mind that if separate tendencies in Finland were to increase, this would be likely to strengthen the centralist tendencies of the Russian bourgeoisie."

That is the point of view of the capitalists, the bourgeoisie, the Cadets, but not of the proletariat. The programme of the Social-Democratic Party, namely, §9, which recognises the right of self-determination for all nation members of the state, has been thrown overboard by the Menshevik Social-Democrats. They have, in effect, renounced this programme and taken sides with the bourgeoisie, just as they did on the question of the replacement of the standing army by the universally armed people, and so on.

The capitalists, the bourgeoisie, including the Cadet Party, never did recognise the right of nations to political self-determination, i.e., *freedom to secede* from Russia.

The Social-Democratic Party *recognised* this right in §9 of its programme, adopted in 1903.

When the Organising Committee “recommended” to the Finnish Social-Democrats an “agreement” between the Finnish Diet and the Constituent Assembly, they were, on this question, taking sides with the bourgeoisie. One merely has to compare the positions of *all* the principal classes and parties to see the truth of this.

The tsar, the Rights, the monarchists are not for an agreement between the Diet and the Constituent Assembly—they are for subjecting Finland to the Russian nation. The republican bourgeoisie are for an *agreement* between the Finnish Diet and the Constituent Assembly. The class-conscious proletariat and the Social-Democrats, *true* to their programme, are for the *right* of Finland, as of all the other underprivileged nations, to *secede from* Russia. We have here a clear, precise, and indisputable picture. Under the guise of an “agreement”, which cannot settle anything—for what are you going to do if an agreement is *not* reached?—the bourgeoisie is pursuing the same old tsarist policy of subjection and annexation.

For Finland was annexed by the Russian tsars as the result of a deal with the suppressor of the French revolution, Napoleon, etc. If we are really against annexations, we should say: *give Finland the right of secession!* Not until this has been said and accomplished can an “agreement” with Finland be a really free and voluntary agreement, a real agreement, and not just a fake.

Agreement is possible only between equals. If the agreement is to be a real agreement, and not a verbal screen for subjection, *both* parties to it must enjoy real equality of status, that is to say, both Russia *and* Finland must have the right to *disagree*. That is as clear as daylight.

Only by “freedom of secession” can that right be expressed. Only when she is free to secede will Finland really be in a position to enter into an “agreement” with Russia as to whether she should secede or not. *Without* this condition, without recognising the right of secession, all phrase-mongering about an “agreement” is self-deception and deception of the people.

The Organising Committee should have told the Finns

plainly whether it recognises the right of secession or not. It befogged the issue, like the Cadets, and thereby repudiated the right of secession. It should have attacked the Russian bourgeoisie for denying the oppressed nations the right to secede, a denial which is *tantamount to annexation*. Instead, the Organising Committee attacks the Finns and warns them that "separate" (they should have said separatist) tendencies would strengthen centralist inclinations! In other words, the Organising Committee threatens the Finns with the strengthening of the annexationist Great-Russian bourgeoisie—just what the Cadets have always done, the very guise under which Rodichev and Co. are pursuing *their* annexationist policy.

We have here a clear and practical commentary on the question of annexations, which "everybody" is now talking about, though afraid to face the issue squarely. *To be against the right of secession is to be for annexations.*

The tsars pursued a crude policy of annexation, bartering one nation for another by agreement with other monarchs (the partition of Poland, the deal with Napoleon over Finland, and so on), just like the landowners, who used to exchange peasant serfs. The bourgeoisie, on turning republican, is carrying on the *same* policy of annexation, only more subtly, less openly, by *promising* an "agreement" while *taking away* the only effective guarantee of real equality in the making of an agreement, namely, the right of secession. The Organising Committee is dragging at the tail-end of the bourgeoisie, and in practice taking its side. (*Birzhevka* was therefore quite right in reprinting all the salient points of the *Rabochaya Gazeta* article and approving the Organising Committee's reply to the Finns, which it called a "lesson by Russian democracy" to the Finns. *Rabochaya Gazeta* deserved this kiss from *Birzhevka*.)

At its conference, the party of the proletariat (the "Bolsheviks") once more confirmed the right of secession in its resolution on the national question.

The alignment of classes and parties is clear.

The petty bourgeois are letting themselves be frightened by the spectre of a frightened bourgeoisie—that is the whole crux of the policy of the Menshevik Social-Democrats and the Socialist-Revolutionaries. They are "afraid" of secession.

The class-conscious proletarians are *not* afraid of it. Both Norway and Sweden gained from Norway's free secession from Sweden in 1905: it made for mutual trust between the two nations, it drew them closer together on a voluntary basis, it did away with the stupid and destructive friction, it strengthened the economic and political, the cultural and social *gravitation* of the two nations to each other, and strengthened the fraternal alliance between the workers of the two countries.

Comrades, workers and peasants, do not be influenced by the annexationist policy of the Russian capitalists, Guchkov, Milyukov, and the Provisional Government towards Finland, Kurland, Ukraine, etc.! Do not fear to recognise the right of all these nations to secede! Nations must be won over to the idea of an alliance with the Great Russians not by force, but by a really voluntary and really free agreement, which is *impossible* without the right of secession.

The freer Russia is, and the more resolutely our republic recognises the right of non-Great-Russian nations to secede, the more strongly will other nations be *attracted* towards an alliance with us, the less friction will there be, the more rarely will actual secession occur, the shorter the period of secession will last, and the closer and more enduring—in the long run—will the fraternal alliance be between the Russian proletarian and peasant republic and the republics of all other nations.

A LETTER TO THE EDITORS

Yesterday the bourgeois papers again published misinformation about my promising to address a meeting of delegates from the front on Sunday, April 30. I gave *no* such promise. Owing to illness I *cannot* speak. I would ask that *only* information published in *Pravda* and only statements signed by me should be believed, otherwise it will be impossible for me to contend with falsehood, inaccuracies and misrepresentation.

N. Lenin

Pravda No. 46,
May 15 (2), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

DEFENCE OF IMPERIALISM CLOAKED WITH SPECIOUS PHRASES

That is what the proclamation of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet to the socialists of the world, published in today's papers, amounts to. It has a lot to say against imperialism, but all these words are nullified by a single little phrase which reads:

“The Provisional Government of revolutionary Russia has adopted this platform” (i.e., peace without annexations and indemnities on the basis of self-determination of nations).

The gist of the matter is summed up in this one phrase. This phrase is a defence of *Russian* imperialism, which it cloaks and whitewashes. As a matter of fact, our Provisional Government, far from “adopting” a platform of peace without annexations, is trampling upon it daily and hourly.

Our Provisional Government has “diplomatically” renounced annexations, just as the government of the German capitalists, those brigands Wilhelm and Bethmann-Hollweg, have done. In words, *both* governments have renounced annexations. In practice, *both* continue the policy of annexations. The German capitalist government forcibly holds Belgium, a part of France, Serbia, Montenegro, Rumania, Poland, Danish provinces, Alsace, etc.; the Russian capitalist government holds part of Galicia, Turkish Armenia, Finland, Ukraine, etc. The British capitalist government is the most annexationist government in the world, for it forcibly keeps the greatest number of nationalities within the British Empire: India (three hundred million), Ireland, Turkish Mesopotamia, the German colonies in Africa, etc.

The Executive Committee's proclamation covers up its lies about annexations with specious phrases, and thereby does great harm to the cause of the proletariat and the revolution. First of all, the proclamation does not differentiate between the renunciation of annexations in words (in this sense, *all* capitalist governments, without exception, have "adopted" the "platform of peace without annexations") and *renunciation of annexations in deeds* (in this sense, *not one* capitalist government in the world has renounced annexations). Secondly, the proclamation—without any justification, without any basis, contrary to the truth—whitewashes the *Russian* Provisional Government of the capitalists, which is not a bit better (and, probably, not worse) than any other capitalist government.

To cloak an unpleasant truth with a specious phrase is most harmful and most dangerous to the cause of the proletariat, to the cause of the toiling masses. The truth, however bitter, must be faced squarely. A policy that does not meet this requirement is a ruinous policy.

And the truth about annexations is that *all* capitalist governments, the Russian Provisional Government included, are deceiving the people with *promises*—they renounce the policy of annexations in words, but continue it *in deeds*. Any intelligent person can prove this truth for himself by simply making up a *full list* of the annexations of, say, only *three* countries: Germany, Russia, and Britain.

Just try it, gentlemen!

By refusing to do this, by whitewashing *one's own* government and blackening others, one becomes in effect a defender of imperialism.

In conclusion we would remark that at the end of the proclamation we have another fly in the ointment, namely, the assurance that "whatever the differences that have been rending socialism during the three years of war, no faction of the proletariat should decline to participate in the general struggle for peace".

This, too, we regret to say, is a specious phrase, an utterly empty and meaningless one. Plekhanov and Scheidemann both assert that they are "fighting for peace", a "peace without annexations" at that. But it is clear to everyone that they are both fighting to defend each his own imperialist

government of the capitalists. What good do we do the cause of the working classes by uttering sugar-coated lies, by playing down the fact that the Plekhanovs and the Scheidemanns have gone over to the side of *their* respective capitalists? Is it not obvious that such glossing over of the truth amounts to whitewashing imperialism and its defenders?

Pravda No. 47,
May 16 (3), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

AN UNFORTUNATE DOCUMENT

The appeal of the Petrograd Soviet to the army published in yesterday's papers is a further defection of the Soviet's leaders, the Narodniks and Mensheviks, to the side of the Russian imperialist bourgeoisie.

The incoherency of thought revealed by this appeal is astonishing. Only people whose heads are hopelessly stuffed with "revolutionary" phrases can fail to see this.

"The working people had no need for the war. They did not start it. It was started by the tsars and the capitalists of all countries."

Quite right. So far so good. And when the appeal "calls upon the workers and peasants of Germany and Austria-Hungary to rise, and make a revolution", we approve wholeheartedly, for this is a correct slogan.

But how, with this indubitable truth, can one utter in the same breath the following *flagrant untruth*:

"You [Russian soldiers] are staunchly defending not the tsar, not the Protopopovs and the Rasputins, *not the rich landowner and capitalists....*"

The words we have italicised are a patent and flagrant untruth.

If the working masses "have no need" for the war, if the war was started *not only* by the tsars, but by "the capitalists of *all* countries" (as was definitely stated in the appeal issued by the Soviet), then, obviously, any nation involved in this war who tolerates a government of the capitalists is *actually* "defending" the capitalists.

One or the other: *either* the Austrian and German capitalists alone are to "blame" for this war; if this is what the Narodnik and Menshevik leaders of the Petrograd Soviet think, then they are sinking to the level of Plekhanov, the

Russian Scheidemann—in that case, the words saying that the war was “started by the capitalists of all countries” should be erased as being untrue; in that case, the slogan “peace without annexations” should be thrown overboard as being untrue, because the appropriate slogan for such a policy would be: take the annexed territories away from the Germans, but keep (and extend) the territories annexed by the British and the Russians.

Or this war was really started by “the capitalists of all countries”; if the Narodnik and Menshevik leaders of the Soviet do *not* deny this unquestionable truth, then all the more revolting is the lie that the Russian soldiers, so long as they put up with their capitalist government, are “not” defending the capitalists.

In that case the Russian soldiers *too* (and not only the Austrian and the German) should be told the truth. Comrade soldiers, we should say to them, so long as we put up with our capitalist government, so long as the tsar’s secret treaties are considered a holy of holies, we are carrying on an imperialist war of conquest, we are *defending* predatory treaties concluded by ex-Tsar Nicholas with the Anglo-French capitalists.

That is a bitter truth. But it is the truth. The people should be told the truth. Only then will their eyes be opened and they will *learn* to fight against untruth.

Look at this matter from another angle, and you will convince yourselves once more of the utter untruthfulness of the Soviet’s appeal. It calls upon the German workers and peasants to “rise”. Very well. But to rise *against* whom? Is it only against Wilhelm?

Imagine Wilhelm replaced by the German Guchkovs and Milyukovs, i.e., by the representatives of the German capitalist class—would this alter the predatory character of the war as far as Germany is concerned? Obviously, it would not. Everyone knows—and the Soviet’s appeal admits it—that the war was “started by the tsars *and the capitalists* of all countries”. Consequently, the overthrow of tsars, with power passing to the capitalists, alters nothing whatever as far as the nature of the war is concerned. The annexation of Belgium, Serbia, etc., will not cease being annexation if the German Cadets take the place of Wilhelm, just as the an-

nexation of Khiva, Bokhara, Armenia, Finland, Ukraine, etc., has not ceased being annexation because the Russian Cadets, the Russian capitalists, have taken the place of Nicholas.

And finally, let us assume that the Soviet's appeal calls upon the German workers and peasants to rise not only against Wilhelm but also against the German capitalists. We should then say that the appeal is correct and sound. We fully support it. But then we should ask our esteemed fellow-citizens, Chernov, Chkheidze, and Tsereteli: Is it right, is it reasonable, is it seemly to call upon the Germans to rise against their capitalists, while *you yourselves are supporting the capitalist government at home*?

Aren't you afraid, my dear fellow-citizens, that the German workers will accuse you of mendacity or even (God forbid) of hypocrisy?

Aren't you afraid that the German workers will turn round and say: Our revolution has not broken out yet, we have not yet reached the point where our Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies can openly make arrangements with the capitalists in the matter of power. If you, our Russian brothers, have already come to this, then why do you preach "revolt" to us (a thing that is painful, bloody, and difficult), while you yourselves *refuse to take over power peacefully* from Lvov and Co., who have expressed their willingness to relinquish it? You speak about the revolution in Russia, but, Citizens Chernov, Chkheidze, and Tsereteli, you have all studied socialism, and you realise only too well that *so far* your revolution has only put the *capitalists* in power. Is it not trebly insincere, when, in the name of the Russian revolution, which has given power to the Russian imperialist capitalists, you demand of us, Germans, a revolution against the German imperialist capitalists? Does it not look as if your "internationalism", your "revolutionism" are for foreign consumption only; as if revolution against the capitalists is only for the Germans, while for the Russians (despite the seething revolution in Russia) it is *agreement* with the capitalists?

Chernov, Chkheidze, and Tsereteli have sunk completely to the level of defending Russian imperialism.

It is a deplorable fact, but a fact nevertheless.

FRIGHTENING THE PEOPLE WITH BOURGEOIS TERRORS

The capitalist newspapers, led by *Rech*, are falling over backwards in their attempt to scare the people with the bogey of "anarchy". Not a day passes without *Rech* screaming about anarchy, whipping up rumours and reports of casual and minor breaches of the law, and frightening the people with the bogey of a frightened bourgeoisie.

In the wake of *Rech* and other capitalist papers comes the press of the Narodniks (including the Socialist-Revolutionaries) and the Mensheviks. They, too, have allowed themselves to be frightened. The editorial in today's *Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet, whose leaders are all members of these parties, shows this paper to have definitely taken sides with the pedlars of "bourgeois terrors". It has talked itself into a statement, which, to put it mildly, is grossly exaggerating:

"There is demoralisation in the army. In some places there is disorderly seizure of the land, and destruction and loosing of livestock and farm implements. Arbitrary action is on the increase."

By arbitrary action the Narodniks and Mensheviks, that is, the parties of the petty bourgeoisie, mean, among other things, the seizure by the peasants in the local areas of all the land without waiting for the Constituent Assembly. It was this bogey ("arbitrary action") that Minister Shingaryov once trotted out in his famous telegram, which was widely featured in the press (see *Pravda* No. 33).*

Arbitrary action, anarchy—what terrifying words! But let any Narodnik or Menshevik who wishes to *think for himself* consider for a minute the following question.

* See p. 134 of this volume.—*Ed.*

Before the revolution the land belonged to the landowners. That was *not* called anarchy. And what did *that* lead to? It led to a break-down all along the line, to "anarchy" in the fullest sense of the word, i.e., to the utter ruin of the country, the ruin of the majority of the population.

Is a way out of this conceivable *other than* by the widest application of energy, initiative and determination on the part of the *majority* of the population? Obviously, it is not.

What does all this add up to?

1. The tsar's supporters stand for the absolute rule of the landowners in the countryside and for their keeping all the land. They are *not* afraid of the "anarchy" which this actually entailed.

2. The Cadet Shingaryov, representing all the capitalists and landowners (with the exception of a small group of tsarists), advocates "agricultural conciliation chambers under the rural supply committees for the purpose of effecting voluntary agreements between the tillers of the land and the landowners" (see his telegram). The petty-bourgeois politicians—the Narodniks and Mensheviks—are following in Shingaryov's footsteps when they advise the peasants "to wait" until the Constituent Assembly meets and when they call the immediate confiscation of the land by the peasants in the local areas "anarchy".

3. The party of the proletariat (the Bolsheviks) stands for the immediate seizure of the land by the peasants in the local areas and recommends the greatest possible degree of organisation. We see no "anarchy" in this, for it is this decision, and this decision alone, that happens to be a *majority* decision of the local population.

Since when has a majority decision come to be called "anarchy"? Would it not be more correct to apply this appellation to the *minority* decision which *both* the tsarists and Shingaryov are proposing in various forms?

When Shingaryov tries to force the peasants into a "voluntary" "reconciliation" with the landowners, he is imposing a minority decision, because there is an average of 300 peasant families in Russia to every one family of the big landowners. If I tell three hundred families to come to a "voluntary" "agreement" with *one* family of a rich exploiter,

I am offering a decision in favour of the minority, and that means anarchy.

In raising this hullabaloo about “anarchy”, you capitalists are trying to disguise the fact that you stand for the interests of the one against those of the three hundred. This is the crux of the matter.

We may be told; But you want to have the matter decided by the local people alone, without waiting for the Constituent Assembly! And that is anarchy!

To this we reply: And what does Shingaryov want? He, too, wants the matter settled locally (by a “voluntary agreement” between the peasants and the landowners) without waiting for the Constituent Assembly!

On this point Shingaryov and we do not differ—we are both for a final decision by the Constituent Assembly and a preliminary decision—to be enforced—by the local people. We differ with Shingaryov only in saying that 300 shall decide and 1 shall submit, whereas Shingaryov says: if the 300 decide, that will be “arbitrary action”, so let the 300 “agree” with the 1.

How low the Narodniks and Mensheviks must have fallen to help Shingaryov and Co. spread bourgeois terrors.

Fear of the people—that is what these alarmists and panic-mongers are actuated by.

There is no reason to fear the people. The decision of the majority of workers and peasants is *not* anarchy. Such a decision is the only possible guarantee of democracy in general, and of success in the search for effective ways of combating the debacle in particular.

Written May 3 (16), 1917

Published May 17 (4), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 48

Published according
to the newspaper text

ON THE EVE

The “conciliation” machine is working at full speed. The Narodniks and Mensheviks are toiling in the sweat of their brow, making up a new list of ministers. We are on the eve of a “new” cabinet....

Alas! It will not be very new. The government of the capitalists will have a few petty-bourgeois ministers tacked on to it in the shape of Narodniks and Mensheviks who have allowed themselves to be lured to the support of the imperialist war.

We shall have more phrase-mongering, more fireworks, more lavish promises and bombast about “peace without annexations”—but no desire whatever to even enumerate frankly, precisely and truthfully the *actual* annexations effected, say, by three countries: Germany, Russia, and Britain.

How long, gentlemen of the old and the new cabinets, can one deceive oneself with the utopia that the peasants will support the capitalists (the well-to-do peasants are not the whole of the peasantry), with the utopia of an “offensive” at the front (in the name of “peace without annexations”)?

THEY HAVE FORGOTTEN THE MAIN THING

THE MUNICIPAL PLATFORM OF THE PROLETARIAN PARTY

Elections to the district councils being close at hand, the two petty-bourgeois democratic parties, the Narodniks and the Mensheviks, have come out with high-sounding platforms. These platforms are exactly the same as those of the European bourgeois parties who are engaged in angling for the gullible uneducated mass of voters from among the petty proprietors, etc., such as, for instance, the platform of the Radical and Radical-Socialist Party of France.⁹⁸ The same specious phrases, the same lavish promises, the same vague formulations, the same silence on or forgetfulness of the main thing, namely, the *actual conditions* on which the practicability of these promises depends.

At present these conditions are: (1) the imperialist war; (2) the existence of a capitalist government; (3) the impossibility of seriously improving the condition of the workers and the whole mass of working people without revolutionary encroachment on the “sacred right of capitalist private property”; (4) the impossibility of carrying out the reforms promised by these parties while the old organs and machinery of government remain intact, while there exists a police force which is bound to back the capitalists and put a thousand and one obstacles in the way of such reforms.

For example: “House rents in war time to be controlled”, “such stocks to be requisitioned for the public needs” (that is, stocks of foodstuffs kept in stores or by private individuals), “communal stores, bakeries, canteens, and kitchens to be organised”—write the Mensheviks. “Proper attention to be paid to sanitation and hygiene,” echo the Narodniks (the Socialist-Revolutionaries).

Excellent wishes, to be sure. The trouble is that they cannot be carried out unless one *stops* supporting the imperialist war, stops supporting the loan (which is profitable to the capitalists), stops supporting the capitalist government, which safeguards capitalist profits, stops preserving the police, who are bound to obstruct, thwart, and kill any such reform, even if the government and the capitalists themselves did not present an ultimatum to the reformers (and they certainly will, once capitalist profits are involved).

The trouble is that once we forget the harsh and rigid conditions of capitalist domination, then all such platforms, all such lists of sweeping reforms are empty words, which in practice turn out to be either harmless "pious wishes", or simple hoodwinking of the masses by ordinary bourgeois politicians.

We must face the truth squarely. We must not gloss it over, we must tell it to people in a straightforward manner. We must not brush the class struggle under the carpet, but clarify what relation it bears to the high-sounding, specious, delightful "radical" reforms.

Comrade workers, and all other citizens of Petrograd! In order to give the people all those pressing and essential reforms of which the Narodniks and the Mensheviks speak, one must throw over the policy of support for the imperialist war and war loans, support for the capitalist government and for the principle of the inviolability of capitalist profits. To carry out those reforms, one must *not allow the police to be reinstated*, as the Cadets are now doing, but have it replaced by a people's militia. This is what the party of the proletariat should tell the people at elections, this is what it must say *against* the petty-bourgeois parties of the Narodniks and the Mensheviks. This is the essence of the proletarian municipal platform that is being glossed over by the petty-bourgeois parties.

Foremost in this platform, topping the list of reforms, there must be, as a basic condition for their actual realisation, the following three fundamental points:

1. No support for the imperialist war (either in the form of support for the war loan, or in any other form).
2. No support to the capitalist government.
3. No reinstatement of the police, which must be replaced by a people's militia.

Unless attention is focused on those cardinal questions, unless it is shown that all municipal reforms are contingent upon them, the municipal programme inevitably becomes (at best) a pious wish.

Let us examine point 3.

In all bourgeois republics, even the most democratic, the police (like the standing army) is the chief instrument of oppression of the masses, an instrument making for a possible restoration of the monarchy. The police beats up the "common people" in the police stations of New York, Geneva, and Paris; it favours the capitalists either because it is bribed to do so (America and other countries), or because it enjoys wealthy "patronage" and "protection" (Switzerland), or because of a combination of both (France). Separated as it is from the people, forming a professional caste of men trained in the practice of violence upon the poor, men who receive somewhat higher pay and the privileges that go with authority (to say nothing of "gratuities"), the police everywhere, in every republic, however democratic, where the bourgeoisie is in power, always remains the unfailing weapon, the chief support and protection of the bourgeoisie. No important radical reforms in favour of the working masses can be implemented through the police. That is objectively impossible.

A people's militia instead of the police force and the standing army is a *prerequisite* of effective municipal reforms in the interests of the working people. At a time of revolution this prerequisite is practicable. And it is on this that we must concentrate the whole municipal platform, for the other two cardinal conditions apply to the state as a whole, and not only to municipal governments.

Just how this people's militia can be brought into existence is something which experience will show. To enable the proletarians and semi-proletarians to serve in this militia, the employers must be made to pay them their full wages for the days and hours they spend in service. This is practicable. Whether we should *first* organise a workers' militia by drawing upon the workers employed at the large factories, i.e., the workers who are best organised and most capable of fulfilling the task of militiamen, or whether we should *immediately* organise general compulsory service for all adult men and women, who would devote to this service one

or two weeks a year and so on, is not a question of fundamental importance. There is no harm in the different districts adopting different procedures—in fact, it would make for richer experience, and the process of organisation would develop more smoothly and come closer to life's practical requirements.

A people's militia would mean education of the *masses* in the practices of democracy.

A people's militia would mean government of the poor by the people themselves, chiefly by the poor, and *not* by the rich, not through *their* police.

A people's militia would mean that control (over factories, dwellings, the distribution of products, etc.) would be *real* and not merely on paper.

A people's militia would mean distribution without any bread queues, *without any* privileges for the rich.

A people's militia would mean that quite a number of the serious and radical reforms listed also by the Narodniks and the Mensheviks would *not* remain mere pious wishes.

Comrades, working men and women of Petrograd! Go to the district council elections. Protect the interests of the poor population. Come out against the imperialist war, against support of the capitalist government, against the restoration of the police and for the immediate unqualified replacement of the police by a people's militia.

MANDATE TO DEPUTIES OF THE SOVIET ELECTED AT FACTORIES AND REGIMENTS

(1) Our Deputy must be unconditionally opposed to the present predatory imperialist war. This war is waged by the capitalists of all countries—Russia, Germany, Britain, etc.—for profits, and the subjugation of the weak nations.

(2) So long as a capitalist government is at the head of the Russian nation, there must be no support for the government, which is carrying on a predatory war—not by a single kopek!

(3) Our Deputy must stand for the immediate publication of the secret predatory treaties (relating to the subjugation of Persia, the partition of Turkey, Austria, etc.), which ex-Tsar Nicholas concluded with the capitalists of Britain, France, etc.

(4) Our Deputy must stand for the immediate abrogation of all these treaties. The Russian people, the workers and the peasants, do not wish to oppress and will not oppress any nation; they do not wish to and will not hold by force within the boundaries of Russia a single non-Russian (non-Great-Russian) nation. Freedom for all the peoples, a fraternal union of the workers and peasants of all nationalities!

(5) Our Deputy must stand for the Russian Government offering openly, immediately and unconditionally, without equivocation and without the least delay, terms of peace to *all* the belligerent countries on the basis of freedom for *all* the oppressed or underprivileged nationalities *without exception*.

This means that the Great Russians shall not forcibly retain either Poland, or Kurland, or Ukraine, or Finland, or Armenia, or any other nation. The Great Russians offer a fraternal union to all the nations and propose the formation of a common state by voluntary consent of each individual people, and under no circumstances by means of violence, direct or indirect. The Great Russians, under the terms of such a peace, undertake immediately to withdraw their troops from Galicia, from Armenia, and from Persia, and to allow these nations and *all* other nations without exception freely to decide whether they wish to live as a separate state, or in union with whomsoever they please.

Germany, by the terms of such a peace, must not only relinquish *all* the territories she has seized since the beginning of the war, but also release the peoples she is keeping by force within the boundaries of Germany, namely, the Danes (Schleswig), the French (part of Alsace and Lorraine), the Poles (Poznan), etc. Germany must undertake immediately, and simultaneously with Russia, to withdraw her troops from all the regions she has seized, as well as from all the regions mentioned above, and allow each nation to decide freely, by a popular vote, whether it wishes to live as a separate state, or in union *with whomsoever it pleases*. Germany must unconditionally and unequivocally relinquish all her colonies, for colonies are oppressed peoples.

Britain, by the terms of such a peace, must relinquish, immediately and unconditionally, not only the territories she has seized from others (the German colonies in Africa, etc., the Turkish lands, Mesopotamia, etc.), but *all her own colonies* as well. Britain, like Russia and Germany, must immediately withdraw her troops from all the territories she has seized, from her colonies, and also from Ireland, and let each nation decide by a free vote whether it wants to live as a separate state, or in union with whomsoever it wishes.

And so on: all the belligerent countries, without exception, must receive an offer to conclude an immediate peace on these clearly defined terms. The capitalists of *all* countries should no longer deceive the peoples by promising "peace without annexations" while holding on to *their own* annexed territories and continuing the war in order to wrest from the enemy "his own" annexed territories.

(6) Our Deputy must not give any support, or vote for any loan, or give a kopek of the people's money to *any* government that does not solemnly undertake immediately to offer to all the nations these terms for an immediate peace and to publish this offer within *two days* for everybody's information.

Written before May 7 (20), 1917

First published in 1925
in *Lenin Miscellany IV*

Published according
to the manuscript

CLASS COLLABORATION WITH CAPITAL, OR CLASS STRUGGLE AGAINST CAPITAL?

That is how history puts the issue—and not history in general, but the economic and political history of the Russia of *today*.

The Narodniks and Mensheviks, Chernov and Tsereteli, have transferred the Contact Commission from the room adjacent to the one the ministers used to meet in to the ministerial chamber itself. This, and this alone, is the purely political significance of the “new” cabinet.

Its economic and class significance is that, at the best (from the point of view of the stability of the cabinet and the preservation of capitalist domination), the leadership of the peasant bourgeoisie, headed since 1906 by Peshekhonov, and the petty-bourgeois “leaders” of the Menshevist workers have *promised* the capitalists their class collaboration. (At the worst—for the capitalists—the whole change has a purely personal or clique significance, but no class significance at all.)

Let us assume that the more favourable eventuality is the case. Even so, there is not a shadow of doubt that the promisers will be unable to fulfil their promises. “We shall—in co-operation with the capitalists—help the country out of its crisis, save it from ruin and get it out of the war”—that is what the action of the petty-bourgeois leaders, the Chernovs and Tseretelis, in joining the cabinet really amounts to. Our answer is: Your help is not enough. The crisis has advanced infinitely farther than you imagine. Only the revolutionary class, by taking revolutionary measures against

capital, can save the country—and not our country alone.

The crisis is so profound, so widespread, of such vast world-wide scope, and so closely bound up with Capital itself, that the class struggle against Capital must inevitably assume the form of political supremacy by the proletariat and semi-proletariat. There is no other way out.

You want to have revolutionary enthusiasm in the army, Citizens Chernov and Tsereteli? But you cannot create it, because the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses is not begotten by a change of “leaders” in cabinets, by florid declarations, or by promises to take steps to revise the treaty with the British capitalists; it can be aroused only by acts of revolutionary policy patent to all and undertaken daily and everywhere *against* almighty Capital and against its making profits out of the war, a policy that will make for a radical improvement in the standard of living of the mass of the poor.

Even if you were to hand over all the land to the people immediately, this would not end the crisis unless revolutionary measures were taken against Capital.

You want an offensive, Citizens Chernov and Tsereteli? But you cannot rouse the army to an offensive, because you cannot use force against the people today. And unless force is used *against* them the people would undertake an offensive only in the great interests of the great revolution against Capital in all countries; and not merely a revolution promised and proclaimed, but a revolution actually in process of realisation, a revolution which is being carried out in actual fact, and is tangible to all.

You want to organise supply, Citizens Peshekhonovs and Skobelevs, the supply of goods for the peasants, of bread and meat for the army, of raw material for industry, and so forth? You want control over, and partly even the organisation of, production?

You cannot do this without the revolutionary enthusiasm of the proletarian and semi-proletarian mass. This enthusiasm can be aroused only by taking revolutionary measures against the privileges and profits of Capital. Failing this, your promised control will remain a dead, capitalist, bureaucratic palliative.

The experiment at class collaboration with Capital is now being made by the Chernovs and Tseretelis, and by certain sections of the petty bourgeoisie, on a new, gigantic, all-Russia scale.

All the more valuable will be its lessons for the people, when the latter become convinced—and that apparently will be soon—of the futility and hopelessness of such collaboration.

Pravda No. 50,
May 19 (6), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

A STRONG REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT

We are for a strong revolutionary government. Whatever the capitalists and their flunkeys may shout about us to the contrary, their lies will remain lies.

The thing is not to let phrases obscure one's consciousness, disorient one's mind. When people speak about "revolution", "the revolutionary people", "revolutionary democracy", and so on, *nine times out of ten* this is a lie or self-deception. The question is—*what class* is making this revolution? A revolution *against whom*?

Against tsarism? In that sense most of Russia's landowners and capitalists today are revolutionaries. When the revolution is an accomplished fact, even reactionaries come into line with it. There is no deception of the masses at present more frequent, more detestable, and more harmful than that which lauds the revolution against tsarism.

Against the landowners? In this sense most of the peasants, even most of the well-to-do peasants, that is, probably nine-tenths of the population in Russia, are revolutionaries. Very likely, some of the capitalists, too, are prepared to become revolutionaries on the grounds that the landowners cannot be saved anyway, so let us better side with the revolution and try to make things safe for capitalism.

Against the capitalists? Now that is the real issue. That is the crux of the matter, because without a revolution against the capitalists, all that prattle about "peace without annexations" and the speedy termination of the war by such a peace is either naïveté and ignorance, or stupidity and deception. But for the war, Russia could have gone on living for years and decades without a revolution against the capitalists. The war has made that objectively impossible. The alternatives are either utter ruin or a revolution against the capitalists. That is how the question stands. That is how the very trend of events poses it.

Instinctively, emotionally, and by attraction, the bulk of Russia's population, namely, the proletarians and semi-proletarians, i.e., the workers and poor peasants, are in sympathy with a revolution against the capitalists. So far, however, there is no clear consciousness of this, and, as a result, no determination. To develop these is our chief task.

The leaders of the petty bourgeoisie—the intellectuals, the prosperous peasants, the present parties of the Narodniks (the S.R.s included) and the Mensheviks—are *not* at present in favour of a revolution against the capitalists and some of them are even opposed to it, greatly to the detriment of the people's cause. The coalition cabinet is the kind of "experiment" that is going to help the people as a whole to quickly *discard* the illusion of petty-bourgeois conciliation with the capitalists.

The conclusion is obvious: only assumption of power by the proletariat, backed by the semi-proletarians, can give the country a really strong and really revolutionary government. It will be really strong because it will be supported by a solid and class-conscious majority of the people. It will be strong because it will not, of necessity, have to be based on a precarious "agreement" between capitalists and small proprietors, between millionaires and petty bourgeoisie, between the Konovalovs-Shingaryovs and the Chernovs-Tseretelis.

It will be a truly revolutionary government, the only one capable of showing the people that at a time when untold suffering is inflicted upon the masses it will not be awed and deterred by capitalist profits. It will be a truly revolutionary government because it alone will be capable of evoking and sustaining the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses and increasing it tenfold, provided the masses, every day and every hour, see and feel that the government believes in the people, is not afraid of them, that it helps the poor to improve their lot right now, that it makes the rich bear an *equal share* of the heavy burden of the people's suffering.

We are for a strong revolutionary government.

We are for a strong revolutionary government because it is the only possible and the only reliable government.

TITBITS FOR THE “NEWBORN” GOVERNMENT⁹⁹

From a *Rech* editorial, penned with an air of heavy gravity:

“Let us hope that no great shocks to our relations with the Allies will be needed to prove to the supporters of the formula ‘without annexations or indemnities’ [read: to the new government] that it is impracticable.”

They are right, the capitalists for whom *Rech* speaks. The formula is indeed “impracticable” ... unless a revolution against capital is put into practice!

* * *

From a speech by Milyukov, who didn’t resign, but got the sack:

“Whatever noble formulas of friendship for the Allies we may devise, once our army remains inactive, we shall merely be shirking our obligations. And vice versa, whatever terrible formulas betraying our loyalties we may devise, once our army is actually fighting, then that, of course, will be actual fulfilment of our obligations towards the Allies.”

Correct! He knows what he is talking about sometimes, does Citizen Milyukov! Citizens Chernov and Tsereteli, don’t you realise what inference is to be drawn from this as regards your *actual* attitude towards the imperialist war?

* * *

From a speech by Shulgin at a meeting of the rallying counter-revolution:

“We prefer to be beggars, but beggars in our own country. If you can preserve that country and keep it safe for us, then take our last shirt from us, we shall shed no tear.”

Don't try to frighten us, Mr. Shulgin. Even when *we* are in power we shall not take your "last shirt" from you, but shall see that you are provided with good clothes and good food, on condition that you do the job you are fit for and used to! You can frighten the Chernovs and the Tsereletis, but you can't frighten us.

* * *

From a speech by Maklakov at the same meeting (of "members of the Duma"):

"Russia has proved unworthy of the freedom she has won."

Read: the workers and peasants have failed to satisfy the Maklakovs. These gentlemen want the Chernovs and Tsereletis to "reconcile" the masses with the Maklakovs. It won't work!

* * *

From the same speech:

"Many people can be blamed, but we, in Russia, can't do without the bourgeoisie or the proletariat, without the various currents or the various individuals."

We beg your pardon, Citizen Maklakov, but "we" (the party of the proletariat) "can do without the bourgeoisie" "in Russia". Time will show you and make you admit that there was no other way out of the imperialist war.

* * *

From the same speech:

"We see a mass of evil instincts which have risen to the surface: we see a reluctance to work, reluctance to recognise one's duty to one's country. We see that at a time of cruel warfare this country has become a land of festivities, meetings and talk, a country that does not recognise authority and refuses to obey it."

Correct! A mass of "evil instincts", especially among the landowners and the capitalists. The petty bourgeois has evil instincts, too: for instance, the instinct that drives him into a coalition cabinet with capitalists. The proletarians and semi-proletarians have evil instincts, too: for example, they are slow in discarding petty-bourgeois illusions, slow

in coming to the conclusion that *all* "power" must be taken over by this class, and this class alone.

* * *

From the same speech:

"The government will move steadily leftward, while the country will move farther and farther to the right."

By "the country" Maklakov means the capitalists. In this sense he is right. But "the country" of the workers and the poor peasants, I assure you, Citizen Maklakov, is a thousand times more leftward than the Chernovs and the Tseretelis, and a hundred times more leftward than we are. The future will prove this to you.

Pravda No. 50,
May 19 (6), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

**ALREADY THE “NEW” GOVERNMENT IS LAGGING
BEHIND EVEN THE PEASANT MASS,
LEAVE ALONE THE REVOLUTIONARY
WORKERS**

Here is the evidence:

The evening edition of *Russkaya Volya** (Russian Freedom indeed!) for May 4 has this to report about the feeling prevailing among the delegates to the Peasant Congress, which is now in session.

“The delegates’ main grievance, voiced on behalf of the peasants, is that while all classes are already reaping the fruits of the revolution the peasants alone are still waiting for their share. The peasants alone are told to wait until the Constituent Assembly meets and settles the land question.

“‘We don’t agree,’ they say. ‘We’re not going to wait, just as others have not waited. We want the land now, at once.’”

There is no doubt that the reporter of *Russkaya Volya*, a paper that serves the worst of the capitalists, is not slandering the peasants in this case (there is no sense in lying), but is telling the truth, is *warning* the capitalists. *All* the news coming from the Congress confirms this truth.

Compare this truth with §5 of the “new” government’s draft declaration:

“While leaving it to the Constituent Assembly to settle the question of transferring the land to the working people, the Provisional Government will take ... measures,” etc. (the “old” Provisional Government also kept on “taking measures”...).

* *Russkaya Volya* means Russian Freedom. See Note No. 4.—*Ed.*

The “new” government is already lagging hopelessly behind even the Peasant Congress!

This is a fact, surprising though it may be to many.

And facts are stubborn things, as the English say.

Pravda No. 50,
May 19 (6), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

STEALING A MARCH ON THE WORKERS

Yesterday, May 5, two of the big dailies—*Dyelo Naroda* and *Rech*—carried an announcement on their front pages, later reprinted in the Guchkov-Suvorin evening paper *Vecherneye Vremya*,¹⁰⁰ which deserves serious attention.

The public is informed that “in accordance with an agreement between the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies and the Union of Engineers, as authorised by the Provisional Government”, there has been organised in Petrograd a “Central Committee for restoring and maintaining normal work in the industrial enterprises”.

“The main task of the Central Committee,” the announcement reads, “is to work out and co-ordinate all measures aimed at restoring and maintaining normal work in the industrial enterprises and to organise regular and active *public control* over all industrial enterprises.”

The words “public control” were italicised in the announcement.

They remind one of the Senate and other bureaucratic committees of the good old tsarist days. No sooner had some knave of a tsar’s minister, governor, marshal of the nobility, etc., been caught red-handed at some thievery, no sooner had some institution directly or indirectly connected with the tsar’s government conspicuously disgraced itself throughout Russia or throughout Europe, than a high commission of “personages” notable and super-notable, high-ranking and super-ranking, rich and super-rich was appointed to “appease *public opinion*”.

And these personages usually managed to “appease” public opinion with conspicuous success. The more high-sounding the phrases about our wise tsar salving “the popular

conscience" the more effectively did these men kill the idea of any "public control".

So it was, so it will be, one feels like saying as one reads the pompously worded announcement about the new Central Committee.

The capitalists have decided to steal a march on the workers. There is a growing consciousness among the workers that a *proletarian* control over factories and syndicates is necessary. The master minds of the business world from among ministerial and near-ministerial circles have had a "brain wave"—to forestall events and take the Soviet in tow. This should not be difficult, they thought, so long as the Narodniks and Mensheviks are still in control there. We'll fix up "public control", they said to themselves. It will look so important, so statesmanlike, so ministeriable, so solid. And it will kill all possible real control, all *proletarian* control so effectively, so quietly. A brilliant idea! The "popular conscience" will be completely "salved".

How is this new Central Committee to be composed?

Why, on democratic lines, of course. Are we not *all* "revolutionary democrats"? If anyone thinks that democracy requires 20 representatives from 200,000 workers and one representative from 10,000 engineers, capitalists, etc., that would be an "anarchist" delusion. No, true democracy consists in imitating the way in which "revolutionary democracy" has composed its "new" government, where the workers and peasants are "represented" by six Mensheviks and Narodniks while eight Cadets and Octobrists represent the landowners and the capitalists. Do not the latest statistical surveys now being completed by the new Ministry of Labour by arrangement with the old Ministry of Industry prove that the majority of Russia's population belongs to the class of landowners and capitalists?

Here, if you please, is a *complete* list of "representatives" of the organisations that have been included in the new Central Committee by agreement between "revolutionary democracy" and the government.

The Central Committee is composed of representatives from the following organisations: (1) The Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies; (2) The Provisional Committee of the Duma; (3) The All-Russia

Union of Zemstvos; (4) The All-Russia Union of Cities; (5) The Petrograd Municipal Administration; (6) The Union of Engineers; (7) The Soviet of Officers' Deputies; (8) The Council of Congresses of Representatives of Industry and Commerce; (9) The Petrograd Society of Factory Owners; (10) The Central War Industries Committee; (11) The Central Committee of Zemstvo and City Unions for Army Supply; (12) The Committee of Technical War Aid; (13) The Free-Economic Society.

And that's all?

Yes, that's all.

Is that not sufficient for salving the popular conscience?

Yes, but what if some big bank or syndicate of capitalists is represented five or ten times through its shareholders in these ten or twelve institutions?

Oh, why quibble about "details", when the main thing is to secure "a regular and active *public control*"!

Written May 6 (19), 1917

Published May 20 (7), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 61

Published according
to the newspaper text

**AN OPEN LETTER TO THE DELEGATES
TO THE ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS
OF PEASANTS' DEPUTIES**

Comrades, peasant deputies,

The Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks), to which I have the honour to belong, wanted me to represent our Party at the Peasant Congress, but illness has prevented me from carrying out this commission. I therefore take the liberty of addressing this open letter to you in order to greet the all-Russia union of the peasantry and briefly to point out the deep-seated differences that divide our Party on the one hand and the party of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Menshevik Social-Democrats on the other.

These profound differences, concern the three most important issues: the land, the war, and state organisation.

All the land must belong to the people. All the landed estates must be turned over to the peasants without compensation. This is clear. The dispute here is whether or not the peasants in the local areas should take all the land at once, without paying any rent to the landowners, or wait until the Constituent Assembly meets.

Our Party believes that they should, and advises the peasants locally to take over all the land without delay, and to do it in as organised a way as possible, under no circumstances allowing damage to property and exerting every effort to increase the production of grain and meat since the troops at the front are in dire straits. In any case, although the final decision on how to dispose of the land will be made by the Constituent Assembly, a preliminary settlement now, at once, in time for the spring sowing, can be made only by

local bodies, inasmuch as our Provisional Government, which is a government of the landowners and capitalists, is putting off the convocation of the Constituent Assembly and so far has not even fixed a date for it.

Only local bodies are able preliminarily to take charge of the land. The fields must be sown to crops. Most of the peasants in the local areas are quite capable of making use of the land in an organised way, of ploughing and putting it all under crops. This is essential if the supply of food to the soldiers at the front is to be improved. Hence, to wait for the Constituent Assembly is out of the question. We by no means deny the right of the Constituent Assembly finally to institute public ownership of the land and to regulate its disposal. In the meantime, however, right now, this spring, the peasants themselves must decide locally what to do with it. The soldiers at the front can and should send delegates to the villages.

Further. For all the land to pass over to the working people, a close alliance of the urban workers and the poor peasants (semi-proletarians) is essential. Unless such an alliance is formed, the capitalists cannot be defeated. And if they are not defeated, no transfer of the land to the people will deliver them from poverty. You cannot eat land, and without money, without capital, there is no way of obtaining implements, livestock, or seed. The peasants must trust not the capitalists or the rich muzhiks (who are capitalists too), but only the urban workers. Only in alliance with the latter can the poor peasants ensure that the land, the railways, the banks, and the factories become the property of all the working people; if this is not done, the mere transfer of the land to the people cannot abolish want and pauperism.

Workers in certain localities in Russia are already beginning to establish their supervision (control) over the factories. Such control by the workers is to the peasants' advantage, for it means increased production and cheaper products. The peasants must give their fullest support to this initiative on the part of the workers and not believe the slander which the capitalists spread against the workers.

The second question is the question of the war.

This war is a war of conquest. It is being waged by the capitalists of all countries with predatory aims, to increase

their profits. To the working people this war can spell only ruin, suffering, devastation, and brutalisation. That is why our Party, the party of class-conscious workers and poor peasants, emphatically and unqualifiedly condemns this war, refuses to justify the capitalists of the one country as against the capitalists of another, refuses to support the capitalists of any country whatever, and is working for the speediest termination of the war through the overthrow of the capitalists in all countries, through a workers' revolution in all countries.

In our new Provisional Government, there are ten ministers belonging to the landowner and capitalist parties and six to the Narodnik (Socialist-Revolutionary) and Menshevik Social-Democratic parties. In our opinion the Narodniks and Mensheviks have made a grave and fatal mistake in joining the capitalist government and in general agreeing to support it. Men like Tsereteli and Chernov are hoping to induce the capitalists to bring the present predatory war to a speedy and more honourable end. But these leaders of the Narodnik and Menshevik parties are mistaken: they are, in effect, helping the capitalists to prepare an offensive by the Russian troops against Germany, that is, to drag out the war, to add to the incredibly enormous sacrifices the Russian people have made in the war.

We are convinced that the capitalists in all countries are deceiving the people by promising an early and just peace when they are actually prolonging the war of conquest. The Russian capitalists, who controlled the old Provisional Government and continue to control the new one, did not even wish to publish the secret predatory treaties ex-Tsar Nicholas Romanov concluded with the capitalists of Britain, France, and other countries with the object of wresting Constantinople from the Turks, Galicia from the Austrians, Armenia from the Turks, and so on. The Provisional Government has confirmed these treaties.

Our Party maintains that these treaties are just as criminal and predatory as the treaties the German brigand-capitalists and their brigand-Emperor Wilhelm have with their allies.

The blood of the workers and peasants must not be shed for the sake of such predatory aims of the capitalists.

This criminal war must be brought to a speedy end, *not* by a separate peace with Germany, *but by a universal peace*, not by a capitalist peace, but by a peace of the working masses *against* the capitalists. There is only one way to do this, and that is by transferring all state power to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies both in Russia and in other countries. Only such Soviets will be able effectively to prevent the capitalists from deceiving the peoples, and prevent the war being dragged on by the capitalists.

This brings me to the third and last of the questions I have mentioned: the question of state organisation.

Russia must become a democratic republic. Even the majority of the landowners and capitalists, who have always stood for the monarchy but now see that the people of Russia will on no account allow it to be restored, are in agreement with this. The capitalists now have directed all their efforts at making the Russian republic as much like a monarchy as possible so that it might be changed back into a monarchy with the least difficulty (this has happened time and again in many countries). For this purpose the capitalists want to preserve the bureaucracy, which stands *above* the people, to preserve the police and the standing army, which is separated from the people and commanded by non-elective generals and other officers. And the generals and other officers, unless they are elected, will almost invariably be landowners and capitalists. That much we know from the experience of all the republics in the world.

Our Party, the party of class-conscious workers and poor peasants, is therefore working for a democratic republic of another kind. We want a republic where there is no police that browbeats the people; where all officials, from the bottom up, are elective and displaceable whenever the people demand it, and are paid salaries not higher than the wages of a competent worker; where all army officers are similarly elective and where the standing army separated from the people and subordinated to classes alien to the people is replaced by the universally armed people, by a people's militia.

We want a republic where all state power, from the bottom up, belongs wholly and exclusively to the

Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', and other Deputies.

The workers and peasants are the majority of the population. The power must belong to them, not to the landowners or the capitalists.

The workers and peasants are the majority of the population. The power and the functions of administration must belong to *their Soviets*, not to the bureaucracy.

Such are our views, comrade peasant deputies. We are firmly convinced that experience will soon show the broad masses how erroneous the policy of the Narodniks and Mensheviks is. Experience will soon show the masses that compromise with the capitalists cannot save Russia, which, like Germany and other countries, is standing on the brink of disaster, cannot save the war-wearied peoples. The transfer of all state power directly to the majority of the population alone can save the peoples.

Petrograd, May 7, 1917

N. Lenin

Published May 24 (11), 1917
in the newspaper *Soldatskaya Pravda* No. 19

Published according
to the newspaper text

THE "VIRTUAL ARMISTICE"

Novaya Zhizn for May 7 publishes interviews with ministers of the "new" government. Prime Minister Lvov has declared that "the country must have its weighty say and send its army into battle".

This is the sum and substance of the new government's "programme". An offensive, an offensive, an offensive!

Defending this imperialist programme, now accepted by the Chernovs and the Tseretelis, Minister Lvov in tones of deepest moral indignation fulminates against the "*virtual armistice that has been established at the front*"!

Let every Russian worker, let every peasant give careful thought to this programme of *offensive*, to these violent ministerial diatribes against the "virtual armistice".

Millions of people have been killed and crippled in the war. Untold sufferings have fallen to the lot of the people, particularly the working masses, as a result of the war. The capitalists are making scandalously high profits out of the war. The soldiers are utterly worn out.

What is wrong with a virtual armistice? What is wrong with having the slaughter stopped? What is wrong with the soldiers getting at least a brief respite?

We are told that an armistice has been established only on one front, and therefore there is a danger of a separate peace. But this argument does not hold water. If *neither* the Russian Government nor the Russian workers and peasants *want* a separate peace with the German capitalists (our Party, as we know, through *Pravda* and in the resolution passed at our Conference,* which spoke in the name of the

* See p. 272 of this volume.—*Ed.*

Party as a whole, has repeatedly protested against such a peace)—if no one in Russia wants a separate peace with separate capitalists, how then, by what miracle, can such a peace come? Who can impose it?

The objection is clearly untenable. It is sheer invention, an attempt to throw dust in our eyes.

Further, why should a virtual armistice on one front imply the “danger” of a separate peace on that front, *and not the danger of such an armistice spreading to all fronts?*

A virtual armistice is an unstable transitional state of affairs. This is incontrovertible. Transitional to what? It cannot lead to a separate peace so long as there is *no* mutual agreement between the two governments or two nations. But why could not such an armistice lead to a virtual truce on *all* fronts? Surely this is what *all* nations agree with, despite all or most of their governments!

Fraternalisation on one front can and should lead to fraternalisation on all fronts. A virtual armistice on one front can and should lead to a virtual armistice on all fronts.

The nations would thus gain a respite from the carnage. The revolutionary workers in *all* the countries would raise their heads still higher; their influence would increase, and faith in the possibility and necessity of a workers’ revolution in the advanced capitalist countries would become strengthened.

What is wrong with such a transition? Why should we not help to bring it about as far as it is in our power to do so?

We may be told that a virtual armistice today on all fronts would help the German capitalists, who have snatched more loot than anybody else. This is not true. For one thing, the British capitalists have grabbed more (the German colonies in Africa, German islands in the Pacific, Mesopotamia, part of Syria, etc.) and, unlike the German capitalists, have lost nothing. Secondly, if the German capitalists had shown greater obstinacy than the British capitalists, the growth of the revolution in Germany would have only been accelerated. The revolution in Germany is obviously mounting. An offensive by the Russian troops would check this growth. The “virtual armistice” hastens the rise of this revolution.

Thirdly, what with growing hunger, ruin, and disorganisation. Germany is in desperate straits, being worse off than any other country, especially since the United States has entered the war. A "virtual armistice" would not remove *this* fundamental source of Germany's weakness; on the contrary, it is likely to improve the position of the other countries (greater freedom for bringing up supplies) while worsening that of the German capitalists (who have nowhere to bring supplies up from and will have greater difficulty in hiding the truth from the people).

The Russian people have two programmes to choose from. One is the programme of the capitalists, adopted by the Chernovs and Tseretelis. This is the programme of offensive, the programme for dragging out the imperialist war, dragging out the carnage.

The other programme is that of the world's revolutionary workers, advocated in Russia by our Party. This programme says: stimulate fraternisation (but do not permit the Germans to deceive the Russians); fraternise by means of proclamations; extend fraternisation and a virtual armistice to all fronts; help to spread these in every possible way, thereby hastening the proletarian revolution in all the countries, giving at least a temporary respite to the soldiers of all the belligerent countries; hasten in Russia the transfer of power to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies, and thereby hasten the conclusion of a really just, really universal peace in the interests of the working people, and not in the interests of the capitalists.

Our government, with the Chernovs and Tseretelis, the Narodniks and the Mensheviks, is for the first programme.

The majority of the Russian nation and of all the nations within Russia (and outside Russia), i.e., the majority of the workers and poor peasants, undoubtedly stand for the second programme.

The victory of *this* second programme is drawing nearer every day.

SECRETS OF FOREIGN POLICY

What a pity that the masses cannot read books on the history of diplomacy, or the editorials in the capitalist newspapers. And an even greater pity—though in this case pity is too feeble a word—that the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik ministers and their ministeriable colleagues should maintain such a discreet silence on certain facts of diplomatic history and on the utterances of the “great diplomatic minds”, though these are only too well known to them.

Rech quotes what it claims to be a reliable report in *Birzhevka* to the effect that Britain is quite prepared to renounce the “dismemberment of Turkey and partitioning of Austria-Hungary”. In other words, Britain readily consents to Russia *not* getting the annexations promised her under earlier treaties (Constantinople, Armenia, Galicia). In *this* sense—and in this sense alone—Britain is prepared to revise the treaties.

And *Rech* waxes indignant:

“So this is the first result of the triumph of the new slogan [the slogan of peace without annexations and indemnities]. The agreements will very likely be revised: our Allies—not we—are already taking ‘preparatory steps’ towards that end. The result of this revision, however, will be not a uniform [mark this!] renunciation of the major objectives of all the Allies, but a one-sided [isn’t that a gem?] renunciation of the objectives in South-Eastern Europe [read: in Austria and Turkey, i.e., the plundering of Armenia, Constantinople, Galicia] in favour of objectives in other areas and in the colonies, formulated not by us but by our Allies.

“In particular, there have been press reports suggesting that our Allies might abandon their objectives in Asia Minor. True, there is so far no official confirmation of the statements to that effect said to have been made by Albert Thomas in the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies and reported in the Moscow press. It would be difficult, however, to expect any such action as far as Britain is concerned.

For Britain takes the correct view that possession is nine-tenths of the law [mark this!] and her troops are already occupying parts of Mesopotamia and Palestine which are of vital interest to her [read: to her capitalists]. In these circumstances, Britain's refusal to fight for the vital interests of the *other* [*Rech's italics*] Allies would, of course, likewise be a one-sided act advantageous to her alone."

Truly, Milyukov, or whoever it was wrote these lines, deserves to have a monument set up to him in his lifetime ... for frankness. Bravo, candid *Rech* diplomats! (And why are they candid? Because they were angered at Milyukov being deprived of his portfolio.)

Everything that has been said in the lines quoted above is the truth, a truth confirmed by the recent history of diplomacy *and the history of foreign investments*. Britain at any rate will not renounce the seizure (annexation) of Palestine and Mesopotamia, though she is prepared to punish the Russians (for the "virtual armistice" on the Russian-German front) by denying them Galicia, Constantinople, Armenia, etc. That, in plain, non-diplomatic language, is the meaning of these statements in *Rech*.

And the Russian capitalists for whom *Rech* speaks can barely hold back their anger. Foaming at the mouth, they are blurting out the secrets of foreign policy and taking digs at the British capitalists: what you are doing is "one-sided", it is to your "advantage", and to the disadvantage of *others*.

Comrades, workers and soldiers! Consider these strikingly frank and strikingly truthful statements of *Rech*, coming from *well*-informed diplomats and former ministers, consider this excellent exposure of the *real aims* which not only the Russian, but the British capitalists, too, are pursuing in the war.

Russian soldiers! Do you want to fight to help the British capitalists seize Mesopotamia and Palestine? Do you want to support the Russian Government of Lvov, Chernov, Tsereshchenko, Tsereteli, a government bound by the interests of the capitalists and *afraid* openly to state the true facts which have been blurted out by *Rech*?

ONE OF THE SECRET TREATIES

We all know that the “revolutionary” Provisional Government’s first word on foreign policy was the declaration that all secret treaties concluded by ex-Tsar Nicholas II with the “Allied” capitalists remained in force, and that the new Russia would regard them as sacred and inviolable.

We know, furthermore, that our “defencists” vehemently support the Milyukovs’ refusal to publish the secret treaties. These so-called socialists have sunk so low as to defend secret diplomacy, and the secret diplomacy of the ex-tsar at that.

Why do the supporters of the imperialist war guard the secret of these treaties so zealously?

Do you want to know why, comrade workers and soldiers?

Familiarise yourselves with at least one of these noble treaties—“our” treaty with Italy (i.e., with the Italian capitalists) signed at the beginning of 1915.

On the basis of material published in *Novoye Vremya*, Mr. V. Vodovozov, a bourgeois democrat, reveals in *Dyen* (for May 6, 1917) the contents of that treaty:

“The Allies have guaranteed Italy Southern Tyrol with Trient, the entire coastline, and the northern part of Dalmatia with the towns of Zara and Spalato, the central part of Albania with Valona, the Aegean islands off the coast of Asia Minor, as well as a profitable railway concession in Asiatic Turkey—such is the price for which Italy has traded her blood. These annexations exceed any national claims ever advanced by Italy many times over. In addition to regions with an Italian population (Southern Tyrol and Trieste) of nearly 600,000, Italy, under this treaty, is to receive territories with a population of over a million who are absolutely alien to Italy ethnographically and in point of religion. These include, for instance, Dalmatia, 97 per cent of whose population are Serbs and only slightly over 2 per cent Italians. It is only natural that this treaty with Italy, concluded without

the knowledge or consent of Serbia, should have provoked such bitterness and resentment in that country. Pašić, speaking in the Skupština, expressed the hope that the rumours concerning the treaty were false, since Italy herself had united in the name of the principle of national unity, and could not therefore do anything that was likely to strike at the very roots of that principle. But Pašić was wrong; the treaty was concluded.

“This is the only treaty concerning the present war whose contents we know of, and this treaty is grossly predatory. Whether similar predatory instincts are or are not reflected in the other treaties, we do not know. At any rate, it is extremely important that democracy, on whose banner is inscribed ‘peace without annexations’, should know this.”

“We do not know” to what extent the other secret treaties are predatory? No, Mr. Vodovozov, we know it very well: the secret treaties concerning the carve-up of Persia and Turkey, the seizure of Galicia and Armenia are just as dirty and predatory as the rapacious treaty with Italy.

Comrade soldiers and workers! You are told that you are defending “freedom” and the “revolution”! In reality you are defending the shady treaties of the tsar, which are concealed from you as one conceals a secret disease.

MINISTERIAL TONE

The editors of *Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet have adopted a ministerial tone. They do not like *Pravda*; they condemn it for its “sharp attacks against the Provisional Government”.

To criticise what he doesn't like is the sacred right of every publicist. But why make oneself ridiculous by dispensing ministerial censure for our “attacks” without criticising the issues we raise? Would it not be better to analyse our arguments, or at least one of our resolutions, or at least one of our statements on the class struggle?

“The country *today* is heading for ruin,” says *Izvestia*'s editorial. Correct. For that very reason it would be unwise today to rely on the conciliatory policy of the petty bourgeoisie, the Narodniks and the Mensheviks, with regard to the capitalists. The country cannot be saved from ruin in that way.

Pravda No. 53,
May 23 (10), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

IN SEARCH OF A NAPOLEON

The newspaper of ex-Minister Milyukov is so furious with the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries for having forced certain individuals out of the cabinet that it lets itself be forced into making rather "indiscreet" statements.

"How can we tolerate such criminal propaganda?"— we read in an unsigned article of May 9 on the question of fraternisation. "Will this never be put a stop to? Must we have a Napoleon? Must we be content with more talk about iron discipline?"

A delicate, a very delicate hint alluding to Kerensky's notorious words about iron discipline.

Rech gives its readers a true and accurate picture of what is going on in "our" "new" government. We thank *Rech* from the bottom of our hearts for this truthfulness, which is exceptionally rare in such a newspaper and which has been called forth by exceptional circumstances.

In the "new" government Kerensky, supported by Chernov and Tsereteli, proclaims "iron discipline" for the army (in order to carry out the imperialist programme for an offensive).

And the landowners and capitalists, who have ten out of the sixteen posts in the cabinet, fume at Kerensky: "Must we be content with mere talk about iron discipline?"

Is it not clear that this phrase is calculated to inspire Kerensky or some "suitable" general to take upon himself the role of a Napoleon, the role of a strangler of freedom, the role of an executioner of the workers?

NOTHING HAS CHANGED

Now that “socialists” have become members of the cabinet,¹⁰¹ things will be different, the defencists have been assuring us. It did not take more than a few days to reveal the falsity of these assurances.

We all know what indignation was aroused among the soldiers and workers by ex-Minister Milyukov’s statement that he had no intention of publishing the secret treaties which ex-Tsar Nicholas II had concluded with the British and French capitalists. And now, what does Mr. Tereshchenko, the *new* Minister of Foreign Affairs, the associate of Skobelev and Tsereteli, have to say on this question?

Tereshchenko admits that “this question [i.e., the secret treaties] arouses passions”. But what does he do to cool these passions? He simply *repeats* what Milyukov, who has just been deposed, said before him.

“Immediate publication of the treaties would amount to a break with the Allies,” Tereshchenko declared in a statement to the press.

And the “socialist” ministers are silent and condone the system of secret diplomacy.

The coalition cabinet has brought no changes. The tsar’s secret treaties remain sacred to it.

And you, gentlemen, want this not to “arouse passions”? What do you take the class-conscious workers and soldiers for? Or do you really regard them as “rebellious slaves”?

A REGRETTABLE DEVIATION FROM THE PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY

Today's *Izvestia* carries a report of the meeting of the Soldiers' Section of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. This meeting, among other things,

"considered the question of whether *soldiers could perform the duties of militiamen*. The Executive Committee proposed to the meeting a resolution to the following effect;

"In view of the fact that soldiers must perform their *direct* duty, the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies *declares against the soldiers' participation* in the militia, and proposes that all soldiers serving in the militia be *immediately returned to their units*."

"After a brief debate, the resolution was passed with an *amendment* permitting soldiers *discharged from active service as well as wounded soldiers* to perform militia duties."

It is to be regretted that the exact texts of the resolution and the amendment have not been published. More regrettable still is the fact that the Executive Committee proposed and the meeting adopted a resolution which is a complete abandonment of the fundamental principles of democracy.

There is hardly a democratic party in Russia that does not include in its programme a demand for the universal arming of the people as a substitute for the standing army. There is hardly a Socialist-Revolutionary or a Menshevik Social-Democrat who would dare oppose such a demand. The trouble is that it has become a "custom" "nowadays", under the cover of high-sounding phrases about "revolutionary democracy", to accept democratic (the more so socialist) programmes "in principle", but reject them in practice.

To oppose the participation of soldiers in the militia on the ground that "soldiers must perform their direct duty" is to forget completely the principles of democracy and

involuntarily, unconsciously, perhaps, to adopt the idea of a standing army. The soldier is a professional; his direct duty is *not* social service at all—such is the point of view of those who are for a standing army. It is not a democratic point of view. It is the point of view of the Napoleons. It is the point of view of the supporters of the old regime and the capitalists, who dream of an easy transition backward, from a republic to a constitutional monarchy.

A democrat is opposed to such a view on principle. Soldiers' participation in the militia amounts to breaking down the wall that separates the army from the people. It amounts to breaking with the accursed "barrack" past where a special group of citizens, detached from and opposed to the people, were trained, "knocked into shape" and drilled for the "direct task" of following only a military profession. Soldiers' participation in the militia is a cardinal issue involving the re-education of the "soldiers" into militiamen citizens, the re-education of the population into public-spirited armed citizens. Democracy will remain an idle deceitful phrase, or merely a half-measure, unless the *entire* people is given a chance immediately and unqualifiedly to learn how to handle arms. Without the systematic, regular, and widespread participation of the soldiers in the militia this will be impossible.

The objection may be raised that soldiers should not be *deflected* from their *direct* duties. No one said they should. To make a point of this is as ridiculous as saying that a physician engaged at the bedside of a patient who is dangerously ill has no right to leave that bedside in order to go and hand in his voting-paper, or that a worker engaged in production, which admittedly must not be interrupted, has no right to go away to exercise his political rights until he is relieved by another worker. Such arguments would simply be frivolous and even unscrupulous.

Participation in the militia is one of the cardinal and basic principles of democracy, one of the most important guarantees of freedom. (We might add, parenthetically, that there is no better way of enhancing the purely military strength and capacity of the army than by substituting the universal arming of the people for the standing army, and by using the soldiers to instruct the people; this method has always been

used and always will be used in every truly revolutionary war.) The immediate, unqualified, universal organisation of a people's militia and the widest participation of soldiers in that militia are in the vital interests of the workers, peasants, and soldiers, that is to say, the vast majority of the population, a majority that is not interested in safeguarding the profits of the landowners and the capitalists.

Written May 10 (23), 1917

Published May 25 (12), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 55

Published according
to the newspaper text

**ON THE QUESTION OF CONVENING
AN INTERNATIONAL,
SO-CALLED SOCIALIST CONFERENCE
JOINTLY WITH
THE SOCIAL-CHAUVINISTS**

Izvestia of the Petrograd Soviet published today the Executive Committee's "Terms of Reference" for the organisation of a commission for convening an international conference. Our Party, among others, is asked to send a representative to the commission. Needless to say, our Party will take no part either in the commission or in any joint conference with so-called socialist ministers who have gone over to their bourgeoisie. This should be well known to anyone who has taken any interest in our Party, or who has read our resolution concerning the state of affairs in the International.

Our Party's Central Committee unanimously decided a few days ago to send a delegate to the forthcoming Zimmerwald Conference with instructions to immediately walk out of that Conference and withdraw from the Zimmerwald group in the event of the Conference declaring in favour of any association or joint discussion with the social-chauvinists.

Written May 10 (23), 1917

Published May 25 (12), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 55

Published according
to the newspaper text

**SPEECH AT A MEETING AT THE PUTILOV WORKS
MAY 12 (25), 1917**

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

Lenin set forth the Bolsheviks' views on the war, on peace, and the coalition government.

In the first part of his speech Lenin briefly stated the reasons for his journey via Germany, then passed on to the war and made clear its predatory nature. He then dwelt on the question of how to end the war and developed the idea that the only way of doing this was by an alliance of the workers of all the belligerent countries.

Lenin next dealt with the question as to what stood in the way of such an alliance and outlined the road by which such an alliance of the workers could and should be achieved.

The way to this was not by an agreement between the workers and the capitalists, and between the soldier-peasants and the landowners, but by a struggle of the workers and peasants against their oppressors.

The coalition government was an agreement between the socialists and the capitalists, it meant suppression of the revolution.

Seizure of power by the workers and the peasants could solve our country's most pressing problems for her—the problem of the land, of its transfer to the peasants, and other questions connected with the war, such as food supply, improving the condition of the workers, etc.

THE PROLETARIAN PARTY AT THE DISTRICT COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Our Party is going to the polls with its own lists of candidates. According to preliminary reports received by the Secretariat of the Central Committee these lists have been made up without any blocs in 4 out of 12 districts (Moskovsky, Rozhdestvenskoye, Kolpino, and Porokhovo districts). In all the other districts we are forming blocs *only* with the internationalists, specifically, in 6 districts (Vtoroi Gorodskoi, Narvsky, Petrogradkaya Storona, Moskovsky, Pervy Gorodskoi and Vasilyevsky Ostrov districts) with the "Inter-District" Organisation¹⁰² (who, as we know, have most emphatically condemned the Narodniks and Mensheviks for joining the capitalist cabinet); in 4 districts (Vyborgsky, Nevsky, Pervy Gorodskoi and Vasilyevsky Ostrov districts) with the internationalist Mensheviks opposed to "socialist" ministerialism¹⁰³; and in 1 district (Nevsky) with internationalists from the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, who condemn their party's "ministerialism".

This co-operation with internationalists from other parties is fully in keeping with the decisions of our conferences (the Petrograd and the All-Russia conferences) and with the basic policy of the proletarian party aimed against petty-bourgeois defencism and Menshevik and Narodnik ministerialism.

The "Left bloc" propaganda, carried on, among others, by *Novaya Zhizn*, obviously could not alter our Party's decision. The view that the municipal elections "are not of such a pronounced political character" (as the elections to the

Constituent Assembly) is wrong, basically wrong. It is just as wrong to maintain that "the municipal programmes of the different socialist [?] parties differ very little from one another". To repeat such odd statements without answering *Pravda's* arguments is to dodge an important issue or simply to haul down the flag.

To narrow the elections in the capital down to a purely (or even predominantly) "municipal" programme at a time of revolution is grotesquely ridiculous. It flies in the face of all revolutionary experience. It is an insult to the common sense of the workers, who know only too well that Petrograd's is a leading role, sometimes a *decisive* one.

The Cadets unite all the Rights, the whole counter-revolution, all the landowners and capitalists. They support the government and want to see revolutionary Petrograd playing second fiddle to the government of the capitalists, who have ten ministers to the Narodniks' and Mensheviks' six.

Opposed to the Cadets, the chauvinists, the supporters of war for the Straits, there is the party of the proletariat, which, definitely hostile as it is to imperialism, is the only party capable of breaking with the interests of Capital and implementing serious revolutionary measures, without which it is *impossible* to help the working masses at a moment of imminent catastrophe of gigantic proportions. Without revolutionary measures there can be *no* salvation. Without a workers' militia as a step towards the immediate creation of a people's militia, it is *impossible*, even with the best will in the world, to carry out such measures, in particular to do away with queues and the disorganisation in the matter of food supply.

As for the middle-of-the-road line taken by the petty bourgeoisie, the Mensheviks and the Narodniks, who proclaim good intentions and weaken themselves by making a deal with and submitting to the capitalists (6 ministers against 10!)—this line is a dead thing. The masses will soon learn this from experience, even if they do, for a time, believe in "agreements" with the capitalists.

All those who really stand for the interests of the working masses, for doing away with the police and having it

replaced by a people's militia, all those who stand for serious revolutionary measures to cope with the crisis and save the country from an unprecedented debacle, should vote for the lists of candidates of the proletarian party—the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks).

Pravda No. 56,
May 26 (13), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

STATEMENTS ABOUT THE WAR MADE BY OUR PARTY BEFORE THE REVOLUTION

The statements dealing with the possible victory of a chauvinist (defencist) revolution are of particular interest. *Sotsial-Demokrat*, the Central Organ of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party published in Geneva under the editorship of Zinoviev and Lenin, carried the following statement of its editors in its issue No. 47 for October 13, 1915:

“(8) By revolutionary chauvinists we mean those who want a victory over tsarism so as to achieve victory over Germany, plunder other countries, consolidate Great-Russian rule over the other peoples of Russia, etc. Revolutionary chauvinism is based on the class position of the petty bourgeoisie. The latter always vacillates between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. At present it is vacillating between chauvinism (which prevents it from being consistently revolutionary, even within the meaning of a democratic revolution) and proletarian internationalism. At the moment the Trudoviks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, *Nasha Zarya*,¹⁰⁴ Chkheidze's Duma group,¹⁰⁵ the Organising Committee, Mr. Plekhanov and the like are political spokesmen for this petty bourgeoisie in Russia.

“(9) If the revolutionary chauvinists won in Russia, we would be opposed to a defence of *their* ‘fatherland’ in the present war. Our slogan is: against the chauvinists, even if they are revolutionary and republican—*against* them, and *for* an alliance of the international proletariat for the socialist revolution.

“(10) To the question of whether it is possible for the proletariat to assume the leadership in the bourgeois Russian revolution, our answer is: yes, it is possible, *if* the petty

bourgeoisie swings to the left at the decisive moment; it is being pushed to the left, not only by our propaganda, but by a number of objective factors, economic, financial (the burden of war), military, political, and others.

“(11) To the question of what the party of the proletariat would do if the revolution placed power in its hands in the present war, our answer is as follows: we would propose peace to *all* the belligerents on the condition that freedom is given to the colonies and *all* peoples that are dependent, oppressed and deprived of rights. Under the present governments, neither Germany nor Britain and France would accept this condition. In that case, we would have to prepare for and wage a revolutionary war, i.e., not only resolutely carry out the whole of our minimum programme, but work systematically to bring about an uprising among all peoples now oppressed by the Great Russians, all colonies and dependent countries in Asia (India, China, Persia, etc.), and also, first and foremost, we would raise up the socialist proletariat of Europe for an insurrection against their governments and despite the social-chauvinists. There is no doubt that a victory of the proletariat in Russia would create extraordinarily favourable conditions for the development of the revolution in both Asia and Europe. *Even* 1905 proved that. The international solidarity of the revolutionary proletariat is a *fact*, despite the scum of opportunism and social-chauvinism.”*

Pravda No. 56,
May 26 (13), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

* See present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 403-04.—*Ed.*

IMPENDING DEBACLE

News, speculation, apprehensions and rumours of an impending disaster are becoming more and more frequent. The capitalist newspapers are trying to frighten people; they are fulminating against the Bolsheviki and making play of Kutler's cryptic allusions to "a certain" factory, to "certain" factories, to "a certain" enterprise, and so forth. Peculiar methods, strange "proofs". Why not *name* a definite factory? Why not give the public *and the workers* a chance to verify these rumours, which are deliberately calculated to excite alarm?

It should not be difficult for the capitalists to understand that by withholding the exact facts about definite specified factories they are only making themselves ridiculous. Why, gentlemen—you capitalists are the government, you have ten out of the sixteen ministers, you bear the responsibility, you give the orders. Is it not ridiculous that people who run the government, people who have a majority in it, should confine themselves to Kutler's anonymous references, should be afraid to come out in the open and should try to shift responsibility to other parties that are not at the helm of the state?

The newspapers of the petty-bourgeois parties, the Narodniks and Mensheviks, are also complaining, though in a somewhat different tone. They do not so much level accusations against the terrible Bolsheviki (that, of course, is all in the day's work) as heap one good wish upon another. Most typical in this respect is *Izvestia*, which is run by a bloc of the two above-named parties. In its issue No. 63 for May 11 are two articles on the subject of combating economic chaos. The articles are identical in character. One of them,

to put it mildly, is injudiciously headed (altogether as “injudicious” as the very fact of the Narodniks and Mensheviks joining the imperialist cabinet): “What Does the Provisional Government Want?” It would have been more correct to say: “What the Provisional Government Does *Not* Want and What It Promises.”

The other article is a “resolution of the Economic Department of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies”. Here are some quotations from it, best illustrative of its contents:

“Many branches of industry are ripe for a state trade monopoly (grain, meat, salt, leather), others are ripe for the organisation of state-controlled trusts (coal, oil, metallurgy, sugar, paper); and, finally, present conditions demand in the case of nearly all branches of industry state control of the distribution of raw materials and manufactures, as well as price fixing.... Simultaneously, it is necessary to place all banking institutions under state and public control in order to combat speculation in goods subject to state control.... At the same time, the most energetic measures should be taken against the workshy, even if labour conscription has to be introduced for that purpose.... The country is already in a state of catastrophe, and the only thing that can save it is the creative effort of the whole nation *headed by a government* which has consciously shouldered [hem, hem!] the stupendous task of rescuing a country ruined by war and the tsarist regime.”

With the exception of the last phrase beginning with the words we have italicised, a phrase which with purely philistine credulity places on the “shoulders” of the capitalists tasks they are incapable of fulfilling, the programme is an excellent one. We have here control, state-controlled trusts, the combating of speculation, labour conscription—in what way does this differ from “terrible” Bolshevism, what more could these “terrible” Bolsheviks want?

That is just the point, that is the crux of the matter, that is just what petty bourgeois and philistines of all shades and colours stubbornly refuse to see. They are *forced* to accept the programme of “terrible” Bolshevism, because no other programme offers a way out of the really calamitous debacle that is impending. *But*—there is this but—the capitalists “accept” this programme (see the famous § 3 of the declaration of the “new” Provisional Government¹⁰⁶) *in order not to carry it out*. And the Narodniks and Mensheviks trust the capitalists, and encourage the people to share this

fatal trust. That is the sum and substance of the political situation.

Control over the trusts, with publication of their full reports, with immediate conferences of their employees, with the unqualified participation in this control of the *workers themselves*, with independent control on the part of representatives of every important political party—all this can be introduced by decree which can be drafted in a *single day*.

What is the difficulty then, Citizens Shingaryovs, Tereshchenkos, Konovalovs? What is stopping you, citizens, near-socialist ministers Chernov and Tsereteli? What is stopping you, Citizens Narodnik and Menshevik leaders of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies?

Neither we nor anybody else could have proposed anything but the *immediate* establishment of such control over the trusts, banks, trade, food supply, and the *workshy* (a surprisingly good word to come from the pen of the *Izvestia* editors!). Nothing better could be devised than "the creative effort of the whole nation".

Only we must not trust the word of the capitalists; we must not believe the naïve (at best, naïve) hope of the Mensheviks and Narodniks that the capitalists can establish such control.

A debacle is impending. Disaster is imminent. The capitalists are heading all countries to destruction. There is only one way out: revolutionary discipline, revolutionary measures by the *revolutionary class*, the proletarians and semi-proletarians, the transfer of all power in the state to that class, a class that is really capable of instituting such control, that is able to cope effectively with the "workshy".

WAR AND REVOLUTION

A LECTURE DELIVERED MAY 14 (27), 1917

The question of war and revolution has been dealt with so often lately in the press and at every public meeting that probably many of you are not only familiar with many aspects of the question but have come to find them tedious. I have not yet had a single opportunity to address or even attend any Party or for that matter any public meetings in this district, and therefore I run the risk, perhaps, of repetition or of not dealing in sufficient detail with those aspects of the question that interest you most.

It seems to me that the most important thing that is usually overlooked in the question of the war, a key issue to which insufficient attention is paid and over which there is so much dispute—useless, hopeless, idle dispute, I should say—is the question of the class character of the war: what caused that war, what classes are waging it, and what historical and historico-economic conditions gave rise to it. As far as I have been able to follow the way the question of the war is dealt with at public and Party meetings, I have come to the conclusion that the reason why there is so much misunderstanding on the subject is because, all too often, when dealing with the question of the war, we speak in entirely different languages.

From the point of view of Marxism, that is, of modern scientific socialism, the main issue in any discussion by socialists on how to assess the war and what attitude to adopt towards it is this: what is the war being waged for, and what classes staged and directed it. We Marxists do not belong to that category of people who are unqualified opponents of all war. We say: our aim is to achieve a socialist

system of society, which, by eliminating the division of mankind into classes, by eliminating all exploitation of man by man and nation by nation, will inevitably eliminate the very possibility of war. But in the war to win that socialist system of society we are bound to encounter conditions under which the class struggle within each given nation may come up against a war between the different nations, a war conditioned by this very class struggle. Therefore, we cannot rule out the possibility of revolutionary wars, i.e., wars arising from the class struggle, wars waged by revolutionary classes, wars which are of direct and immediate revolutionary significance. Still less can we rule this out when we remember that though the history of European revolutions during the last century, in the course of 125-135 years, say, gave us wars which were mostly reactionary, it also gave us revolutionary wars, such as the war of the French revolutionary masses against a united monarchist, backward, feudal and semi-feudal Europe. No deception of the masses is more widespread today in Western Europe, and latterly here in Russia, too, than that which is practised by citing the example of revolutionary wars. There are wars and wars. We must be clear as to what historical conditions have given rise to the war, what classes are waging it, and for what ends. Unless we grasp this, all our talk about the war will necessarily be utterly futile, engendering more heat than light. That is why I take the liberty, seeing that you have chosen war and revolution as the subject of today's talk, to deal with this aspect of the matter at greater length.

We all know the dictum of Clausewitz, one of the most famous writers on the philosophy and history of war, which says: "War is a continuation of policy by other means."¹⁰⁷ This dictum comes from a writer who reviewed the history of wars and drew philosophic lessons from it shortly after the period of the Napoleonic wars. This writer, whose basic views are now undoubtedly familiar to every thinking person, nearly eighty years ago challenged the ignorant man-in-the-street conception of war as being a thing apart from the policies of the governments and classes concerned, as being a simple attack that disturbs the peace, and is then followed by restoration of the peace thus disturbed, as much as to say: "They had a fight, then they made up!" This is a

grossly ignorant view, one that was repudiated scores of years ago and is repudiated by any more or less careful analysis of any historical epoch of wars.

War is a continuation of policy by other means. All wars are inseparable from the political systems that engender them. The policy which a given state, a given class within that state, pursued for a long time before the war is inevitably continued by that same class during the war, the form of action alone being changed.

War is a continuation of policy by other means. When the French revolutionary townspeople and revolutionary peasants overthrew the monarchy at the close of the eighteenth century by revolutionary means and established a democratic republic—when they made short work of their monarch, and short work of their landowners, too, in a revolutionary fashion—that policy of the revolutionary class was bound to shake all the rest of autocratic, tsarist, imperial, and semi-feudal Europe to its foundations. And the inevitable continuation of this policy of the victorious revolutionary class in France was the wars in which all the monarchist nations of Europe, forming their famous coalition, lined up against revolutionary France in a counter-revolutionary war. Just as within the country the revolutionary people of France had then, for the first time, displayed revolutionary energy on a scale it had never shown for centuries, so in the war at the close of the eighteenth century it revealed a similar gigantic revolutionary creativeness when it remodelled its whole system of strategy, broke with all the old rules and traditions of warfare, replaced the old troops with a new revolutionary people's army, and created new methods of warfare. This example, to my mind, is noteworthy in that it clearly demonstrates to us things which the bourgeois journalists are now always forgetting when they pander to the philistine prejudices and ignorance of the backward masses who do not understand this intimate economic and historical connection between every kind of war and the preceding policy of every country, every class that ruled before the war and achieved its ends by so-called "peaceful" means. So-called, because the brute force required to ensure "peaceful" rule in the colonies, for example, can hardly be called peaceful.

Peace reigned in Europe, but this was because domination over hundreds of millions of people in the colonies by the European nations was sustained only through constant, incessant, interminable wars, which we Europeans do not regard as wars at all, since all too often they resembled, not wars, but brutal massacres, the wholesale slaughter of unarmed peoples. The thing is that if we want to know what the present war is about we must first of all make a general survey of the policies of the European powers as a whole. We must not take this or that example, this or that particular case, which can easily be wrenched out of the context of social phenomena and which is worthless, because an opposite example can just as easily be cited. We must take the whole policy of the entire system of European states in their economic and political interrelations if we are to understand how the present war steadily and inevitably grew out of this system.

We are constantly witnessing attempts, especially on the part of the capitalist press—whether monarchist or republican—to read into the present war an historical meaning which it does not possess. For example, no device is more frequently resorted to in the French Republic than that of presenting this war on France's part as a continuation and counterpart of the wars of the Great French Revolution of 1792. No device for hoodwinking the French masses, the French workers and the workers of all countries is more widespread than that of applying to our epoch the "jargon" of that other epoch and some of its watchwords, or the attempt to present matters as though now, too, republican France is defending her liberty against the monarchy. One "minor" fact overlooked is that then, in 1792, war was waged in France by a revolutionary class, which had carried out an unparalleled revolution and displayed unmatched heroism in utterly destroying the French monarchy and rising against a united monarchist Europe with the sole and single aim of carrying on its revolutionary struggle.

The war in France was a continuation of the policy of the revolutionary class which had carried out the revolution, won the republic, settled accounts' with the French capitalists and landowners with unprecedented vigour, and was waging a revolutionary war against a united monarchist Europe in continuation of that policy.

What we have at present is primarily two leagues, two groups of capitalist powers. We have before us all the world's greatest capitalist powers—Britain, France, America, and Germany—who for decades have doggedly pursued a policy of incessant economic rivalry aimed at achieving world supremacy, subjugating the small nations, and making threefold and tenfold profits on banking capital, which has caught the whole world in the net of its influence. That is what Britain's and Germany's policies really amount to. I stress this fact. This fact can never be emphasised strongly enough, because if we forget this we shall never understand what this war is about, and we shall then be easy game for any bourgeois publicist who tries to foist lying phrases on us.

The real policies of the two groups of capitalist giants—Britain and Germany, who, with their respective allies, have taken the field against each other—policies which they were pursuing for decades before the war, should be studied and grasped in their entirety. If we did not do this we should not only be neglecting an essential requirement of scientific socialism and of all social science in general, but we should be unable to understand anything whatever about the present war. We should be putting ourselves in the power of Milyukov, that deceiver, who is stirring up chauvinism and hatred of one nation for another by methods which are applied everywhere without exception, methods which Clausewitz wrote about eighty years ago when he ridiculed the very view some people are holding today, namely, that the nations lived in peace and then they started fighting. As if this were true! How can a war be accounted for without considering its bearing on the preceding policy of the given state, of the given system of states, the given classes? I repeat: this is a basic point which is constantly overlooked. Failure to understand it makes nine-tenths of all war discussions mere wrangling, so much verbiage. We say: if you have not studied the policies of both belligerent groups over a period of decades—so as to avoid accidental factors and the quoting of random examples—if you have not shown what bearing this war has on preceding policies, then you don't understand what this war is all about.

These policies show us just one thing—continuous economic rivalry between the world's two greatest giants, capitalist

economies. On the one hand we have Britain, a country which owns the greater part of the globe, a country which ranks first in wealth, which has created this wealth not so much by the labour of its workers as by the exploitation of innumerable colonies, by the vast power of its banks which have developed at the head of all the others into an insignificantly small group of some four or five super-banks handling billions of rubles, and handling them in such a way that it can be said without exaggeration that there is not a patch of land in the world today on which this capital has not laid its heavy hand, not a patch of land which British capital has not enmeshed by a thousand threads. This capital grew to such dimensions by the turn of the century that its activities extended far beyond the borders of individual states and formed a group of giant banks possessed of fabulous wealth. Having begotten this tiny group of banks, it has caught the whole world in the net of its billions. This is the sum and substance of Britain's economic policy and of the economic policy of France, of which even French writers, some of them contributors to *L'Humanité*,¹⁰⁸ a paper now controlled by ex-socialists (in fact, no less a man than Lysis, the well-known financial writer), stated several years before the war: "France is a financial monarchy, France is a financial oligarchy, France is the world's money-lender."

On the other hand, opposed to this, mainly Anglo-French group, we have another group of capitalists, an even more rapacious, even more predatory one, a group who came to the capitalist banqueting table when all the seats were occupied, but who introduced into the struggle new methods for developing capitalist production, improved techniques, and superior organisation, which turned the old capitalism, the capitalism of the free-competition age, into the capitalism of giant trusts, syndicates, and cartels. This group introduced the beginnings of state-controlled capitalist production, combining the colossal power of capitalism with the colossal power of the state into a single mechanism and bringing tens of millions of people within the single organisation of state capitalism. Here is economic history, here is diplomatic history, covering several decades, from which no one can get away. It is the one and only guide-post to a proper solution of the problem of war; it leads you to the

conclusion that the present war, too, is the outcome of the policies of the classes who have come to grips in it, of the two supreme giants, who, long before the war, had caught the whole world, all countries, in the net of financial exploitation and economically divided the globe up among themselves. They were bound to clash, because a redivision of this supremacy, from the point of view of capitalism, had become inevitable.

The old division was based on the fact that Britain, in the course of several centuries, had ruined her former competitors. A former competitor was Holland, which had dominated the whole world. Another was France, which had fought for supremacy for nearly a hundred years. After a series of protracted wars Britain was able, by virtue of her economic power, her merchant capital, to establish her unchallenged sway over the world. In 1871 a new predator appeared, a new capitalist power arose, which developed at an incomparably faster pace than Britain. That is a basic fact. You will not find a book on economic history that does not acknowledge this indisputable fact—the fact of Germany's faster development. This rapid development of capitalism in Germany was the development of a young strong predator, who appeared in the concert of European powers and said: "You ruined Holland, you defeated France, you have helped yourself to half the world—now be good enough to let us have our fair share." What does "a fair share" mean? How is it to be determined in the capitalist world, in the world of banks? There power is determined by the number of banks, there power is determined in the way described by a mouthpiece of the American multimillionaires, which declared with typically American frankness and typically American cynicism: "The war in Europe is being waged for world domination. To dominate the world two things are needed: dollars and banks. We have the dollars, we shall make the banks and we shall dominate the world." This statement was made by a leading newspaper of the American multimillionaires. I must say, there is a thousand times more truth in this cynical statement of a blustering American multimillionaire than in thousands of articles by bourgeois liars who try to make out that this war is being waged for national interests, on national issues, and utter similar glaring-

ly patent lies which dismiss history completely and take an isolated example like the case of the German beast of prey who attacked Belgium. The case is undoubtedly a real one. This group of predators did attack Belgium with brutal ferocity, but it did the same thing the other group did yesterday by other means and is doing today to other nations.

When we argue about annexations—and this bears on the question I have been trying briefly to explain to you as the history of the economic and diplomatic relations which led up to the present war—when we argue about annexations we always forget that these, generally, are what the war is being waged for; it is for the carve-up of conquered territories, or, to put it more popularly, for the division of the plundered spoils by the two robber gangs. When we argue about annexations we constantly meet with methods which, scientifically speaking, do not stand up to criticism, and which, as methods of public journalism, are deliberate humbug. Ask a Russian chauvinist or social-chauvinist what annexation by Germany means, and he will give you an excellent explanation, because he understands that perfectly well. But he will never answer a request for a general definition of annexation that will fit them all—Germany, Britain, and Russia. He will never do that! And when *Rech* (to pass from theory to practice) sneered at *Pravda*, saying, “These Pravdists consider Kurland a case of annexation! How can you talk to such people!” and we answered: “Please give us such a definition of annexation as would apply to the Germans, the English, and the Russians, and we add that either you evade this issue or we shall expose you on the spot”*—*Rech* kept silent. We maintain that no newspaper, either of the chauvinists in general, who simply say that the fatherland must be defended, or of the social-chauvinists, has ever given a definition of annexation that would fit both Germany and Russia, that would be applicable to any side. It cannot do this for the simple reason that this war is the continuation of a policy of annexations, that is, a policy of conquest, of capitalist robbery on the part of both groups involved in the war. Obviously, the question of which of these two robbers was the first to draw the knife is of small account

* See pp. 35-36 of this volume.—*Ed.*

to us. Take the history of the naval and military expenditures of these two groups over a period of decades, take the history of the little wars they waged before the big war—"little" because few Europeans died in those wars, whereas hundreds of thousands of people belonging to the nations they were subjugating died in them, nations which from their point of view could not be regarded as nations at all (you couldn't very well call those Asians and Africans nations!); the wars waged against these nations were wars against unarmed people, who were simply shot down, machine-gunned. Can you call them wars? Strictly speaking they were not wars at all, and you could forget about them. That is their attitude to this downright deception of the masses.

The present war is a continuation of the policy of conquest, of the shooting down of whole nationalities, of unbelievable atrocities committed by the Germans and the British in Africa, and by the British and the Russians in Persia—which of them committed most it is difficult to say. It was for this reason that the German capitalists looked upon them as their enemies. Ah, they said, you are strong because you are rich? But we are stronger, therefore we have the same "sacred" right to plunder. That is what the real history of British and German finance capital in the course of several decades preceding the war amounts to. That is what the history of Russo-German, Russo-British, and German-British relations amounts to. There you have the clue to an understanding of what the war is about. That is why the story that is current about the cause of the war is sheer duplicity and humbug. Forgetting the history of finance capital, the history of how this war had been brewing over the issue of redivision, they present the matter like this: two nations were living at peace, then one attacked the other, and the other fought back. All science, all banks are forgotten, and the peoples are told to take up arms, and so are the peasants, who know nothing about politics. All they have to do is to fight back! The logical thing, following this line of argument, would be to close down all newspapers, burn all books and ban all mention of annexations in the press. In this way such a view of annexations could be justified. They can't tell the truth about annexations because the whole history of Rus-

sia, Britain, and Germany has been one of continuous, ruthless and sanguinary war over annexations. Ruthless wars were waged in Persia and Africa by the Liberals, who flogged political offenders in India for daring to put forward demands which were being fought for here in Russia. The French colonial troops oppressed peoples too. There you have the pre-history, the real history of unprecedented plunder! Such is the policy of these classes, of which the present war is a continuation. That is why, on the question of annexations, they cannot give the reply that we give, when we say that any nation joined to another one, not by the voluntary choice of its majority but by a decision of a king or government, is an annexed nation. To renounce annexation is to give each nation the right to form a separate state or to live in union with whomsoever it chooses. An answer like that is perfectly clear to every worker who is at all class-conscious.

In every resolution, of which dozens are passed, and published even in such a paper as *Zemlya i Volya*,¹⁰⁹ you will find the answer, poorly expressed: We don't want a war for supremacy over other nations, we are fighting for our freedom. That is what all the workers and peasants say, that is how they express the view of the workingman, his understanding of the war. They imply by this that if the war were in the interests of the working people against the exploiters they would be for such a war. So would we, and there is not a revolutionary party that could be against it. Where they go wrong, these movers of numerous resolutions, is when they believe that the war is being waged by them. We soldiers, we workers, we peasants are fighting for our freedom. I shall never forget the question one of them asked me after a meeting. "Why do you speak against the capitalists all the time?" he said. "I'm not a capitalist, am I? We're workers, we're defending our freedom." You're wrong, you are fighting because you are obeying your capitalist government; it's the governments, not the peoples, who are carrying on this war. I am not surprised at a worker or peasant, who doesn't know his politics, who has not had the good or bad fortune of being initiated into the secrets of diplomacy or the picture of this finance plunder (this oppression of Persia by Russia and Britain, say)—I am not surprised at him forgetting this history and saying naively: Who cares about the capitalists,

when it's me who's fighting! He doesn't understand the connection between the war and the government, he doesn't understand that the war is being waged by the government, and that he is just a tool in the hands of that government. He can call himself a revolutionary people and write eloquent resolutions—to Russians this means a lot, because this has come into their lives only recently. There has recently appeared a “revolutionary” declaration by the Provisional Government. This doesn't mean anything. Other nations, more experienced than we are in the capitalist art of hoodwinking the masses by penning “revolutionary” manifestos, have long since broken all the world's records in this respect. If you take the parliamentary history of the French Republic since it became a republic supporting tsarism, you will find dozens of examples during the decades of this history when manifestos full of the most eloquent phrases served to mask a policy of the most outrageous colonial and financial plunder. The whole history of the Third Republic in France is a history of this plunder. Such are the origins of the present war. It is not due to malice on the part of capitalists or the mistaken policy of some monarch. To think so would be incorrect. No, this war is an inevitable outgrowth of super-capitalism, especially banking capital, which resulted in some four banks in Berlin and five or six in London dominating the whole world, appropriating the world's funds, reinforcing their financial policy by armed force, and finally clashing in a savage armed conflict because they had come to the end of their free tether in the matter of conquests. One or the other side had to relinquish its colonies. Such questions are not settled voluntarily in this world of capitalists. This issue could only be settled by war. That is why it is absurd to blame one or another crowned brigand. They are all the same, these crowned brigands. That is why it is equally absurd to blame the capitalists of one or another country. All they are to blame for is for having introduced such a system. But this has been done in full keeping with the law, which is safeguarded by all the forces of a civilised state. “I am fully within my rights, I am a buyer of shares. All the law courts, all the police, the whole standing army and all the navies in the world are safeguarding my sacred right to these shares.” Who's to blame for banks being set

up which handle hundreds of millions of rubles, for these banks casting their nets of plunder over the whole world, and for their being locked in mortal combat? Find the culprit if you can! The blame lies with half a century of capitalist development, and the only way out of this is by the overthrow of the rule of the capitalists and by a workers' revolution. That is the answer our Party has arrived at from an analysis of the war, and that is why we say: the very simple question of annexations has been so muddled up and the spokesmen of the bourgeois parties have uttered so many lies that they are able to make out that Kurland is not annexation by Russia. They have shared Kurland and Poland between them, those three crowned brigands. They have been doing this for a hundred years, carving up the living flesh. And the Russian brigand snatched most because he was then the strongest. And now that the young beast of prey, Germany, who was then a party to the carve-up, has grown into a strong capitalist power, she demands a redivision. You want things to stay as they were? she says. You think you are stronger? Let's try conclusions!

That is what the war boils down to. Of course, the challenge "let's try conclusions" is merely an expression of the decade-long policy of plunder, the policy of the big banks. That is why no one but we can tell this truth about annexations, a simple truth that every worker and peasant will understand. That is why the question of treaties, such a simple question, is deliberately and disgracefully confused by the whole press. You say that we have a revolutionary government, that there are ministers in that government who are well-nigh socialists—Narodniks and Mensheviks. But when they make declarations about peace without annexations, on condition that this term is not defined (because it means taking away German annexations and keeping our own), then we say: Of what value are your "revolutionary" cabinet, your declarations, your statements that you are not out for a war of conquest, if at the same time you tell the army to take the offensive? Don't you know that we have treaties, that these treaties were concluded by Nicholas the Bloody in the most predatory fashion? You don't know it? It is pardonable for the workers or peasants not to know that. They did not plunder, they read no clever books. But when

educated Cadets preach this sort of stuff they know perfectly well what these treaties are about. Although they are "secret" treaties, the whole diplomatic press in all countries talks about them, saying: "You'll get the Straits, you'll get Armenia, you'll get Galicia, you'll get Alsace-Lorraine, you'll get Trieste, and we'll make a final carve-up of Persia." And the German capitalist says: "I'll seize Egypt, I'll subjugate the European nations unless you return my colonies to me with interest." Shares are things that can't do without interest. That is why the question of treaties, itself a clear, simple question, has touched off such a torrent of barefaced outrageous lies as those that are now pouring from the pages of all the capitalist newspapers.

Take today's paper *Dyen*. Vodovozov, a man absolutely innocent of Bolshevism, but who is an honest democrat, states in it: I am opposed to secret treaties; let me say this about the treaty with Rumania. There *is* a secret treaty with Rumania and it says that Rumania will receive a number of foreign peoples if she fights on the side of the Allies. The treaties which the other Allies have are all the same. They wouldn't have started to subjugate nations if they had not had these treaties. To know their contents you do not have to burrow in special journals. It is sufficient to recollect the basic facts of economic and diplomatic history. For decades Austria has been after the Balkans with an eye to subjugation. And if they have clashed it is because they couldn't help clashing. That is why, when the masses demand that these treaties should be published, a demand that is growing more insistent every day, ex-Minister Milyukov and the present Minister Tereshchenko (one in a government without socialist ministers, the other in a government with a number of near-socialist ministers) declare that publication of the treaties would mean a break with the Allies.

Obviously, you can't publish the treaties because you are all participants in the same gang of robbers. We agree with Milyukov and Tereshchenko that the treaties cannot be published. Two different conclusions can be drawn from this. If we agree with Milyukov and Tereshchenko that the treaties cannot be published—what follows from this? If the treaties cannot be published, then we've got to help the

capitalist ministers continue the war. The other conclusion is this: since the capitalists cannot publish the treaties themselves, then the capitalists have got to be overthrown. Which of these two conclusions you consider to be correct, I leave it to you to decide, but be sure to consider the consequences. If we reason the way the Narodnik and Menshevik ministers reason, we come to this: once the government says that the treaties cannot be published, then we must issue a new manifesto. Paper is not so dear yet that we cannot write new manifestos. We shall write a new manifesto and start an offensive. What for? With what aims? Who is to set these aims? The soldiers are called upon to carry out the predatory treaties with Rumania and France. Send Vodovozov's article to the front and then complain that this is all the Bolsheviks' doing, the Bolsheviks must have invented this treaty-with-Rumania business. In that case you would not only have to make life a hell for *Pravda*, but even kick Vodovozov out for having studied history. You would have to make a bonfire of all Milyukov's books—terribly dangerous books those. Just open any book by the leader of the party of "people's freedom", by this ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs. They are good books. What do they say? They say that Russia has "a right" to the Straits, to Armenia, to Galicia, to Eastern Prussia. He has carved them all up, and even appends a map. Not only the Bolsheviks and Vodovozov will have to be sent to Siberia for writing such revolutionary articles, but Milyukov's books will have to be burnt too, because if you collected simple quotations from these books today and sent them to the front, no inflammatory leaflet would have such an inflammatory effect as this would have.

It remains for me now, according to the brief plan of this talk I have sketched for myself, to touch on the question of "revolutionary defencism". I believe, after what I have had the honour of reporting to you, that I may now be allowed to touch only briefly on this question.

By "revolutionary defencism" we mean vindication of the war on the plea that, after all, we have made the revolution, after all, we are a revolutionary people, a revolutionary democracy. But what answer do we give to that? What revolution did we make? We overthrew Nicholas. The revo-

lution was not so very difficult compared with one that would have overthrown the whole class of landowners and capitalists. Who did the revolution put in power? The landowners and capitalists—the very same classes who have long been in power in Europe. Revolutions like this occurred there a hundred years ago. The Tereshchenkos, Milyukovs, and Konovalovs have been in power there for a long time, and it doesn't matter a bit whether they have a civil list to pay their tsars or whether they do without this luxury. A bank remains a bank, whether capital is invested in concessions by the hundred or not; profits remain profits, be it in a republic or in a monarchy. If any savage country dares to disobey our civilised Capital, which sets up such splendid banks in the colonies, in Africa and Persia—if any savage nation should disobey our civilised bank, we send troops out who restore culture, order, and civilisation, as Lyakhov did in Persia,¹¹⁰ and the French “republican” troops did in Africa, where they exterminated peoples with equal ferocity. What difference does it make? We have here the same “revolutionary defencism”, displayed only by the unenlightened masses, who see no connection between war and the government, who do not know that this policy is sanctioned by treaties. The treaties have remained, the banks have remained, the concessions have remained. In Russia the best men of their class are in the government, but the nature of the war has not changed a bit because of this. The new “revolutionary defencism” uses the great concept of revolution merely as a cloak to cover up the dirty and bloody war waged for the sake of dirty and outrageous treaties.

The Russian revolution has not altered the war, but it has created organisations which exist in no other country and were seldom found in revolutions in the West. Most of the revolutions were confined to the emergence of governments of our Tereshchenko and Konovalov, type, while the country remained passive and disorganised. The Russian revolution has gone further than that. In this we have the germ of hope that it may overcome the war. Besides the government of “near-socialist” ministers, the government of imperialist war, the government of offensive, a government tied up with Anglo-French capital—besides this government and independent of it we have all over Russia a

network of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies. Here is a revolution which has not said its last word yet. Here is a revolution which Western Europe, under similar conditions, has not known. Here are organisations of those classes which really have no need for annexations, which have not put millions in the banks, and which are probably not interested in whether the Russian Colonel Lyakhov and the British Liberal ambassador divided Persia properly or not. Here is the pledge of this revolution being carried further, i.e., that the classes which have no interest in annexations, and despite the fact that they put too much trust in the capitalist government, despite the appalling muddle and appalling deception contained in the very concept "revolutionary defencism", despite the fact that they support the war loan, support the government of imperialist war—despite all this—have succeeded in creating organisations in which the mass of the oppressed classes are represented. These are the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies, which, in very many local areas in Russia, have gone much further than the Petrograd Soviet in their revolutionary work. It is only natural, because in Petrograd we have the central authority of the capitalists.

And when Skobelev in his speech yesterday said: "We'll take all the profits, we'll take 100 per cent," he was just letting himself go with ministerial *élan*. If you take today's *Rech* you will see what the response is to this passage in Skobelev's speech. They write there: "Why, this means starvation, death! One hundred per cent means all!" Minister Skobelev goes farther than the most extreme Bolshevik. It's slandering the Bolsheviks to say that they are the extreme Left. Minister Skobelev is much more "Left". They called me all the ugly names they could think of, saying that I wanted to take their last shirt from the capitalists. At any rate, it was Shulgin who said: "Let them take our last shirt!" Imagine a Bolshevik going up to Citizen Shulgin and wanting to take his shirt from him. He could just as well and with greater justification accuse Minister Skobelev of this. We never went as far as that. We never suggested taking 100 per cent of profits. Nevertheless, it is a valuable promise. If you take the resolution of our Party you will see that we pro-

pose there, only in a more closely reasoned form, exactly what I have been proposing. Control must be established over the banks, followed by a fair tax on incomes.* And nothing more! Skobelev suggests taking a hundred kopeks in the ruble. We proposed and propose nothing of the sort. Skobelev doesn't really mean it, and if he does he would not be able to do it for the simple reason that to promise such things while making friends with Tereshchenko and Konovalov is somewhat ludicrous. You could take 80 or 90 per cent of a millionaire's income, but not arm in arm with such ministers. If the Soviets had the power they would really take it, but not all of it—they have no need to. They would take the bulk of the income. No other state authority could do that. Minister Skobelev may have the best of intentions. I have known those parties for several decades—I have been in the revolutionary movement for thirty years. I am the last person, therefore, to question their good intentions. But that is not the point. It is not a question of good intentions. Good intentions pave the road to hell. All the government offices are full of papers signed by our ministers, but nothing has changed as a result of it. If you want to introduce control, start it! Our programme is such that in reading Skobelev's speech we can say: we do not demand more. We are much more moderate than Minister Skobelev. He proposes both control and 100 per cent. We don't want to take 100 per cent, but we say: "Until you start doing things we don't believe you!" Here lies the difference between us: we don't believe words and promises and don't advise others to believe them. The lessons of parliamentary republics teach us not to believe in paper utterances. If you want control, you've got to start it. One day is enough to have a law on such control issued. The employees' council at every bank, the workers' council at every factory, and all the parties receive the right of control. But you can't do that, we shall be told. This is a commercial secret, this is sacred private property. Well, just as you like, make your choice. If you want to safeguard all those ledgers and accounts, all the transactions of the trusts, then don't chatter about control, about the country going to ruin.

* See p. 311 of this volume.—*Ed.*

In Germany the situation is still worse. In Russia you can get grain but in Germany you can't. You can do a lot in Russia through organisation, but you can do nothing more in Germany. There is no more grain left, and the whole nation is faced with disaster. People today write that Russia is on the brink of ruin. If that is so, then it is a crime to safeguard "sacred" private property. Therefore, what do the words about control mean? Surely you haven't forgotten that Nicholas Romanov, too, wrote a good deal about control. You will find him repeating a thousand times the words "state control", "public control", "appointment of senators". In the two months following the revolution the industrialists have robbed the whole of Russia. Capitalists have made staggering profits; every financial report tells you that. And when the workers, two months after the revolution, had the "audacity" to say they wanted to live like human beings, the whole capitalist press throughout the country set up a howl. Every number of *Rech* is a wild howl about the workers wanting to rob the country, but all we promise is merely control over the capitalists. Can't we have less promises and more deeds? If what you want is bureaucratic control, control through the same organs as before, our Party declares its profound conviction that you cannot be given support in this, even if there were a dozen Narodnik and Menshevik ministers in your government instead of half a dozen. Control can only be exercised by the people. You must arrange control by bank employees' councils, engineers' councils, and workers' councils, and start that control right away, tomorrow. Every official should be made responsible, on pain of criminal persecution, for any wrong information he may give in any of these institutions. It is a matter of life and death to the country. We want to know how much grain there is, how much raw material, how many work hands there are and where they are to be placed.

This brings me to the last question—that of how to end the war. The ridiculous view is ascribed to us that we are out for a separate peace. The German robber capitalists are making peace overtures, saying: "We'll give you a piece of Turkey and Armenia if you give us ore-bearing lands. That is what the diplomats are talking about in every neutral city! Everybody knows it. Only it is veiled with conventional

diplomatic phrases. That's what diplomats are for—to speak in diplomatic language. What nonsense it is to allege that we are for ending the war by a separate peace! To end the war which is being waged by the capitalists of all the wealthiest powers, a war stemming from the decade-long history of economic development, by one-sided withdrawal from military operations is such a stupid idea that it would be absurd even to refute it. The fact that we specially drew up a resolution to refute it is because we wanted to explain things to the broad masses before whom we were being slandered. It is not a matter that can be seriously discussed. The war which the capitalists of all countries are waging cannot be ended without a workers' revolution against these capitalists. So long as control remains a mere phrase instead of deed, so long as the government of the capitalists has not been replaced by a government of the revolutionary proletariat, the government is doomed merely to reiterate: We are heading for disaster, disaster, disaster. Socialists are now being jailed in "free" Britain for saying what I am saying. In Germany Liebknecht has been imprisoned for saying what I am saying, and in Austria Friedrich Adler is in jail for saying the same thing with the help of a revolver (he may have been executed by now). The sympathy of the mass of workers in all countries is with these socialists and not with those who have sided with their capitalists. The workers' revolution is mounting throughout the world. In other countries it is a more difficult matter, of course. They have no half-wits there like Nicholas and Rasputin. There the best men of their class are at the head of the government. They lack conditions there for a revolution against autocracy. They have there a government of the capitalist class. The most talented representatives of that class have been governing there for a long time. That is why the revolution there, though it has not come yet, is bound to come, no matter how many revolutionaries, men like Friedrich Adler and Karl Liebknecht, may die in the attempt. The future belongs to them, and the workers of all countries follow their lead. The workers in all countries are bound to win.

On the question of America entering the war I shall say this. People argue that America is a democracy, America

has the White House. I say: Slavery was abolished there half a century ago. The anti-slave war ended in 1865. Since then multimillionaires have mushroomed. They have the whole of America in their financial grip. They are making ready to subdue Mexico and will inevitably come to war with Japan over a carve-up of the Pacific. This war has been brewing for several decades. All literature speaks about it. America's real aim in entering the war is to prepare for this future war with Japan. The American people do enjoy considerable freedom and it is difficult to conceive them standing for compulsory military service, for the setting up of an army pursuing any aims of conquest—a struggle with Japan, for instance. The Americans have the example of Europe to show them what this leads to. The American capitalists have stepped into this war in order to have an excuse, behind a smoke-screen of lofty ideals championing the rights of small nations, for building up a strong standing army.

The peasants refuse to give up their grain for money and demand implements, boots, and clothes. There is a great measure of profound truth in this decision. Indeed, the country has reached a stage of ruin when it now faces the same situation, although to a less intensive degree, that other countries have long been facing, a situation in which money has lost its value. The rule of capitalism is being so strongly undermined by the whole course of events that the peasants, for instance, refuse to accept money. They say: "What do we want money for?" And they are right. The rule of capitalism is being undermined not because somebody is out to seize power. "Seizure" of power would be senseless. It would be impossible to put an end to the rule of capitalism if the whole course of economic development in the capitalist countries did not lead up to it. The war has speeded up this process, and this has made capitalism impossible. No power could destroy capitalism if it were not sapped and undermined by history.

And now we see this clearly demonstrated. The peasant expresses what everybody sees—that the power of money has been undermined. The only way out is for the Soviets to agree to give implements, boots, and clothes in exchange for grain. This is what we are coming to, this is the answer

that life dictates. Without this, tens of millions of people will go hungry, without clothes and boots. Tens of millions of people are facing disaster and death; safeguarding the interests of the capitalists is the last thing that should bother us. The only way out is for all power to be transferred to the Soviets, which represent the majority of the population. Possibly mistakes may be made in the process. No one claims that such a difficult task can be disposed of offhand. We do not say anything of the sort. We are told that we want the power to be in the hands of the Soviets, but they don't want it. We say that life's experience will suggest this solution to them, and the whole nation will see that there is no other way out. We do not want a "seizure" of power, because the entire experience of past revolutions teaches us that the only stable power is the one that has the backing of the majority of the population. "Seizure" of power, therefore, would be adventurism, and our Party will not have it. If the government will be a government of the majority, it may perhaps embark on a policy that will prove, at first, to be erroneous, but there is no other way out. We shall then have a peaceful policy shift within the same organisations. No other organisations can be invented. That is why we say that no other solution of the question is conceivable.

How can the war be ended? If the Soviet were to assume power and the Germans continued the war—what would we do then? Anyone interested in the views of our Party could have read in *Pravda* the other day an exact quotation of what we said abroad as far back as 1915, namely, that if the revolutionary class in Russia, the working class, comes to power, it will have to offer peace. And if our terms are rejected by the German capitalists or by the capitalists of any other country, then that class will stand wholly for war.* We are not suggesting that the war be ended at one blow. We do not promise that. We preach no such impossible and impracticable thing as that the war can be ended by the will of one side alone. Such promises are easy to give but impossible to fulfil. There is no easy way out of this terrible war. It has been going on for three years. You will

* See p. 394 of this volume.—*Ed.*

go on fighting for ten years unless you accept the idea of a difficult and painful revolution. There is no other way out. We say: The war which the capitalist governments have started can only be ended by a workers' revolution. Those interested in the socialist movement should read the Basle Manifesto of 1912 adopted unanimously by all the socialist parties of the world, a manifesto that was published in our newspaper *Pravda*, a manifesto that can be published now in none of the belligerent countries, neither in "free" Britain nor in republican France, because it said the truth about war before the war. It said that there would be war between Britain and Germany as a result of capitalist competition. It said that so much powder had accumulated that the guns would start shooting of their own accord. It told us what the war would be fought for, and said that the war would lead to a proletarian revolution. Therefore, we tell those socialists who signed this Manifesto and then went over to the side of their capitalist governments that they have betrayed socialism. There has been a split among the socialists all over the world. Some are in ministerial cabinets, others in prison. All over the world some socialists are preaching a war build-up, while others, like Eugene Debs, the American Bebel, who enjoys immense popularity among the American workers, say: "I'd rather be shot than give a cent towards the war. I'm willing to fight only the proletariat's war against the capitalists all over the world." That is how the socialists have split throughout the world. The world's social-patriots think they are defending their country. They are mistaken—they are defending the interests of one band of capitalists against another. We preach proletarian revolution—the only true cause, for which scores of people have gone to the scaffold, and hundreds and thousands have been thrown into prison. These imprisoned socialists are a minority, but the working class is for them, the whole course of economic development is for them. All this tells us that there is no other way out. The only way to end this war is by a workers' revolution in several countries. In the meantime we should make preparations for that revolution, we should assist it. For all its hatred of war and desire for peace, the Russian people could do nothing against the war, so long as it was being waged by the tsar, except work for a revolu-

tion against the tsar and for the tsar's overthrow. And that is what happened. History proved this to you yesterday and will prove it to you tomorrow. We said long ago that the mounting Russian revolution must be assisted. We said that at the end of 1914. Our Duma deputies were deported to Siberia for this, and we were told: "You are giving no answer. You talk about revolution when the strikes are off, when the deputies are doing hard labour, and when you haven't a single newspaper!" And we were accused of evading an answer. We heard those accusations for a number of years. We answered: You can be indignant about it, but so long as the tsar has not been overthrown we can do nothing against the war. And our prediction was justified. It is not fully justified yet, but it has already begun to receive justification. The revolution is beginning to change the war on Russia's part. The capitalists are still continuing the war, and we say: Until there is a workers' revolution in several countries the war cannot be stopped, because the people who want that war are still in power. We are told: "In a number of countries everything seems to be asleep. In Germany all the socialists to a man are for the war, and Liebknecht is the only one against it." To this I say: This only one, Liebknecht, represents the working class. The hopes of all are in him alone, in his supporters, in the German proletariat. You don't believe this? Carry on with the war then! There is no other way. If you don't believe in Liebknecht, if you don't believe in the workers' revolution, a revolution that is coming to a head—if you don't believe this, then believe the capitalists!

Nothing but a workers' revolution in several countries can defeat this war. The war is not a game, it is an appalling thing taking toll of millions of lives, and it is not to be ended easily.

The soldiers at the front cannot tear the front away from the rest of the state and settle things their own way. The soldiers at the front are a part of the country. So long as the country is at war the front will suffer along with the rest. Nothing can be done about it. The war has been brought about by the ruling classes and only a revolution of the working class can end it. Whether you will get a speedy peace or not depends on how the revolution will develop.

Whatever sentimental things may be said, however much we may be told: Let us end the war immediately—this cannot be done without the development of the revolution. When power passes to the Soviets the capitalists will come out against us. Japan, France, Britain—the governments of all countries will be against us. The capitalists will be against, but the workers will be for us. That will be the end of the war which the capitalists started. There you have the answer to the question of how to end the war.

First published April 23, 1929
in *Pravda* No. 23

Published according to
the shorthand report

DESPICABLE METHODS

A whole congress of delegates from the front,¹¹¹ in a resolution adopted unanimously on May 13, condemns the shabby methods which *Rech* uses to slander our Comrade Zinoviev and sow discord between the army and the Bolsheviks. The worthy gentlemen of *Rech* have no intention, of course, of publishing the resolution of the congress of front-line delegates, although a copy of it was forwarded to the paper by the congress. Instead, that disreputable newspaper is keeping up its smear campaign against our paper and Comrade Zinoviev in a deliberate attempt to provoke a minor riot.

“*Pravda* regularly publishes reports about Germany which are to be found in no other paper. Where, how does *Pravda* get its special [!] information?” *Rech* asks significantly in an article significantly entitled “Curious Sources of Information”.

Where, Messrs. Slanderers?

From the telegrams and letters of our correspondent, Comrade Radek, the Polish Social-Democrat, who spent a number of years in tsarist prisons, who has been active for over ten years in the ranks of the German Social-Democrats, who has been expelled from Germany on account of his revolutionary agitation against Wilhelm and against the war, and who has gone specially to Stockholm to keep us supplied with information. From letters and telegrams, Messrs. Cadets, which your servants who rule the roost on the Russian-Swedish frontier are not always able to intercept, from newspaper cuttings and illegal German newspapers and leaflets, which our friends, the followers of Karl Liebknecht, send us, in exactly the same way as we receive similar mate-

rial about France from the *French* socialist-internationalist Henri Guilbeaux, friend of Romain Rolland and associate of the well-known French internationalist Comrade Loriot.

“The German General Staff has banned fraternisation,” we wrote in *Pravda* on the basis of information recently published in all the Russian newspapers. The *Rech* slanderers make big eyes at this and counter it with the statement of the Russian War Minister that “all sectors of the front where fraternisation took place have been destroyed by the enemy’s artillery”.

We do not know, of course, whether this report about destroyed sectors is true or not. But *if* it is true, it *confirms* rather than refutes the report that the German General Staff is opposed to fraternisation. It is obvious that by destroying the sectors where fraternisation occurred, the German General Staff is *discouraging* fraternisation both on the part of the Russian soldiers and of those honest German soldiers who do not want to use fraternisation as a trap.

You are not very convincing, you gentlemen counterfeiters of the Cadet Party!

In conclusion, one more of their lies: “At the Peasant Congress, as we know, Zinoviev was not given a chance to finish his speech,” writes Milyukov’s mouthpiece. “As we know”, you are lying again, gentlemen of the Cadet Party, just as you lied about the congress of front-line delegates. Things must be pretty bad for you, gentlemen, if you are compelled to resort to such shameless and despicable methods.

INEVITABLE CATASTROPHE AND EXTRAVAGANT PROMISES

(ARTICLE ONE)

The inevitable debacle, the catastrophe of unprecedented dimensions that is facing us is of such importance that we must dwell on this question again and again if we are to fully grasp its implications. In the last issue of *Pravda* we said that the *programme* of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies no longer differs *in any way* from that of "terrible" Bolshevism.*

Today we must point out that the programme of the Menshevik Minister Skobelev goes even *further* than Bolshevism. Here is the programme, as reported in the ministerial paper, *Rech*:

"The Minister [Skobelev] declared that '...the country's economy is on the brink of disaster. We must intervene in all fields of economic life, as there is no money in the Treasury. We must improve the condition of the working masses, and to do that we must take the profits from the tills of the businessmen and bankers'. (*Voice in the audience*: 'How?') 'By ruthless taxation of property,' replied the Minister of Labour, Skobelev. 'It is a method known to the science of finance. The rate of taxation on the propertied classes must be increased to one hundred per cent of their profits.' (*Voice in the audience*: 'That means everything.') 'Unfortunately,' declared Skobelev, 'many corporations have already distributed their dividends among the shareholders, and we must therefore levy a progressive personal tax on the propertied classes. We will go even further, and, if the capitalists wish to preserve the bourgeois method of business, let them work without interest, so as not to lose their clients.... We must introduce compulsory labour service for the shareholders, bankers and factory

* See p. 396 of this volume.—*Ed.*

owners, who are in a rather slack mood because the incentive that formerly stimulated them to work is now lacking.... We must force the shareholders to submit to the state; they, too, must be subject to labour service.”

We advise the workers to read and reread this programme, to discuss it and go into the matter of its practicability.

The important thing is the conditions necessary for its fulfilment, and the taking of immediate steps towards its fulfilment.

This programme in itself is an excellent one and coincides with the Bolshevik programme, except that in one particular it goes even *further* than our programme, namely, it promises to “take the profits from the tills of the bankers” to the extent of “one hundred per cent”.

Our Party is much more moderate. Its resolution demands much less than this, namely, the mere establishment of control over the banks and the “gradual [just listen, the Bolsheviks are for gradualness!] introduction of a more just progressive tax on incomes and properties”.

Our Party is more moderate than Skobelev.

Skobelev dispenses immoderate, nay, extravagant promises, *without understanding the conditions required for their practical realisation*.

That is the crux of the matter.

It is *impossible* not only to realise Skobelev’s programme, but even to make any serious efforts towards its realisation, either arm in arm with ten ministers from the party of the landowners and capitalists, or with the bureaucratic, official-ridden machine to which the government of the capitalists (plus a few Mensheviks and Narodniks) is perforce limited.

Less promises, Citizen Skobelev, and more practicalness. Less rhetoric and more understanding as to *how* to get down to *business*.

And get down to business we can and should immediately, without a day’s delay, if we are to save the country from an inevitable and terrible catastrophe. But the whole thing is that the “new” Provisional Government *does not want* to get down to business; and even if it wanted to, it *could not*, for it is fettered by a thousand chains which safeguard the interests of capital.

We can and should in a single day call upon the people to get down to business; we can and should in a single day issue a decree *immediately* convening:

1) Councils and congresses of bank employees, both of individual banks and on a national scale, to work out immediate practical measures for amalgamating all banks and banking houses into a single State Bank, and exercising precise control over all banking operations, the results of such control to be published forthwith;

2) Councils and congresses of employees of all syndicates and trusts to work out measures for control and accountancy; the results of such control to be published forthwith;

3) This decree should grant the right of control not only to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies, but also to councils of the workers at every large factory, as well as to the representatives of every large political party (those parties should be regarded as large parties which, for example, on May 12 put forward independent lists of candidates in not less than two Petrograd districts); all ledgers and documents to be open to control;

4) The decree should call upon all shareholders, directors and members of the boards of all companies to publish the names of all shareholders owning stock to an amount of not less than 10,000 (or 5,000) rubles, together with a list of stocks and companies in which these persons are "interested"; false statements (made to the controlling bodies of the bank and other employees) shall be punished by confiscation of all property and by imprisonment for a term of not less than five years;

5) The decree should call upon the people to establish immediately, through the local organs of self-government, universal labour service, for the control and enforcement of which a universal people's militia should be established (in the rural districts directly, in the cities through the workers' militia).

Without universal labour service, the country *cannot be saved* from ruin; and without a people's militia, universal labour service cannot be effected. This will be obvious to everyone who has not reached a state of ministerial insanity or has not had his brain turned by putting too much trust in ministerial eloquence.

Every person is *bound* to stand for such measures if he really wishes to save tens of millions from ruin and disaster.

In the next article we shall deal with the question of the gradual introduction of a more equitable system of taxation, and also what should be done to advance from among the people and gradually place in ministerial positions really gifted organisers (both from among the workers and the capitalists) who have given a good account of themselves in this kind of work.

(ARTICLE TWO)

When Skobelev, with ministerial *élan*, talked himself into taking one hundred per cent of the capitalists' profits, he furnished us with a specimen of claptrap. This kind of phrase-mongering is always used in bourgeois parliamentary republics to hoodwink the people.

But here we have something worse than mere phrase-mongering. "If the capitalists wish to preserve the bourgeois method of business, let them work without interest, so as not to lose their clients," Skobelev said. This sounds like a "terrible" threat to the capitalists; but in fact, it is an attempt (unconscious probably on the part of Skobelev, but certainly conscious on the part of the capitalists) to *make safe the rule* of almighty capital by a temporary sacrifice of profits.

The workers are taking "too much", say the capitalists; let us make them responsible without giving them either power or the opportunity to effectively control production. Let us sacrifice our profits for a time; by "preserving the bourgeois method of business and not losing our clients", we shall hasten the collapse of this transitory stage in industry, we shall disorganise it in every possible way and lay the blame on the workers.

That such is the plan of the capitalists is proved by the facts. The colliery owners in the South are actually disorganising production, are "*deliberately neglecting and disorganising it*" (see *Novaya Zhizn* for May 16 reporting statements made by a *workers' delegation*¹¹²). The picture is clear: *Rech* is lying brazenly when it puts the blame on the workers. The colliery owners are "deliberately disorganising

production”; and Skobelev sings his song: “If the capitalists wish to preserve the bourgeois method of business, let them work without interest.” The position is clear.

It is to the *advantage* of the capitalists and the bureaucrats to make “extravagant promises”, diverting people’s attention away from the *main thing*, namely, the transfer of real control to the workers.

The workers must sweep aside all high-sounding phrases, promises, declarations, project-mongering by bureaucrats in the centre, who are ever ready to draw up spectacular plans, rules, regulations, and standards. Down with all this lying! Down with all this hullabaloo of bureaucratic and bourgeois project-mongering which has everywhere ended in smoke. Down with this habit of shelving things! The workers must demand the *immediate* establishment of *genuine* control, to be exercised by the *workers themselves*.

That is the most important condition of success, success in averting catastrophe. If that is lacking, all else is sheer deception. If we have it, we need not be in a hurry to “take one hundred per cent of the profits”. We can and should be more moderate; we should *gradually* introduce a more equitable system of taxation; we shall differentiate between the small and large shareholders; we shall take *very little* from the former, and a great deal (but *not* necessarily all) from the latter *only*. The number of large shareholders is insignificant; but the role they play, like the wealth they possess, is *tremendous*. It may safely be said that if one were to draw up a list of the *five or even three thousand* (or perhaps even one thousand) of Russia’s wealthiest men, or if one were to trace (by means of control exercised from *below*, by bank, syndicate, and other employees) all the threads and ties of their finance capital, their banking connections, there would be revealed the whole complexus of capitalist domination, the vast body of wealth amassed at the expense of the labour of others, all the essential roots of “control” over the social production and distribution of goods.

It is *this* control that must be handed over to the workers. It is this complexus, these roots, that the interests of capital require to be concealed from the people. Better forego for time “all” our profits, or ninety-nine per cent of our income, than disclose to the people these roots of our power—thus

reason the capitalist class and its unconscious servant, the government official.

Under no circumstances shall *we* relinquish our right, our demand that this citadel of finance capital be disclosed to the people, that it be placed under workers' control—thus reasons the class-conscious worker. And every passing day will prove the correctness of this reasoning to growing masses of the poor, to a growing majority of the people, to a growing number of sincere people who are honestly seeking a way to avert disaster.

This citadel of finance capital has to be taken if all those phrases and projects for averting disaster are not to remain sheer deception. As far as individual capitalists, or even most of the capitalists, are concerned, the proletariat has no intention of "taking their last shirt from them" (as Shulgin has been "scaring" himself and his friends), has no intention of taking "everything" from them. On the contrary, it intends to put them on useful and honourable jobs—under the control of the workers.

The most useful and indispensable job for the people at this moment of impending catastrophe is that of *organisation*. Marvels of proletarian organisation—that is our slogan now, and will become our slogan and our demand doubly so when the proletariat is in power. Without the organisation of the masses it will be absolutely impossible either to introduce universal labour service, which is absolutely essential, or establish any at all serious control over the banks and syndicates and over the production and distribution of goods.

That is why it is necessary to begin, and begin immediately, with a workers' militia, in order that we may proceed gradually, but firmly and intelligently, to the creation of a people's militia and the replacement of the police and the standing army by the universally armed people. That is why it is necessary to advance talented organisers from among *all* sections of society, from among *all* classes, not excepting the capitalists, who *at present* have more of the required experience. There are many such talents among the people. Such forces lie dormant among the peasantry and the proletariat for lack of application. They must be advanced from below in the course of practical work, such as the efficient

elimination of queues in a given district, skilful organisation of house committees, domestic servants, and model farms, proper management of factories that have been taken over by the workers, and so on and so forth. When these have been advanced from below in the course of practical work, and their abilities tested in practice, they should all be promoted to “ministers”—not in the old sense of the term, not in the sense of giving them portfolios, but by appointing them national instructors, travelling organisers, assistants in the business of establishing *everywhere* the strictest order, the greatest economy in human labour, the strictest comradesly discipline.

That is what the party of the proletariat must preach to the people as the means of averting disaster. That is what it must start carrying out now in part in those localities where it is gaining power. That is what it must carry out in full when it assumes state power.

Pravda No. 58 and 59,
May 29 and 30 (16 and 17), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

THE QUESTION OF UNITING THE INTERNATIONALISTS

The All-Russia Conference of our Party passed a resolution recognising that closer relations and unity with groups and trends that have adopted a real internationalist stand are necessary on the basis of a definite break with the policy of petty-bourgeois betrayal of socialism.*

The question of unity was also recently discussed at a conference of the Inter-District Organisation of the United Social-Democrats of Petrograd.

In compliance with the decision of the All-Russia Conference, the Central Committee of our Party, recognising the extreme desirability of union with the Inter-District Organisation, advanced the following proposals (they were first made to the Inter-District Organisation only in the name of Comrade Lenin and a few other members of the Central Committee, but were subsequently approved by the majority of the members of the Central Committee):

“Unity is desirable immediately.

“The Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party will be asked to include a representative of the Inter-District Organisation on the staff of each of the two papers (the present *Pravda*, which is to be converted into an All-Russia *popular* newspaper, and the Central Organ to be established in the near future).

“The Central Committee will be asked to set up a special Organising Committee to summon a Party Congress (in six weeks’ time). The Inter-District Conference will be entitled to appoint two delegates to this committee. If the Mensheviks, adherents of Martov, break with the ‘defencists’,

* See p. 294 of this volume.—*Ed.*

it would be desirable and essential to include their delegates on the above-mentioned committee.

“Free discussion of controversial issues shall be ensured by the publication of discussion leaflets by Priboi Publishers and by free discussion in the journal *Prosveshcheniye (Kommunist)*,¹¹³ publication of which is being resumed.”

(Draft read by N. Lenin on May 10, 1917, in his own name and in the name of several members of the Central Committee.)

The Inter-District Organisation, for their part, passed a different resolution, which reads:

“On unity. Realising that only by the closest consolidation of all its revolutionary forces can the proletariat

“1) become the foremost fighter in clearing the way for socialism;

“2) become the leader of Russian democracy in its struggle against the survivals of the semi-feudal regime and the heritage of tsarism;

“3) fight out the revolution and finally settle the questions of war and peace, the confiscation of the land, the eight-hour day, etc.,

“the Conference is of the opinion

“a) that a consolidation of forces, so indispensable to the proletariat, can be achieved only under the banner of Zimmerwald and Kienthal, and the programme and decisions of the Party of the years 1908 and 1910, 1912 and 1913;

“b) that not a single labour organisation, be it a trade union, an educational club, or a consumers’ co-operative society, and not a single labour newspaper or periodical should refrain from enlisting under that banner;

“c) at the same time, the Conference declares itself to be decidedly and ardently in favour of unity on the basis of those decisions.”

Which of these resolutions will be quicker in bringing about unity is a question for all internationalist workers to discuss and decide.

The political resolutions of the Inter-District Organisation have in general adopted the sound course of breaking with the “defencists”.

Under the circumstances, any division of forces would, in our opinion, be utterly unjustifiable.

MUDDLEHEADEDNESS

MORE ON THE SUBJECT OF ANNEXATIONS

The editors of *Izvestia*, a paper controlled by the Narodnik and Menshevik bloc, are beating all records of muddledom. In that paper's issue No. 67 for May 16, they try to chop logic with *Pravda*, without, of course, mentioning its name—a usual ill-mannered “ministerial” practice. *Pravda*, we are told, has a foggy, misleading *idea* of annexations.

Begging your pardon, citizen-ministers and ministeriable editors, but facts are facts, and the fact is that our Party was the *only one* to give a definition of annexation in official and carefully worded resolutions. Annexation means keeping an alien people by force within the bounds of a given state. No person able to read and understand Russian *could fail* to understand that on reading the Supplement to No. 13 of *Soldatskaya Pravda* (resolutions of the All-Russia Conference of April 24-29, 1917).*

What exception do the Narodnik and Menshevik editors of *Izvestia* take to this? Simply this: that if our view were adopted it would be necessary to “keep on fighting until Germany is reduced to the Duchy of Brandenburg, and Russia to the Principality of Muscovy”! Annexation, the editors explain for the edification of their readers, “is the forcible seizure of territory which, on the day war was declared, belonged to another country” (in short: no annexations means status quo, that is, a return to the state of affairs that existed before the war).

* See p. 271 of this volume.—*Ed.*

It is careless, most careless, on the part of the Narodnik and Menshevik leaders of the Soviet's Executive Committee to put such muddle-headed people in charge of a newspaper.

Let us apply to *their* definition the argument *they* used against us. Would we have to "keep on fighting until Russia recovered Poland, and Germany Togoland and her African colonies"? Palpable nonsense, nonsense from the practical as well as the theoretical point of view, since no soldier anywhere would think twice about dismissing any editors who argued in this way.

The flaw in their argument is this:

(1) The theoretical definition of annexation involves the conception of an "alien" people, that is, a people that has preserved its distinctive features and its will towards independent existence. Ponder this, fellow-citizens, and if it is still not clear to you, read what Engels and Marx had to say about Ireland, about Germany's Danish territories, and the colonies—and you will realise how confused you are. The Duchy of Brandenburg and the Principality of Muscovy have nothing to do with it. (2) To confuse the *idea* of annexation with the question of how long "to keep on fighting" is ridiculous; it means failure to grasp the connection that exists between war and the interests and rule of definite classes; it means abandoning the standpoint of the *class struggle* for the philistine "non-class" standpoint. *So long as* the capitalist class is in power the nations are bound "to keep on fighting" as long as that class wants it. To think that one can escape this by wishes, demands, or conferences is the illusion of a petty bourgeois. (3) *So long as* the capitalist class is in power, *their peace is bound* to be "an exchange of annexations"—Armenia for Lorraine, colony for colony, Galicia for Kurland, and so on. We can pardon an ignorant man for failing to see this, but not the editors of *Izvestia*. (4) When the proletariat comes to power—and that is what the war is leading up to everywhere—then and only then will "peace without annexations" *become possible*.

When our Party speaks of "peace without annexations" it always explains—as a warning to muddle-headed people—that this slogan must be *closely linked* with the proletarian revolution. Only in connection with this revolution is it true and useful; it pursues only the *revolution's* line, and

works only for the revolution's growth and development. To vacillate weakly between hopes in the capitalists and hopes in the workers' revolution is to condemn oneself to impotence and muddle in the question of annexations.

P.S. *Dyelo Naroda* for May 17 agrees with *Izvestia* that "no annexations" is equivalent to status quo. Try and say that, gentlemen of the S.R. or Menshevik fold, say it clearly, precisely, and straightforwardly in the name of your party, your Petrograd Committee, your congress!

Pravda No. 60,
May 31 (18), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

COMBATING ECONOMIC CHAOS BY A SPATE OF COMMISSIONS

Izvestia for May 17 publishes a tiresomely lengthy and silly resolution of the Soviet's Economic Department concerning ways of combating economic chaos.

And what a combat that is! Splendid ideas and excellent plans are smothered in a net of dead, bureaucratic institutions. "The Economic Department shall be converted [mark this!] into a department for the organisation of the national economy."

Excellent! We are on the right track! The country can make its mind easy. The Department has been *renamed*.

But is it possible to "organise the national economy" without wielding state power? This the Executive Committee has overlooked.

The Department has *six* "sub-departments".... That is Point 1 of the resolution. Point 2 is about establishing "close organisational ties"; Point 3 is about working out the "basic principles" of regulation; Point 4 is about establishing "close organisational contact" with the cabinet ministers (upon my oath, this is not from a fable by Muzhik Vredny¹⁴ but from *Izvestia* No. 68, for May 17, page 3, column 3, Point 4); Point 5 is about "the government forming commissions"; Point 6 is about "a bill to be drafted in the very near future"; Point 7 is about starting immediately "to draw up basic legislative proposals" on five sub-points....

O wise men! O lawgivers! O Louis Blancs!

ONE MORE DEPARTURE FROM DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES

The Narodniks and Mensheviks, who are editing *Izvestia*, wish to be considered socialists, but do not even know how to be democrats. In their issue No. 68, for May 17, they advise "caution" with regard to the "slogan of partial re-elections". They tell the workers that "deputies should be elected for a fixed term—two or three months, say—but never [!] for a week, from one meeting to another".

Is it proper for an official organ to worry about re-elections and to advise "caution"? ... Caution in what? In the expression of popular distrust in *that organ*!

That is the first question.

The second question is: Should not an intelligent democrat deal with the question of caution in the matter of re-elections (if it is to be dealt with at all) from the point of view of *partyism*? Is it not his duty, for instance, to say: We, Narodniks and Mensheviks, consider the line taken by our bloc to be correct on such-and-such grounds, and that of the Bolsheviks to be incorrect for such-and-such reasons? Why then do the editors depart from democratic principles and, instead of appealing to partyism, use such a strange argument as that mistakes at elections are an "exception"? Don't they know that the "mistake" of having the Skobelevs and Chernovs join the capitalist cabinet is being weighed and discussed by the workers everywhere, that it is *not* an "exception" *at all*?

The third question is this: Is it not the duty of a democrat, who wishes to raise the question of re-elections, to recognise and emphasise the principle of democracy—the right of the

population *at any time* to recall each and every representative, each and every person holding elected office?

Will not the editors of *Izvestia*, if they still reckon with the opinions of the founders of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, recall what those real socialists said with regard to such a right?

Pravda No. 60,
May 31 (18), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

HOW THE CAPITALISTS ARE TRYING TO SCARE THE PEOPLE

In an editorial on May 17 *Finansovaya Gazeta* writes:

“The political upheaval, which everyone looked forward to, is assuming the form of a social revolution without precedent anywhere. The ‘class struggle’, which is a legitimate and natural thing in a free country, has taken on with us the character of a class war. A financial crash is imminent. An industrial crash is unavoidable.

“To effect a political revolution it was enough to make Nicholas II abdicate the throne and to arrest a dozen of his ministers. That was easily done in a single day. To effect a social revolution, however, tens of millions of citizens must be made to abdicate their property rights and all non-socialists must be arrested. This cannot be done in scores of years.”

That is untrue, worthy fellow-citizens. It is a glaring lie! You choose to call *control* over industry by the workers “social revolution”. In doing so you are committing three monstrous errors.

First, the revolution of February 27 was also a social revolution. Every political upheaval, if it is not a mere change of cliques, is a social revolution. The thing is—*what class* makes that social revolution. The revolution of February 27, 1917 took the power from the feudal landowners headed by Nicholas II and gave it to the bourgeoisie. It was a social revolution of the *bourgeoisie*.

By the use of clumsy unscientific terminology which confuses “social” with “socialist” revolution, *Finansovaya Gazeta* tries to *conceal* from the people the obvious fact that the workers and peasants cannot content themselves with seizure of power by the bourgeoisie.

By trying to ignore this clear and simple fact the capitalists are deceiving themselves and the people.

Secondly, “without precedent anywhere” is also applicable to the great imperialist war of 1914-17. Such a debacle, such bloody horrors, such a disaster, and such a *break-down of our*

entire civilisation are “without precedent anywhere”. It is not anybody’s impatience, not anybody’s propaganda, but objective conditions and this unprecedented break-down of civilisation that necessitate this control over production and distribution, over the banks, factories, etc.

Failing this, tens of millions of people can be said without exaggeration to face inevitable ruin and death.

In view of the freedom created by the “political upheaval” of February 27, in view of the existence of the Soviets, such control is *impossible* unless the workers and peasants preponderate, unless the minority of the population bows to the majority. Nothing can alter this, protest as you may.

Third, and most important of all—even for the purpose of a socialist revolution there is *no* need at all for “tens of millions of citizens to abdicate their property rights”. Not even socialism (and control over the banks and factories *does not yet* mean socialism) requires anything of the kind.

This is an infamous libel on socialism. No socialist has ever proposed that the “tens of millions”, i.e., the small and middle peasants, should be deprived of their property (=“made to abdicate their property rights”).

Nothing of the kind!

Socialists everywhere have always denied such nonsense.

Socialists are out to make *only* the landowners and capitalists “abdicate”. To deal a decisive blow at those who are defying the people the way the colliery owners are doing when they disrupt and ruin production, it is sufficient to make a *few hundred*, at the most one or two thousand, millionaires, bank and industrial and commercial bosses, “abdicate” their property rights.

This would be quite enough to break the resistance of capital. Even this *tiny group of wealthy people need not* have *all* their property rights taken away from them; they could be allowed to keep many possessions in the way of consumption articles and ownership of a certain modest income.

The question at issue is merely that of breaking down the resistance of a few hundred millionaires. Only in this way can disaster be averted.

ONE MORE CRIME OF THE CAPITALISTS

The report made in Petrograd recently by a delegation of Donets workers exposed the Donets colliery owners, who are criminally *disrupting* and stopping production, and (for the sake of safeguarding their "sacred" right to enormous profits) are condemning the workers to unemployment, the country to starvation, and industry to a crisis through a coal shortage.

Today we have received a telegram reporting similar outrageous and criminal conduct on the part of the colliery owners at the other end of Russia. Here is the text of the telegram sent to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and to three cabinet ministers (with our corrections in brackets):

"On April 29 the (Soviet) of Soldiers' Deputies and the Union of Employees at Michelson's Sudzhensk coal mines removed from office the nine-man administration owing to the criminally provocative manner in which they ran the business, which threatened to lead to a shutdown. The management has been placed (in) the hands of a Council of Engineers—a technical board directly controlled by the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. A committee from the executive bodies in Tomsk has investigated and approved our decision.

"In a telegram dated May 11 Michelson refused to pay the workers. We demand full restoration. Restoration impossible.* The mines are facing anarchy, the workers—disaster. Take urgent steps to send half a million rubles, decide the fate of the mines, confiscate them. The mines are working for national defence, daily output is 135,000 poods. A stoppage may affect railway traffic and (operation of the) factories. So far work is normal. Wages for March and April not paid in full. Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, and Union of Employees."

No more fitting expression than that used by the Soviet and the Employees' Union in their telegram could be found,

* The meaning is not clear. Does it mean that in case of a stoppage it will be difficult and almost impossible to get the mines restarted?

namely, that the capitalists are running the business in a “criminally provocative manner”.

All the members, of the Provisional Government, the so-called socialist ministers included, will be accomplices in this crime if they continue to “grapple” with the impending debacle by means of resolutions, commissions, conferences with employers, if they continue “to waste words where they should use their power” (against the capitalists).

Pravda No. 61,
June 1 (May 19), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

STILL MORE LIES

Yedinstvo (unity with the bourgeoisie*) alleges today that “the Leninists contend that Kurland is a German province”.

That is a lie. That is in the vein of *Russkaya Volya* and *Rech*, and it is a lie.

Pravda has challenged *Rech* and other papers to give a definition of annexation that would fit all annexations, German, British, and Russian.

The bourgeois newspapers (*Yedinstvo* included) are unable to answer this question and so they dismiss it by repeating the old lies. Shame!

Written May 18 (31), 1917

Published June 1 (May 19), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 61

Published according
to the newspaper text

* A play on words, *Yedinstvo* meaning “Unity”.—*Ed.*

A LETTER TO THE EDITORS

The newspapers have again published a false report, alleging that for some unexplained reason I did not attend the Peasant Congress, evaded it, etc. As a matter of fact I was to have addressed the Congress on Wednesday and was prepared to do so when I was notified that on Wednesday the organisation question was to be discussed instead of the agrarian question, which was temporarily put off. The same thing occurred today, i.e., on Thursday. Once more I ask readers not to believe the papers, except *Pravda*.

N. Lenin

Written May 18 (31), 1917

Published June 1 (May 19), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 61

Published according
to the newspaper text

HAS DUAL POWER DISAPPEARED?

It has not. Dual power still remains. The basic question of every revolution, that of state power, is still in an uncertain, unstable, and obviously transitory state.

Compare the papers of the cabinet, *Rech*, for instance, with *Izvestia*, *Dyelo Naroda*, and *Rabochaya Gazeta*. Scan the meagre—unfortunately all too meagre—official reports of what is going on at the meetings of the Provisional Government, of how the government “postpones” discussion of the most vital issues, because of its inability to take any definite course. Study the resolution of the Soviet’s Executive Committee passed on May 16, which deals with such a crucial and momentous question as that of how to cope with economic chaos and avert imminent debacle—and you will see that dual power is absolutely intact.

Everyone admits that the country is swiftly heading for disaster—yet all that is done about it is to brush the question under the carpet.

Is it not side-stepping the issue, when a resolution on such a grave question as impending economic catastrophe, at such a grave moment, merely creates a spate of commissions, departments, and sub-departments; when the same Executive Committee passes a resolution expressing nothing but pious wishes on such a scandalous affair as that of the Donets colliery owners who were found guilty of deliberately disorganising production? Price fixing, profit regulation, the establishment of a minimum wage, and the formation of state-controlled trusts—yes, but how, through whom? “Through the central and local institutions in the Donets Krivoi Rog Basin. These institutions must be democratic in character and made up of representatives of the workers,

employers, the government, and democratic revolutionary organisations”!

This would be comic if the matter involved were not a tragedy.

It is common knowledge that such “democratic” institutions have existed and still exist locally and in Petrograd (the very same Executive Committee of the Soviet) but they are powerless to do anything. Meetings between the Donets workers and the employers have been going on since the end of March—March! Over six weeks have passed and the result is that the Donets workers have been forced to the conclusion that the colliery owners are deliberately disorganising production!

And again the people are fed with promises, commissions, meetings between representatives of the workers and employers (in equal numbers?), and the old rigmarole starts all over again.

The root of the evil is in the dual power. The root of the Narodniks’ and Mensheviks’ error is that they do not understand the class struggle, and want to replace or cloak it, reconcile it by means of phrases, promises, resolutions, commissions “with the participation” of representatives ... of the same dual government!

The capitalists have made fantastic, outrageous fortunes out of the war. They have the majority of the government on their side. They want to rule supreme; in view of their class position they are bound to make a bid for supreme power and fight for it.

The working masses constitute the vast majority of the population, they control the Soviets, they are aware of their power as a majority, they see everywhere the promise of a “democratised” life, they know that democracy is the rule of the majority over the minority (*and not the reverse*—which is what the capitalists want), they have been striving to better their lives only since the revolution (and then not everywhere), and not since the beginning of the war—therefore they cannot but aspire towards supreme rule by the people, i.e., the majority of the population, towards affairs being managed according to the will of the worker majority as opposed to the capitalist minority, and not according to “an agreement” between the majority and the minority.

Dual power still remains. The government of the capitalists remains a government of the capitalists, despite the appended tag of Narodniks and Mensheviks in a minority capacity. The Soviets remain the organisation of the majority. The Narodnik and Menshevik leaders are floundering helplessly in an attempt to straddle two stools.

Meanwhile the crisis is growing. Things have reached a point where the capitalists—the colliery owners—are brazenly committing outrageous *crimes*—they are *disorganising and stopping* production. Unemployment is spreading. There is talk of lockouts. Actually they have *started* in the form of disorganisation of production by the capitalists (for coal is the *bread of industry!*), in the form of growing unemployment.

Sole responsibility for this crisis, for the impending catastrophe, rests with the Narodnik and Menshevik leaders. For it is they who are at present the leaders of the Soviets, i.e., of the majority. That the minority (the capitalists) should be unwilling to submit to the majority is inevitable. No person who has not forgotten the lessons which science and the experience of all countries teach us, no person who has not forgotten the class struggle, will look trustfully towards “an agreement” with the capitalists on such an essential, burning question.

The majority of the population, i.e., the Soviets, the workers and peasants, would be fully able to save the situation, prevent the capitalists from disorganising and stopping production, establish *their own* immediate and effective control over production if it were not for the “conciliatory” policy of the Narodnik and Menshevik leaders. They bear full responsibility for the crisis and the catastrophe.

There is *no* way out, however, other than by the worker and peasant majority deciding to act against the capitalist minority. Playing for time will not help, it will only make matters worse.

Viewed from a Marxist angle, the “conciliatory” attitude of the Narodnik and Menshevik leaders is a manifestation of petty-bourgeois indecision. The petty bourgeoisie is afraid to trust the workers, and is afraid to break with the capitalists. Such wavering is inevitable, as inevitable as our struggle, the struggle of the proletarian party, to overcome

indecision, and to make the people see the necessity for rehabilitating, organising, and increasing production in the teeth of capitalist opposition.

There is no other way out. Either we go back to supreme rule by the capitalists, or forward towards real democracy, towards majority decisions. This dual power cannot last long.

Pravda No. 62,
June 2 (May 20), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

ON THE "UNAUTHORIZED SEIZURE" OF LAND

FLIMSY ARGUMENTS OF THE SOCIALIST-REVOLUTIONARIES

Izvestia of the All-Russia Soviet of Peasants' Deputies,¹¹⁵ in its issue No. 10 for May 19, publishes a report by S. Maslov who discourses on the subject of "land seizures".

"In some places," says S. Maslov, "the peasants are endeavouring to assert their right to the land by unauthorised seizure of lands belonging to the local landowners. The question arises: is such a procedure advisable?"

S. Maslov considers it inadvisable, and gives four reasons for thinking so. Let us examine his arguments.

Argument 1. Russia's lands are distributed unevenly in the various regions and gubernias. In pointing out this incontestable fact. S. Maslov says:

"It is not difficult to imagine how complicated the proper settlement of the land question would become if every gubernia or region laid claim only to its own lands and seized them for its own use. It is not difficult to foresee what would happen if the peasants of some villages seized the land of the local landowners and left the other peasants without any land."

This argument is an obvious, a gross deviation from the truth. It would hold good against anybody who might take it into his head to advise the peasants to seize the land—and seize it in an unorganised way at that—as *private property*. Take it, share it—and that's that.

That would indeed be the height of anarchism, the height of absurdity.

We do not know what party, if any, proposed such nonsense. If that is what S. Maslov had in mind, then he is tilting at windmills. It is ludicrous.

Our Party, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party of the Bolsheviks, has proposed in a carefully worded resolution that *property* in the land be vested in the people as a whole. Consequently, *we are opposed to any seizure of land as private property.*

But this is not the question at issue, and S. Maslov has betrayed himself by mentioning what is really the essential and cardinal point, namely, the seizure of the *landed estates*. That is the crux of the matter. It is on this question that S. Maslov is beating about the bush.

The landed estates must be confiscated *immediately*, that is, private ownership of them must be abolished *immediately* and *without compensation.*

And what about the *possession* of these lands? Who is to take immediate possession of them and cultivate them? The local peasants are to do this in an organised way, that is, in accordance with the decision of the majority. That is the advice of our Party. The local peasants are to have the *immediate* use of these lands, which are to become the *property* of the people as a whole. Ownership will be *finally* decided by the Constituent Assembly (or the All-Russia Council of Soviets, should the people choose to make it the Constituent Assembly).

What has the uneven distribution of lands in the various regions got to do with this? Obviously, nothing whatever. Pending the convocation of the Constituent Assembly this uneven distribution will remain under *all* plans, be it the landowners' plan, S. Maslov's plan or our own plan.

S. Maslov is simply drawing the attention of the peasants away from the matter in hand. He has screened the real issue behind empty words that have no bearing upon the matter.

And the real issue is that of the landed estates. The landowners are for keeping them. We are for handing them over *immediately* to the peasants *without compensation, free of charge.* Maslov is for shelving the question by means of "conciliation chambers".

That is bad. Stalling tactics are bad. The landowners must submit at once to the will of the peasant majority without attempts at conciliation between this peasant majority and the landowner minority. This conciliation is an unlawful, unjust, undemocratic privilege for the landowners.

Maslov's second argument is this:

"The peasants are for seizing the land in the hope that if they manage to raise a crop on it they will be able to keep it. But this can be done only by such peasant households as have the necessary number of work hands and horses. Horseless families or families that have given most of their labour-power to the army will not be able to get land by this seizure method. Obviously, those who will gain by this method are those who are the stronger, or even those who are more land-prosperous, and not those who are most in need of land."

This argument, too, is a downright falsehood. Again S. Maslov tries to draw the attention of the peasants away from the real issue—that of the landed estates. If the peasants were to take the landed estates not by "seizure" (i.e., free of charge, as we propose), *but on lease*, that is, *paying rent* for the land (as the landowners and S. Maslov propose)—would anything be altered? Are not horses and work hands needed to till the land rented from the landowners? Can families that have given their working members to the army lease land on a par with large families?

The difference between our Party, the Bolsheviks, and Maslov on this point is that he proposes the land should be taken from the landowners for payment after a "conciliation" agreement has been arrived at, whereas we propose taking it immediately and free of charge.

The question of rich people *among* the peasants has nothing to do with it. What is more, to take the land free of charge is more in the interests of *the poor*. To pay rent is easier for *the rich*.

What measures are possible and necessary to prevent the rich peasant from wronging the poor one?

1. Majority decision (there are more poor than rich). This is what we propose;

2. A special organisation of poor peasants, where they can *specialy* discuss their own *special* interests. This is what we propose;

3. Common cultivation of the landed estates by common draft animals and common implements under the direction of the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies. This is what we propose.

These last two measures—the most important—are just the ones the Party of the “Socialist-Revolutionaries” does not support. It's a great pity.

The third argument is this:

“At the beginning, during the early days of the revolution, when rumours were current among the soldiers that back there, at home, a division of the land was taking place, many of them were eager to go home for fear of being done out of their share. Cases of desertion became more frequent.”

This argument concerns the immediate *division* of the land as *private property*. No one has proposed any such thing. S. Maslov is wide of the mark again.

The fourth argument:

“Finally, land seizures simply threaten to reduce the crops. There have been cases when the peasants, after seizing the landed estates, have done the sowing poorly, using insufficient seeds or leaving their own land uncultivated. Now that the country is so badly in need of food such a situation is absolutely intolerable.”

This is such a flimsy argument that people can only laugh at it. We are asked to believe that if the land taken from the landowners is paid for it will be cultivated better!

You ought to be ashamed of yourself to use such arguments, Citizen Maslov!

If the peasants sow the fields poorly, they should be helped—and this particularly applies to the *poor peasants*—by means of collective cultivation of the large estates. There is *no* other way of helping the poor peasants. And this, unfortunately, is just the remedy which S. Maslov does *not* propose.

In all justice it should be said that S. Maslov apparently realises the flimsiness of his arguments, for he hastens to add:

“After what I have said I feel that some of you are ready to protest, saying, how can we be told to leave things as they were when we have suffered so much from this big landownership. I do not claim to propose anything.”

Precisely! From what Maslov said it could be inferred that he wished to leave things as they were (although he does *not* want that). There is something wrong with his arguments then.

It is for the peasants to decide. It is for *parties* to propose. Our Party proposes what I have stated above. These proposals have been clearly elaborated in our resolutions,* for which see Supplement to No. 13 of *Soldatskaya Pravda*, price 5 kopeks.

Pravda No. 62, June 2
(May 20), 1917
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

* See pp. 291-92 and 311 of this volume.—*Ed.*

**MATERIALS RELATING
TO THE REVISION
OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME**

Written April-May 1917

Published June 1917
in the pamphlet *Materials Relating
to the Revision
of the Party Programme*,
Priboi Publishers, Petrograd

Published according
to the pamphlet text

1

PREFACE TO THE PAMPHLET *MATERIALS RELATING
TO THE REVISION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME*

The Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party ("Bolsheviks") has instructed the undersigned to publish immediately the material at present in the possession of the Central Committee relating to the revision of the Party Programme.

This material consists of the following:

a) The initial draft of amendments to the theoretical and political sections of the programme which the present writer submitted to the All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. on April 24-29, 1917, and which was examined so far only by the committee set up by the Conference for the detailed elaboration of this question.

b) Comments on the draft, or in connection with the draft, made by the committee or by its individual members.

c) My reply to these comments.

d) A complete draft of proposed changes in the economic minimum programme worked out at the Conference of April 24-29, 1917 by the sub-committee on the protection of labour.

e) A draft, supplied with brief explanatory notes, of changes to be made in the clauses of the Party Programme dealing with public education. This draft was drawn up by N. K. Krupskaya after the Conference.

I am appending brief notes to this material, for I consider that the chief purpose of the Party in publishing this material at the present time is to secure the active participation of the greatest possible number of comrades in the work of drawing up the Party Programme.

Taken together, the proposed changes above enumerated form the draft of the complete text of a new programme. I therefore give *both* the old and the new texts of the programme at the end of this pamphlet, arranged so as to present the reader with all the material in the form most convenient for comparison and for the insertion of amendments.

On behalf of the Central Committee, I ask all comrades, both members of the Party and sympathisers, to reprint this material in Party publications as widely as possible, to bring it to the attention of *every* member of the Party and to address all comments and proposals to the office of *Pravda* (32 Moika, Petrograd, marked: for the Central Committee, Material Relating to Programme Revision).

May 20, 1917

N. Lenin

2

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS
TO THE DOCTRINAL, POLITICAL AND OTHER SECTIONS
OF THE PROGRAMME

At the end of the preamble (after the words “the standpoint of the proletariat”) insert:

World capitalism has at the present time, i.e., about the beginning of the twentieth century, reached the stage of imperialism. Imperialism, or the epoch of finance capital, is a high stage of development of the capitalist economic system, one in which monopolist associations of capitalists—syndicates, cartels, and trusts—have assumed decisive importance; in which enormously concentrated banking capital has fused with industrial capital; in which the export of capital to foreign countries has assumed vast dimensions; in which the whole world has been divided up territorially among the richer countries, and the economic carve-up of the world among international trusts has begun.

Imperialist wars, i.e., wars for world domination, for markets for banking capital and for the subjugation of small and weaker nations, are inevitable under such a state of affairs. The first great imperialist war, the war of 1914-17, is precisely such a war.

The extremely high level of development which world capitalism in general has attained, the replacement of free competition by monopoly capitalism, the fact that the banks and the capitalist associations have prepared the machinery for the social regulation of the process of production and distribution of products, the rise in the cost of living and increased oppression of the working class by the syndicates due to the growth of capitalist monopolies, the tremendous

obstacles standing in the way of the proletariat's economic and political struggle, the horrors, misery, ruin, and brutalisation caused by the imperialist war—all these factors transform the present stage of capitalist development into an era of proletarian socialist revolution.

That era has dawned.

Only a proletarian socialist revolution can lead humanity out of the impasse which imperialism and imperialist wars have created. Whatever difficulties the revolution may have to encounter, whatever possible temporary setbacks or waves of counter-revolution it may have to contend with, the final victory of the proletariat is inevitable.

Objective conditions make it the urgent task of the day to prepare the proletariat in every way for the conquest of political power in order to carry out the economic and political measures which are the sum and substance of the socialist revolution.

The fulfilment of this task, which calls for the fullest trust, the closest fraternal ties, and direct unity of revolutionary action on the part of the working class in all the advanced countries, is impossible without an immediate break in principle with the bourgeois perversion of socialism, which has gained the upper hand among the leadership of the great majority of the official Social-Democratic parties. Such a perversion is, on the one hand, the social-chauvinist trend, socialism in word and chauvinism in deed, the defence of the predatory interests of "one's own" national bourgeoisie under the guise of "defence of the fatherland"; and, on the other hand, the equally wide international trend of the so-called "Centre", which stands for unity with the social-chauvinists and for the preservation or correction of the bankrupt Second International, and which vacillates between social-chauvinism and the internationalist revolutionary struggle of the proletariat for the achievement of a socialist system.

In the minimum programme, the whole beginning (from the words "On the path" down to §1) should be crossed out, and replaced by the following:

In Russia at the present moment, when the Provisional Government, which is part and parcel of the capitalist class and enjoys the confidence—necessarily unstable—of the broad mass of the petty-bourgeois population, has undertaken to convene a Constituent Assembly, the immediate duty of the party of the proletariat is to fight for a political system which will best guarantee economic progress and the rights of the people in general, and make possible the least painful transition to socialism in particular.

The party of the proletariat cannot rest content with a bourgeois parliamentary democratic republic, which throughout the world preserves and strives to perpetuate the monarchist instruments for the oppression of the masses, namely, the police, the standing army, and the privileged bureaucracy.

The party fights for a more democratic workers' and peasants' republic, in which the police and the standing army will be abolished and replaced by the universally armed people, by a people's militia; all officials will be not only elective, but also subject to recall at any time upon the demand of a majority of the electors; all officials, without exception, will be paid at a rate not exceeding the average wage of a competent worker; parliamentary representative institutions will be gradually replaced by Soviets of people's representatives (from various classes and professions, or from various localities), functioning as both legislative and executive bodies.

The constitution of the Russian democratic republic must ensure:

§1. The sovereignty of the people; supreme power in the state must be vested entirely in the people's representatives, who shall be elected by the people and be subject to recall at any time, and who shall constitute a single popular assembly, a single chamber.

§2. Add:

Proportional representation at all elections; all delegates and elected officials, without exception, to be subject to recall at any time upon the decision of a majority of their electors.

§3. Add:

The abolition of all state-appointed local and regional authorities.*

The last sentence in §8 to be worded as follows:

The native language to be used in all local public and state institutions; the obligatory official language to be abolished.

§9 to read:

The right of all member nations of the state to freely secede and form independent states. The republic of the Russian nation must attract other nations or nationalities not by force, but exclusively by voluntary agreement on the question of forming a common state. The unity and fraternal alliance of the workers of all countries are incompatible with the use of force, direct or indirect, against other nationalities.

§11 to read:

Judges and other officials, both civil and military, to be elected by the people with the right to recall any of them at any time by decision of a majority of their electors.

§12 to read:

The police and standing army to be replaced by the universally armed people; workers and other employees to receive regular wages from the capitalists for the time devoted to public service in the people's militia.

After the fiscal clause of the programme (following the words "on incomes and inheritances") insert:

The high level of development of capitalism already achieved in banking and in the trustified branches of industry, on the one hand, and the economic disruption caused by the imperialist war, everywhere evoking a demand for state and public control of the production and distribution of all staple products, on the other, induce the Party to demand the nationalisation of the banks, syndicates (trusts), etc.

* See *Pravda* No. 68, May 28, 1917, F. Engels's discussion of the Marxist view—and consistently democratic view in general—on the question of the appointment and endorsement of officials elected by the local population.¹¹⁶

The agrarian programme to be formulated thus:

The beginning (from the words "In order to do away with the relics" to the words "the Party demands") to be retained; the continuation to be amended as follows:

1) Fights with all its strength for the immediate and complete confiscation of all landed estates in Russia (and also crown lands, church lands, etc.).

2) Stands for the immediate transfer of all land to the peasantry organised in Soviets of Peasants' Deputies or in other organs of local self-government elected on a truly democratic basis and completely independent of the landowners and bureaucrats.

3) Demands the nationalisation of all lands in the country; nationalisation implies that all property rights in land are vested in the state, while the right of disposal of the land is vested in the local democratic institutions.

4) Encourages the initiative of those peasant committees which, in various localities of Russia, are turning over the landowners' livestock and agricultural implements to the peasants organised in these committees for the purpose of their socially regulated utilisation in the cultivation of the land.

5) Advises the rural proletarians and semi-proletarians to strive towards turning every landed estate into a sufficiently large model farm, to be conducted on a communal basis by the local Soviet of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies under the direction of agricultural experts and with the aid of the best technical appliances.

The Party under all circumstances and whatever the conditions, etc.—to the end of the paragraph ("exploitation").

The conclusion of the agrarian programme, from the words "The Party under all circumstances, and whatever the conditions of democratic agrarian reform may be" to the words "poverty and exploitation", to remain unchanged.

The whole concluding part of the programme, the last two paragraphs (from the words "In the endeavour to achieve" to the end), to be entirely deleted.

3

COMMENTS ON THE REMARKS MADE BY THE COMMITTEE
OF THE APRIL ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE

With regard to the remarks on the preamble to the programme, I must say the following.

In my opinion, there is no need for a revision of the entire preamble. The plan for such a revision proposed by the committee seems to me theoretically incorrect.

As now worded, the preamble contains a description and analysis of the main and essential features of capitalism as a social and economic system. Fundamentally, these features have *not* been changed by imperialism, by the era of finance capital. Imperialism is a continuation of the development of capitalism, its highest stage—in a sense, a transition stage to socialism.

I cannot therefore see how the addition of an analysis of imperialism to the general analysis of the basic features of capitalism can be regarded as “mechanical”. Imperialism, in fact, does not *and cannot transform* capitalism from top to bottom. Imperialism complicates and sharpens the contradictions of capitalism, it “ties up” monopoly with free competition, but *it cannot do away* with exchange, the market, competition, crises, etc.

Imperialism is moribund capitalism, capitalism which is dying but not dead. The essential feature of imperialism, by and large, is not monopolies pure and simple, but monopolies in conjunction with exchange, markets, competition, crises.

It is therefore theoretically wrong to delete an analysis of exchange, commodity production, crises, etc., in general and to “replace” it by an analysis of imperialism *as a whole*.

There is no such whole. There is a *transition* from competition to monopoly, and therefore the programme would be much more correct, and much more true to reality, if it retained the general analysis of exchange, commodity production, crises, etc., and had a characterisation of the *growing* monopolies added to it. In fact it is this combination of antagonistic principles, viz., competition and monopoly, that is the essence of imperialism, it is this that is making for the final crash, i.e., the socialist revolution.

Furthermore, in the case of Russia it would be wrong to present imperialism as a coherent whole (imperialism in general is an incoherent whole), since in Russia there are no few fields and branches of labour that are still in a state of transition from natural or semi-natural economy to capitalism. Backward and poor though they are, they nevertheless exist, and given the conditions, may introduce an element of delay in the collapse of capitalism.

The programme proceeds—as it should proceed—from the simplest phenomena of capitalism to the more complex and “higher” ones, from exchange to commodity production, to the ousting of small industries by the large ones, to crises and so forth, ending up in imperialism, that highest stage of capitalism, which is only now being reached in the advanced countries. That is how matters stand in actual reality. To begin by placing “exchange” in general in juxtaposition with the export of capital is incorrect historically and theoretically.

These are the comments I have to make on the remarks of the committee.

4

DRAFT OF REVISED PROGRAMME

THE OLD AND NEW TEXTS OF THE PROGRAMME

To make it easier and more convenient for the reader to compare the old and new texts of the programme, both texts are printed together in the following manner:

Those parts of the old programme which remain unchanged in the new one are given in ordinary type.

Those parts of the old programme which are to be completely deleted from the new one are given in italics.

Those parts of the new programme which were not in the old programme are given in bold type.

PROGRAMME OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY

The development of exchange has established such close ties between all the nations of the civilised world that the great movement of the proletariat towards emancipation was bound to become—and has long since become—international.

Russian Social-Democracy regards itself as a detachment of the world army of the proletariat, and is working towards the same ultimate goal as the Social-Democrats of all other countries. This ultimate goal is determined by the character of modern bourgeois society and by the trend of its development. The principal specific feature of this society is commodity production based on capitalist production relations, under which the most important and major part of the means of production and exchange of commodities belongs to a numerically small class of persons while the vast majority of the population is made up of proletarians and semi-

proletarians, who, owing to their economic position, are compelled permanently or periodically to sell their labour-power, i.e., to hire themselves out to the capitalists and to create by their labour the incomes of the upper classes of society.

The ascendancy of capitalist production relations extends its area more and more with the steady improvement of technology, which, by enhancing the economic importance of the large enterprises, tends to eliminate the small independent producers, converting some of them into proletarians and narrowing the role of others in the social and economic sphere, and in some places making them more or less completely, more or less obviously, more or less painfully dependent on capital.

Moreover, this technical progress enables the employers to make growing use of female and child labour in the process of production and exchange of commodities. And since, on the other hand, it causes a relative decrease in the employers' demand for human labour-power, the demand for labour-power necessarily lags behind its supply, as a result of which the dependence of wage-labour on capital is increased and exploitation of labour rises to a higher level.

This state of affairs in the bourgeois countries and the steadily growing competition among them in the world market make it more and more difficult for them to sell the goods which are produced in ever increasing quantities. Over-production, manifesting itself in more or less acute industrial crises followed by more or less protracted periods of industrial stagnation, is an inevitable consequence of the development of the productive forces in bourgeois society. Crises and periods of industrial stagnation, in their turn, still further ruin the small producers, still further increase the dependence of wage-labour on capital, and lead still more rapidly to the relative and sometimes to the absolute deterioration of the condition of the working class.

Thus, improvement in technology, signifying increased labour productivity and greater social wealth, becomes in bourgeois society the cause of greater social inequality, of widening gulfs between the rich and poor, of greater insecurity, unemployment, and various hardships of the mass of the working people.

However, in proportion as all these contradictions, which are inherent in bourgeois society, grow and develop, so also does the discontent of the toiling and exploited masses with the existing order of things grow; the numerical strength and solidarity of the proletarians increase and their struggle against their exploiters is sharpened. At the same time, by concentrating the means of production and exchange and socialising the process of labour in capitalist enterprises, the improvement in technology more and more rapidly creates the material possibility of capitalist production relations being superseded by socialist relations, i.e., the possibility of bringing about the social revolution, which is the ultimate aim of all the activities of international Social-Democracy as the conscious exponent of the class movement.

By introducing social in place of private ownership of the means of production and exchange, by introducing planned organisation of social production to ensure the well-being and many-sided development of all the members of society, the proletarian social revolution will do away with the division of society into classes and thereby emancipate the whole of oppressed humanity, for it will put an end to all forms of exploitation of one section of society by another.

A necessary condition for this social revolution is the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., the conquest by the proletariat of such political power as will enable it to suppress all resistance on the part of the exploiters. Aiming at making the proletariat capable of fulfilling its great historic mission, international Social-Democracy organises the proletariat in an independent political party opposed to all the bourgeois parties, guides all the manifestations of its class struggle, reveals to it the irreconcilable antagonism between the interests of the exploiters and those of the exploited, and explains to the proletariat the historical significance of and the necessary conditions for the impending social revolution. At the same time it reveals to all the other toiling and exploited masses the hopelessness of their position in capitalist society and the need for a social revolution if they are to free themselves from the yoke of capital. The Social-Democratic Party, the party of the working class, calls upon all sections of the toiling and exploited population to join its ranks insofar as they adopt the standpoint of the proletariat.

World capitalism has at the present time, i.e., about the beginning of the twentieth century, reached the stage of imperialism. Imperialism, or the epoch of finance capital, is a high stage of development of the capitalist economic system, one in which monopolist associations of capitalists—syndicates, cartels, and trusts—have assumed decisive importance; in which enormously concentrated banking capital has fused with industrial capital; in which the export of capital to foreign countries has assumed vast dimensions; in which the whole world has been divided up territorially among the richer countries, and the economic carve-up of the world among international trusts has begun.

Imperialist wars, i.e., wars for world domination, for markets for banking capital and for the subjugation of small and weaker nations, are inevitable under such a state of affairs. The first great imperialist war, the war of 1914-17, is precisely such a war.

The extremely high level of development which world capitalism in general has attained, the replacement of free competition by monopoly capitalism, the fact that the banks and the capitalist associations have prepared the machinery for the social regulation of the process of production and distribution of products, the rise in the cost of living and increased oppression of the working class by the syndicates due to the growth of capitalist monopolies, the tremendous obstacles standing in the way of the proletariat's economic and political struggle, the horrors, misery, ruin, and brutalisation caused by the imperialist war—all these factors transform the present stage of capitalist development into an era of proletarian socialist revolution.

That era has dawned.

Only a proletarian socialist revolution can lead humanity out of the impasse which imperialism and imperialist wars have created. Whatever difficulties the revolution may have to encounter, whatever possible temporary setbacks or waves of counter-revolution it may have to contend with, the final victory of the proletariat is inevitable.

Objective conditions make it the urgent task of the day to prepare the proletariat in every way for the conquest

of political power in order to carry out the economic and political measures which are the sum and substance of the socialist revolution.

The fulfilment of this task, which calls for the fullest trust, the closest fraternal ties, and direct unity of revolutionary action on the part of the working class in all the advanced countries, is impossible without an immediate break in principle with the bourgeois perversion of socialism, which has gained the upper hand among the leadership of the great majority of the official Social-Democratic parties. Such a perversion is, on the one hand, the social-chauvinist trend, socialism in word and chauvinism in deed, the defence of the predatory interests of "one's own" national bourgeoisie under the guise of "defence of the fatherland"; and, on the other hand, the equally wide international trend of the so-called "Centre", which stands for unity with the social-chauvinists and for the preservation or correction of the bankrupt Second International, and which vacillates between social-chauvinism and the internationalist revolutionary struggle of the proletariat for the achievement of a socialist system.

On the path to their ultimate common goal, which is conditioned by preponderance of the capitalist mode of production throughout the civilised world, the Social-Democrats of different countries are obliged to set themselves dissimilar immediate tasks, both because the capitalist system is not developed everywhere to the same degree, and because in different countries it develops in a different social and political setting.

In Russia, where capitalism has already become the prevailing mode of production, there are still numerous survivals of the old, pre-capitalist order, which was based on the enslavement of the working masses to the landowners, the state, or the head of the state.

While greatly hampering economic progress, these survivals also prevent the full development of the class struggle of the proletariat; they help to preserve and intensify the most barbarous forms of exploitation of the peasant millions by the state and the propertied classes and keep the people in a state of ignorance and subjection.

The most important of these relics of the past, and the most powerful bulwark of all this barbarism, is the tsarist autocracy. By its very nature it is hostile to every social movement and is bound to be the bitterest opponent of every aspiration towards freedom on the part of the proletariat.

In view of this, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party makes it its primary and immediate task to overthrow the tsarist autocracy and set up in its place a democratic republic whose constitution would guarantee the following:

In Russia at the present moment, when the Provisional Government, which is part and parcel of the capitalist class and enjoys the confidence—necessarily unstable—of the broad mass of the petty-bourgeois population, has undertaken to convene a Constituent Assembly, the immediate duty of the party of the proletariat is to fight for a political system which will best guarantee economic progress and the rights of the people in general, and make possible the least painful transition to socialism in particular.

The party of the proletariat cannot rest content with a bourgeois parliamentary democratic republic, which throughout the world preserves and strives to perpetuate the monarchist instruments for the oppression of the masses, namely, the police, the standing army, and the privileged bureaucracy.

The party fights for a more democratic workers' and peasants' republic, in which the police and the standing army will be abolished and replaced by the universally armed people, by a people's militia; all officials will be not only elective, but also subject to recall at any time upon the demand of a majority of the electors; all officials, without exception, will be paid at a rate not exceeding the average wage of a competent worker; parliamentary representative institutions will be gradually replaced by Soviets of people's representatives (from various classes and professions, or from various localities), functioning as both legislative and executive bodies.

The constitution of the Russian democratic republic must ensure:

1) The sovereignty of the people; supreme power in the state must be vested entirely in the people's representatives, who shall be elected by the people and be subject

to recall at any time, and who shall constitute a single popular assembly, a single chamber.

1) *The sovereignty of the people, i.e., the concentration of supreme state power entirely in the hands of a legislative assembly, consisting of the representatives of the people and constituting a single chamber.*

2) Universal, equal, and direct suffrage for all citizens, men and women, who have reached the age of twenty, in the elections to the legislative assembly and to the various bodies of local self-government; secret ballot; the right of every voter to be elected to any representative institution; biennial parliaments; salaries to be paid to the people's representatives; **proportional representation at all elections; all delegates and elected officials, without exception, to be subject to recall at any time upon the decision of a majority of their electors.**

3) Local self-government on a broad scale; regional self-government in localities where the composition of the population and living and social conditions are of a specific nature; **the abolition of all state-appointed local and regional authorities.**

4) Inviolability of person and domicile.

5) Unrestricted freedom of conscience, speech, the press, assembly, strikes, and association.

6) Freedom of movement and occupation.

7) Abolition of the social estates; equal rights for all citizens irrespective of sex, creed, race, or nationality.

8) The right of the population to receive instruction in their native tongue in schools to be established for the purpose at the expense of the state and local organs of self-government; the right of every citizen to use his native language at meetings; the native language to be used *on a level with the official language* in all local public and state institutions; **the obligatory official language to be abolished.**

9) *The right of self-determination for all member nations of the state.*

9) **The right of all member nations of the state to freely secede and form independent states. The republic of the Russian nation must attract other nations or nationalities not by force, but exclusively by voluntary agreement on the question of forming a common state. The unity and**

fraternal alliance of the workers, of all countries are incompatible with the use of force, direct or indirect, against other nationalities.

10) **The right of all persons to sue any official in the regular way before a jury.**

11) *Election of judges by the people.*

11) Judges and other officials, both civil and military, to be elected by the people with the right to recall any of them at any time by decision of a majority of their electors.

12) *Replacement of the standing army by the universally armed people.*

12) The police and standing army to be replaced by the universally armed people; workers and other employees to receive regular wages from the capitalists for the time devoted to public service in the people's militia.

13) **Separation of the church from the state, and schools from the church; schools to be absolutely secular.**

14) *Free and compulsory general and vocational education for all children of both sexes up to the age of sixteen; poor children to be provided with food, clothing, and school supplies at the expense of the state.*

14) Free and compulsory general and polytechnical education (familiarising the student with the theoretical and practical aspects of the most important fields of production) for all children of both sexes up to the age of sixteen; training of children to be closely integrated with socially productive work.

15) **All students to be provided with food, clothing, and school supplies at the cost of the state.**

16) Public education to be administered by democratically elected organs of local self-government; the central government not to be allowed to interfere with the arrangement of the school curriculum, or with the selection of the teaching staffs; teachers to be elected directly by the population with the right of the latter to remove undesirable teachers.

As a basic condition for the democratisation of our country's national economy, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party demands the abolition of all indirect taxes and the establishment of a progressive tax on incomes and inheritances.

The high level of development of capitalism already achieved in banking and in the trustified branches of industry, on the one hand, and the economic disruption caused by the imperialist war, everywhere evoking a demand for state and public control of the production and distribution of all staple products, on the other, induce the Party to demand the nationalisation of the banks, syndicates (trusts), etc.

To safeguard the working class from physical and moral deterioration, and develop its ability to carry on the struggle for emancipation, the Party demands:

1) An eight-hour working day for all wage-workers.

1) An eight-hour working day for all wage-workers, including a break of not less than one hour for meals where work is continuous. In dangerous and unhealthy industries the working day to be reduced to from four to six hours.

2) A statutory weekly uninterrupted rest period of not less than forty-two hours for all wage-workers of both sexes in all branches of the national economy.

3) Complete prohibition of overtime work.

4) Prohibition of night-work (from 9 p.m. to 6 a.m.) in all branches of the national economy except in cases where it is absolutely necessary for technical reasons endorsed by the labour organisations.

4) Prohibition of night-work (from 8 p.m. to 6 a.m.) in all branches of the national economy except in cases where it is absolutely necessary for technical reasons endorsed by the labour organisations—provided, however, that night-work does not exceed four hours.

5) Prohibition of the employment of children of school age (under sixteen) and restriction of the working day of adolescents (from sixteen to eighteen) to six hours.

5) Prohibition of the employment of children of school age (under sixteen), restriction of the working day of adolescents (from sixteen to twenty) to four hours, and prohibition of the employment of adolescents on night-work in unhealthy industries and mines.

6) Prohibition of female labour in all branches of industry injurious to women's health; women to be released from work for four weeks before and six weeks after child-birth without loss of pay.

6) Prohibition of female labour in all branches of industry injurious to women's health; prohibition of night work for women; women to be released from work eight weeks before and eight weeks after child-birth without loss of pay and with free medical and medicinal aid.

7) *Establishment of nurseries for infants and young children at all factories and other enterprises where women are employed; nursing mothers to be allowed recesses of at least half-hour duration at intervals of not more than three hours.*

7) Establishment of nurseries for infants and young children and rooms for nursing mothers at all factories and other enterprises where women are employed; nursing mothers to be allowed recesses of at least half-hour duration at intervals of not more than three hours; such mothers to receive nursing benefit and their working day to be reduced to six hours.

8) *State insurance for workers covering old age and total or partial disablement out of a special fund formed by a special tax on the capitalists.*

8) Full social insurance of workers:

a) for all forms of wage-labour;

b) for all forms of disablement, namely, sickness, injury, infirmity, old age, occupational disease, child-birth, widowhood, orphanhood, and also unemployment, etc.

c) all insurance institutions to be administered entirely by the insured themselves;

d) the cost of insurance to be borne by the capitalists;

e) free medical and medicinal aid under the control of self-governing sick benefit societies, the management bodies of which are to be elected by the workers.

9) *Payment of wages in kind to be prohibited; regular weekly pay-days to be fixed in all labour contracts without exception and wages to be paid in cash and during working hours.*

10) *Prohibition of deductions by employers from wages on any pretext or for any purpose whatsoever (fines, spoilage, etc.).*

11) *Appointment of an adequate number of factory inspectors in all branches of the national economy; factory inspection to be extended to all enterprises employing hired labour, including government enterprises (domestic service also to be liable to inspection); women inspectors to be appointed in industries where female labour is employed; representatives*

elected by the workers and paid by the state to supervise the enforcement of the factory laws, the fixing of rates and the passing or rejection of raw materials and finished products.

9) The establishment of a labour inspectorate elected by the workers' organisations and covering all enterprises employing hired labour, as well as domestic servants; women inspectors to be appointed in enterprises where female labour is employed.

12) Local self-governing bodies, assisted by representatives elected by the workers, to inspect sanitary conditions at dwellings assigned to workers by employers, as well as the internal regulations in force in such dwellings and the renting conditions, in order to protect wage-workers against interference by employers in their life and activities as private citizens.

13) The establishment of properly organised sanitary control over all enterprises employing hired labour, the whole system of medical aid and sanitary inspection to be entirely independent of the employers; free medical aid to the workers at the expense of the employers, with full pay during sickness.

14) Employers violating the labour protection laws to be liable to criminal prosecution.

10) Sanitary laws to be enacted for improving hygienic conditions and protecting the life and health of workers in all enterprises where hired labour is employed; questions of hygiene to be handled by the sanitary inspectorate elected by the workers' organisations.

11) Housing laws to be enacted and a housing inspectorate elected by the workers' organisations to be instituted for the purpose of sanitary inspection of dwelling houses. However, only by abolishing private property in land and building cheap and hygienic dwellings can the housing problem be solved.

12) Industrial courts to be established in all branches of the national economy.

15) Industrial courts to be established in all branches of the national economy, composed of equal numbers of representatives from the workers' and employers' organisations.

16) Employment bureaux (labour exchanges) to be established by the organs of local self-government in all industries for the hire of local and non-local workers; representatives of

the workers and employers to participate in their administration.

13) Labour exchanges to be established for the proper organisation of work-finding facilities. These labour exchanges must be proletarian class organisations (organised on a non-parity basis), and must be closely associated with the trade unions and other working-class organisations and financed by the communal self-governing bodies.

In order to do away with the relics of serfdom, which are a heavy yoke on the necks of the peasants, and to enable the class struggle to develop freely in the countryside, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party demands:

1) *The abolition of all personal and property restrictions imposed on the peasants by the existing system of social estates.*

2) *The abolition of all charges and duties involved in the social-estate status of the peasants, and the annulment of all debt obligations having the nature of a usurious contract.*

3) *The confiscation of church, monastery, and crown lands and their transfer (together with state lands) to the control of the higher organs of local self-government embracing urban and rural districts; resettlement lands and also forests and waters of national importance to be transferred to the democratic state.*

4) *The confiscation of privately-owned lands other than small holdings, and their transfer to the control of the higher, democratically elected organs of local self-government. The minimum size of a confiscatable land holding to be determined by the higher organs of local self-government.*

While supporting revolutionary action on the part of the peasantry, including confiscation of the landed estates, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party will always oppose any attempt to check the course of economic development. Though it stands for the transfer of confiscated lands to the democratic organs of local self-government in the event of a victorious development of the revolution, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party will, if circumstances prove unfavourable for such a transfer, declare itself in favour of dividing among the peasants those lands belonging to the landowners on which small-scale farming has been conducted or which are made up of complement farm lands.

1) Fights with all its strength for the immediate and complete confiscation of all landed estates in Russia (and also crown lands, church lands, etc.).

2) Stands for the immediate transfer of all land to the peasantry organised in Soviets of Peasants' Deputies or in other organs of local self-government elected on a truly democratic basis and completely independent of the landowners and bureaucrats.

3) Demands the nationalisation of all lands in the country; nationalisation implies that all property rights in land are vested in the state, while the right of disposal of the land is vested in the local democratic institutions.

4) Encourages the initiative of those peasant committees which, in various localities of Russia, are turning over the landowners' livestock and agricultural implements to the peasants organised in these committees for the purpose of their socially regulated utilisation in the cultivation of the land.

5) Advises the rural proletarians and semi-proletarians to strive towards turning every landed estate into a sufficiently large model farm, to be conducted on a communal basis by the local Soviet of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies under the direction of agricultural experts and with the aid of the best technical appliances.

Furthermore, the Party under all circumstances, and whatever the conditions of democratic agrarian reform may be, will unswervingly work for the independent class organisation of the rural proletariat, will explain to the latter the irreconcilable antagonisms that exist between it and the peasant bourgeoisie, will warn it against the false attraction of the system of petty farming, which, while commodity production exists, can never do away with the poverty of the masses, and, finally, will urge the need for a complete socialist revolution as the only means of abolishing poverty and exploitation.

In the endeavour to achieve its immediate aims, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party supports every oppositional and revolutionary movement directed against the existing social and political set-up in Russia, but at the same time emphatically rejects all reformist projects involving any

expansion or consolidation of the guardianship of the police and bureaucracy over the labouring masses.

For its part, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party is firmly convinced that the full, consistent, and firm realisation of all these political and social reforms can be achieved only by the overthrow of the autocracy and by the convocation of a Constituent Assembly freely elected by the entire people.

***FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS
OF PEASANTS' DEPUTIES***¹¹⁷

MAY 4-28 (MAY 17-JUNE 10), 1917

(1)

Проект реформы
по аграрному вопросу
представителем Н. Ленинским на Всероссийском
съезде крестьянских депутатов от имени с.-д.
фракции

1. Все помещичьи и государственных земли, а равно удельная, церковная и так далее, должны немедленно перейти к народу без всякого вознаграждения.

2. Крестьянство должно организовать через свои Съезды Крестьянских Депутатов, даря всю землю как и прежде немедленно для коллективного распоряжения его, независимо от предшествующей формы собственности земельных распределений Учреждениями Государства или Всероссийскими Съездами Съездов, если народ передаст централизованное управление землею в руки такого Съезда Съездов.

3. Земля должна принадлежать только народу; распоряжаться же землей должны

The first page
of Lenin's manuscript
"Draft Resolution
on the Agrarian Question".
May 1917

1

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION

1) All landed estates and privately-owned lands, as well as crown and church lands, etc., are to be turned over immediately to the people without any compensation.

2) The peasantry must in an organised manner, through their Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, immediately take over all the land in their localities for the purpose of its economic exploitation, without however in any way prejudicing thereby the final establishment of land regulations by the Constituent Assembly or by the All-Russia Council of Soviets, should the people decide to vest the central power of the state in such a Council of Soviets.

3) Private property in land must be abolished altogether, i.e., all the land shall belong only to the nation as a whole, and its disposal shall be placed in the hands of the local democratic institutions.

4) The peasants must reject the advice of the capitalists and landowners and their Provisional Government to come to "an agreement" with the local landowners on the immediate disposal of the land; the disposal of all the land must be governed by the organised decision of the majority of the local peasants, and not by an agreement between the majority, i.e., the peasants, and the minority, and an insignificant minority at that, i.e., the landowners.

5) Not only the landowners are fighting and will continue to fight as hard as they can against the transfer of all landed estates to the peasants without compensation, but also the capitalists, who wield great power both because of their money and because of their influence on the as yet unen-

lightened masses through the newspapers and the numerous officials, employees, etc., who are accustomed to the domination of capital. Hence, the transfer of all the landed estates to the peasantry without compensation cannot be carried through on a complete and secure basis unless the confidence of the peasant masses in the capitalists is destroyed, unless a close alliance is established between the peasantry and the urban workers, and unless state power is taken over completely by the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', and other Deputies. Only state power wielded by such Soviets and administering the state not through a police, or a bureaucracy, or a standing army isolated from the people, but through a nation-wide, universal and armed militia of the workers and peasants, can guarantee the realisation of the above-mentioned agrarian reforms, which are being demanded by the entire peasantry.

6) Agricultural labourers and poor peasants, i.e., those who, because of the lack of sufficient land, cattle, and implements, earn a living partly by working for hire, must strive their hardest to organise themselves independently into separate Soviets, or into separate groups within the general peasants' Soviets, in order to protect their interests against the rich peasants, who inevitably strive towards an alliance with the capitalists and landowners.

7) As a result of the war, Russia, like all other belligerent and many neutral (non-belligerent) countries, is facing an economic debacle, disaster and famine owing to the shortage of workers, coal, iron, etc. The only way to save the country is by the workers' and peasants' deputies assuming control and management of the entire production and distribution of goods. It is therefore necessary to proceed immediately to arrange agreements between Soviets of Peasants' Deputies and Soviets of Workers' Deputies on the exchange of grain and other rural products for implements, footwear, clothing, etc., without the medium of the capitalists, who must be removed from the management of the factories. With the same purpose in view, the peasant committees must be encouraged to take over the livestock and implements of the landowners, such livestock and implements to be used in common. Similarly, the conversion of all large landed estates into model farms must be encouraged, the

land to be cultivated collectively with the aid of the best implements under the direction of agricultural experts and in accordance with the decision of the local Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies.

Written before May 17 (30), 1917

First published in 1917
in the pamphlet
Material on the Agrarian Question,
Priboi Publishers

Published according
to the manuscript

2

SPEECH ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION
MAY 22 (JUNE 4), 1917

Comrades, the resolution that I am privileged to present to you in the name of the Social-Democratic group of the Peasants' Soviet has been printed and distributed to the delegates. If any delegates have not received it we shall have more copies printed tomorrow for distribution to all who wish to have them.

In a short report I can, of course, deal only with the main, basic questions, those that are of greatest interest to the peasantry and the working class. To those interested in the question in greater detail, I can recommend the resolution of our Party, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks), published as a Supplement to *Soldatskaya Pravda* No. 13, and repeatedly dealt with in our newspaper *Pravda*.* At the moment I shall have to confine myself to elucidating the more important points of my resolution and of our Party programme on the agrarian question that are most controversial or give rise to misunderstanding. One of the first of these moot points is that touched upon yesterday or the day before in the Chief Land Committee¹¹⁸ at the session you have probably heard about or read about in the newspapers of yesterday or the day before. That session of the Chief Land Committee was attended by a representative of our Party, Comrade Smilga, a colleague of mine on

* See pp. 290-93 of this volume.—*Ed.*

the Central Committee. He proposed to the session that the Chief Land Committee should express itself in favour of the immediate organised seizure by the peasants of the landed estates, but a number of violent objections were raised to Comrade Smilga's proposal. (*Voice*: "Here, too.") I am now told that a number of comrades here will also speak against that proposal. All the more reason for my clarifying that point in our programme, because I believe that most of the objections against our programme are based on a misunderstanding or misrepresentation of our views.

What do all our Party resolutions, all the articles in our newspaper *Pravda* say? We say that all the land, without exception, must become the property of the whole nation. We have come to this conclusion after having studied, in particular, the peasant movement of 1905 and the statements made by peasant deputies to the First and Second Dumas, where many peasant deputies from all over Russia were able to speak with relative—*relative*, of course—freedom.

All the land must be the property of the whole nation. From this it follows that in advocating the immediate transfer, without payment, of the landed estates to the local peasants we do not by any means advocate the seizure of those estates as private property, we do not by any means advocate the division of those estates. We believe the land should be taken by the local peasantry for one sowing in accordance with a decision adopted by the majority of local peasant deputies. We do not by any means advocate the transfer of this land as private property to those peasants who are now taking it for one sowing. All objections of this kind to our proposal that I am constantly hearing and reading in the columns of the capitalist newspapers are based on a sheer misinterpretation of our views. Since we have said—and I repeat: we have said that in all our resolutions—that the land must be the property of the whole nation and must be taken over by it without payment—it is obvious that arrangements for the final disposal of the land, the final establishment of land regulations must be made only by a central state power, that is, by a Constituent Assembly or an All-Russia Council of Soviets, should the masses of peasants and workers establish such state power as a Council

of Soviets. On this score there are no differences of opinion.

The differences begin after this, when we are told: "If that is so, then any immediate uncompensated transfer of the landed estates to the peasantry would be an unauthorised act." That is the view that was expressed most exactly, most authoritatively and most weightily by Minister of Agriculture Shingaryov in his well-known telegram; we consider this view to be fallacious, unfair, most prejudicial to the peasantry, prejudicial to the farmers, and the least likely to ensure the country a supply of grain. Allow me to read that telegram to show you what we mostly object to.

"An independent solution of the land question in the absence of a general state law is inadmissible. Arbitrary action will lead to a national calamity . . . the lawful solution of the land question is the business of the Constituent Assembly. At the present time agricultural conciliation chambers have been set up by the tillers of the land and the landowners in each local area under the rural supply committees."

This is the chief passage from the government's statement on this question. If you acquaint yourselves with the resolution of the Chief Land Committee on this question adopted yesterday or the day before, and the resolution adopted, also the other day, at a private meeting of Duma deputies, you will see that the two resolutions proceed from the same viewpoint. The peasants who want land handed over immediately to the peasants without payment and distributed by local peasant committees are accused of unauthorised acts on the assumption that only a voluntary agreement between peasants and landowners, between the tillers and the owners of the land, would be in accordance with the needs and interests of the state. That is what we deny, that is what we dispute.

Let us examine the objections raised to our proposal. The usual objections are that the land in Russia is distributed very unevenly, both between individual small units such as villages and volosts and between the bigger units such as gubernias and regions. It is said that if the local population were to take over the land by a majority decision against the will of the landowners and without payment at that, the unevenness would remain and there would even be a danger of it becoming perpetuated. We say in reply that this argu-

ment is based on a misunderstanding. The uneven distribution will remain in any case until the Constituent Assembly or some other central state power finally establishes a new system. Until such a system is established the uneven distribution will remain whether the question is settled in the peasant's or in the landowner's way, whether in our way, with the immediate transfer of the land to the peasants, or in the way of the landowners, who are prepared to lease their land out at a high rent provided the tenant farmer and the landowner each retains his own rights. This objection is obviously incorrect and unjust. We say that a central state power must be established as quickly as possible, one that not only relies on the will and the decision of the peasant majority, but also directly expresses the opinion of that majority. There are no differences on this score. When we hear objections to the Bolsheviki, attacks levelled against us in the capitalist newspapers accusing us of being anarchists, we repudiate such accusations most emphatically and regard them as an attempt to spread malicious lies and slander.

Anarchists are those who deny the need for a state power, whereas we say that a state power is absolutely necessary, not only for Russia today but for any state, even one that goes over directly to socialism. Without doubt the firmest possible authority is necessary. All we want is for that power to be wholly and exclusively in the hands of the majority of workers', soldiers', and peasants' deputies. That is where we differ from other parties. By no means do we deny the need for a firm state power; we only say that all landed estates must pass into the hands of the peasants without payment, in accordance with a decision of the local peasant committee adopted by the majority, and on the condition that no damage is done to property. This is stated most explicitly in our resolution. We emphatically reject any allegation that our view implies an arbitrary act.

In our opinion, on the contrary, if the landowners keep back the land for their own use or charge money for it, that is an arbitrary act, but if the majority of peasants say that the landed estates must not remain in the hands of their owners, and that the peasantry has known nothing but oppression by those landowners for decades, for centuries, that is not

arbitrary, that is the *restitution of justice*, and we cannot put off that restitution. If the land is transferred to the peasants immediately the unevenness among the regions cannot be eliminated, that is indisputable; but nobody can eliminate that unevenness until the Constituent Assembly meets. If you were to ask Shingaryov today—that same Shingaryov who raises objections to us and reviles the champions of our views in official papers for “arbitrary action”—if you were to ask him what he proposes to do about that unevenness, he would be unable to answer you. He does not and cannot propose anything.

He speaks about “voluntary agreement between peasants and landowners”. What does that mean? I will cite two basic figures on landownership in European Russia. These figures show that at one end of the Russian village there are the most wealthy landowners, among them the Romanovs, the richest and the worst of landowners, and at the other end are the extremely poor peasants. I am citing two figures to show you the significance of the sermon preached by Shingaryov and all landowners and capitalists. These are the two figures: if we take the richest landowners of European Russia, we shall see that the biggest of them, numbering less than 30,000, own about 70,000,000 dessiatines of land. That works out at over 2,000 dessiatines each. If you take the upper crust of rich Russian landowners, irrespective of what social estate they belong to (most of them are nobles, but there are other landowners as well), you find that there are 30,000 of them and they own 70,000,000 dessiatines! And if you take the poor peasants according to the same 1905 Census, which is the latest available information gathered uniformly throughout Russia—information, which, like all statistics gathered in tsarist times by tsarist civil servants, is none too trustworthy, although it does give some approximation of the truth, some data can be compared—if you take the poor peasantry you get 10,000,000 households owning from 70,000,000 to 75,000,000 dessiatines of land. This means that one person has over 2,000 dessiatines and the other seven and a half-dessiatines per household! And they say the peasants are guilty of arbitrary acts if they do not enter into a voluntary agreement. What is meant by “voluntary agreement”? It means that the landowners may perhaps let

you have land for a good rent but will not give it up to anybody without payment. Is that just? Of course it is not. Is that profitable to the peasant population? Of course it is not. The form in which landed property will ultimately be established is for the future central state authority to decide, but at the present time the landed estates must be immediately transferred to the peasantry without compensation, provided the seizure is organised. Minister Chernov, opposing my colleague Smilga in the Chief Land Committee, said that the two words "organised seizure" are a contradiction in terms; if it's a seizure, then it is unorganised, and if it's organised, then it is not a seizure. I do not think this criticism is correct. I think that if the peasantry make a majority decision in any village or volost, any uyezd or gubernia—in some gubernias, if not all, the peasant congresses have set up local authorities representing the interests and will of the majority, the will of the population, i.e., of the majority of the tillers of the soil—once these authorities are set up in the localities the decision they make will be the decision of authorities recognised by the peasants. The local peasantry are certain to respect these authorities, for there is no doubt that these freely elected authorities will decide that the landed estates must immediately pass into the hands of the peasants. Let the peasant know that he is taking the estate of the landowner, and if he pays anything, let him pay it into a local peasant fund, and let him know that the money will go towards farm improvements, paving and road building, etc. Let him know that the land he is taking is not his land, *nor is it the landowner's*, but the common property of the people, which the Constituent Assembly will, in the end, dispose of. For this reason the landowners must have no right to the land from the very beginning of the revolution, from the moment the first land committee was set up, and no payment should be required for it.

The basic difference between ourselves and our opponents is in our respective understanding of what order is and what law is. Up to now law and order have been regarded as things that suited the landowners and bureaucrats, but we maintain that law and order are things that suit the majority of the peasantry. Until there is an All-Russia Council of Soviets,

until there is a Constituent Assembly, local authority—uyezd and gubernia committees—constitutes the supreme law and order! We call it lawlessness when one landowner, on the basis of ancient rights, demands a “voluntary” agreement with three hundred peasant families who have an average of seven and a half dessiatines of land each! We say: “Let a decision be taken by the majority; we want the peasants to obtain the landed estates now, without losing a single month, a single week or even a single day.”

We are told: “If the peasants seize the land now, it is the richer peasants who will get it, those who have animals, implements, etc.; would this, therefore, not be dangerous from the point of view of the poor peasants?” Comrades, I must dwell on this argument, because our Party, in all our decisions, programmes and appeals to the people, declares: “We are the party of wage-workers and poor peasants; it is their interests we are out to protect; it is through them, and through them alone, through those classes, that mankind can escape the horrors into which the capitalists’ war has plunged it.”

To objections like these, claiming that our decisions are contrary to the interests of the poor peasants, we pay careful attention and invite a most careful study of them because they touch the very heart of the matter, the very root of the problem. And the heart of the matter is this: how can the interests of the wage-workers, both urban and rural, and the interests of the poor peasants be protected in the revolution, in the transformation of the political system, that is now taking place in Russia, how can and should their interests be protected against those of the landowners or rich peasants who are also capitalists? That, of course, is the crux of the matter, the nub of the whole problem. But we are told that if we advise the peasants to seize the land immediately, it is those who have implements and animals who will mostly do the seizing and the poor will be left out of the picture. And now I ask you—will a voluntary agreement with the landowners help?

You know very well that the landowners are not anxious to rent out land to those peasants who have not got a kopek in their pockets, but, on the contrary, resort to “voluntary” agreements where they are promised substantial payment.

Up to now the landowners do not seem to have been giving their land away for nothing—at least nobody in Russia ever noticed it.

To speak of voluntary agreements with the landowners means greatly increasing and consolidating the privileged, preferential position and the advantages enjoyed by the rich peasant, because the rich peasant can certainly pay the landowner and every landowner regards him as a person who is good for his money. The landowner knows that the rich peasant can pay and that he can be sued for the money, so that the rich peasant has more to gain by such “voluntary” deals with the landowners than the poor peasant. If there is any possibility of helping the poor peasant straight away, it is by a measure such as I propose—the land must go to the peasants immediately and without payment.

Landed estates always have been and will be a flagrant injustice. The free tenure of that land by the peasants, if the tenure is in accordance with the will of the majority, will not be an arbitrary act but a restitution of justice. That is our point of view, and that is why we consider the argument that the poor peasantry would lose by it to be a great injustice. The agreement is called “voluntary”—only Shingaryov could call it that—when one landowner has 2,000 dessiatines and 300 peasants have an average of seven and a half per family. To call such an agreement voluntary is sheer mockery of the peasants. For the peasant it is not a voluntary agreement, but a compulsory one, and will be such until every volost, gubernia or uyezd peasant Soviet or the All-Russia Council of Soviets declares that the landed estates are a gross injustice and that they must be abolished without losing a single hour, a single minute.

The land must be the property of the entire people, and must be declared such by a central state power. Until that power is established, the local authorities, I again repeat, should take over the landed estates and should do so in an organised manner according to the will of the majority. It is not true, as the newspapers assert, that disorder reigns in Russia! It isn't true—there is greater order in the countryside than ever before, because majority decisions are being

made; there have been scarcely any acts of violence against the landowners; unfair treatment of the landowners has occurred only in isolated cases; they are insignificant and in Russia as a whole are not more in number than those which formerly occurred.

Now I want to mention another argument that I have heard and had occasion to deal with in our newspaper *Pravda* in connection with the immediate transfer of the land to the peasantry.*

The argument is this: if we advise the peasants to take over the landed estates immediately and without payment, this will cause discontent, annoyance and anxiety and perhaps even indignation among the soldiers at the front who may say, "If the peasants take the land now and we have to stay at the front, we shall be left without land." Perhaps the soldiers would all leave the front and chaos and anarchy would result. But in answer to this we say that this objection has nothing to do with the real issue; whether the land is taken for payment, by agreement with the landowners, or by a decision of the majority of the peasantry, in either case the soldiers will remain at the front and will certainly remain there as long as the war lasts and will not be able to return to their villages. Why should the soldiers at the front not be anxious about the landowners imposing unfavourable terms in the form of a voluntary agreement, why should they be anxious about the peasants making a majority decision against the landowners? It is incomprehensible! Why should the soldier at the front place his trust in the landowner, in a "voluntary" agreement with the landowner? I can understand the political parties of the landowners and capitalists talking like this, but I do not believe that the Russian soldier at the front sees it that way. If there is a "voluntary" agreement with the landowner, the soldier will not call it good order, will not place his trust in it, he is more likely to see in it a continuation of the old disorder that existed under the landowners.

If the soldier is told that the land is being taken over by the people, that the local peasants are renting land and

* See pp. 449-53 of this volume.—*Ed.*

paying rent, not to the landowner but to their own committee for the common good, for those very soldiers at the front, and not for the landowner, he is more likely to have faith in this. If this is a majority decision, the soldier at the front will know that there cannot be any "voluntary" agreements with landowners, that the landowners are also citizens with equal rights whom nobody wishes to wrong; the land belongs to the entire nation, consequently it belongs also to the landowner, not as a privilege of the nobility, but in the same way as it belongs to any other citizen. From the day the power of the tsar was overthrown—a tsar who was the biggest landowner and oppressor of the masses—there must be no privileges for the landowners. With the establishment of liberty, the power of the landowners must be considered overthrown once and for all. The soldier at the front does not stand to lose anything from this point of view; on the contrary, he will have much greater faith in the state authorities, he will not worry about his household or about his family being treated unjustly or being neglected.

There remains one other objection that has been raised to our proposal. This argument is that if the peasants were to seize the landed estates immediately, such immediate, poorly prepared seizure might lead to a deterioration in the tilling and sowing of the land. I must say that a government of the majority, a central state power, has not yet been established, the peasants have not yet acquired sufficient confidence in themselves and have not lost their trust in the landowners and capitalists; I believe that we are drawing closer to this day by day, that the peasantry are day by day losing their confidence in the old state power and realising that only the peasants', soldiers', workers' and other elected deputies and nobody else can constitute the government in Russia; I believe that every passing day brings us closer to this, not because any political party has advised it—millions of people will never listen to the advice of parties if that advice does not fall in with their own experience. We are rapidly approaching the time when there will be no other state power in Russia except the power of the representatives of the peasants and workers. When I am told that the immediate seizure of the land is likely to lead to

its being poorly cultivated, that the sowing will be poor, I must say that our peasants cultivate the land very poorly because of their downtrodden condition, because of centuries of oppression by the landowners. There is, of course, a fearful crisis in Russia, a crisis that has hit her as it has other belligerent countries, and Russia can only weather it by better cultivation of the land and the greatest economy of manpower. But today, at the time of the first sowing of crops, can anything be changed by "voluntary" agreements with the landowners? Are we to understand that the landowners will better look after the cultivation of the soil, that the peasants will sow worse if they know they are sowing land which is the property of the whole people and not of the landowner? If they pay rent into their own peasant funds and not to the landowner? This is such nonsense that I am astonished to hear such arguments; it is absolutely unbelievable and is nothing but a ruse on the part of the landowners.

The landowners realise that they can no longer rule by means of the big stick; they realise that very well, and are adopting a form of rule that is new to Russia but which has existed for a long time in Western Europe, in the West-European countries. Two revolutions in Russia have shown that the rule of the stick is no longer possible, and in the West-European countries dozens of revolutions have demonstrated it. Those revolutions have taught the landowners and capitalists a lesson; they have taught them that they have to rule the people by deception, by flattery; that they have to adapt themselves, wear a red badge on their jackets, and, sharks though they are, declare: "We are revolutionary democrats, please wait a bit and we'll do everything for you." The argument that the peasants will make a worse job of the sowing now if they sow land which no longer belongs to the landowners but is national property, is simply making fun of the peasants, it is an attempt to maintain rule over them by means of deception.

I repeat—there must be no landed proprietorship at all; tenure is not proprietorship, tenure is a temporary measure and it changes from year to year. The peasant who rents a plot of land does not dare regard the land as his own. The land is not his nor the landowner's, it belongs to the people.

I repeat that this cannot make the sowing of crops this year, this spring, any worse. That assumption is so monstrous and improbable that there is only one thing for me to say—beware of the landowners, do not trust them, do not be taken in by fair words and promises. It must be remembered that a decision made by a majority of peasants, who are careful enough in making decisions, is a lawful decision of state significance. In this respect the peasants are to be relied upon. I have, for example, a decision passed by Penza peasants which is worded throughout with extraordinary caution; the peasants are not planning any immediate changes for the whole of Russia, but they do not want to place themselves in intolerable bondage, and in this they are right. The greatest bondage was that of the peasant to the landowner, and such it remains, bondage to the landowners and oppressors. The abolition of that bondage, therefore, must not be put off for a single week, even a single hour; but every seizure must be an organised seizure, not to make property of the seized land, not to divide it up, but to use it in common, as the property of the whole people.

I could finish with this question of the seizure of land by answering that the objections against our proposal are based on deception when they come from the landowners and capitalists, and on misunderstanding, on a too credulous belief in what the landowners and capitalists say untruthfully against us when they come from those who are neither landowners nor capitalists but people who have the interests of the working people at heart. If you examine our arguments you will see that the just demand that the landed estates be abolished immediately and similarly that property in land belong to the people cannot be put into effect until a central government is established, but what we do advise, and urge most insistently, is that the peasants themselves, right on the spot, in the localities, take over the land so as to avoid any breach of good order. We offer this advice in our resolutions, but perhaps it is superfluous, since the peasants are doing this without our advice.

I shall pass to the second question, the one to which the greatest attention should be drawn, the question of what we think should be done with the land in the best interests of the masses when it becomes the property of the whole people,

when private property is abolished. That time is close at hand in Russia. In fact, the landowners' power, if not destroyed, has been undermined. When all the peasants are in possession of the land, when there are no landowners, how are we to distribute the land? It seems to me that we must have some sort of common, basic view on this question, because, obviously, local arrangements will always be made by the peasantry. It cannot be otherwise in a democratic state; this is so obvious that there is no need even to talk about it. But in answer to the question of what must be done to secure the land for the working people, we say: "We want to protect the interests of the wage-workers and poor peasants." Our Russian Social-Democratic Party of Bolsheviks regards this as its duty. We ask ourselves: If we say that the land will belong to the nation is that the same as saying the land will belong to the working people? Our answer is: No, it is not the same thing! By saying that the land will belong to the nation, we mean that landed property will be abolished; we mean that all the land will belong to the whole people; we mean that anyone who uses land will rent it from the nation. If such an arrangement is made no differences in land tenure will remain, all the land will be alike, and, as the peasants often say, "All the old bounds and barriers will fall away, the land will be unfenced—there will be free soil, and free labour."

Does that mean that the land will be handed over to all working people? No, it does not. Free labour on free soil means that all the old forms of land tenure will be abolished and there will be no other form of ownership than national ownership; everyone rents land from the state; there is a single state authority, that of all the workers and peasants; a peasant can rent land from it as a leaseholder; between the peasant and the state there are no middlemen; the terms on which land is rented are equal for all; that is free labour on free soil.

Does that mean that the land will be handed over to all the working people? No, it does not. You cannot eat land, and to farm it you need implements, animals, equipment, and money; without money, without implements, you cannot farm. And so, when you set up a system of free labour on free soil, there will be no landed estates, no categories on

the land.¹¹⁹ There will be only land which is national property and free tenants renting land from the state. When you set up this system it will not mean the transfer of the land to all the working people, it will merely mean that every farmer will freely dispose of his land; anybody who wants land will be free to rent it from the state. That will be a big step forward compared with the Russia of the tsars and landowners. It will be a big step forward because Russia of the tsars and landowners was a country in which 70,000,000 dessiatines were given over to 30,000 Markovs, Romanovs and other such landowners; it will be a Russia in which there will be free labour on free soil. This has already been done in many places. Already now Russia is ahead of the Russia of the tsars and landowners, but this is not a transfer of land to the working people, it is the transfer of land to the farmer, because if the land belongs to the state, and those people take it who want to farm it, that is not enough; it is not enough to want to farm, the ability to farm is also needed, and even ability is not enough. Any farm labourer or day-labourer has that ability, but he does not have sufficient animals, implements, and capital, so that no matter how many decisions are taken, no matter how much we talk about it, we shall not establish free labour on free soil in that way. Even if we were to hang up notices about free soil in every volost administration, it would not improve matters as far as the working people are concerned, any more than the prisons in West-European republics would cease to be prisons because they had the words "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" inscribed on them. If the words "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" are written on a factory, as in America, the factory does not thereby cease to be a hell for the workers and a paradise for the capitalists.

And so we have to think of what to do further, how to ensure that there should not be merely free labour—that is a step forward, but it is still not a step towards protecting the interests of the working people; it is a step towards liberation from the landowner sharks, from exploitation by the landowners, liberation from the Markovs, from the police, etc., but it is not a step towards protecting the interests of the working people, because the poor, propertyless peasant cannot do anything with the land without animals,

implements, and capital. That is why I am very sceptical about the two so-called norms or standards of land tenure, the labour standard and the subsistence standard. I know that arguments about these two norms and explanations of them are always to be met with in the Narodnik parties. I know that those parties hold the view that these two norms, these two standards, must be established—the labour standard is the largest amount of land a family can till; the subsistence standard is one just sufficient to feed the family, less would mean hunger. I have said that I am very sceptical about this question of standards or norms and I believe it is a bureaucrat's plan that will not do any good; it can't be put into practice even if it were decided upon here. That is the crux of the whole matter! That plan cannot relieve the position of the hired labourers and poor peasants to any appreciable extent, and even if you accept it, it will remain on paper so long as capitalism dominates. That plan does not help us find the true road for the transition from capitalism to socialism.

When people speak of these two norms, these two standards, they imagine that only two things exist—the land and the citizen, as if there had never been anything else in the world. If that were so, the plan would be a good one. But that is not so—there exists the power of capital, the power of money; without money there cannot be any farming on the freest land, no matter what “standards” of it you have, because as long as money remains wage-labour will remain. And this means that the rich peasants—and there are no less than a million families of them in Russia—are oppressing and exploiting hired labourers, and will continue to oppress them on the “free” soil. Those rich peasants constantly, not by way of exception but as a general rule, resort to the hiring of workers by the year, by the season and by the day, that is, they resort to the exploitation of the poor peasants, the proletarians. Alongside this you have millions and millions of peasants who have no horses and cannot exist without selling their labour-power, without doing seasonal work for somebody else, etc. As long as the power of money, the power of capital, remains, no matter what “standards” of land tenure you establish they will at best be useless in practice because they do not take into consideration the chief factor—

that property in implements, animals, and money is distributed unevenly; they do not take into consideration the existence of the hired labour that is exploited. That is a basic fact in the present-day life of Russia, and there is no getting away from it; but if we establish any kind of "standards", life will bypass them and they will remain on paper. To protect the interests of the propertyless, poor peasants in this great transformation of Russia in which you are now engaged and which you will undoubtedly carry through, when private property in land will be abolished and a step forward will have been made towards the better, socialist future; to protect the interests of the workers and poor peasants in this great work of transformation that you are only just beginning, which will go a long way forward and which, it may be said without exaggeration, will undoubtedly be brought to completion in Russia because there is no power that can stop it, we must not take the road of establishing norms or standards, but must find some other way.

I and my Party comrades, in whose name I have the honour to speak, know of only two ways of protecting the interests of agricultural labourers and poor peasants, and we recommend these two ways to the Peasants' Soviet for its attention.

The first way is to organise the agricultural labourers and poor peasants. We should like, and we advise it, to have in each peasant committee, in each volost, uyezd and gubernia, a separate group of agricultural labourers and poor peasants who will have to ask themselves: "If the land becomes the property of the whole people tomorrow—and it certainly will, because the people want it to—then where do we come in? Where shall we, who have no animals or implements, get them from? How are we to farm the land? How must we protect our interests? How are we to make sure that the land, which will belong to the whole people, which will really be the property of the nation, should not fall *only* into the hands of *proprietors*? If it falls into the hands of those who own enough animals and implements, shall we gain anything by it? Is that what we made this great revolution for? Is that what we wanted?"

The "people" will have the land, but that is *not enough* to protect the interests of agricultural labourers. It is not

a matter of us here, from above, or the peasant committee, establishing a "standard" of land to be held by individuals. Such measures will not help as long as capital is dominant, and they will not offer deliverance from the domination of capitalism. There is only one way to escape the yoke of capitalism and ensure that the people's land goes to the *working people*, and that is by organising the agricultural labourers, who will be guided by their experience, their observations and their distrust of what the village sharks tell them, even though these sharks wear red rosettes in their buttonholes and call themselves "revolutionary democrats".

The poor peasants can only be taught by independent organisation in the localities, they can only learn from their own experience. That experience will not be easy, we cannot and do not promise them a land flowing with milk and honey. The landowners will be thrown out because the people wish it, but *capitalism* will remain. It is much more difficult to do away with capitalism, and the road to its overthrow is a different one. It is the road of independent, separate organisation of the agricultural labourers and the poor peasants. And that is what our Party proposes in the first instance.

Only this road promises a gradual, difficult, but real and certain transfer of the land to the working people.

The second step which our Party recommends is that every big economy, for example, every big landed estate, of which there are 30,000 in Russia, should be organised as soon as possible into a model farm for the *common* cultivation of the land jointly by agricultural labourers and scientifically trained agronomists, using the animals, implements, etc., of the landowner for that purpose. Without this *common* cultivation under the direction of the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers the land will not go entirely to the *working people*. To be sure, joint cultivation is a difficult business and it would be madness of course for anybody to imagine that joint cultivation of the land can be decreed from above and imposed on people, because the centuries-old habit of farming on one's own cannot suddenly disappear, and because money will be needed for it and adaptation to the new mode of life. If this advice, this view, on the common cultivation

of the land with commonly owned animals and implements to be used to the best purpose jointly with agronomists—if this advice—were the invention of individual political parties, the case would be a bad one, because changes are not made in the life of a people on the advice of a party, because tens of millions of people do not make a revolution on the advice of a party, and such a change would be much more of a revolution than the overthrow of the weak-minded Nicholas Romanov. I repeat, tens of millions of people will not make a revolution to order, but will do so when driven to it by dire need, when their position is an impossible one, when the joint pressure and determination of tens of millions of people break down the old barriers and are actually capable of creating a new way of life. When we advise such a measure, and advise caution in the handling of it, saying that it is becoming necessary, we are not drawing that conclusion from our programme, from our socialist doctrine alone, but because we, as socialists, have come to this conclusion by studying the life of the West-European nations. We know that there have been many revolutions over there and that they have established democratic republics; we know that in America in 1865 the slave-owners were defeated and hundreds of millions of dessiatines of land were distributed among the peasantry for nothing or next to nothing, and nevertheless capitalism dominates there more than anywhere else and oppresses the mass of the working people as badly as, if not worse than, in other countries. This is the socialist teaching, this is our study of other nations that firmly convinces us that without the common cultivation of the land by agricultural labourers using the best machinery and guided by scientifically trained agronomists there is no escape from the yoke of capitalism. But if we were to be guided only by the experience of the West-European countries it would be very bad for Russia, because the Russian people in the mass are only capable of taking a serious step along that new path when the direst need arises. And we say to you: the time has now come when that dire need for the entire Russian people is knocking at the door. The dire need I speak of is precisely this—we cannot continue farming in the old way. If we continue as before on our small isolated farms, albeit as free citizens on free soil, we are still faced with imminent

ruin, for the debacle is drawing nearer day by day, hour by hour. Everyone is talking about it; it is a grim fact, due not to the malice of individuals but to the world war of conquest, to capitalism.

The war has exterminated millions of people, has drenched the world in blood, brought it to the brink of disaster. This is no exaggeration, nobody can vouch for what will happen tomorrow; everyone is talking about it. Take the newspaper *Izvestia* of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies—everybody there is saying that the capitalists are resorting to slow-down tactics and lockouts. That means there is no work and the capitalists are laying off large numbers of workers. That is what this criminal war has brought all countries to, and not Russia alone.

That is why we say that farming on individual plots, even if it is "free labour on free soil", is no way out of the dreadful crisis, it offers no deliverance from the general ruin. A *universal labour service* is necessary, the greatest economy of manpower is necessary, an exceptionally strong and firm authority is necessary, an authority capable of effecting that universal labour service; it cannot be done by officials, it can be done only by the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies, because they are the people, they are the masses, because they are not a government of officials, because they, knowing the life of the peasant from top to bottom, can organise labour conscription, can organise that protection of human labour that would not permit the squandering of the peasant's labour, and the transition to common cultivation would, under these circumstances, be carried out gradually and with circumspection. It is a difficult business, but it is necessary to go over to common cultivation on big model farms; if that is not done it will be impossible for Russia to find a way out of the debacle, out of the truly desperate situation in which she finds herself, and it would be the greatest mistake to think that such a gigantic transformation in the life of the people can be made at a single stroke. That cannot be done, it requires the greatest labour effort, it requires concentration, determination and energy on the part of each peasant and worker at his own place, at his own particular job, which he knows and has been working at for years. It is not a thing that can

be done by any sort of decree, but it is a thing that must be done, because this war of conquest has brought all mankind to the brink of destruction; tens of millions of lives have been lost, and still more will be lost in this terrible war unless we strain our efforts, unless all organisations of the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies take joint and determined action towards the common cultivation of the soil without the capitalists and without the landowners. That path is the only one that will lead to the real transfer of the land to the working people.

Published May 25, 1917
in *Izvestia* of the All-Russia Soviet
of Peasants' Deputies No. 14;
and in December 1917 in the
pamphlet *Material on the Agrarian
Question*, Priboi Publishers

Published according
to the text of the pamphlet
verified with the newspaper text

PARTIES IN THE PETROGRAD DISTRICT COUNCIL ELECTIONS

The lists of candidates for members of the district councils have been published (in a free supplement to *Vedomosti Obshchestvennovo Gradonachalstva* for May 17¹²⁰). Unfortunately, information is given only for ten districts. Nevertheless, we have a very clear and striking picture of *party alignments*, a picture that deserves close study on account of its electioneering value and the light it throws on the *class ties* of the different parties.

Partisanship, as we know, is both a condition for and index of political development. The more politically developed and enlightened the given population or given class is, the higher, as a general rule, is its party organisation. This rule is borne out by the experience of all civilised countries. From the point of view of the class struggle that is obviously how it should be. Non-partisanship or insufficient party crystallisation and party organisation implies at best class instability (at worst, this deficiency signifies deception of the masses by political charlatans—a thing that is only too well known in parliamentary countries).

What, then, do the published lists of candidates in Petrograd reveal to us in the matter of party alignments?

Altogether 71 lists have been put forward in 10 districts. The first thing we notice is that they fall into *five* major groups.

1. The R.S.D.L.P.—the *Bolsheviks*. Lists have been put forward in all 10 districts. Our Party has formed a bloc with two other groups—the Inter-District group and the internationalist Mensheviks. This bloc is strictly based on principles and is openly proclaimed in resolutions passed by our

Party's Petrograd and All-Russia conferences.* The fundamental issue in contemporary political life both in Russia and the rest of the world is that of the struggle of proletarian internationalism against the chauvinism (or "defencism") of the big and petty bourgeoisie. Our Party has publicly declared its determination to work for closer relations and unity among all internationalists (see the resolution of the All-Russia Conference on uniting the internationalists against the petty-bourgeois defencist bloc).

The party of the proletariat has taken a clear, open and honest stand on the issues involved in the elections.

2. A no less clear class physiognomy is shown by the party of "people's freedom", namely, the Cadets, actually the party of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. They, too, have put forward 10 party lists in all 10 districts. As we know, *all* the parties of the landowners and capitalists are now *supporting* the Cadets, but for the time being they do so *on the quiet*.

3. Third as regards clearly defined party alignment comes the new-fledged Radical-Democratic Party, which has put forward its lists in only 6 out of the 10 districts. This unknown party is obviously another capitalist party which hopes to "pull" the votes of the men in the street by non-committal promises—something in the nature of Cadets in disguise.

4. Fourth comes a group that has put up 17 lists in 9 districts—a motley assortment of Narodniks (Trudoviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries, and Popular Socialists) and Mensheviks with the addition of the notorious *Yedinstvo* group in varied combinations.¹²¹

A regular petty-bourgeois hodge-podge and petty-bourgeois lack of principles! *Not one* of these groups and parties has dared to come out in advance with an open statement of principles in support of their decision to work for closer relations and unity. They have been swept along by events, and are trailing after the chauvinists. They have all fallen into the same mire and are floundering in it like the true philistines they are. They are trying to worm themselves into each district in every way they can. If it can't be done by hook it will have to be done by crook—that is their motto.

* See pp. 159-60 and 294 of this volume.—*Ed.*

If they are all of one mind on defencism or on supporting the coalition cabinet, then why don't they join forces to fight the elections in a united, open, political bloc recognising a set of definite principles?

The whole trouble is that the petty bourgeoisie, that is to say, the Narodniks and Mensheviks, lack principles and the spirit of party. They are all defencists and ministerialists. Yet they do not trust one another. In one district the Socialist-Revolutionaries run independently, in another they make common cause with the Popular Socialists and the Trudoviks (with people who approve of compensation for the landowners! With parties whom the S.R.s Vikhlayev, Chernov and Co. in 1906-07 *openly* accused of worshipping at the shrine of *proprietary* instincts!). More often than not they make common cause with the Mensheviks, sometimes with *Yedinstvo*, that very same *Yedinstvo* of which *Dyelo Naroda* writes in either a hostile or contemptuous tone.

Never mind! The man in the street will swallow anything! The petty bourgeois does not bother his head about partyism or principles. In the newspaper "we" are against *Yedinstvo*, but in order to get into the District Councils "we" are for it....

Exactly like the Mensheviks. They too, in their paper, are against *Yedinstvo*, and at their All-Russia conference¹²² they greeted the notorious Deutsch with shouts of disapproval—a fact of which *Yedinstvo* complained openly. Never mind, the man in the street has a short memory. We shall act in the man-in-the-street way! "In principle" we are against the Deutsches and the Jordanskys, we are ashamed of them in front of the workers, but when it comes to getting a political berth for ourselves we don't mind running with these gentlemen on the same tickets!

Let all the class-conscious workers know, and let them spread the news about it among the working-class masses, that the bloc of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and all the Narodniks with the Mensheviks is a bloc of people who are trying to sneak in the *Yedinstvo* heroes, a bloc of *people who are ashamed of their allies*.

In two districts, Kazansky and Spassky, there are no Mensheviks or S.R.s at all. Apparently they have *concealed* their identity in the lists of the District Soviets, i.e., in the

lists of *non-party* candidates (in each district the number of candidates is incomplete—38 and 28 respectively against 54 and 44 of the Cadet Party and 43 and 46 of our Party). In two districts, therefore, the petty-bourgeois parties found even their motley semi-partyism too much for them, and landed for good and all in the mire of non-partyism—“who cares for parties, the thing is to get elected!” That, always and everywhere, has been the motto of bourgeois parliamentarians.

5. In the fifth group non-partisanship reigns supreme. They have 28 lists in 10 districts, and most of these groups exist in one district only. This is philistinism at its local narrowest. And what a mixed crowd they are! We have here a “House Management”, a “Group of Employees in Educational Institutions”, an “Honesty, Accountancy, and Fairness Group” (believe it or not ...) and a group of “Democratic Republicans and Socialist Functionaries Nominated by Non-Party Toilers, Republican Democrats, Working in the House Committees”....

Comrade workers! Let us all get down to work, canvassing all the poorest homes, awakening and enlightening the domestic servants, the most backward workers, etc., etc. Let us campaign against the capitalists and the Cadets, disguised as “Radical Democrats”, who hide behind the Cadets’ backs. Let us campaign against the petty-bourgeois defencist mire of the Narodniks and Mensheviks, against their bloc, which stands for no parties and no principles, against their attempts to sneak into their joint lists the Trudoviks, the advocates of compensation, and the heroes of Plekhanov’s *Yedinstvo* with whom even such ministerial papers as *Dyelo Naroda* and *Rabochaya Gazeta* are ashamed to be seen in the same company!

TWO SHORTCOMINGS

In criticising other parties we should not forget to criticise ourselves. The published lists of candidates for members of the Petrograd District Councils have revealed two shortcomings in our Party organisation and Party work.

The first shortcoming is this. Our list for Liteiny District has only 33 candidates as against the 63 of the Cadets and the Menshevik bloc with *Yedinstvo* and the Narodniks. Apparently, our Party workers have not been able to find more than 33 candidates of the proletarian party in this wealthy district. But this is an obvious shortcoming in our work, an obvious indication that we have not gone down far enough into the midst of the working and exploited people. We must break with established custom. In the wealthy districts we must “go among the people” more energetically than ever, and waken more and more strata of the working and exploited people to political consciousness. We should get the non-party proletarian elements—especially the *domestic servants*, for instance—to take an active part in the elections and not hesitate to put the most reliable of them into our *proletarian* list. Why should we fear a minority of non-party proletarian elements, when the majority are class-conscious internationalist proletarians?...*

Written between May 23 and 27
(June 5 and 9), 1917

First published in 1928
in *Lenin Miscellany VII*

Published according
to the manuscript

* The manuscript breaks off here.—*Ed.*

RESOLUTION ON MEASURES TO COPE WITH ECONOMIC DISORGANISATION¹²³

1. The complete disruption of Russia's economic life has now reached a point where catastrophe is unavoidable, a catastrophe of such appalling dimensions that a number of essential industries will be brought to a standstill, the farmer will be prevented from conducting farming on the necessary scale, and railway traffic will be interrupted with a consequent stoppage of grain deliveries to the industrial population and the cities, involving millions of people. What is more, the break-down has already started, and has affected various industries. Only by the greatest exertion of all the nation's forces and the adoption of a number of immediate revolutionary measures, both in the local areas and at the centre of government, can this debacle be effectively coped with.

2. Neither by bureaucratic methods, i.e., the setting up of institutions in which the capitalists and officials preponderate, nor by preserving the profits of the capitalists, their supreme rule in industry, their supremacy over finance capital, and their commercial secrets as regards their banking, commercial, and industrial transactions, can the disaster be averted. This has been amply proved by the partial effects of the crisis as revealed in a number of industries.

3. The only way to avert disaster is to establish effectual workers' control over the production and distribution of goods. For the purpose of such control it is necessary, first of all, that the workers should have a majority of not less than three-fourths of all the votes in all the decisive institutions and that the owners who have not withdrawn from their business and the engineering staffs should be enlisted

without fail; secondly, that shop committees, the central and local Soviets, as well as the trade unions, should have the right to participate in this control, that all commercial and bank books be open to their inspection, and that the management supply them with all the necessary information; third, that a similar right should be granted to representatives of all the major democratic and socialist parties.

4. Workers' control, which the capitalists in a number of conflict cases have already accepted, should, by means of various well-considered measures introduced gradually but without any delay, be developed into full regulation of the production and distribution of goods by the workers.

5. Workers' control should similarly be extended to all financial and banking operations with the aim of discovering the true financial state of affairs; such control to be participated in by councils and conventions of bank, syndicate and other employees, which are to be organised forthwith.

6. To save the country from disaster the workers and peasants must first of all be inspired with absolute and positive assurance, conveyed by deeds and not by words, that the governing bodies both in the local areas and at the centre will not hesitate to hand over to the people the bulk of the profits, incomes, and property of the great banking, financial, commercial, and industrial magnates of capitalist economy. Unless this measure is carried out, it is futile to demand or expect real revolutionary measures or any real revolutionary effort on the part of the workers and peasants.

7. In view of the break-down of the whole financial and monetary system and the impossibility of rehabilitating it while the war is on, the aim of the state organisation should be to organise on a broad, regional, and subsequently country-wide, scale the exchange of agricultural implements, clothes, boots and other goods for grain and other farm products. The services of the town and rural co-operative societies should be widely enlisted.

8. Only when these measures have been carried out will it be possible and necessary to introduce general and compulsory labour service. This measure, in turn, calls for the establishment of a workers' militia, in which the workers are to serve without pay after their regular eight-hour day; this to be followed by the introduction of a nation-wide people's

militia in which the workers and other employees shall be paid by the capitalists. Only such a workers' militia and the people's militia that will grow out of it could and should introduce universal compulsory labour service, not by bureaucratic means and in the interests of the capitalists, but to save the country from the impending debacle. Only such a militia could and should introduce real revolutionary discipline and get the whole people to make that supreme effort necessary for averting disaster. Only universal compulsory labour service is capable of ensuring the maximum economy in the expenditure of labour-power.

9. Among the measures aimed at saving the country from disaster, one of the most important tasks is that of engaging a large labour force in the production of coal and raw materials, and for work in the transport services. No less important is it that the workers employed in producing ammunition should be gradually switched over to producing goods necessary for the country's economic rehabilitation.

10. The systematic and effective implementation of all these measures is possible only if all the power in the state passes to the proletarians and semi-proletarians.

A DEAL WITH THE CAPITALISTS OR OVERTHROW OF THE CAPITALISTS?

HOW TO END THE WAR

Everyone is thinking and talking about how to end the war.

Practically all the workers and peasants are agreed that the war was started by the capitalists and that it is the capitalists of *all* countries who need it. And that is what the resolutions of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and *Peasants'* Deputies say.

This is the undoubted truth.

Opinion differs when we come to the question of *what way* to end the war (*everyone* realises that it cannot be ended *abruptly*). Are we to go about it by way of a deal with the capitalists, and if so, what kind of deal? Or are we to go by way of a workers' revolution, i.e., by overthrowing the capitalists? That is the basic, cardinal issue.

On this question our Party disagrees with the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and with the All-Russia Soviet of Peasants' Deputies, both of which *incline towards deciding this question in favour of the capitalists and through the capitalists*.

This has been strikingly confirmed by the resolution on the war adopted by the All-Russia Soviet of Peasants' Deputies. In keeping with the notorious—and no less muddled—appeal to the nations of the world (dated March 14), this resolution demands:

“peace without annexations and indemnities, with the right of every nation, in whatever state boundaries it may be living, to decide its own destiny.”

The question of annexations is formulated differently here compared with the way it was recently put in *Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet and in *Dyelo Naroda* (see *Pravda* No. 60 for May 18*).

The two latter newspapers, controlled by the Narodnik Menshevik bloc, are in a hopeless muddle when they declare that peace “without annexations” means returning to the state of things that existed before the war (the Latin phrase used for this is *status quo ante bellum*).

Such a solution of the problem—let us not blink the truth—means making a deal with the capitalists and between the capitalists. It means: Let us keep the old annexations (made before the war), but let us have no new ones.

For one thing, no socialist who does not wish to betray socialism can accept such a solution. It is not a socialist’s job to make peace between the capitalists on the basis of the old division of spoils, that is, annexations. That is obvious. Secondly, such a solution, in any event, is impracticable unless there is a revolution *against capital*, at least against Anglo-Japanese capital, since no man in his right senses can doubt that *without a revolution* Japan will never give up Kiaochow, nor Britain Baghdad and her African colonies.

The peasant resolution gives a *different* definition to annexations. It proclaims the right of *every* nation (meaning also those annexed *before* the war) to be free and “to decide its own destiny”.

This is the only correct solution of the problem as far as any really consistent democrat, not to mention a socialist, is concerned. No true socialist can put the question of annexations in any other way or deny *any* nation the right to self-determination and secession.

Let us not deceive ourselves, however. Such a demand implies a revolution against the capitalists. And the first to turn down such a demand (unless there is a revolution) will be the British capitalists, who have more annexed territories than any other nation in the world.

Neither of these demands, these wishes, either that of renouncing annexations in the sense of restoring status quo,

* See pp. 433-35 of this volume.—*Ed.*

or renouncing all annexations, both old and new, are realisable without a revolution against capital, without the overthrow of the capitalists. We must not deceive ourselves or the people on this score.

Either we advocate and look forward to a deal with the capitalists—and that would amount to inspiring the people with faith in their worst enemies—or we place our faith solely in the workers' revolution and concentrate all our efforts on overthrowing the capitalists.

We must make our *choice* between these *two* ways of *ending* the war.

Pravda No. 65,
June 7 (May 25), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

THE CHAIN IS NO STRONGER THAN ITS WEAKEST LINK

If an iron chain is needed to hold a weight, say, of 100 poods, what would happen if we replaced *one* of its links by a wooden one?

The chain would break.

No matter how strong and intact all the other links are, if the wooden link breaks the whole chain will burst.

The same is true in politics.

The Mensheviks and Narodniks, the ministerialist gentlemen of these petty-bourgeois parties, have joined forces with *Plekhanov's* "*Yedinstvo*" in the elections to the District Councils.

You have only yourselves to blame, gentlemen!

Your "iron" chain was poor and rusty enough as it is, and now it has several links made not even of wood, but of clay and paper.

You have only yourselves to blame!

Comrades, working men and working women, soldiers, toilers, do you realise that by voting for the Narodnik-Menshevik bloc *you will be voting for Plekhanov's "Yedinstvo"?*

You will be voting for that disgraceful *Yedinstvo* of Plekhanov's which even the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary newspapers *turn away from*.

You will be voting for that disgraceful *Yedinstvo* of Plekhanov's which, to the capitalists' delight, frankly advocates *war to a victorious finish*.

You will be voting for that disgraceful *Yedinstvo* of Plekhanov's which daily whitewashes the Russian capitalists by throwing all the blame on the German capitalists and tramples on the fraternal alliance of the workers of *all*

countries in their struggle against the capitalists of *all* countries.

If you stand for the working people against the capitalists, if you wish to fight for bread, peace and liberty—then *do not give a single vote to the bloc of the Narodniks and Mensheviks*, who are trying to hide *the rotten “Yedinstvo” in their lists!*

Vote only for the Bolshevik and internationalist Social-Democrats!

Pravda No. 67,
June 9 (May 27), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

THE CAPITALISTS MUST BE EXPOSED

V. Bazarov, admittedly an authority on the condition of our industries, wrote in *Novaya Zhizn* for May 24:

“The war and the resulting economic and financial break-down have created a state of affairs in which the private interest of private enterprise tends not towards strengthening and developing the productive forces of the country, but towards destroying them. It is much more profitable at the present moment—in expectation of higher prices—to keep all the material elements of capital inactive than to put them into circulation; it is more profitable to produce, on terms ruinous to the country, absolutely useless military supplies than to serve conscientiously the pressing needs of the people, and it is most profitable of all to build new munition factories which will never be utilised, and which would not be in a position to start work until two or three years hence. Is it any wonder that our so-called ‘national economy’ has degenerated into an orgy of wanton pillage, into industrial anarchy, into a systematic spoliation of the national wealth?... Why should an ignorant, and, for that matter, even a fully class-conscious worker, forego an ‘excessive’ increase in wages amounting to three or four rubles, when he sees hundreds of millions of rubles looted and squandered before his very eyes?”

No honest person can deny that V. Bazarov is speaking the exact truth.

An “*orgy of pillage*”—no other words can describe the behaviour of the capitalists during the war.

This orgy is leading to national disaster.

We cannot keep silent. We cannot put up with it.

Every worker who knows and understands what is going on at “his” factory, every office employee working in a bank, factory or commercial house, who cannot remain indifferent to his country’s ruin, every engineer, statistician, accountant—all should do everything in their power to *collect* accurate, even fragmentary, and, if possible, documented

data concerning this orgy of pillage, i.e., concerning *prices and profits*.

We must not keep silent. We must not put up with it. After all, we are not children to let ourselves be lulled by promises made by near-socialist ministers or by commissions, departments, or sub-departments of government officials.

If the Russian Government were not a captive of the capitalists, if it were made up of people who could and would act decisively, act to save their country from ruin, it would immediately, without a day's, without an hour's delay, issue a decree ordering the publication of *all* prices charged on war contracts, of *all* data pertaining to *profits*.

To chatter about the impending debacle and about saving the country from ruin *without doing* this, means descending to the level of deceivers of the people, or of playthings in the hands of tricksters.

To expect a government of capitalists, of Lvov, Tere-shchenko, Shingaryov and Co., and their impotent, toylike "appendage" in the persons of Chernov, Tsereteli, Peshekhonov and Skobelev, to issue such a decree, and thus expose the capitalists, would be childish and naïve. Only those suffering from "ministerialist softening of the brain" are likely to expect that.

All the more energetically therefore must we encourage private initiative. Comrades and citizens! All those who really wish to save the country from famine must immediately collect and publish all accessible data pertaining to *prices and profits*.

Exposing the capitalists is the first step towards curbing the capitalists.

Exposing the orgy of pillage is the first step in our fight against the pillagers.

REPORTS ON THE ECONOMIC DEBACLE

The basic and cardinal issue of today is that of the impending catastrophe. We must collect the most accurate possible data on it. Here are some very informative quotations from the paper of our opponents, the united Narodniks and Mensheviks (*Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet No. 70, May 19):

“The calamity of mass unemployment is drawing nearer. Resistance to the workers’ demands on the part of the united employers is growing. The employers are resorting to slow-down tactics in production and to lockouts.”

And further:

“The capitalists are doing nothing to help the country out of economic difficulties....

“The real disorganisers and counter-revolutionaries are the capitalists, who are hanging on to their profits. But the revolution will not and should not be allowed to go under. If the capitalists do nothing to help it voluntarily, the revolution must lay hands on them.”

This could hardly be expressed more eloquently. The situation must be critical indeed. “The revolution must lay hands on the capitalists.” But *what* revolution? The revolution of *which* class? *How* should it lay hands on them?

Here are answers given by speakers who reported to the Executive Committee of the Soviet on May 16:

“A number of speakers revealed a depressing picture of widespread economic disorganisation in the country ... the bourgeois press says nothing about the real causes of the trouble, i.e., the war and the selfish conduct of the bourgeoisie.”

From the report of the Menshevik ministerialist Cherevanin:

“The present economic debacle is too grave to be cured by one or another palliative, by a number of separate concrete measures. What we need is a general plan, regulation of our whole economic life by the state....

“To carry out this plan a special Economic Council must be set up under the Ministry.”

The mountain has brought forth a mouse. Instead of “the revolution laying hands on the capitalists” we are offered a purely bureaucratic remedy.

From the report of Avilov:

“The main cause of the present economic break-down is the shortage of the most essential industrial products....

“Owing to the rising cost of living the position of the workers of numerous grades verges on chronic starvation....

“Although they are making enormous profits, the employers refuse to meet the workers unless there is a simultaneous rise in the prices of their goods....

“The only way out of the present situation is price fixing. But this can only be carried out if there is public control of distribution.

“Given compulsory distribution of commodities at controlled prices, there must also be established control of production, which otherwise may sag or even be suspended....

“At the same time the state must institute control over the sources from which industry receives its circulating and fixed assets—the banking houses.”

What Comrade Avilov seems to have forgotten is that the “state” is a machine which the working class and the capitalists are pulling different ways. Which class is now capable of wielding state power?

From Bazarov’s report:

“Fixed prices are virtually evaded; the state monopolies exist only on paper; controlled supply of the factories with coal and metal has not only failed to organise production in the interests of the state, but has not even been able to cope with the market anarchy or eliminate the unrestrained speculation of the middlemen and dealers.

“What is needed is compulsory state trustification of industry.

“Only by drafting the managements of the various enterprises and the capitalists into compulsory state service can really effective measures be taken to combat the anarchy which the industrialists are deliberately creating in production.”

To say that the government of the capitalists (who are deliberately creating anarchy) must draft the capitalists into compulsory state service is tantamount to forgetting the class struggle.

From the report by G. V. Shuba:

“Despite the ceaseless demands we have been making for the last two months, not an inch of progress has been made in the general question—the problem of organising the national economy and labour. The result is that we have been simply marking time. At present the situation is this: although we have succeeded, in the face of opposition, in getting a number of measures and laws passed—we already have a grain monopoly law—all this remains on paper...”

“We have reached an agreement in principle on the municipalisation of agricultural machines, but we can do nothing about it because there are practically no machines to speak of. The factories built to produce agricultural machines are turning out absolutely unessential articles for the army. Apart from the fact that the whole economic life of the country must be subject to regulation, we must at last break up and remodel the whole executive machinery of government.”

This is more to the point, closer to the heart of the matter! “Break up and remodel the whole executive machinery of government”—now that gets us down to bedrock. Obviously, the question of government *machinery* is only a fraction of the larger question as to which *class* is wielding the state power.

From Kukovetsky’s report:

“The country’s financial situation is appalling. We are heading rapidly for financial bankruptcy....

“Purely financial measures will do no good....

“Measures must be taken towards compulsory distribution of the government loan, and if this does not yield the desired results, we must introduce a compulsory loan.

“The second measure is the compulsory regulation of industry and the establishment of fixed prices on goods.”

“Compulsory” measures are a good thing, but the question is—which class will be the compellers and which the compelled?

From the report of Groman:

“What is happening in all countries today may be described as a process of disintegration of the national economic organism. It is being countered everywhere by the organising principle. The state has everywhere begun to organise the economy and labour....

“So far neither the government nor the country at large has a central organ which could regulate the country’s economic life. There is no economic brain, as it were. It must be created.... An authoritative executive body must be organised. An Economic Council must be set up.”

A new bureaucratic institution—that is what Groman’s idea amounts to! Very sad.

They all admit that an unheard-of catastrophe is inevitable. But they do not understand the main thing—that *only the revolutionary class* can save the country.

Pravda No. 67,
June 9 (May 27), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

“SLEIGHT OF HAND” AND UNPRINCIPLED POLITICIANS

The expression “sleight of hand” has been taken from the editorial in today’s *Dyelo Naroda*. This newspaper of the “Socialist-Revolutionaries”, to which Kerensky and Chernov are contributors, exposes the tricks of the *French* spokesmen of “tamed socialism”, saying:

“These are old tricks, a very old sleight of hand, which in our country have been repeatedly and unsuccessfully practised by Mr. Plekhanov without deceiving anybody....”

Are you sure they were practised only by Plekhanov, my dear sirs?

Are you not going to the elections in a bloc with *this very* Plekhanov’s *Yedinstvo*? Are you not helping it to get in, are you not saving it?

It was in your paper (No. 44 for May 9) that S. Mstislavsky wrote of Plekhanov:

*“When a recent leader of Russian Social-Democracy lends his hand to such counter-revolutionary attacks [as those of *Russkaya Volya* and *Novoye Vremya*], then it is with profound regret and sincere sorrow that we are compelled to recognise this fact, since we never really imagined that the degeneration of the International had gone so far.”*

We would add: and the degeneration of the Socialist-Revolutionaries who have joined forces with *this very* “*Yedinstvo*”.

And in an unsigned, i.e., editorial, note in *Dyelo Naroda* No. 48, for May 13, we read:

“‘Yedinstvo’s’ political unity with the liberal bourgeoisie is common knowledge.”

Mark that carefully! The “Socialist-Revolutionaries” and the Mensheviks are in unity with that very *Yedinstvo*

whose political unity with the liberal bourgeoisie is *common knowledge*. Do not forget this, comrades, men and women workers, and soldiers!

The Menshevik *Rabochaya Gazeta* for April 20 (No. 35) wrote in an editorial:

“We are against the British imperialists. *Yedinstvo* is against the British socialists. Herein lies the whole difference. Herein lies the reason why *Yedinstvo* has to argue à la Hottentot.... The Russian workers remember only too well how Plekhanov, during the tsarist regime [there is a misprint in the text: it should read “during the tsarist-republican regime”], tried in all manner of ways to dissuade them from going on strike. Then, too, Plekhanov tried to scare us with things even more terrible; he tried to assure us that such conflicts only played into the hands of the German General Staff.”

And in the issue of the same paper for May 16 (No. 57) the discreetly moderate ministerialist Cherevanin wrote:

“Plekhanov and his *Yedinstvo* are doing everything they possibly can here to compromise the principle of defencism, which has been compromised enough on an international scale thanks to the efforts of the majority of the German, French and other socialists.”

This is how *Yedinstvo* is estimated by the Narodniks and the Mensheviks, this is how they try to *dissociate themselves from it*, this is how *ashamed they are of it!*

Nevertheless they have entered into a bloc with it at the elections, and Plekhanov accepts seats from people who publicly call him names, such as “juggler”, “tamed socialist”, “Hottentot”, “compromised”, “in unity with the liberal bourgeoisie”.

Which member of that bloc is the worst?

Workers and soldiers! Not one vote to the bloc of the Narodniks and Mensheviks, who are shielding and working for *Yedinstvo*, which is “*in unity with the liberal bourgeoisie!*”!

Written May 25 (June 7), 1917

Published June 9 (May 27), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 67

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

**THE DARK FORCES ARE FOR THE CADETS,
THE MENSHEVIKS AND NARODNIKS ARE
IN ONE GOVERNMENT WITH THE CADETS**

Who does not know the newspaper *Novoye Vremya*? Who does not know that in the course of many a decade this paper has “earned” for itself the name of defender of the tsarist regime, defender of the capitalists, Jew baiter and hound-er of revolutionaries?

Who does not know that all that was honest in Russia always turned away from *Novoye Vremya* with indignation and contempt? That this paper, even now, after the revolution, has not changed its ways by one iota?

And now we have the first elections in a free Russia. On the first day of the elections *Novoye Vremya* comes out with the call: “Put forward the list of the people’s freedom party”.

The fact speaks for itself: all the landowners and capitalists, all the dark forces, all those who are trying to restore the tsar, are for the Cadets.

And the Mensheviks and Narodniks have given *six* ministers as hostages to the *Cadets’ ten*.

The Mensheviks and Narodniks have allowed themselves to be taken in by empty promises, not one of which has been kept. *Not a single step has been taken* by the government to stop the war, to abandon annexations* and to curb the capitalists, who are making outrageous profits and heading the country for destruction.

The war is dragging on, a debacle is imminent, the capitalists are making fortunes, the Mensheviks and Narodniks

* To publish the secret treaties, to make an open, honest, frank offer of peace to all the nations on clearly defined terms.

are talking and threatening, threatening and talking.... But all this falls on deaf ears—Vaska the Cat (the capitalist) listens but goes on eating.*

Workers and soldiers, all tolling people! Not a single vote to the Cadets, not a single vote to the Mensheviks and Narodniks!

Vote for the Bolsheviks!

Pravda No. 68,
June 10 (May 28), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

* See Note No. 28.—*Ed.*

THE SHAMEFUL MENSHEVIK-NARODNIK BLOC WITH *YEDINSTVO*

Today is the second and principal day of the elections. The most importunate in offering themselves to the electorate, besides the Cadets, are the united Mensheviks and Narodniks.

What answer did they have to our accusation concerning their shameful bloc with *Yedinstvo*? Are they prepared to defend this bloc on grounds of *principle*?

They are *not*.

In reply to our suggestion that the bloc with *Yedinstvo* was a disgrace, *Rabochaya Gazeta* quotes the example of—whom would you think?—of the agent provocateur Malinovsky and of his being smuggled into the Duma by the secret police!

The dishonesty of such a “method” of controversy is dealt with elsewhere in a separate paragraph.* Here we are concerned with “*Rabochaya Gazeta*’s” *logic* rather than its dishonesty. Look what you do, gentlemen! You parry our reference to “your” *Yedinstvo* by a counter-reference to “our” agent provocateur Malinovsky! What is the inference? The inference is that you consider *Yedinstvo* on a par with an agent provocateur!

That is how the wise heads of *Rabochaya Gazeta* “defend” the bloc with *Yedinstvo*. Very clever of them, to be sure. When told that they *have* in *free* Russia such a disgraceful colleague as Plekhanov’s *Yedinstvo*, they *answer*: And the Bolsheviks, in *tsarist* Russia, *had* the agent provocateur Malinovsky! Isn’t this a gem of a defence?

* See p. 539 of this volume.—*Ed.*

Dyelo Naroda, too, has put its foot into it in regard to *Yedinstvo*. On May 27, the first day of the elections, this paper of Kerensky, Chernov and Co. carried a front-page appeal to vote for the lists in which "*Yedinstvo*" is smuggled in.

And on the second page of the same issue of *Dyelo Naroda* we read a lengthy denunciation of the "social-patriot" Plekhanov and his *Yedinstvo*, containing, among others, the following "vitriolic remark":

"We will gladly inform our readers what other liberal- and social-imperialists—'Rech', 'Russkaya Volya' and 'Yedinstvo'—think about the Italian annexation [of Albania]."

A gem, is it not?

The "Socialist-Revolutionaries" call on the people to vote for lists in which the candidates of *Yedinstvo* are concealed, the very same "*Yedinstvo*" which the Socialist-Revolutionaries themselves, and on election day at that, call "social-imperialist", i.e., socialist in word and "imperialist in deed", the very same *Yedinstvo* which they identify with *Rech* and *Russkaya Volya*.

The wise *Rabochaya Gazeta*, in a bloc with the wise *Dyelo Naroda*, has certainly "defended" *Yedinstvo* today.

And Plekhanov accepts alms from people who "accidentally" compare him with Malinovsky, or, on election day, openly declare him to be a "social-imperialist".

Such is the exhibition which this disgraceful bloc of the Mensheviks plus Narodniks plus *Yedinstvo* is making of itself.

Workers and soldiers! All toiling people! Not a single vote to the Narodniks and Mensheviks, who are trying to drag in the "social-imperialists"!

Vote for the Bolsheviks!

COUNTER-REVOLUTION TAKES THE OFFENSIVE

“JACOBINS WITHOUT THE PEOPLE”

The counter-revolution has mustered strength enough to assume the offensive. With the aid of the Narodnik and Menshevik ministers the capitalists are organising an assault on liberty.

The decision to disband the “45th, 46th, 47th and 52nd regiments” of the 12th and 13th divisions, the decision to “prosecute” the “instigators” (what an odd word! Are “instigators” more important than “perpetrators” in war?), and side by side with this, the news of the *arrest* of Ensign Krusser *for a speech made at a meeting* in Skuliany, and finally, the Provisional Government’s extremely insulting tone in regard to Kronstadt¹²⁴ (for example, that orders “must be obeyed without question”—is that the way to talk to citizens who, so far, have not been accused of anything, not of a *single* act of disobedience?)—all this, taken together, and highlighted by that gloating defender of the counter-revolutionary capitalists, *Rech* (“the government at last has spoken up in the language of authority”)—all this clearly points to the fact that the counter-revolution is taking the offensive.

This “offensive” creates a strange impression. At the front the instigators, those guilty of “inciting to insubordination”, are arraigned before the court, and four regiments are “disbanded” (four out of the two divisions’ eight regiments mentioned in the telegram, although, according to the same telegram reported in *Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet No. 76, only *one* regiment out of the eight “came out in full force” and another one “almost in full force”). If you gentlemen of the government inform the people that you are disbanding certain regiments, if you find this useful, if you allow a

telegram about it to go through, then why don't you tell us, clearly and plainly, in at least a few lines, what the reasons for insubordination were on the part of those you are prosecuting?

One of two things, gentlemen: either you work in silence—you have a military censorship—and do not bother about informing the public, or bothering it with your reports; or, if you do decide to keep the public informed, then tell it what it's all about, give it the why and the wherefore of the case, let it know whether the people you are prosecuting are guilty of insubordination on a particular or general point.

Vagueness is a bad thing.

In the case of Krusser's arrest, everything is quite clear. To hustle a man off to prison *for a speech he has made at a meeting* is hardly reasonable. Does it not signify that you have simply lost your heads? Why, you Cadets and Rights who share the cabinet with the Narodniks and Mensheviks have ten if not a hundred times more newspaper circulation than your opponents! And with such superiority in chief propaganda weapons, you hustle a man off to prison for "a speech at a meeting"! Have you gone berserk with fear, gentlemen?

We are not opposed to the use of revolutionary force in the interests of the nation's majority.

When Plekhanov the other day mentioned the Jacobins of 1793 and their *forthright* statement that "such-and-such persons are enemies of the people", we thought in this connection: *No party* should draw the line at imitating the Jacobins of 1793 on this point cited by Plekhanov.

The trouble is that there are Jacobins and Jacobins. A witty French saying, which Plekhanov was fond of quoting twenty years ago, when he was still a socialist, pokes fun at the "Jacobins without the people" (*jacobins moins le peuple*).

The historical greatness of the true Jacobins, the Jacobins of 1793, is that they were "Jacobins *with* the people", with the revolutionary *majority* of the nation, with the *revolutionary* advanced classes of *their* time.

They are ridiculous and pitiful, the "Jacobins without the people", they who merely pose as Jacobins, who are *afraid*

to declare clearly, openly and for all to hear that the exploiters, the oppressors of the people, the servants of the monarchy in all countries, the defenders of the landowners in all countries, are enemies of the people.

You have studied history, Messrs. Milyukovs and Plekhanovs—can you deny that the *great* Jacobins of 1793 were not afraid to denounce precisely the members of the reactionary exploiting *minority* of their time as enemies of the people? Precisely the members of the reactionary *classes* of their time?

You, the present government, its backers, its defenders, its servants—can you say openly, clearly, and officially which *classes* you consider “enemies of the people” *all over the world*?

But how can you! You are Jacobins without the people. You are merely posing as Jacobins. You look more like ordinary representatives of ordinary landowner and capitalist reaction.

Workers and soldiers! All toiling people! The counter-revolution of the landowners and capitalists is assuming the offensive. Not a single vote for a *single* government party, *for any parties participating in the government!*

Vote for the Bolsheviks!

A QUESTION OF PRINCIPLE

“FORGOTTEN WORDS” OF DEMOCRACY

The filthy torrent of lies and slander which the capitalist papers have spewed out against the Kronstadt comrades has revealed once more how dishonest these papers are. They have seized on a quite ordinary and unimportant incident and magnified it to the dimensions of a “state” affair, of “secession” from Russia and so on and so forth.

Izvestia of the Petrograd Soviet No. 74 reports that the Kronstadt incident has been settled. As was to have been expected, Ministers Tsereteli and Skobelev easily came to an understanding with the Kronstadt people on the basis of a compromise resolution. Needless to say, we express our hope and confidence that this compromise resolution, provided *both* sides faithfully live up to it, will, for a sufficiently lengthy period of time, eliminate conflicts in the work of the *revolution* both in Kronstadt and the rest of Russia.

The Kronstadt incident is a matter of principle to us in two respects.

First, it has revealed a fact long ago observed by us and officially recognised in our Party’s resolution (on the Soviets), namely, that in the *local areas* the revolution has gone farther than it has in Petrograd. Succumbing to the current craze for the revolutionary phrase, the Narodniks and Mensheviks as well as the Cadets did not wish to or could not grasp the significance of this fact.

Secondly, the Kronstadt incident raised an important fundamental issue of programmatic significance, which no honest democrat, to say nothing of a socialist, can afford to treat with indifference. It is the question of whether

the central authority has the right to *endorse* officials elected by the local population or not.

The Mensheviks, to whose party Ministers Tsereteli and Skobelev belong, still claim to be Marxists. Tsereteli and Skobelev got a resolution passed in favour of such endorsement. In doing so, did they stop to think of their duty as Marxists?

Should the reader find this question naïve and pass a remark to the effect that the Mensheviks now have really become a petty-bourgeois, even defencist (i.e., chauvinist) party, and therefore it would be ludicrous even to talk about Marxism, we shall not argue the point. All we shall say is that Marxism always gives close attention to questions of democratism, and the name of democrats can hardly be denied to citizens Tsereteli and Skobelev.

Did they stop to think of their duty as democrats, of their "title" as democrats, when they passed the resolution authorising the Provisional Government to "endorse" officials elected by the Kronstadt population?

Obviously, they did not.

In support of this conclusion, we shall quote the opinion of a writer who, we hope, even in the eyes of Tsereteli and Skobelev, is considered something of a scientific and Marxian authority. That writer is Frederick Engels.

In criticising the draft programme of the German Social-Democrats (now known as the Erfurt Programme) Engels wrote in 1891 that the German proletariat was in need of a single and united republic.

"But not," Engels added, "such a republic as the present French Republic, which is really an empire founded in 1798 but without an emperor. From 1792 to 1798 every French department, every commune enjoyed complete self-government after the American pattern. That is what we [the German Social-Democrats] should have too. How self-government can be organised and how a bureaucracy can be dispensed with has been demonstrated to us by America and the First French Republic, as well as by Australia, Canada and other British colonies even today. Such provincial and communal self-government is much freer than, for instance, Swiss federalism, where each canton is really independent of the confederation [i.e., the central government] but at the same time is

the supreme authority as far as the minor subdivisions of the canton are concerned—the Bezirk and the Commune. The cantonal governments appoint the Bezirkestatthalter and Prefects. This right of appointing local officers is entirely unknown in English-speaking countries, and in future we must politely abolish this right [i.e., appointment from above], just as we should the Prussian Landräthe and Regierungsräthe.”¹²⁵

Such was Engels’s opinion on questions of democracy as applied to the right of appointing officers from above. To express these views with greater precision and accuracy, he proposed that the German Social-Democrats should insert in their programme the following demand:

“Complete self-government in the communes, districts, and regions through officers elected by universal suffrage; *abolition of all state-appointed local and regional authorities.*”

The italicised words leave nothing to be desired in the way of clarity and definiteness.

Worthy citizens, Ministers Tsereteli and Skobelev! You are probably flattered to have your names mentioned in history books. But will it be flattering to have every Marxist—and every honest democrat—say that Ministers Tsereteli and Skobelev helped the Russian capitalists to build such a republic in Russia as would turn out to be not a republic at all, but *a monarchy without a monarch?*

P.S. This article was written *before* the Kronstadt incident entered its last stage, as reported in today’s papers. The Kronstadt people have *not* broken the compromise agreement. *Not a single fact* remotely suggesting a breach of this agreement has been cited. *Rech’s* reference to newspaper articles is mere subterfuge, since you can only break an agreement by deeds and not by newspaper articles. The fact then remains, that Ministers Tsereteli, Skobelev and Co. have allowed themselves to be scared for the hundredth and thousandth time by the screams of the frightened bourgeoisie and have resorted to *gross threats* against the people of Kronstadt. Crude, absurd threats, that merely serve the counter-revolution.

Written before May 25
(June 7) 1917

Published June 10 (May 28),
1917 in *Pravda* No. 68

Published according
to the newspaper text

FOR LACK OF A CLEAN PRINCIPLED WEAPON THEY SNATCH AT A DIRTY ONE

Rabochaya Gazeta, the organ of the Menshevik ministerialists, takes a dig at us by recalling the fact that the secret police arrested the Bolshevik conciliator Rykov in 1911 in order to give the Bolsheviks of our Party "freedom" of action "on the eve of the elections to the Fourth Duma" (*Rabochaya Gazeta* rubs this in).

But what does this fact prove? It proves that the secret police were clearing the way to the Duma for Malinovsky, who turned out to be an agent provocateur. Naturally, the secret police looked after their undercover agents.

Is our Party to be blamed for this? It is not, no more than any *honest* man would think of blaming Chernov and Co. for mistakenly vindicating Azef, or blaming Yonov and Co. (member of the Bund and colleague of *Rabochaya Gazeta*) for exonerating the agent provocateur Zhitomirsky ("Otsov") in 1910 in the name of the united Central Committee, or blaming those Mensheviks who, in 1904, tried for a time to defend the agent provocateur Dobroskokov, or blaming those Cadets who also had agent provocateurs in their midst, whose names have now been made public.

All parties without exception have made mistakes in failing to detect agent provocateurs. This is a fact. *Rabochaya Gazeta*, which has entered into a bloc with Minister Chernov, chooses to ignore *his* old mistakes and mentions only those of its present opponents. Such a method is clearly dishonest, clearly unscrupulous. The blow which *Rabochaya Gazeta* aimed at us has fallen upon itself, for it will never dare to admit to the world that it is honest to keep silent about Azef while shouting about a similar agent provocateur, Malinovsky, for selfish factional motives.

**MEETING
OF THE PETROGRAD COMMITTEE
OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (*Bolsheviks*)**

MAY 30 (JUNE 12), 1917

First published in 1925
in the journal *Krasnaya Letopis*
(Red Annals) No. 3 (14)

Published according
to the typewritten copy
of the Minutes

1

SPEECH CONCERNING AN ORGAN
OF THE PRESS FOR THE PETROGRAD COMMITTEE

The desire of the Petrograd Committee to have a press organ of its own is something new as far as the Central Committee is concerned. It is difficult to understand how such a question could have arisen at a time when arrangements are being made for a printing-press of our own and an agreement is about to be reached with the Inter-District group for getting Comrade Trotsky to edit a popular organ.

In the West, in the capitals or big industrial centres, there is no division of the press into local and central organs. Such a division is wasteful and harmful. It is not advisable to have a Petrograd Committee organ apart from the Central Organ. Petrograd, as a separate locality, does not exist. Petrograd is the geographical, political and revolutionary centre of all Russia. The life of Petrograd is being followed by the whole of Russia. Every step of Petrograd's is a guideline for the whole of Russia. In view of this the life of the Petrograd Committee cannot be treated as a local affair.

Why not accept the Central Committee's suggestion that a Press Committee be formed? In the history of the press in the West, where such committees have existed, there have of course been occasional misunderstandings between the editorial board and the committee, but these were due entirely to disagreements on policy. What grounds are there for any disagreements on policy between the Petrograd Committee and the Central Committee? Whether we want it or not the organ of the Petrograd Committee will always be the leading organ of the Party.

The experience gained in establishing an organ of its own would quickly convince the Petrograd Committee that it is impossible to confine the paper to local affairs. The Central Committee does not deny the need for giving more space to the Petrograd branch in the newspapers. The Central Committee does not deny the need for a popular organ that would bring our slogans home to the masses. But the establishment of a popular newspaper is a difficult job that calls for considerable experience. That is why the Central Committee is enlisting the services of Comrade Trotsky, who has succeeded in establishing his own popular organ—*Russkaya Gazeta*.¹²⁶

In the history of the West the question of a popular organ has never been so acute as it is with us. The level of the masses there rose more evenly as a result of the cultural and educational work done by the Liberals. In countries like Bohemia there are such popular organs. The purpose of a popular organ is to elevate the reader to an understanding of the leading party organ. If we do not establish a popular organ other parties will win the masses and use them to speculate with. The popular organ should not be of a local type, but owing to postal difficulties it is bound primarily to serve the needs of Petrograd. In order that local needs be adequately served the Petrograd Committee should secure proper representation on the editorial board of the paper.

2

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED
AT THE MEETING OF THE PETROGRAD COMMITTEE

FIRST RESOLUTION

The Central Committee is to issue two newspapers in Petrograd—the Central Organ and a popular paper with a single editorial board. The Petrograd Committee is to receive a consultative voice on the editorial board of the Central Organ, and a vote in the popular organ. The Central Committee is to devote a definite number of columns in both papers to items of local interest.

SECOND RESOLUTION

The Petrograd Committee resolves to co-operate in both papers published by the Central Committee on the conditions proposed by the latter, and to make every effort to serve the needs of local activities more fully and widely and to work out in greater detail the general line of the Party. Having reason to fear that the Central Committee or the editorial board appointed by it may place too much trust in the internationalist comrades who have disagreed with Bolshevism in the past, that the Central Committee may cramp the freedom and independence of action of the local comrades, that the Central Committee may not give them the influence they are entitled to as leaders of local activities, the Petrograd Committee is to elect a committee to formulate precise guarantees of the rights of the Petrograd Committee in the local department of both papers.

THE HARM OF PHRASE-MONGERING

The answers of the French and the British governments clearly demonstrate the soundness of our repeated assertions that neither the Russian, nor the French, nor the British, nor the German capitalist government can throw over the policy of annexations, and that all such promises are designed to deceive the peoples.¹²⁷

We are fighting to seize Alsace-Lorraine, we are fighting for victory, the French replied. Be good enough to comply with the treaty and fight for Russian and German Poland, the British replied.

The bitter truth that capitalism cannot be reconciled to a non-annexationist policy has been exposed once more. The policy of the "conciliators", of those who wish to reconcile the capitalists and the proletariat, the policy of the Narodnik and Menshevik ministerialists, is an obvious failure. All their hopes on a coalition government have been shattered, all their promises have been exposed as mere verbiage.

And most harmful of all, as far as the cause of the revolution and the interests of the toiling masses are concerned, is the attempt to cover up the whole thing with phrases. Two shadings stand out in this torrent of phrases, one as bad as the other.

Rabochaya Gazeta, the organ of the Menshevik ministerialists, brings grist to the Cadet mill. On the one hand, it says: "On this basis [on the basis of the answers of the two Allied powers] there can be no agreement between them and us...." When they say "us", do they mean the Russian *capitalists*? The theory of the class struggle is thrown overboard; it is much more profitable to spout phrases about "democracy" in the abstract, while trampling underfoot the elementary

truth of Marxism, namely, that it is precisely *within* a “democracy” that the gulf between the capitalists and the proletarians is widest.

On the other hand, *Rabochaya Gazeta* wishes to make “an attempt at revision [of the agreements and the treaties] through a conference of representatives of the Allied governments to be specially convened”. The same old story: agreement with the capitalists, which, in fact, signifies *deception of the workers* by playing at negotiations with their class foes.

“The pressure of the rank and file of the French and British democracies, even pressure by the French and British proletariat alone upon their respective governments...” writes *Rabochaya Gazeta*. In Russia the Mensheviks are supporting *their own* imperialist government, but in other countries they want *pressure* to be brought to bear.... What is this, if not sheer phrase-mongering and humbug from beginning to end?

“We are working for it [for world peace] by convening an international socialist conference” ... to be attended by ministers from among those ex-socialists who have sided with *their* governments! This is “working” with a vengeance to deceive the people on a major scale by means of a series of minor deceptions.

We have *Dyelo Naroda* phrase-mongering “à la Jacobin”. That stern tone, those spectacular revolutionary exclamations: “we know enough” ... “faith in the victory of our Revolution” (with a capital letter, of course), “upon this or that step ... of the Russian revolutionary democracy ... depend the destinies ... of the *entire* Uprising [with a capital letter, of course] which the working people have so happily and so victoriously begun.”

Obviously, if you write the words Revolution and Uprising with capital letters it makes the thing look “awfully” frightening, just like the Jacobins. Plenty of effect at small expense. For the people who write this are virtually helping to crush the revolution and impede the uprising of the working people by supporting the *Russian* government of the imperialists, by supporting *their* methods of concealing from the people the secret treaties, *their* tactics of putting off the immediate abolition of the landed estates, by supporting *their* war

policy of “offensive”, *their* high-handed insulting behaviour towards the local representative bodies, *their* presumption to appoint or endorse the local officers elected by the local population, and so on *ad infinitum*.

Gentlemen, heroes of the phrase, knights of revolutionary bombast! Socialism demands that we distinguish, between capitalist democracy and proletarian democracy, between bourgeois revolution and proletarian revolution, between a rising of the rich against the tsar and a rising of the working people *against the rich*. Socialism demands that we distinguish our bourgeois revolution, which has ended (the bourgeoisie now is counter-revolutionary), from the mounting revolution of the proletarians and poor peasants. The former revolution is *for war*, *for preserving the landed estates*, *for “subordinating” the local organs of self-government to the central government*, *for secret treaties*. The latter revolution has *begun* to throttle the war by revolutionary fraternisation, by abolishing the power of the landowners in the local areas, by increasing the number and the power of the Soviets, and by introducing everywhere the elective principle.

The Narodnik and Menshevik ministerialists are spouting phrases about “democracy” in the abstract, about “Revolution” in the abstract in order to *cover up* their agreement with the imperialist, now definitely counter-revolutionary, bourgeoisie of their own country—an agreement which, in effect, is turning into a struggle *against* the revolution of the proletarians and semi-proletarians.

CAPITALIST MOCKERY OF THE PEOPLE

The meeting of representatives of the capitalists and workers of the southern mining industry ended on May 23.

The meeting came to *nothing*. The capitalists found all the demands of the workers unacceptable. The workers' delegation attending the meeting read a statement *disclaiming all responsibility for possible complications*.

The case is as clear as clear can be. The crisis has not been averted in the least. The employers have not been curbed.

And now we read—it would be amusing, were it not so sad—that it has been decided to appoint a committee made up of representatives of the government and the two conflicting parties (!) and that the employers have asked for an *immediate* increase in prices!

To give the reader an idea to what lengths the capitalists go in defying the people, we quote a few passages from a *ministerial* newspaper (i.e., the mouthpiece of a party that has representatives in the cabinet):

“The workers' delegation [from the southern mining industry] informed the Economic Department of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies about the actual state of affairs. On the basis of this information, we can declare that the employers' figures quoted by N. N. Kutler are absolutely untrustworthy.

“The colliery owners had been making enormous profits before the revolution, and yet, just before its outbreak, they were haggling with the old government for a rise in the requisition prices on coal. In addition to the three kopeks which the government was willing to grant, the colliery owners were asking five more kopeks. From the revolutionary Provisional Government, on the other hand, they succeeded, during the very first days of the revolution, in obtaining a rise of eight kopeks, this new rate being extended to the old deliveries to the railways, and to requisitions dating back to January. Afterwards they managed to get three kopeks more, making a total of eleven kopeks.

“Before the revolution the requisition price was eighteen kopeks; now it is twenty-nine. Government contracts at that time brought twenty two kopeks per pood, while now the prices are thirty-three and thirty-four and even more.”

What is this if not the most outrageous *mockery* of the people on the part of the capitalists?

Taking advantage of the revolution, the capitalist government, styling itself a “revolutionary” government and using this “noble” name to hoodwink the ignorant people, is putting more and more money into the pockets of the capitalists, helping them to amass more and more millions!

The country is on the verge of ruin, and the ten capitalist members of the Provisional Government are accommodating the employers who are looting the land, robbing the people, and *swelling* the colossal profits of capital.

“The Ministry of Commerce and Industry is under the beck and call of the congress of the South Russian mine owners. Faced by the catastrophe towards which industry in the South is heading, it does nothing to avert it; on the contrary, it systematically submits to the pressure of the southern industrialists.”

Thus wrote the very same ministerial paper, the organ of the Mensheviks, *Rabochaya Gazeta*, on May 14, 1917, a week after the coalition cabinet was formed.

Since then absolutely nothing has changed.

But the ministerial paper has been forced to admit even more damaging facts. Listen to this:

“The owners are sabotaging. They are deliberately letting things slide. If a pump is needed, no one looks for it. If wire gauze is needed for the miners’ safety lamps, it is not supplied. The owners do not want to increase production. Nor do they want to spend any money on essential repairs, or on replacing worn-out equipment. The machines are getting old, and will soon be out of commission. Frequently the workers themselves, when told that this or that article cannot be obtained, go out to buy the necessary tools, and they generally find what they need. The employers do nothing to ship their products, such as coal, cast-iron, etc. Products to the value of tens and hundreds of millions of rubles lie idle, while the country is in dire need of them.”

Thus wrote the ministerial paper, mouthpiece of that same Menshevik party to which Tsereteli and Skobelev belong.

This is sheer mockery of the people on the part of the capitalists. It’s like a madhouse, with the capitalists acting

in collusion with the bourgeois section of the Provisional Government (among the members of which are Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries), with the capitalists using *obstruction* and *wrecking* tactics, and *doing nothing* to ship their products, without which the country is facing *ruin*.

Without coal, the factories and railways are coming to a stand. Unemployment is spreading. There is a shortage of goods. The peasants cannot part with their grain without getting anything in return. Famine is imminent.

And all this because of the capitalists, who are in collusion with the government!

And all this is tolerated by the Narodniks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, and the Mensheviks! They dismiss the matter with phrases. They wrote about these crimes of the capitalists *on May 14*. It is now May 31. Over a fortnight has passed. But nothing has changed. Famine is steadily approaching.

To cover up the crimes of the capitalists and distract the attention of the people, all the capitalist newspapers—*Rech*, *Dyen*, *Novoye Vremya*, *Russkaya Volya*, *Birzheviye Vedomosti* and *Yedinstvo*—vie with each other in daily emptying their slop pails of lies and calumny over the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks are to blame for the colliery owners acting in collusion with the government, for their stopping and wrecking production!

This would indeed resemble a madhouse, were it not for the theory and world-wide experience of the class struggle which have shown us that the capitalists and *their* government (supported by the Mensheviks) will stop at nothing when it comes to safeguarding their profits.

When is this going to stop? Must we wait until disaster sweeps the land, and people begin to die of starvation by the hundred and the thousand?

**LETTER TO THE DISTRICT COMMITTEES
OF THE PETROGRAD ORGANISATION
OF THE R.S.D.L.P.
(BOLSHEVIKS)**

Dear comrades,

I enclose a resolution of the Petrograd Committee concerning the establishment of a paper of its own, and two resolutions introduced by me on behalf of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party at a meeting of the P.C. held on Tuesday, May 30.* Will you please discuss these three resolutions and give us your well-considered opinion on them in the fullest possible detail.

On the question as to whether a separate paper for the Petrograd organisation is needed or not, the P.C. and the C.C. hold conflicting views. It is essential and desirable that the greatest possible number of Party members in Petrograd should take an active part in the discussion of this growing conflict and help, by their decision, to settle it.

The Executive of the P.C. has expressed itself unanimously in favour of a separate press organ for the Petrograd Committee, despite the C.C.'s decision to establish *two* newspapers in place of *Pravda*, the size of which is obviously inadequate. These two papers are: the old *Pravda*, as the Party's Central Organ, and a small *Narodnaya Pravda* (the names of the two papers have not yet been definitely decided

* See p. 545 of this volume.—*Ed.*

upon), as a popular organ for the masses. The two papers, according to the decision of the C.C., are to have a single editorial board, and the P.C. is to have a representative on each paper (one with a consultative voice on the Central Organ, and a voting representative on the popular organ). A Press Committee is to be set up (consisting of workers from the districts who are in close touch with the masses) and a definite number of columns in *both* papers are to be set aside for the needs of the local labour movement.

That is the plan of the C.C.

The Executive of the P.C., on the other hand, wants a special paper *of its own*. The Executive has decided upon this unanimously.

At the meeting of the P.C. held on May 30, after the report by Comrade M. Tomsky and his speech winding up the debate, after my own speech and the discussion in which many comrades participated, there was an equal division of votes—fourteen in favour of the Executive and fourteen against it. My motion was rejected by sixteen votes to twelve.

My own view is that there is no fundamental need for a special organ of the P.C. In view of the *capital's* leading role and country-wide influence, only *one* organ of the Party is needed there, namely, the Central Organ, and a popular paper to be put out in a *specially* popular form by the *same* editorial board.

A special organ of the P.C. is bound to create obstacles towards harmonious work and may even give rise to different lines (or shadings) of policy, which would be extremely harmful, especially at a time of revolution.

Why should we split up our forces?

We are all terribly overworked and have few people to do the work; the party writers are siding more and more with the defencists. Under the circumstances we cannot afford any dispersion of efforts.

We must concentrate our efforts, not disperse them.

Are there any grounds for mistrusting the C.C., for believing that it will not select the editorial board properly, or not give sufficient space in both papers to local activities, or that it will "bully" the P.C.'s editors, who will be in the minority, and so on?

In my second draft resolution I specially listed some of these arguments (which I heard mentioned at the P.C. meeting on May 30) in order to put the issue frankly before all members of the Party so as to make them weigh *each* of the two arguments carefully and arrive at a well-considered decision.

If you, comrades, have weighty and serious reasons for not trusting the C.C., then say so openly. It is the duty of every member of our democratically organised Party to do so, and then it would be the duty of our Party's C.C. to give special consideration to this distrust of yours, report it to the Party congress and enter into special negotiations with a view to overcoming this deplorable lack of confidence in the C.C. on the part of the local organisation.

If there is no such lack of confidence, then it is unfair and wrong to challenge the C.C.'s right, vested in it by the Party congress, to *direct the activities* of the Party in general and its activities in the capital in particular.

Is our C.C. asking too much in wanting to direct the Petrograd papers? It is not. In the German Social-Democratic Party, in its best days, when Wilhelm Liebknecht stood at the head of the party for scores of years, he was the editor of the party's Central Organ. The C.O. was published in Berlin. The Berlin organisation *never* had a special Berlin paper of its own. There was a Press Committee of workers, and there was a *local section* in the party's Central Organ. Why should we depart from this good example which our comrades in other countries have set us?

If you, comrades, desire *special guarantees* from the C.C., if you want changes made in one or another point of the C.C.'s plan for the establishment of two papers, I would ask you on behalf of the C.C. to carefully consider the matter and present your views.

I believe that the decision of the P.C.'s Executive to establish a *special* newspaper in Petrograd is utterly wrong and undesirable, because it splits up our forces and introduces into our Party the elements of conflict. In my opinion—and on this point I merely voice the view of the C.C.—it is desirable that the Petrograd organisation should support the

decision of the C.C., give itself time to check results from the *experience* of the two papers working according to the C.C.'s plan, and then, if need be, pass a special decision on the results of that experiment.

With comradely Social-Democratic greetings,

May 31, 1917

N. Lenin

First published in 1925
in the journal *Krasnaya*
Letopis No. 3 (14)

Published according
to the text
of the typewritten copy

**SPEECH MADE AT THE FIRST PETROGRAD
CONFERENCE OF SHOP COMMITTEES
MAY 31 (JUNE 13), 1917**

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

Comrade Avilov's resolution shows a complete disregard for the class stand. B. V. Avilov would seem to have made up his mind in this resolution to collect together and concentrate all the faults common to all the resolutions of the petty-bourgeois parties.

Avilov's resolution starts with the postulate, by now indisputable to any socialist, that capitalism's robber economy has reduced Russia to complete economic and industrial ruin, but then goes on to propose the hazy formula of control of industry by "the state authorities" with the co-operation of the broad democratic mass.

Everybody nowadays is having a good deal to say about control. Even people who used to scream "murder" at the very mention of the word "control" now admit that control is necessary.

By using the term "control" in the abstract, however, they want to reduce the idea of control to naught.

The coalition government, which "socialists" have now joined, has done nothing yet in the way of putting this control into effect, and therefore it is quite understandable that the shop committees are demanding real workers' control, and not control on paper.

In dealing with the idea of control and the question of when and by whom this control is to be effected, one must not for a single moment forget the class character of the modern state, which is merely an organisation of class rule.

A similar class analysis should be applied to the concept "revolutionary democracy", and this analysis should be based on the actual balance of social forces.

Avilov's resolution starts with a promise to give everything, but ends, in effect, with a proposition to leave everything as it was. There is not a shadow of revolutionism in the whole resolution.

In revolutionary times of all times it is necessary accurately to analyse the question as to the very essence of the state, as to whose interests it shall protect, and as to how it should be constructed in order effectively to protect the interests of the working people. In Avilov's resolution this has not been dealt with at all.

Why is it that our new coalition government, which "socialists" have now joined, has not carried out control in the course of three months, and, what is more, in the conflict between the colliery owners and the workers of Southern Russia, the government has openly sided with the capitalists?

For control over industry to be effectively carried out it must be a *workers' control* with a workers' majority in all the leading bodies, and the management must give an account of its actions to all the authoritative workers' organisations.

Comrades, workers, see that you get real control, not fictitious control, and reject in the most resolute manner all resolutions and proposals for establishing such a fictitious control existing only on paper.

INFAMY JUSTIFIED

The International Relations Department of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet has sent a letter to Huysmans, well-known as Secretary of the bankrupt Second International, whose members went over to the side of "their" national governments.

This letter, published in issue No. 78 of *Izvestia*, tries to prove that the Russian Narodniks and Mensheviks, who joined the bourgeois and imperialist government, cannot be "compared" to the West-European betrayers of socialism, who joined "their" governments. The "Department's" case is so feeble and pitiful, so ludicrously impotent that it needs to be shown up again and again in all its unsightly futility.

Argument 1. In other countries these people joined the government "under entirely different conditions". This is not true. The difference between Britain, France, Denmark, Belgium, Italy, etc., on the one hand, and present-day Russia, on the other, is "entirely" *negligible*. Everyone who has *not* betrayed socialism knows that the question at issue is the class *rule* of the bourgeoisie. In *this* respect conditions in all the countries mentioned above are the same, and not "different". National peculiarities do not in the least affect the basic issue of bourgeois class rule.

Argument 2. "Our" ministers have joined a "revolutionary" government. This is a disgraceful method of hoodwinking the people by means of the great word "revolution", which the Mensheviks and Narodniks use to cover up their betrayal of it. Everyone knows that ten of the sixteen ministers in today's "revolutionary" government belong to the parties of the landowners and capitalists, who stand for the imperial-

ist war and non-publication of the secret treaties, and that these parties are now pursuing a *counter-revolutionary* policy. This was clearly demonstrated by the elections to the District Councils of Petrograd on May 27-29, when *all* the Black-Hundred elements rallied to *support* the majority in our "revolutionary" government.

Argument 3. "Our" ministers joined "with a definite mandate to achieve world peace by agreement among the nations and not to drag out the imperialist war for the sake of liberating the nations by force of arms". For one thing, this mandate is not "definite" at all, since it implies neither a definite *programme* nor any definite *action*. These are mere words. It is like the secretary of a labour union becoming an executive member of a capitalist association at a salary of 10,000 rubles "with a definite mandate" to work for the welfare of labour and not drag out the rule of capitalism. Second, *all* imperialists, including Wilhelm and Poincaré, are out for "an agreement among the nations". This, too, is an empty phrase. Third, the war on Russia's part, since May 6, 1917, is obviously being "dragged out", among other reasons, because our imperialist government has so far failed to announce or propose clear and precise terms of peace, terms of an agreement.

Argument 4. "Our" ministers' aim "is not cessation of the class struggle, but its continuation by means of the instruments of political power". Splendid! All you need to do is to cloak vileness with a good aim or a good excuse for participation in vileness—and the trick is done! Participation in a bourgeois imperialist government, which is *actually* waging an imperialist war, may, it appears, be called "continuation of the class struggle by means of instruments of political power". This is a perfect gem. We suggest that at every workers' and public meeting three cheers should be raised for Chernov, Tsereteli, Peshekhonov and Skobelev, who are waging "*a class struggle*" against Tereshchenko, Lvov and Co.

You will be laughed to scorn, gentlemen of the "Department", for defending ministerialism with such arguments. You are not original, though. The famous Vandervelde, friend of Plekhanov (whom you scold, although, since you have joined the cabinet, you have no moral right to do so),

said long ago that he, too, had joined the cabinet "to continue the class struggle".

Argument 5. "Our" ministers joined the cabinet after the overthrow of tsarism and the expulsion of "the enemies of the Russian proletariat [i.e., Milyukov and Guchkov] by the movement of the revolutionary mass on April 20-21".

You can hardly blame the French for having overthrown their autocracy 122 years ago, instead of 100 days ago, or the English for having done it over 260 years ago, or the Italians for having done it decades ago. April 20 saw Milyukov ejected and replaced by Tereshchenko, i.e., absolutely nothing has changed as far as class or party relations are concerned. New promises do not imply a new policy.

You could dismiss the Metropolitan and put the Pope in his place, but that does not mean you would cease to be a clerical.

Argument 6. In Russia "there is full freedom for the proletariat and the army". That is untrue—it is *not* full. It is fuller than in other countries, and all the more shameful therefore is it to *soil* this young unsullied freedom with the dirt of participation in a bourgeois imperialist government.

The Russian betrayers of socialism differ from their European namesakes no more than the rapist differs from the ravisher.

Argument 7. "Moreover the Russian proletariat has the means of exercising complete control over those it elects."

That is untrue. Partyism in Russia is so young and disintegration among the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries is so evident (Martov's semi-breakaway, Kamkov's protests and his forming a bloc with us at the elections against *his own* party, the Menshevik-S.R. bloc with *Yedinstvo*, which *they themselves* call *imperialist*, etc.) that there can be *no* question of any serious, not to say "complete", control of the ministers on the part of the proletariat.

Besides, proletariat is a *class* concept, which the Mensheviks and Narodniks have no right to use, because they rely mostly on the support of the *petty bourgeoisie*. Once you speak of classes, be precise!

Argument 8. "The fact that representatives of the Russian socialist [?] proletariat [?] have joined the government does

not imply any weakening of its bonds with the socialists of all countries who are fighting against imperialism. On the contrary, it signifies a strengthening of those bonds in the joint struggle for world peace.”

That is untrue. A mere phrase.

Everyone knows that their joining the government in Russia has strengthened the *bonds* that unite the *adherents* of imperialism, the social-chauvinists, the *social-imperialists* of all countries—Henderson and Co., Thomas and Co., *Scheidemann* and Co.

Yes, *Scheidemann*, too! For he realises that *German* social-imperialism will be *safe* to continue exercising its baneful influence on the world's labour movement, since *even* the Russians, their great measure of freedom and their revolution *notwithstanding*, have entered into a shameful alliance with *their* imperialist bourgeoisie.

Pravda No. 70,
June 14 (1), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

THE PETTY-BOURGEOIS STAND ON THE QUESTION OF ECONOMIC DISORGANISATION

Novaya Zhizn today publishes a resolution introduced by Comrade Avilov at a meeting of shop committees. Unfortunately, this resolution must be regarded as an example of a petty-bourgeois attitude that is neither Marxist nor socialist. Because this resolution accentuates in sharp focus all the weaknesses peculiar to the Menshevik and Narodnik Soviet resolutions, it is typical and worthy of attention.

The resolution begins with an excellent general statement, with a splendid indictment of the capitalists: "The present economic debacle ... is a result of the war and the *predatory anarchic rule of the capitalists and the government.*" Correct! That capital is oppressive, that it is a predator, that it is the original source of anarchy—in this the petty bourgeois is ready to agree with the proletariat. But there the similarity ends. The proletarian regards capitalist economy as a robber economy, and therefore wages a class struggle against it, shapes his whole policy on unconditional distrust of the capitalist class, and in dealing with the question of the state his first concern is to distinguish which class the "state" serves, whose class interests it stands for. The petty bourgeois, at times, gets "furious" with capital, but as soon as the fit of anger is over he goes back to his old faith in the capitalists, to the hopes placed in the "state" ... of the capitalists!

The same thing has happened with Comrade Avilov.

After a splendid, strongly worded, formidable introduction accusing the capitalists and even the government of the capitalists of running a "robber" economy, Comrade Avilov, throughout his resolution, in all its concrete sub-

stance and all its practical proposals, *forgets the class standpoint*, and, like the Mensheviks and Narodniks, lapses into bombast about the "state" in general, about "revolutionary democracy" in the abstract.

Workers! Predatory capital is creating anarchy and economic chaos, and the government of the capitalists, too, is ruling by anarchy. Salvation lies in control on the part of "the state with the co-operation of revolutionary democracy". This is the substance of Avilov's resolution.

What are you talking about, Comrade Avilov! How can a Marxist forget that the state is an organ of class rule? Is it not ridiculous to appeal to a *capitalist state* to take action against "predatory capitalists"?

How can a Marxist forget that in the history of all countries the capitalists, too, have often been "revolutionary democrats", as in England in 1649, in France in 1789, in 1830, 1848, and 1870, and in Russia in February 1917?

Can you have forgotten that the revolutionary democracy of the capitalists, of the petty bourgeoisie and of the proletariat must be distinguished one from the other? Does not the *whole* history of *all* the revolutions I have just mentioned show a distinction of classes *within* "revolutionary democracy"?

To continue in Russia to speak of "revolutionary democracy" in general after the experience of February, March, April and May 1917 is to deceive the people knowingly or unknowingly, consciously or unconsciously. The "moment" of general fusion of classes against tsarism has come and gone. The very first agreement between the first "Provisional Committee" of the Duma and the Soviet marked the *end* of the class fusion and the beginning of the class struggle.

The April crisis (April 20), followed by that of May 6, then May 27-29 (the elections), etc., etc., have brought about a definite cleavage of *classes* in the Russian revolution within the Russian "revolutionary democracy". To ignore this is to sink to the helpless level of the petty bourgeois.

To appeal now to the "state" and to "revolutionary democracy" on the matter of predatory capitalism of all questions, is to drag the working class backward. *In effect* it means preaching complete stoppage of the revolution. For our "state" *today*, after April, after May, is a state of "predator" capital-

ists, who, in the persons of Chernov, Tsereteli and Co., have *tamed* a fairly considerable portion of “revolutionary (petty-bourgeois) democracy”.

This state is hindering the revolution everywhere, in all fields of home and foreign policy.

To hand over to *this* state the job of fighting the capitalist “predators” is like *throwing the pike into the river*.*

Written May 31 (June 13), 1917

Published June 14 (1), 1917
in *Pravda* No. 70

Published according
to the newspaper text

* The offending pike, in Krylov's fable, was sentenced to be drowned by being thrown into the river.—*Ed.*

A MOTE IN THE EYE

Algeria let them down.... Our ministeriable "Socialist-Revolutionaries" had almost succeeded in stunning the public—and themselves—into believing all their talk about "peace without annexations", but ... Algeria let them down. *Dyelo Naroda*, a newspaper to which two Socialist-Revolutionary ministers, Kerensky and Chernov, contribute, was ... incautious enough to invite the views of three Allied cabinet ministers (belonging to the same near-socialist camp) on Algeria. How terribly careless this was on the part of the newspaper of the Kerenskys and Chernovs will be seen from the following.

The three Allied ministers—Henderson, Thomas and Vandervelde of Britain, France and Belgium, stated that they did not want "annexation", but only "liberation of territories". The paper of the Kerenskys and Chernovs described this—quite rightly—as a "sleight of hand" on the part of the "tamed-socialists", and poured out on them the following angry and sarcastic tirade:

"True, they [the three ministers] demand the liberation of territories' only 'in conformity with the will of the population'. Very well! But in that case we ought to demand that they, and we, be consistent and recognise the 'liberation' of Ireland and Finland on the one hand, and Algeria or Siam on the other. It would be very interesting to hear the opinion of, say, the socialist Albert Thomas on 'self-determination' for Algeria."

Indeed, "it would be very interesting to bear the opinion" also of Kerensky, Tsereteli, Chernov and Skobelev on "self-determination" for Armenia, Galicia, Ukraine, and Turkestan.

Don't you see, you Narodnik and Menshevik members of the Russian Government, that by citing the example of

Ireland and Algeria you have exposed the whole lie and falsity of your own position and behaviour. You have shown that "annexation" *cannot* be interpreted merely as the seizure of territory *in this war*. In other words, you have refuted yourselves and *Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet which only the other day declared with proud ignorance that the term annexation could be applied only to territories seized in the present war. But who does not know that Ireland and Algeria were annexed decades and centuries before the outbreak of this war?

Careless, very careless of *Dyelo Naroda!* It has exposed its utter confusion of ideas, and that of the Mensheviks and *Izvestia*, on such a key issue as annexations.

Nor is that all. You question Henderson about Ireland, and Albert Thomas about Algeria; you contrast the views on annexation of the "French *bourgeoisie* now in power" with the views of the French *people*; you call Henderson and Albert Thomas "tamed socialists"—but what about yourselves?

What are you, Kerensky, Tsereteli, Chernov, Skobelev, if not "tamed socialists"? Did *you* raise the question of the *Russian* Ireland and the *Russian* Algeria, i.e., of Turkestan, Armenia, Ukraine, Finland, etc., before the government of the "Russian *bourgeoisie* now in power"? When did you raise this question? Why don't you tell the Russian "people" about it? Why don't you qualify as "sleight of hand" the *Russian* Narodniks' and Mensheviks' blether about "peace without annexations" in the Soviet, in the government and before the people, *without raising*, clearly and unambiguously, the question of *all Russian* annexations of the same type as Ireland and Algeria?

The Russian ministeriable Narodniks and Mensheviks are in a hopeless muddle; every passing day adds to their self-exposure.

Their "final" stock argument is that we are having a revolution. But that argument is false from beginning to end. For our revolution *so far* has only brought the *bourgeoisie* to power, and in France and Britain, with a "harmless minority" of "tamed socialists", as in France and Britain. What our revolution will produce tomorrow—whether a return to the monarchy, the strengthening of the bourgeoisie, or the trans-

fer of power to more advanced classes—neither we nor anyone else knows. Consequently, the plea of “revolution” in general is a gross deception of the people and of oneself.

The annexation issue is a good touchstone for the Narodniks and Mensheviks, who are entangled in a web of lies. They are *just as* muddled as Plekhanov, Henderson, Scheidemann and Co.; they are distinguishable from each other *only in words*, for as far as *deeds* are concerned they are all alike—dead to socialism.

Pravda No. 70,
June 14 (1), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

IT IS UNDEMOCRATIC, CITIZEN KERENSKY!

The Petrograd Telegraph Agency reports:

“*Kiev*, May 30. A telegram from War Minister Kerensky read at the All-Ukraine Peasant Congress stated that for military reasons the convocation of the second Ukrainian army congress was considered untimely. The Congress held the Minister’s order to be an infringement of the Ukrainians’ right of assembly and sent the following telegram to the Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies:

“We call your attention to this first case of infringement of the right of assembly on the part of Minister Kerensky in respect of the Ukrainian army congress. We decline all responsibility for the possible consequences of this infringement of democratic principles of the new life in respect of the Ukrainians. We lodge an emphatic protest and await the Provisional Government’s immediate reply to the demands submitted by the delegation of the Ukrainian Central Rada.”

This report will undoubtedly cause great concern among the socialist workers.

The War Minister deems the congress of Ukrainians “untimely” and uses his power to ban it! Not so long ago citizen Kerensky tried to bring Finland to heel, and now he has decided to bring the Ukrainians to heel. And all this is done in the name of “democracy”!

A. I. Herzen once said that when you look at the antics of Russia’s ruling classes you feel ashamed of being a Russian.¹²⁸ This was said at a time when Russia was groaning under the yoke of serfdom, when the land was ruled by the knout and the rod.

Today Russia has overthrown the tsar. Today the Kerenskys and the Lvovs speak in the name of Russia. Russia of the Kerenskys and Lvovs treats her subject nations in such a way that one cannot help recalling these bitter words of Herzen’s.

We say nothing of the fact that by his "dominant-nation" policy Citizen Kerensky is merely augmenting and bolstering the very tendencies towards "separatism" which the Kerenskys and the Lvovs are trying to smother.

We ask: Is such treatment of the oppressed nationalities compatible with plain democracy, let alone socialism? We ask: Is there a limit to the "antics" of Citizen Kerensky and his followers?

We ask the Party of the "Socialist-Revolutionaries" whether it subscribes to this step taken by its honourable member, Citizen Kerensky, in banning the Ukrainian congress.

* * *

We are informed that the Executive Committee of the Soviet yesterday decided to invite Citizen Kerensky specially to discuss with him the question of self-determination of nations and the question of national policy in general.

Yet people had been saying that the Contact Commission was dead. Nothing of the sort, gentlemen! Dual power still exists. The only way out of the present situation is to have all power pass to the Soviets.

Pravda No. 71,
June 15 (2), 1917

Published according
to the text in *Pravda*

BOLSHEVIKS AND "DEMORALISATION" OF THE ARMY

Everybody is screaming for "strong government". The only salvation is in a dictatorship, in "iron discipline", in silencing and reducing to obedience all the refractory members of the Right and Left. We know *whom* they wish to silence. The Rights are making no noise, they are *working*. Some of them in the government, others at the factories, all of them with threats of lockouts, orders for the disbanding of regiments, and the threat of penal servitude. The Konovalovs and the Tereshchenkos, with the help of the Kerenskys and the Skobelevs, are working in an *organised* manner for their own good. And they don't have to be silenced.

All we have is the *right of speech*.

And of this right they want to deprive us.

Pravda is barred from the front. The Kiev "agents" have decided not to distribute *Pravda*. The Zemstvo Union is not selling *Pravda* in its newspaper stands. And now we are promised a "systematic fight against the preaching of Leninism" (*Izvestia*). On the other hand, every spontaneous protest, every excess, wherever it comes from, is *blamed on us*.

This, too, is a method for combating Bolshevism.

A well-tried method.

Unable as they are to get clear guidelines, aware instinctively how false and unsatisfactory is the position of the official leaders of democracy, the masses are compelled to *grope a way out for themselves*.

The result is that every dissatisfied, class-conscious revolutionary, every angered fighter who yearns for his village home and sees no end to the war, and sometimes simply men

who are out to save their own skins, rally to the banner of Bolshevism.

Where Bolshevism has a chance to air its views openly, there we find no disorganisation.

Where there are no Bolsheviks or where they are not allowed to speak, there we find excesses, demoralisation, and pseudo-Bolsheviks.

And that is just what our enemies need.

They need a pretext for saying: "*The Bolsheviks are demoralising the army*" and then *shutting the Bolsheviks' mouths*.

To dispose once for all of "enemy" slander and the ridiculous distortions of Bolshevism, we quote the concluding part of a leaflet distributed in the army by one of our delegates on the eve of the All-Russia Congress.

Here it is:

"Comrades, you must have your say.

"Do not let us have any agreements with the bourgeoisie!

"All power to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies!

"This does not mean that we must immediately overthrow the present government or disobey it. So long as the majority of the people support it and believe that five socialists can cope with all the rest, we cannot afford to fritter away our forces in desultory uprisings.

"Never!

"Husband your strength! Get together at meetings! Pass resolutions! Demand that all power be handed over to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies! Convince those who disagree with us! Send your resolution to me at the Congress in Petrograd in the name of your regiment, so that I can quote your voice there!

"But beware of those who, posing as Bolsheviks, will try to provoke you to riots and disturbances as a screen for their own cowardice! Know that though they are with you now, they will sell you out to the old regime at the first hint of danger.

"The real Bolsheviks call you to conscious revolutionary struggle, and not to riots.

"Comrades! The All-Russia Congress will elect representatives, to whom, pending the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the Provisional Government will be accountable.

"Comrades! At that Congress I shall demand:

"First, that *all power be handed over to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies*.

"Second, that *a proposal for peace without annexations or indemnities* be made immediately in the name of our people *to the peoples and governments of all the belligerent nations, both our Allies and our enemies*. If any government tries to turn it down it will be *overthrown by its own people*.

“Third, that the money which people have made out of the war should be converted to state needs *by way of confiscation of the capitalists’ war profits*.

“Comrades! Only by the transfer of power to the democracy in Russia, Germany, and France, only *by the overthrow of the bourgeois governments in all countries, can the war be ended*.

“*Our revolution has started this, and it is our task now to give a further impetus to the world revolution by having a fully authorised popular Russian government make an offer of peace to all the governments of Europe and by strengthening our alliance with the revolutionary democrats of Western Europe*.

“*Woe betide the bourgeois government that will persist in continuing the war after this*.

“*Together with its people we shall make revolutionary war upon that government*.

“It is to say all this to our government in Petrograd in your name that I have been elected to the Congress in Petrograd.

“Member of the Army Committee of the 11th Army, Delegate of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks) to the Congress of the South-Western Front, Ensign *Krylenko*.

No one who has taken the trouble to read our Party’s resolutions can fail to see that the *gist* of them has been correctly expressed by Comrade Krylenko.

The Bolsheviks are calling the proletariat, the poor peasants and all the toiling and exploited people to a conscious revolutionary struggle, and not to riots and disturbances.

Only a genuine government of the people, a government belonging to the *majority* of the nation, is capable of following the *right* path leading mankind to the overthrow of the capitalist yoke, to deliverance from the horrors and misery of the imperialist war, and to a just and lasting peace.

THE LAUGH IS ON YOU!

“King Constantine [of Greece] signed the act of abdication under pressure from Allied diplomacy,” writes the newspaper of Mr. Milyukov, ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Provisional “revolutionary” Government.

The Allied diplomats have completed the subjugation of Greece by first sparking off the Venizelos movement (Venizelos is a former minister of Constantine’s who entered the service of the British capitalists), causing a split in the army, seizing part of Greek territory, and finally using “pressure” to force the abdication of the “lawful” monarch, i.e., to force a revolution from above. What kind of “pressure” that was and is everybody knows. It was pressure by *starvation*. Greece was blockaded by the warships of the Anglo-French and Russian imperialists and left *without bread*. The “pressure” on Greece was of the same order as that recently applied in Russia by the ignorant peasants of some out-of-the-way village, who, if we are to believe the newspapers, condemned a citizen to death by starvation for having allegedly insulted the Christian religion.

The ignorant peasants in some godforsaken hole in Russia starved a “criminal” to death. The “civilised” imperialists of Britain, France, Russia, etc., *starved* a whole country, a whole nation, to force it, by “pressure”, to change its policy.

There we have the *reality* of the imperialist war. There we have the real state of international relations at the present time. The S.R. gentlemen laugh at this. It is really funny, very funny....

Dyelo Naroda, the ministerial paper of Kerensky, Chernov and Co., publishes a laughing editorial entitled: “‘Self-determination’ for Greece”. The S.R.s’ gibe at Greek “self-determination” would have been admirable *had it been sincere*.

Sincerity in politics does not mean that Kerensky, Chernov and Co. have to prove their personal sincerity—we readily take that for granted. That is not the point. Sincerity in politics, that is, in that sphere of human relations which involves, not individuals, but the *millions*, is a *correspondence between word and deed* that lends itself to verification.

The editorial in *Dyelo Naroda* is insincere because it is precisely the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, precisely the Kerenskys and the Chernovs, *as its leaders*, who support the Ministry of subjugation ... I beg your pardon, the Ministry of Greek “self-determination”, together with citizens Tsereteli and Skobelev.

“It is clear to everyone,” writes *Dyelo Naroda*, “that there is no essential difference between imperialist Germany’s robber attack on Belgium, Austria’s attack on Serbia and the present ‘advance into the interior of Greece’ on the part of the Allies governments.”

Yes, this is clear, and this is not at all a question of “ethics”, as the S.R.s believe, but a matter of pure politics. A robber attack—*that is what you* are participating in, citizens S.R.s, citizens Mensheviks, *as members of the government*. The robber attack is an established fact, and “pressure from Allied diplomacy”—from all the Allies, including *Russia*—was apparently applied *also after* Chernov, Tsereteli and Co. joined the cabinet.

And what about the platforms of “peace without annexations”? What about the “demands” of “revolutionary democracy” from the new government? What about the declarations? Surely it is clear by this time that all these platforms, declarations, promises, statements, pledges, vows, etc., etc., are a *sheer mockery* of the people.

The laugh is on you, gentlemen of the S.R. and Menshevik fold! You are laughing at your own policy of trust in the capitalists and the government of the capitalists! You are laughing at your own role of eloquent and bombastic servants of capitalism and imperialism, servants in the rank of ministers!

NOTES

¹ Published in *Pravda* No. 26, for April 7, 1917, over the signature N. Lenin, this article contains Lenin's famous April Theses read by him at two meetings held at the Taurida Palace on April 4 (17), 1917 (at a meeting of Bolsheviks and at a joint meeting of Bolshevik and Menshevik delegates to the All-Russia Conference of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies). The article was reprinted in the Bolshevik newspapers *Sotsial-Demokrat* (Moscow), *Proletary* (Kharkov), *Krasnoyarsky Rabochy* (Krasnoyarsk), *Vperyod* (Ufa), *Bakinsky Rabochy* (Baku), *Kavkazsky Rabochy* (Tiflis) and others. p. 19

² *Socialist-Revolutionaries* (S.R.s)—a petty-bourgeois party formed in Russia at the end of 1901 and beginning of 1902 through the amalgamation of various Narodnik groups and circles (the Union of Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries, and others). The views of the S.R.s were an eclectic medley of Narodism and revisionism; they tried, as Lenin put it, to "patch up the rents in the Narodnik ideas with bits of fashionable opportunist 'criticism' of Marxism" (see present edition, Vol. 9, p. 310). The First World War found most of the S.R.s taking a social-chauvinist stand.

After the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917, the S.R.s, together with the Mensheviks and Cadets, were the mainstay of the counter-revolutionary Provisional Government of the bourgeoisie and landowners, and the leaders of the party (Kerensky, Avksentyev, Chernov) were members of that government. The S.R. Party refused to support the peasants' demand for the abolition of the landed estates and in effect stood for private property in land; the S.R. ministers in the Provisional Government sent punitive expeditions against the peasants who had seized landed estates. On the eve of the October armed uprising this party openly sided with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie in defence of the capitalist system and found itself isolated from the mass of the revolutionary people.

At the end of November 1917 the Left wing of the party founded a separate Left Socialist-Revolutionary Party. In an endeavour to maintain their influence among the peasant masses, the Left S.R.s formally recognised the Soviet Government and entered into an agreement with the Bolsheviks, but very soon turned against the Soviet power.

During the years of foreign military intervention and civil war the S.R.s engaged in counter-revolutionary subversive activities, zealously supported the interventionists and whiteguard generals, took part in counter-revolutionary plots, and organised terrorist acts against leaders of the Soviet state and Communist Party. After the Civil War they continued their anti-Soviet activities within the country and as whiteguard émigrés abroad.

Popular Socialists—members of the petty-bourgeois Labour Popular Socialist Party, which separated from the Right wing of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party in 1906. The P.S.s stood for a bloc with the Cadets. Lenin called them “Social-Cadets”, “petty-bourgeois opportunists”, and “Socialist-Revolutionary Mensheviks” who vacillated between the Cadets and the S.R.s, and he emphasised that this party “differs very little from the Cadets, for it deletes from its programme both the republicanism and the demand for all the land” (see present edition, Vol. 11, p. 228). The party’s leaders were A. V. Peshekhonov, N. F. Annensky, V. A. Myakotin, and others. During the First World War the P.S.s took a social-chauvinist stand. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 the Popular Socialist Party merged with the Trudoviks and actively supported the bourgeois Provisional Government, in which it was represented. After the October Socialist Revolution the P.S.s participated in plots and armed acts against the Soviet government. The party went out of existence during the period of foreign military intervention and civil war.

The *Organising Committee* (O.C.) was set up in 1912 at the August conference of the liquidators. During the First World War the O.C. justified the war on the part of tsarism and advocated the ideas of nationalism and chauvinism. The O.C. published the journal *Nashe Zarya*, and when this was closed down, *Nashe Dyelo*, then *Dyelo*, and the newspapers *Rabocheye Utro*, then *Utro*. The O.C. functioned up to the time of the election of the Central Committee of the Menshevik party in August 1917. p. 22

³ *Yedinstvo* (Unity)—a daily published in Petrograd from March to November 1917, and then under another name from December 1917 to January 1918. Edited by G. V. Plekhanov. United the extreme Right of the Menshevik defencists and gave unqualified support to the bourgeois Provisional Government. Carried on a fierce struggle against the Bolshevik Party. p. 24

⁴ *Russkaya Volya* (Russian Freedom)—a bourgeois daily founded and run by the big banks. Carried on a riot-provoking campaign against the Bolsheviks. Lenin called it one of the most disreputable bourgeois newspapers. Appeared in Petrograd from December 1916 to October 1917. p. 25

⁵ See Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 21-22, 516-30, Vol. II, Moscow, 1962, pp. 42, 463-64. p. 26

⁶ On August 4, 1914, the Social-Democrats in the Reichstag voted together with the bourgeois M.P.s in favour of a 5,000 million war loan for the Kaiser government, thereby approving the imperialist policy of Wilhelm II. As it afterwards emerged, the Left Social-Democrats, during the discussion of this question by the Social-Democratic group previous to the Reichstag session, were against granting the government war loans, but they bowed to the decision of the opportunist majority and voted in favour. p. 26

⁷ This article is a report to the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet made by Lenin the day after his arrival in Petrograd on April 4 (17), 1917, on behalf of the emigrants who returned from Switzerland together with him. p. 27

⁸ The *Bund* (General Jewish Workers' Union of Lithuania, Poland, and Russia) was organised in 1897 at the inaugural congress of the Jewish Social-Democratic groups in Vilna. It was an association mainly of semi-proletarian elements from among the Jewish artisans of Russia's western regions.

During the First World War (1914-18) the Bundists took a social-chauvinist stand. In 1917 the Bund supported the bourgeois Provisional Government and fought on the side of the enemies of the October Socialist Revolution. During the foreign military intervention and civil war its leaders joined forces with the counter-revolution. At the same time a change was taking place among the rank-and-file membership in favour of collaboration with the Soviet power. In March 1921 the Bund decided to dissolve itself, and some of its members were admitted to membership of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) by the usual rules of procedure. p. 27

⁹ *Nashe Slovo* (Our Word)—a Menshevik-Trotskyist daily published in Paris from January 1915 to September 1916. p. 27

¹⁰ *Rech* (Speech)—a daily, central organ of the Cadet Party, published in St. Petersburg from February 1906. Closed down by the Revolutionary Military Committee of the Petrograd Soviet on October 26 (November 8), 1917. Reappeared under other names until August 1918. p. 29

¹¹ Lenin refers to the appeal of the Petrograd Soviet "To the Peoples of the World", adopted at its meeting on March 14 (27), 1917, and published the next day in the central newspapers. The Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik leaders were obliged to issue this appeal under pressure from the revolutionary masses, who demanded an end to the war.

The appeal called upon the working people of the belligerent countries to come out in favour of peace. It did not, however, expose the predatory nature of the war, did not propose any practical steps in the fight for peace, and in effect, justified the continuation of the imperialist war by the bourgeois Provisional Government. p. 29

¹² *Novoye Vremya* (New Times)—a daily newspaper of the reactionary nobility and bureaucracy, published in St. Petersburg from 1868. In 1905 it became an organ of the Black Hundreds. Lenin called it a model of the venal press. After the February revolution *Novoye Vremya* fully supported the counter-revolutionary policy of the bourgeois Provisional Government and conducted a vicious hounding campaign against the Bolsheviks. The paper was closed down by the Revolutionary Military Committee of the Petrograd Soviet on October 26 (November 8), 1917. p. 30

¹³ *Izvestia* (News) of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies—a daily, began to appear on February 28 (March 13), 1917. After the First All-Russia Congress of Soviets at which the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies was elected, the newspaper became the organ of the C.E.C., and from August 1 (14), 1917 (beginning with No. 132) it appeared under the name of *Izvestia* of the Central Executive Committee and the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Throughout this time the newspaper was controlled by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries and waged a fierce struggle against the Bolshevik Party. Beginning with October 27 (November 9), 1917, after the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets, *Izvestia* became the official organ of the Soviet government. With the transfer to Moscow of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars, the newspaper was published in Moscow. p. 30

¹⁴ *Pravda* (Truth)—a legal Bolshevik daily, published in St. Petersburg. Founded in April 1912 on the initiative of the St. Petersburg workers.

Pravda was a mass working-class newspaper published with money collected by the workers themselves. A wide circle of worker correspondents and worker writers formed round the paper. In a single year it published over 11,000 items from worker correspondents. *Pravda* had an average daily circulation of 40,000 rising in some months to as high a figure as 60,000.

Lenin directed the newspaper while living abroad. He wrote for it almost every day, gave instructions and advice to its editors, and gathered around the paper the Party's best literary forces.

Pravda was subjected to constant police persecutions. During its first year of publication it was confiscated forty-one times, its editors were prosecuted thirty-six times and were sentenced to terms of imprisonment totalling 47½ months. During two years and three months *Pravda* was closed down by the tsarist government eight times, but reappeared under other names (*Rabochaya Pravda*, *Severnaya Pravda*, *Pravda Truda*, *Za Pravdu*, *Proletarskaya Pravda*, *Put Pravdy*, *Rabochy*, *Trudovaya Pravda*). The paper was closed down on July 8 (21), 1914, on the eve of the First World War, and did not resume publication until after the February revolution. Beginning with March 5 (18), 1917 it came out as the Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P. On April 5 (18), on his

return from abroad, Lenin joined the Editorial Board of *Pravda* and became its Editor-in-Chief. On July 5(18), 1917 the newspaper offices were wrecked by the officer cadets and Cossacks. Between July and October 1917 *Pravda* was persecuted by the Provisional Government and repeatedly changed its name, coming out as *Listok Pravdy*, *Proletary*, *Rabochy*, *Rabochy Put*. Beginning with October 27 (November 9) the paper came out under its old name of *Pravda*. p. 30

- ¹⁵ The *All-Russia Conference of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies* convened by the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet was held in Petrograd between March 29 and April 3 (April 11 and 16), 1917.

The Conference was attended by representatives of the Petrograd and local Soviets, as well as of front and rear army units. The Conference discussed the questions of the war, the attitude towards the Provisional Government, the Constituent Assembly, the agrarian, food and other questions.

The Conference, at which the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries had a controlling influence, took a stand of "revolutionary defencism" and adopted a resolution calling for support to the bourgeois Provisional Government. p. 34

- ¹⁶ *Kurland*—the old name of a Baltic region west and south-west of the Gulf of Riga. p. 35

- ¹⁷ *Rabochaya Gazeta* (Worker's Newspaper)—the central organ of the Mensheviks, published as a daily in Petrograd from March to November 1917. p. 36

- ¹⁸ Lenin's pamphlet *Letters on Tactics. First Letter* was issued in Petrograd in 1917 by the Bolshevik publishing house Priboi in three editions. The April Theses were given as a supplement to all three editions. p. 42

- ¹⁹ See Engels's letter to F. A. Sorge dated November 29, 1886 (Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1955, pp. 469-73). p. 43

- ²⁰ Lenin here quotes the words of Mephistopheles from Goethe's tragedy *Faust*. Erster Teil, Studierzimmer. p. 45

- ²¹ The expression "*His Majesty's Opposition*" belongs to P. N. Milyukov, the leader of the Cadet Party. In a speech made at a luncheon given by the Lord Mayor of London on June 19 (July 2), 1909, Milyukov said: "So long as there is a legislative chamber in Russia which controls the budget, the Russian Opposition will remain the Opposition of His Majesty, not to His Majesty" (*Rech* No. 167, June 21 [July 4], 1909). p. 48

- ²² "*No Tsar, but a workers' government*"—an anti-Bolshevik slogan put forward in 1905 by Parvus and Trotsky. This slogan of a

revolution without the peasantry, which became one of the basic postulates of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, was sharply criticised by Lenin. p. 48

²³ See Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 516-30, 473-74. p. 49

²⁴ Lenin refers to Plekhanov's pamphlet *Anarchism and Socialism*, first published in German in 1894. p. 50

²⁵ Lenin here refers to the volume of his writings published in St. Petersburg at the end of 1907: Vl. Ilyin *Twelve Years. A Collection of Articles. Volume I. Two Trends in Russian Marxism and Russian Social-Democracy*. p. 52

²⁶ *Cadets*—(abbreviated) members of the Constitutional-Democratic Party, the chief party of the liberal monarchist bourgeoisie in Russia. Founded in October 1905, its membership was made up of representatives of the bourgeoisie, Zemstvo leaders of the landowning class and bourgeois intellectuals. Among the leading personalities of the party were P. N. Milyukov, S. A. Muromtsev, V. A. Maklakov, A. I. Shingaryov, P. B. Struve and F. I. Rodichev. Eventually, the Cadets became a party of the imperialist bourgeoisie. During the First World War they fully supported the tsarist government's aggressive foreign policy. During the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 they tried their hardest to save the monarchy. They used their key positions in the bourgeois Provisional Government to pursue a counter-revolutionary policy opposed to the interests of the people, but favouring the U.S., British and French imperialists. After the victory of the October Revolution the Cadets came out as implacable enemies of the Soviet power. They took part in all the counter-revolutionary armed actions and campaigns of the interventionists. Living abroad as émigrés after the defeat of the interventionists and whiteguards, the Cadets did not cease their anti-Soviet counter-revolutionary activities. p. 57

²⁷ *Trudoviks* (the Trudovik group)—a group of petty-bourgeois democrats in the Russian Duma consisting of peasants and intellectuals of a Narodnik trend. The Trudovik group was formed in April 1906 by peasant deputies to the First Duma. In the Duma the Trudoviks vacillated between the Cadets and the revolutionary Social-Democrats. During the First World War most of the Trudoviks took a social-chauvinist stand.

After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 the Trudoviks, representing the interests of the kulaks, actively supported the Provisional Government. The Trudovik Zarudny, who became Minister of Justice after the July events, persecuted the Bolshevik Party. The Trudoviks were enemies of the October Revolution and sided with the bourgeois counter-revolution. p. 58

- ²⁸ A quotation from Krylov's fable "The Cat and the Cook". p. 64
- ²⁹ See Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Moscow, 1962, p. 42. p. 68
- ³⁰ See Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 522-23. p. 69
- ³¹ The term *Narodniks* is here used to denote the three petty-bourgeois parties of the Narodnik trend, namely, the Trudoviks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, and the Popular Socialists. p. 72
- ³² *Manilovism*—from the name Manilov, a character in Gogol's *Dead Souls*, represented as a type of easy-going sentimental landowner, whose name has become a synonym for an idle weak-willed dreamer and gas-bag. p. 75
- ³³ Lenin refers to the *Fabian Society*, an English reformist organisation, founded in 1884, so called after the Roman General Quintus Fabius Maximus (III century B.C.) surnamed Cunctator (Procrastinator) for his mark-time tactics and evasion of decisive battles in the war with Hannibal. The membership of the Fabian Society consisted chiefly of bourgeois intellectuals—scholars, writers and politicians (the Webbs, Ramsay MacDonald, Bernard Shaw and others). They denied the need for the proletariat's class struggle and a socialist revolution, and maintained that the transition from capitalism to socialism could be brought about by means of minor and gradual reforms. Lenin described Fabianism as "an *extremely opportunist* trend—(see present edition, Vol. 13, p. 358). In 1900 the Fabian Society joined the Labour Party. Fabian socialism is one of the sources of Labour Party ideology. During the First World War (1914-18) the Fabians took a social-chauvinist stand. p. 76
- ³⁴ *Workers' or labour group*—Arbeitsgemeinschaft (Social-Democratic Labour Group)—an organisation of the German Centrists formed in March 1916 by breakaway members of the official Social-Democratic group in the Reichstag. Eventually, in 1917, it formed the core of the Centrist Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany, which sought to justify the overt social-chauvinists and stood for preserving unity with them. p. 77
- ³⁵ *Minoritaires* or *Longuetists*—the minority of the French Socialist Party formed in 1915. The *minoritaires* were followers of the social-reformist Longuet; they held Centrist views and pursued a conciliatory policy towards the social-chauvinists. During the First World War they took a social-pacifist stand. After the victory of the October Revolution in Russia they declared themselves adherents of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but in reality they were against it. They continued the policy of co-operation with the social-chauvinists and supported the annexationist Treaty

of Versailles. Finding themselves in a minority at the congress of the French Socialist Party held in Tours in December 1920, where the Left wing won ascendancy, the Longuetists together with the open reformists split away from the party and joined the Two-and-a-Half International, and after its break-down returned to the Second International. p. 77

³⁶ The *Independent Labour Party*—a reformist organisation founded by the leaders of the “new trade unions” in 1893 during the active strike movement and the mounting drive for independence of the British working class from the bourgeois parties. The membership of the I.L.P. consisted of the “new trade unionists” and members of some of the old trade unions, as well as intellectuals and petty bourgeois holding Fabian views. The leaders of the Party were James Keir Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald. From the day it was founded the I.L.P. took a bourgeois-reformist stand, devoting its chief attention to parliamentary forms of struggle and parliamentary deals with the Liberal Party. In the words of Lenin, the Independent Labour Party was “actually an opportunist party that has always been dependent on the bourgeoisie” (see V. I. Lenin, *On Britain*, Moscow, p. 401)

On the outbreak of the imperialist world war the I.L.P. issued a manifesto against the war, but shortly afterwards adopted a social-chauvinist stand. p. 77

³⁷ The *British Socialist Party* was founded in 1911 in Manchester, as a result of the amalgamation of the Social-Democratic Party with other socialist groups. The B.S.P. carried on propaganda in the spirit of Marxist ideas, it was “not opportunist and was really independent of the Liberals” (see present edition, Vol. 19, p. 273). Owing to its small membership and poor contact with the masses, however, it was somewhat sectarian in character. During the First World War a sharp struggle developed in the party between the internationalist trend (William Gallacher, Albert Inkpin, John MacLean, Theodore Rothstein and others) and the social-chauvinist trend headed by Hyndman. There were inconsistent elements within the internationalist trend who took a Centrist stand on a number of issues. In February 1916 a group of the party’s active members founded the newspaper *The Call*, which played an important part in uniting the internationalists. The annual conference of the B.S.P. held at Salford in April 1916 condemned the social-chauvinist stand taken by Hyndman and his adherents, and they left the Party.

The British Socialist Party hailed the October Revolution, and its members played a great part in the British working people’s movement in defence of Soviet Russia against foreign intervention.

In 1919 the majority of the Party organisations (98 against 4) declared in favour of joining the Communist International. The B.S.P., together with the Communist Unity Group, played a leading role in the formation of the Communist Party of Great

Britain. At the First (Unity) Congress held in 1920 the overwhelming majority of the B.S.P. locals joined the Communist Party. p. 77

³⁸ The *Zimmerwald Left group* was founded on Lenin's initiative at the International Socialist Conference held in Zimmerwald in September 1915. It consisted of delegates from the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., the Left Social-Democrats of Sweden, Norway, Switzerland and Germany, the Polish Social-Democratic opposition and the Social-Democrats of the Latvian area. The Zimmerwald Left group, headed by Lenin, waged a struggle against the Centrist majority of the Conference and moved resolutions condemning the imperialist war, exposing the betrayal by the social-chauvinists, and urging the necessity of active struggle against the war. These draft resolutions were rejected by the Centrist majority. The Zimmerwald Left succeeded, however, in getting a number of important points from its own draft resolution included in the manifesto adopted by the Conference. Regarding this manifesto as a first step in the fight against the war, the Zimmerwald Left voted for it, and in a special statement pointed out the inadequacy and inconsistency of the manifesto and their reasons for voting for it. They declared that while remaining within the Zimmerwald organisation they would disseminate their views and work independently on an international scale. The group elected an executive body—a Bureau, consisting of Lenin, Zinoviev and Radek. The Zimmerwald Left published a journal *Vorbote* (Herald) in German, which carried a number of articles by Lenin.

The Bolsheviks, the only group to take a consistent internationalist stand, were the guiding force in the Zimmerwald Left. Lenin opposed Radek's opportunist waverings and criticised the mistakes of other Leftists. The Zimmerwald Left soon became the rallying point for internationalist elements of world Social-Democracy. At the Second International Socialist Conference in April 1916 in Kienthal, Switzerland, the Zimmerwald Left had 12 out of the 43 delegates to the Conference, and on a number of issues obtained nearly half of the total votes. The Social-Democrats of various countries who belonged to the Zimmerwald Left group carried on active revolutionary work and played an important role in the establishment of Communist parties in their countries.

On the Zimmerwald Left see Lenin's articles: "The First Step", "Revolutionary Marxists at the International Socialist Conference, September 5-8, 1915" (see present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 383-93). p. 77

³⁹ The *Internationale* group, later called the Spartacus League, was formed by the German Left Social-Democrats Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring, Clara Zetkin and others at the beginning of the First World War. The group played an important part in the history of the German labour movement. At the national conference of Left Social-Democrats held in

January 1916 the group adopted the thesis concerning the tasks of international Social-Democracy drafted and proposed by Rosa Luxemburg. The *Internationale* group carried on revolutionary propaganda among the masses against the imperialist war, exposing the aggressive policy of German imperialism and the treachery of the leaders of Social-Democracy. The group was not free, however, from serious errors on the most important questions of theory and policies: it rejected the principle of self-determination of nations in its Marxist interpretation (that is, including the right of secession and the formation of a separate state), denied the possibility of national liberation wars in the epoch of imperialism, and underestimated the role of the revolutionary party, so on. Lenin criticised the errors of the German Lefts in his articles: "The Junius Pamphlet", "The War Programme of the Proletarian Revolution" and others (see present edition, Vols. 22 and 23). In 1917 the *Internationale* group became affiliated to the Centrist Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany preserving its organisational independence. After the November revolution in Germany in 1918 it broke with the "Independents", and in December of the same year founded the Communist Party of Germany. p. 78

⁴⁰ The *Socialist Labour Party of America* was founded in 1876 at the unity congress held in Philadelphia as a result of the amalgamation of the American sections of the First International and other socialist organisations. A leading part at the congress was played by F. A. Sorge, an associate of Marx and Engels. The overwhelming majority of the party were immigrants who had poor contacts with the American working class. During the early years the party was controlled by the Lassalleans who made mistakes of a sectarian and dogmatic nature. Some of the party's leaders considered parliamentary activity to be the chief task of the party and underestimated the importance of leadership of the economic struggle of the masses; others slid down to trade-unionism and anarchism. The ideological and tactical waverings of the leaders weakened the party and led to a number of groups dropping away from it. Marx and Engels sharply criticised the sectarianism of the American socialists.

In the nineties the leadership of the party was assumed by the Left wing, headed by D. De Leon, but this group, too, committed errors of an anarcho-syndicalist nature. The S.L.P. withdrew from the struggle for satisfaction of partial demands of the working class, withdrew from work in the reformist trade unions and gradually lost its already weakened contacts with the mass labour movement. During the First World War (1914-18) the S.L.P. leaned towards internationalism. Under the impact of the October Revolution in Russia the more revolutionary section of the S.L.P. took an active part in organising the Communist Party of America. Today the S.L.P. is a small organisation having no influence on the labour movement in the U.S.A. p. 79

⁴¹ The *Socialist Party of America* was formed in July 1901 at the congress in Indianapolis as a result of the amalgamation of groups that had split away from the Socialist Labour Party and the Social-Democratic Party of the U.S.A., one of whose organisers was Eugene Debs, a popular leader of the American labour movement; he was one of the founders of the new party. The party had a mixed social composition, being made up of American workers immigrant workers, as well as small farmers and petty bourgeois. The Centrist and Right opportunist leadership of the party (Victor L. Berger, Morris Hillquit and others) denied the need for a dictatorship of the proletariat, rejecting revolutionary methods of struggle, and reduced the activities of the party mainly to participation in election campaigns. During the First World War three trends appeared in the S.P.—the social-chauvinists, who supported the government's imperialist policy, the Centrists, who paid only lip-service to the cause of anti-imperialism, and the revolutionary minority, who took an internationalist stand and were actively anti-war.

The Left wing of the Socialist Party headed by Charles Ruthenberg, William Foster, William Haywood and others, and backed by the proletarian membership, waged a struggle against the party's opportunist leadership and for independent political action by the proletariat, for the creation of industrial trade unions based on the principles of the class struggle. In 1919 a split occurred in the Socialist Party. The breakaway Left wing took the lead in forming the Communist Party of America, of which it was the core.

At the present time the Socialist Party is a small sectarian organisation. p. 79

⁴² *Tribunists*—members of the Social-Democratic Party of Holland, whose mouthpiece was the newspaper *De Tribune*. The leaders of the Tribunists were David 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 Dutch labour movement, and during the First World War (1914-18) they adopted, in the main, an internationalist stand.

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 expulsion of the Leftists, who formed the Social-Democratic Party of Holland, the paper became the official organ of this party; in 1918 it became the organ of the Dutch Communist Party, and appeared under this name until 1940. p. 79

⁴³ *Party of the Young*, or *the Left*—the name given by Lenin to the Left wing of the Swedish Social-Democrats. During the First World War (1914-18) they took an internationalist stand and aligned themselves with the Zimmerwald Left. In May 1917 they

- formed the Left Social-Democratic Party of Sweden. At the party's congress in 1919 a resolution was adopted in favour of joining the Communist International. The revolutionary wing of the party formed the Communist Party of Sweden in 1921. p. 79
- ⁴⁴ *Tesnyaki*—the revolutionary Social-Democratic Labour Party of Bulgaria, founded in 1903 after the split in the Social-Democratic Party. The founder and leader of the Party was D. Blagoev; subsequent leaders, Blagoev's disciples, were G. Dimitrov, V. Kolarov and others. In 1914-18 the *Tesnyaki* came out against the imperialist war. In 1919 they joined the Communist International and formed the Communist Party of Bulgaria, later reorganised into the Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communists). p. 79
- ⁴⁵ *Avanti!*—a daily, central organ of the Italian Socialist Party, founded in December 1896 in Rome. During the First World War (1914-18) the paper took an inconsistent internationalist stand without breaking with the reformists. In 1926 it was closed down by Mussolini's fascist government, but continued to appear irregularly outside the country. In 1943 it resumed publication in Italy. At present *Avanti!* is the central organ of the Italian Socialist Party. p. 79
- ⁴⁶ *Regional Executive and Chief Executive*—executive bodies of the Social-Democrats of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania. p. 79
- ⁴⁷ *Volksstimme*—organ of the German Social-Democratic Party, published in Chemnitz from January 1891 to February 1933.
Die Glocke—a fortnightly journal published in Munich and subsequently in Berlin between 1915-25 by the social-chauvinist Parvus (A. L. Gelfand), member of the German Social-Democratic Party. p. 81
- ⁴⁸ This refers to the appeal "To the Peoples Suffering Ruination and Death" adopted at the Second International Conference of the "Zimmerwaldists" held on April 24-30, 1916 in Kienthal (Switzerland). p. 81
- ⁴⁹ *Die Jugendinternationale* (Youth International)—organ of the International Union of Socialist Youth Organisations associated with the Zimmerwald Left. Published in Zurich from September 1915 to May 1918. p. 82
- ⁵⁰ On April 7(20), 1917, the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet, by a majority of 21 votes against 14, adopted a resolution in favour of supporting the so-called "Liberty Loan" issued by the Provisional Government to finance the continuing imperialist war. The Bolshevik members of the Executive Committee opposed this loan, declaring that support of it was "the worst form of 'civil truce'" and moved a resolution containing a detailed statement of their position. Several members of the E.C. not belonging to the Bolshevik group voted with the Bolsheviks. The

question was put before the plenary meeting of the Soviet after a preliminary discussion in the groups. p. 84

⁵¹ See Engels, Preface to *Internationales aus dem Volkstaat (1871-1875)*. p. 84

⁵² This expression from Heine was quoted by Marx and Engels in their *German Ideology*. p. 86

⁵³ *Soldatskaya Pravda* (Soldiers' Truth)—a Bolshevik daily, began to appear on April 15 (28), 1917 as the organ of the Military Organisation of the Petrograd Committee, R.S.D.L.P.(B.), from May 19 (June 1), 1917 it became the organ of the Military Organisation of the Central Committee, R.S.D.L.P.(B.); during the July events of 1917 the paper was closed down by the Provisional Government; from July to October 1917 it came out under the names of *Rabochy i Soldat* (Worker and Soldier) and *Soldat* (Soldier). After the October Revolution publication was resumed under the old name and continued up to March 1918. p. 89

⁵⁴ The coalition Provisional Government was formed as a result of the crisis caused by the Note which Milyukov, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, had sent to the Allied governments on April 18 (May 1), 1917, confirming the Provisional Government's readiness to honour all the treaties which the tsarist government had concluded with the imperialist powers—Britain and France. Owing to the spontaneous demonstrations of protest, which reached a head on April 20 and 21 (May 3 and 4) in a powerful movement of the workers and soldiers, the Provisional Government, to create the appearance of a change in policy, accepted the resignation of Foreign Minister Milyukov, and War Minister Guchkov, and made a proposal to the Petrograd Soviet to form a coalition government.

Despite its decision of March 1 (14) forbidding members of the Soviet to join the Provisional Government, the Executive Committee, at a special meeting held on the night of May 1 (14), accepted the proposal of the Provisional Government. At the preliminary meetings of the party groups the Bolsheviks were the only group to come out against it. The decision to have representatives of the Soviet join the government was carried by 44 votes to 19 with two abstentions. A commission authorised to negotiate the terms for forming a coalition government was elected, consisting of Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Dan, Bogdanov (Mensheviks), Stankevich, Bramson (Trudoviks), Gots, Chernov (S.R.s), Kamenev (Bolshevik), Yurenev (member of the Inter-District group), and Sukhanov (independent Social-Democrat). On the evening of May 2 (15) an emergency meeting of the Petrograd Soviet was called at which the action of the Executive Committee was approved by a majority vote. After the negotiations an agreement was reached on May 5 (18) for the distribution of posts in the new government as a result of which 6 socialist ministers were to join the cabinet, namely: Kerensky—War and Naval Minister, Skobelev—Labour

Minister, Chernov—Minister of Agriculture, Peshekhonov—Minister of Food Supply, Tsereteli—Minister of Post and Telegraph, and Pereverzev—Minister of Justice. On the evening of May 5(18) the Petrograd Soviet, after hearing Skobelev's report on the results of the negotiations with the Provisional Government, decided to have its representatives join the government on condition that they were answerable and accountable to the Soviet, and expressed full confidence in the new government.

Lenin wrote afterwards that by joining the bourgeois government, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks "saved it from collapse and allowed themselves to be made its servants and defenders" (see present edition, Vol. 25, p. 241). p. 90

- 55 Lenin is referring to the order by War Minister Kerensky published on May 11 (24), 1917, containing a "Declaration of the Rights of the Soldier", in which there was a point allowing a superior officer to use military force in cases of insubordination in the field. This point was aimed against soldiers and officers who refused to go into the attack. Simultaneously with the promulgation of this order Kerensky started to disband regiments and prosecute officers and soldiers guilty of "inciting to insubordination". p. 91

- 56 This pamphlet was planned originally as a leaflet, owing to the fact that the Cadets, S.R.s and Mensheviks were making wide use of leaflets in their propaganda and pasted them up all over the town. Lenin believed that a Bolshevik leaflet explaining what every party was and what it stood for should be pasted alongside the anti-Bolshevik proclamations. The article was too long to be issued as a leaflet; it was published in the Helsingfors Bolshevik newspaper *Volna*, and then issued in pamphlet form by the Zhizn i Znaniye publishers in fifty thousand copies. The proprietors of the printing-press, who sympathised with the Cadets, held up publication, but with the help of the workers' committee the pamphlet was issued on July 4 (17). Owing to the July events, however, it was hidden away in the publishers' warehouse. A few days later it began to circulate in the working-class quarters. The first edition sold out quickly and, according to the testimony of V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich, a reprint was put out.

The pamphlet came out with the following introductory text: "Explanation to the draft platform outlined by *N. Lenin* for discussion at meetings of the Bolsheviks. The printing of the draft itself has been held up owing to lack of printing facilities in Petrograd."

The pamphlet was published in English in the journal *The Class Struggle* (New York, November-December 1917, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 49-59) as well as in *The New York Evening Post*, January 15, 1918.

A second edition of it was published in Moscow in 1918 with a foreword by Lenin. p. 93

- ⁵⁷ The *Contact Commission* was set up by the Menshevik-S.R.-controlled Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet on March 8 (21), 1917 to maintain contact with the Provisional Government, to "influence" it and exercise "control" over its activities. Actually, the Contact Commission helped the Provisional Government to carry out its bourgeois policy, and tried to keep the working-class mass from taking part in the active revolutionary struggle to bring about the transfer of all power to the Soviets. The members of the Contact Commission were Chkheidze, Steklov, Sukhanov, Phillipovsky and Skobelev (later joined by Chernov and Tsereteli). The Commission existed up to May 1917, when the Mensheviks and S.R.s joined the bourgeois Provisional Government. p. 98
- ⁵⁸ See p. 134 of this volume. p. 103
- ⁵⁹ *Black Hundreds*—monarchist gangs organised by the tsarist police to fight the revolutionary movement. They assassinated revolutionaries, assaulted progressive intellectuals, and organised pogroms against the Jews. p. 106
- ⁶⁰ *Military conference in Minsk*—the meeting of army and workers' deputies of the Western front held in Minsk from April 7 to 16 (20-29), 1917. It was attended by nearly 1,200 delegates.
In keeping with their endeavours to win over to their side the mass of soldiers, the Bolsheviks took part in the work of this conference. Members of the Menshevik and S.R. parties and their sympathisers were in the majority at the conference, and this fact predetermined the nature of its decisions. On the most important questions on the agenda (the questions of war and the attitude towards the Provisional Government) the conference adopted the conciliatory resolutions of the All-Russia Conference of Soviets held in Petrograd at the end of March and beginning of April 1917. In other words, it took the stand of "revolutionary defensism" and came out in favour of support to the bourgeois Provisional Government. p. 114
- ⁶¹ The reference is to Lenin's report at the joint meeting of Bolshevik and Menshevik delegates to the All-Russia Conference of Soviets on April 4 (17), 1917 (see pp. 21-26, 42-43 of this volume). p. 118
- ⁶² *Dyelo Naroda* (People's Cause)—a daily newspaper, organ of the Centrist group of the S.R. Party, published in Petrograd from March 1917 to July 1918 (after the October Revolution it was repeatedly closed down and came out under new names). In June 1917 it became the organ of the Central Committee of the S.R. Party. The paper took a defencist and conciliatory stand and supported the bourgeois Provisional Government. Publication was resumed in October 1918 in Samara, which was captured by the whiteguard Czechs and S.R. rebels (4 issues were put out), and in March 1919 in Moscow (10 issues were put out), after which the paper was closed down for counter-revolutionary activities. p. 120

- ⁶³ The appeal "*Against the Riot-Mongers*", which is a redraft of the appeal "To the Soldiers and Sailors" (see pp. 124-26 of this volume), was adopted by the Petrograd City Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) on April 14 (27), 1917 during the discussion, out of order, of Point 6 of the agenda, namely, "The Hounding Campaign Against *Pravda*". p. 127
- ⁶⁴ *Dyen* (Day)—a bourgeois liberal daily, published in St. Petersburg from 1912. Among its contributors were Menshevik liquidators, who took over complete control of the paper after February 1917. Closed down by the Revolutionary Military Committee of the Petrograd Soviet on October 26 (November 8), 1917. p. 134
- ⁶⁵ *Malenkaya Gazeta* (Small Newspaper)—a gutter-press organ of a Black-Hundred tendency, published in Petrograd from September 1914 to July 1917 by A. Suvorin, Junior. From May 1917, playing up to public feeling in favour of socialism, the paper carried the subheading "The paper of the non-party socialists". After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 it was rabidly anti-Bolshevik, and conducted a vicious smear campaign against Lenin. p. 135
- ⁶⁶ The *Petrograd City Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks)* attended by 57 delegates had the following agenda: the present situation; the attitude towards the Provisional Government; the attitude towards the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and the question of its reorganisation; the organizational structure of the Party; the attitude towards the Social-Democrats of other trends the municipal elections; the hounding of *Pravda*. The report on the current situation was made by Lenin.
The Conference approved Lenin's April Theses and based its proceedings upon them. p. 139
- ⁶⁷ *Sotsial-Demokrat*—an illegal newspaper, Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P., published from February 1908 to January 1917. Altogether 58 issues appeared. The first issue was put out in Russia, but further publication was arranged abroad, first in Paris, then in Geneva. By a decision of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., the Editorial Board was made up of representatives of the Bolsheviks, the Mensheviks and the Polish Social-Democrats. Virtually, the paper was run by Lenin.
Over eighty articles and paragraphs by Lenin were published in the paper. Lenin fought for a consistent Bolshevik line on the Editorial Board. Some of its members (Kamenev and Zinoviev) adopted a conciliatory attitude towards the liquidators and opposed Lenin's line. The Menshevik members of the Editorial Board—Martov and Dan—obstructed the work of the editorial staff while at the same time openly defending liquidationism in their factional newspaper *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* (Voice of the Social-Democrat). Lenin's uncompromising struggle against the liquidators led to Martov and Dan resigning from the Editorial

Board in June 1911. From December 1911 *Sotsial-Demokrat* was edited by Lenin.

At the beginning of the First World War (1914-18), after a year's interval, Lenin succeeded in restarting the newspaper. Issue No. 33 containing the manifesto of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. drafted by Lenin came out on November 1 (new style), 1914. Lenin's articles published in *Sotsial-Demokrat* during the war played an important part in helping to apply the strategy and tactics of the Bolshevik Party on the questions of war, peace and revolution, in exposing the overt and covert social-chauvinists, and uniting the internationalist forces in the world labour movement. p. 142

⁶⁸ An advance announcement of the publication of the weekly journal *Internatsional* was published in *Rabochaya Gazeta* on April 16 (29), 1917. The first issue appeared on April 18 (31), and on April 22 (May 5) Lenin, apparently, had not yet seen it. The title page bore a notice to the effect that pending the arrival of L. Martov the journal was edited by Y. Larin. The list of contributors included L. Martov, Y. Larin, P. B. Axelrod and G. O. Binshtok. In the first issue the editors proclaimed the conciliatory slogan of bringing pressure to bear on the Provisional Government to meet the demands of the proletariat in domestic and foreign policies. The third issue of the journal (for June 1917) was its last. In August 1917 some of the journal's contributors headed by Y. Larin broke with the Mensheviks and joined the ranks of the Bolshevik Party. p. 156

⁶⁹ *Conference of Peasants' Deputies* is the name Lenin gives to the Conference of representatives of peasant organisations and of the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies held in Petrograd on April 13-17 (26-30), 1917 on the initiative of the Moscow Co-operative Congress. The Conference was attended by delegates from 27 gubernias, from the army and from the Central and Petrograd Regional committees of the Peasant Union. The Conference was dominated by the Popular Socialists, Trudoviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, and was devoted to the business of preparing for an All-Russia Congress of Peasants' Deputies. It declared in favour of setting up a united peasants' organisation, and elected a Bureau for convening the First Congress of Soviets of Peasants' Deputies which appealed to the peasants and soldiers to conduct elections to the congress on a democratic basis. p. 167

⁷⁰ Meaning the All-Russia Congress of Co-operative Associations held in Moscow on March 25-28 (April 7-10), 1917. The Congress attended by nearly 800 delegates discussed the questions of organising an All-Russia Co-operative Union, preparing for the elections to the Constituent Assembly, participation of the co-operative organisations in the business of food supply, and other questions. Controlling influence at the Congress was wielded by the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries. The Congress

declared in favour of support to the Provisional Government and the continuation of the imperialist war but demanded the transfer of all the land to the working people, the democratisation of the system of government and self-government.

The Congress's attitude to the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, as the best form of peasants' mass organisation—an attitude which drew Lenin's attention—was expressed in the resolution on the report concerning "Participation of the Co-operatives in the Country's Regeneration". p. 167

⁷¹ *Finansovaya Gazeta* (Financial Newspaper)—a daily evening paper of politico-financial, economic, industrial and stock-exchange news. Published in Petrograd from 1915 to 1917. p. 176

⁷² *Octobrists*—members of the Octobrist Party (or Union of October Seventeenth) formed in Russia after the promulgation of the tsar's Manifesto of October 17, 1905. It was a counter-revolutionary party, representing and defending the interests of the big bourgeoisie and the landowners who were running their economy on capitalist lines. Its leaders were A. I. Guchkov, the well-known Moscow landlord and industrialist, and M. V. Rodzyanko, a big landowner. The Octobrists fully supported the home and foreign policies of the tsarist government. During the First World War they joined the opposition "progressive bloc" that demanded the setting up of a responsible cabinet, meaning a government enjoying the confidence of bourgeois and landowner circles. After the February bourgeois-democratic revolution the Octobrists became the ruling party, and actively combated the mounting socialist revolution. The party's leader, Guchkov, was War Minister in the first Provisional Government. After the October Revolution the Octobrists fought against the Soviet government. p. 177

⁷³ The reference is to Saltykov-Shchedrin's comments on France contained in his sketches *Abroad*. p. 179

⁷⁴ See Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 520-21. p. 180

⁷⁵ See Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 46-47. p. 194

⁷⁶ *Novaya Zhizn* (New Life)—a daily newspaper of a Menshevik trend, organ of a group of Social-Democrats known as Internationalists, whose members were Menshevik adherents of Martov and non-aligned intellectuals of a semi-Menshevik trend. The *Novaya Zhizn* group constantly vacillated between the conciliators and the Bolsheviks

The paper was published in Petrograd from April 1917. After the October Revolution it took a hostile stand towards the Soviet government and was closed down in July 1918. p. 196

- ⁷⁷ *Gapon, G. A.* (1870-1906)—a Russian priest, leader of the Assembly of Russian Factory Workers of the City of St. Petersburg. On January 9, 1905, Gapon organised, with provocative aims, a peaceful procession of workers to the Winter Palace to present a petition to the tsar. The procession ended with the unarmed workers being shot down. After this Gapon emigrated abroad, where he joined the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, then returned to Russia illegally, and resumed contact with the secret political police. Was killed by the S.R.s. p. 197
- ⁷⁸ *Gazeta-Kopeika* (Kopek Newspaper)—a bourgeois daily of the gutter-press type, published in St. Petersburg from 1908. Was closed down in 1918. p. 209
- ⁷⁹ Lenin is referring to the adventurist tactics of a small group of members of the Petrograd Party Committee (Bagdatyev and others), who, during the April demonstration in 1917, put forward the slogan of immediate overthrow of the Provisional Government despite the policy of peaceful development of the revolution which the Party pursued at that period. This group's behaviour was censured by the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks). p. 211
- ⁸⁰ *Birzheviye Vedomosti* (Stock-Exchange Recorder)—a bourgeois daily published in St. Petersburg from 1880. Its abbreviated name *Birzhevka* became a generic term for the unscrupulous and venal bourgeois press. At the end of October 1917 the paper was closed down by order of the Revolutionary Military Committee of the Petrograd Soviet. p. 218
- ⁸¹ This interview was published in the "Correspondence" column of the Finnish Social-Democratic newspaper *Työmies* (Worker) No. 122, for May 8, 1917, under the heading "Interview with Russian Revolutionaries", to which the correspondent supplied the following introduction:
"I found Comrade Lenin, of whom so much has been spoken lately in Russia, in the editorial office of *Pravda*. Pressed for time, Lenin agreed to speak only briefly. Nevertheless, he answered my questions with the following statement."
Työmies was published in Helsingfors from March 1895 to 1918. p. 222
- ⁸² The Conference was attended by 133 delegates with a vote and 18 delegates with a consultative voice, representing 80,000 members of the Party. It was the first legal conference of the Bolshevik Party to be held in Russia, and was equal, in point of significance, to a party congress.
The Conference discussed the following questions: (1) The current situation (the war and the Provisional Government, etc.). (2) The peace conference. (3) The attitude to the Soviets. (4) Revision of the Party programme. (5) The situation in the International and the tasks of the Party. (6) Unity of the Social-Democratic

internationalist organisations. (7) The agrarian question. (8) The national question. (9) The Constituent Assembly. (10) The organisational question. (11) Reports from the regions. (12) Election of the Central Committee. Lenin made reports and spoke on all the main questions on the agenda. All his speeches were based on the April Theses. Lenin was opposed at the Conference by Kamenev and Rykov. They declared, with the Mensheviks, that Russia was not yet ripe for a socialist revolution. Lenin exposed the capitulatory, anti-Party position of Kamenev and Rykov, who denied the possibility of socialism being victorious in Russia. Lenin also scathingly criticise Pyatakov, who opposed the Party's policy on the national question and who, already during the war, had adopted together with Bukharin a national-chauvinist stand. Pyatakov and Bukharin were opposed to the right of nations to self-determination if that right included secession. This point of view meant, in effect, refusal on the part of the proletariat to utilise the revolution's reserve forces as represented by the various nationalities, and doomed the revolution to defeat. Lenin strongly condemned Zinoviev's speech in favour of the Bolsheviks co-operating with the Zimmerwaldists and against the organisation of a new, Communist, International.

The April Conference unanimously adopted Lenin's draft resolutions on the war, on the attitude towards the Provisional Government, on the current situation, on the revision of the Party programme, on the agrarian question, on the Soviets, on the national question and others. The Conference elected a Central Committee headed by Lenin. The decisions of the Conference showed the working class and all the working people that struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution was the only way to get rid of exploitation, to lead the country out of the war and save it from ruin and the threat of enslavement by the foreign imperialists. The Conference equipped the Party with a plan of action for developing the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution.

p. 225

⁸³ See Marx's letter to Kugelmann dated April 17, 1871. Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Moscow, 1962, p. 464. p. 239

⁸⁴ *Erfurt Programme*—the programme of the German Social-Democratic Party adopted at the Congress in Erfurt in October 1891. The Erfurt Programme was a step forward in comparison with the Gotha Programme (1875); it was based on the Marxist doctrine of the inevitable doom of the capitalist mode of production and its replacement by the socialist mode; it stressed the need for the working class to carry on a political struggle, pointed out the party's leading role in that struggle, and so on. The Erfurt Programme, however, contained serious concessions to opportunism. A comprehensive criticism of the Erfurt Programme was given by Engels in his "Zur Kritik des sozialdemokratischen Programmwerfes 1891". This was, in effect, a criticism of the opportunism of the whole Second International for whose parties the Erfurt

Programme served as a model. The leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party, however, concealed Engels's criticism from the general membership, and his most important comments were disregarded when the final text of the programme was drawn up. Lenin (and Plekhanov, too, before his defection to Menshevism) considered the chief defect of the Erfurt Programme, its cowardly concession to opportunism, to be the fact that it passes over in silence the dictatorship of the proletariat. p. 240

⁸⁵ See Engels, "Zur Kritik des sozialdemokratischen Programmwerfes 1891", *Neue Zeit*, Jg. 20, I. Bd., Stuttgart, 1902, S. 7-8. p. 240

⁸⁶ The question of calling an international conference of socialists of the belligerent and neutral countries was repeatedly discussed in the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet in April 1917, the Executive Committee offering to take upon itself the initiative in convening such a conference. During the latter half of April the Danish Social-Democrat Borgbjerg, who was associated with the German social-chauvinists, arrived in Petrograd, and, on behalf of the joint committee of the Danish, Norwegian and Swedish labour parties (the social-patriot majorities of these parties), invited the socialist parties of Russia to attend a conference on the question of concluding peace, due to be held in Stockholm in May 1917.

On April 23 (May 6) Borgbjerg made a report to the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet in which he frankly declared that the German Government would "agree" to the peace terms which the German Social-Democrats would propose at the conference. On April 25 (May 8) the Executive Committee heard the declarations of the Party groups on this question. The Bolsheviks announced the "Resolution on Borgbjerg's Proposal" adopted that day by the April Conference. They were supported by the representatives of the Polish and Lettish Social-Democrats. Lenin considered participation in this conference a complete betrayal of internationalism. The April Conference was emphatically opposed to participation, and denounced Borgbjerg as an agent of German imperialism. The Trudoviks, Bundists and Mensheviks were in favour of attending the conference. A Menshevik resolution was adopted in which the Executive Committee announced that it took upon itself the initiative in calling the conference and was setting up a special committee for that purpose. The plenary meeting of the Soviet endorsed this decision.

The majority of the British, French and Belgian socialists refused to take part in the conference, since the British and French governments were out for complete victory over Germany. The Centrists agreed to attend: they were the Longuet group in France, and the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany headed by Kautsky, Haase and Ledebour.

The Spartacus group affiliated to the Independents refused to attend the conference with the social-imperialists. A declaration to this effect in his own name and on behalf of Karl Liebknecht

and Rosa Luxemburg, who were in prison, was made by Franz Mehring. The Stockholm conference did not take place, since some of the delegates did not receive passports from their governments, and others refused to sit with the representatives of the enemy countries. p. 247

⁸⁷ The drafting of the new Party programme was completed after the October Revolution. The programme was adopted at the Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) in March 1919. p. 277

⁸⁸ See Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, p. 51. p. 277

⁸⁹ “*Bill of the 104*”—“A Draft of Fundamental Principles” for a Land Law introduced in the First Duma over the signatures of 104 peasant deputies on May 23 (June 5), 1906. The Bill called for the formation of a national land fund consisting of state, crown and monastery lands, as well as privately-owned lands that exceeded the established labour norm, and demanded that the right to use the land be granted only to those who worked it. Compensation was provided for alienated privately-owned lands. The agrarian reform was to be implemented by the local peasant committees elected by general vote. p. 283

⁹⁰ The reference is to the *Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907*, written towards the end of 1907. The book was printed in St. Petersburg in 1908 but the police seized it while still at the printers and destroyed it. Only one copy was saved. The book was first published in 1917. p. 283

⁹¹ This refers to Stolypin’s agrarian reform aimed at creating a bulwark for the tsarist regime in the countryside in the person of the rich farmers. The tsarist government issued a decree on November 9 (22), 1906 regulating the peasants’ withdrawal from the village communes and the establishment of their proprietary rights on the allotment lands. Under this law (named after P. A. Stolypin, the then Chairman of the Council of Ministers) the peasant was free to withdraw from the village commune, take possession of his allotment on a proprietorship basis, or sell it. The village commune was obliged to give the peasant who withdrew from the commune an allotment of land in one place (an *otrub*, homestead). The Stolypin reform speeded up the development of capitalism in the countryside and the process of differentiation among the peasantry, and sharpened the class struggle in the village.

The Stolypin reform is described and evaluated in a number of works by Lenin, notably in *The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907*. (See present edition, Vol. 13, pp. 217-431.) p. 284

⁹² See Engels, “Flüchtlings-Literatur. 1. Eine polnische Proklamation”. *Der Volksstaat*, Nr. 69, 17. VI. 1874. p. 301

⁹³ This refers to participation in the proposed third conference of the internationalist socialists due to be held in Stockholm on May 18, 1917. It was held in August 1917. By decision of the April Conference, the Bolsheviks attended it. Lenin disagreed with this decision and voted against the resolution on the situation in the International and the tasks of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.). Lenin considered attendance of the Bolsheviks at this conference possible only for purposes of information. He wrote about this in his pamphlet *The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution* (see p. 82 of this volume). In the postscript to the pamphlet, written in May 1917, Lenin calls this decision of the conference a mistake (see pp. 89-90 of this volume). p. 304

⁹⁴ See Engels, "Zur Kritik des sozialdemokratischen Programmwerfes 1891", *Neue Zeit*, Jg. 20, I. Bd., Stuttgart, 1902, S. 12. p. 323

⁹⁵ The centrist *Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany* was formed in April 1917 at the inaugural congress in Gotha amid an atmosphere of revolutionary enthusiasm stimulated by the February bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia. The opportunist leadership of the German Social-Democratic Party was losing the confidence of the rank and file, and the party was faced with the threat of the Left elements breaking away from it. To prevent a split and the formation of a revolutionary party of the working class the Centrist leaders made an attempt to form a so-called "independent" party by means of which they could maintain their influence upon the masses. Behind a screen of Centrist phraseology the "Independents" preached unity with the social-chauvinists and sank to renunciation of the class struggle. The bulk of the party was made up of the Kautskian organisation *Arbeitsgemeinschaft*—the "Labour Group" in the Reichstag.

For a time the Spartacus group was associated with the party of "Independents" as an affiliated group, which preserved its organisational and political independence, and continued its illegal work and struggle to free the Social-Democratic workers from the influence of the Centrist leaders. In 1918 the Spartacus League left the Independent Social-Democratic Party and formed the core of the newly founded Communist Party of Germany.

At its congress in Halle in October 1920 a split occurred in the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany. In December 1920 many of the "Independents" joined the Communist Party of Germany. The Rights formed a separate party and adopted the old name of Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany. This party existed up to 1922. p. 325

⁹⁶ *Petrogradskaya Storona*—a district in Petrograd where the Central and City committees of the Bolshevik Party, the Military Organisation under the Central Committee of the Party, the Soldiers' Club, and other organisations of the workers and Soldiers were situated. They were housed in the former mansion of Kshesinskaya. p. 327

⁹⁷ “*Reassuring missive*”—the Provisional Government’s statement published in the central newspapers on April 22 (May 5), 1917 “elucidating” Foreign Minister Milyukov’s Note of April 18 (May 1), 1917. By this “elucidation” the Provisional Government tried to cover up the imperialist character of the Note, which had announced the intention of continuing the war “to decisive victory”, and to pacify the angry masses. p. 332

⁹⁸ The *Radical and Radical-Socialist Party of France*—a bourgeois party organised as such in 1901, had been in existence since the eighties of the nineteenth century. Before the First World War (1914-18) it largely represented the interests of the petty and middle bourgeoisie. In the period between the first and second world wars the big bourgeoisie gained more influence in the party, whose leaders frequently headed the French Government. p. 350

⁹⁹ With the exception of the *Rech* editorial, this article was written on the basis of speeches made at a private meeting of the Fourth Duma members in Petrograd, reported in the bourgeois newspapers for May 5 (18), 1917.

After the February revolution the Provisional Government did not, in spite of the public demand, officially dissolve the Fourth Duma the members of which (from the violent monarchists to the Cadets) regularly gathered at private meetings held at the residence of M. V. Rodzyanko, the Chairman of the Duma, to discuss and adopt resolutions on important issues of foreign and domestic policy. These meetings were widely reported in the bourgeois press. Lenin called these meetings of the Fourth Duma deputies “the headquarters of counter-revolution”.

The particular meeting referred to in this article was held on May 4 (17), 1917, and was attended by representatives of all the Duma parties except the Social-Democrats. Speeches were made by the Octobrist and Cadet leaders A. I. Guchkov, V. A. Maklakov, P. N. Milyukov, N. V. Savich, V. V. Shulgin and others, the gist of which was summed up in two demands: first, that the Russian army resume offensive operations at the front, and second, that “order” be restored in the army and in the country at large, meaning that a stop be put to the revolution. The aim of the meeting was to bring pressure to bear on the new, coalition, government.

In June-July the counter-revolutionary activities of the Fourth Duma deputies increased still further. On June 2 (15) Rodzyanko addressed a letter to the deputies of the Fourth Duma calling upon them not to leave Petrograd, since “current political events required that the members of the Duma should be ready on the spot”.

On the demand of the Bolsheviks, who were supported by the working masses, the Fourth Duma was officially dissolved by the Provisional Government on October 6 (19), 1917. p. 362

¹⁰⁰ *Vechneye Vremya* (Evening Times)—a Black-Hundred daily of the gutter-press type founded by the reactionary publisher A. S.

Suvorin. Appeared from November 1911 to November 1917 in St. Petersburg. In 1917 it was the mouthpiece of the counter-revolutionary officers. p. 367

¹⁰¹ The representatives of the "socialist" parties who joined the coalition Provisional Government formed on May 5 (18), 1917 were Tsereteli and Skobelev (Mensheviks), Kerensky and Chernov (Socialist-Revolutionaries), Pereverzev (closely connected with the S.R.s) and Peshekhonov (Popular Socialist Party). p. 384

¹⁰² The "*Inter-District*" *Organisation of United Social-Democrats* was formed in St. Petersburg in November 1913 with the declared object of working for the unity of the R.S.D.L.P. Under cover of unity slogans and in an attempt to unite the Bolshevik and Menshevik organisations in St. Petersburg, its members set up a factional organisation of their own consisting of some of the former Bolsheviks who had adopted a conciliatory attitude towards the opportunists, and Trotskyist Mensheviks.

During the First World War the members of the Inter-District Organisation occupied a Centrist position. They considered the war to be an imperialist war and were against social-chauvinism, but at the same time would not agree to a complete break with the Mensheviks.

In 1917 the I.D.O., among whose members were Volodarsky, Joffe, Lunacharsky, Manuilsky, Trotsky, Uritsky and Yurenev, declared its agreement with the line of the Bolshevik Party. Therefore, at the elections to the Petrograd district councils in May-June 1917 the Bolsheviks formed a bloc with the I.D. Organisation. At the Sixth Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) the I.D. Organisation (membership about 4,000), which had broken with the Menshevik defencists, was admitted to membership of the Bolshevik Party. As events showed, some of the I.D.O. members—Lunacharsky, Manuilsky, Volodarsky, Uritsky and others—broke with their Centrist past, but Trotsky and a small group of his close associates only temporarily suspended their fight against Bolshevism, and "joined the Party so as, once inside, to fight Leninism and foist their opportunist, anti-socialist policy upon it" (*History of the C.P.S.U.*, Moscow, 1960, p. 240). The I.D.O. published a journal of its own, *Vperyod*. One number was put out illegally in 1915, and publication was resumed in 1917, when it came out legally from June to August as the organ of the St. Petersburg Inter-District Committee of the United Social-Democrats (Internationalists). Eight issues were put out. After the Sixth Congress of the Party the editorial board was changed, and No. 9 of the journal appeared as the organ of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.). Publication was discontinued in September 1917 by decision of the Central Committee. p. 390

¹⁰³ "*Socialist*" *ministerialism* (*Millerandism*)—opportunist tactics of socialists' participation in bourgeois reactionary governments. The term arose in connection with the French socialist Millerand joining the bourgeois government of Waldeck-Rousseau in 1899.

Millerandism was discussed at the Paris Congress of the Second International in 1900. The Congress adopted a conciliatory resolution proposed by Kautsky, condemning the participation of socialists in bourgeois governments but admitting it in certain "exceptional" cases. The French and other socialists made this an excuse for joining the governments of the imperialist bourgeoisie during the First World War. Lenin described ministerialism as revisionism and renegadism, and pointed out that in joining the bourgeois governments the social-reformists were bound to act as figure-heads; as a screen for the capitalists, an instrument in the hands of these governments for deceiving the masses.

p. 390

¹⁰⁴ *Nasha Zarya* (Our Dawn)—a legal monthly of the Menshevik liquidators, published in St. Petersburg from January 1910 to September 1914. The Editor-in-Chief was A. N. Potresov, and among its contributors were F. I. Dan and S. O. Tserdobaum. The liquidators' centre formed around this journal. At the beginning of the First World War *Nasha Zarya* took a social-chauvinist stand.

p. 393

¹⁰⁵ The *Chkheidze group*—the Menshevik group in the Fourth Duma, led by N. S. Chkheidze. During the First World War the Menshevik Duma group occupied a Centrist position, but actually gave full support to the policy of the Russian social-chauvinists. Lenin criticised Chkheidze's opportunist line in his articles: "Have the Organising Committee and the Chkheidze Group a Policy of Their Own?" (see present edition, Vol. 22, pp. 127-37) and "The Chkheidze Faction and Its Role" (see Vol. 23, pp. 171-74) and other articles.

p. 393

¹⁰⁶ The *Declaration* referred to was issued on May 6 (19), 1917 by the first coalition Provisional Government. Paragraph 3 of this document read: "The Provisional Government will redouble its determined efforts to combat economic disorganisation by developing planned state and public control of production, transport, commerce and distribution of products, and where necessary will resort also to the organisation of production."

p. 396

¹⁰⁷ See Clausewitz, *On War*, Vol. 1.

p. 399

¹⁰⁸ *L'Humanité*—a daily founded by Jean Jaurès in 1904 as the organ of the French Socialist Party. During the First World War (1914-18) it was controlled by the extreme Right wing of the party and took a social-chauvinist stand.

In 1918, Marcel Cachin, a prominent leader of the French and international labour movement, became political director and head of the newspaper. In 1918-20 the paper came out against the imperialist policy of the French Government, which had sent its armed forces against the Soviet Republic. In December 1920, after the split in the French Socialist Party and the formation of

the Communist Party of France, the newspaper became the latter's central organ. p. 403

¹⁰⁹ *Zemlya i Volya* (Land and Freedom)—a daily published by the Regional Committee of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party in Petrograd from March 21 (April 3) to October 13 (26), 1917. p. 407

¹¹⁰ *Lyakhov, V. P.* (1869-1919)—a colonel of the tsarist army who made a name for himself as a result of the suppression of the national-revolutionary movement in the Caucasus and Persia. p. 412

¹¹¹ The *Congress of delegates from the front*, held in Petrograd on May 12-17 (25-30), discussed, among others, the following questions: the war, fraternisation by the soldiers at the front, deserters, and prisoners of war. The Congress declared in favour of organising a Front Section under the Petrograd Soviet pending the formation of an All-Russia Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The Congress, whose proceedings were influenced by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, came out against fraternisation and for continuing the war. p. 422

¹¹² This refers to statements made by a delegation of Donets workers to the Economic Department of the Petrograd Soviet. This delegation was sent to Petrograd by the April-May conference (1917) of workers of the coal and iron and steel industries in the south of Russia to ask the Ministry of Commerce and Industry and the Ministry of Labour to intercede in obtaining a rise for the lower-paid brackets from the association of Donets capitalists.

The delegation submitted statements describing the intolerable conditions of the workers and giving numerous instances of sabotage on the part of the owners and managers of the collieries and metallurgical works, who were out to crush the revolutionary-minded workers and starve them into submission. p. 427

¹¹³ *Priboi* (Tide)—a Bolshevik legal publishing house, founded in St. Petersburg at the beginning of 1913; existed up to the summer of 1914, and resumed its activities in 1917.

Prosveshcheniye (Enlightenment)—a Bolshevik legal theoretical monthly, published in St. Petersburg from December 1911 to June 1914, with a circulation of up to five thousand copies.

The journal was founded on Lenin's initiative to replace the Moscow-published *Mysl*, a Bolshevik journal which was closed down by the tsarist government. Lenin directed *Prosveshcheniye* from Paris and subsequently from Cracow and Poronin. He edited articles and regularly corresponded with the Editorial Board.

The journal exposed the opportunists—the liquidators, otzovists, and Trotskyists, as well as the bourgeois nationalists. It highlighted the struggle of the working class under conditions of a new revolutionary upsurge, propagandised Bolshevik slogans in the Fourth Duma election campaign, and came out against revisionism and Centrism in the parties of the Second International.

The journal played an important role in the Marxist internationalist education of the advanced workers in Russia.

On the eve of the First World War *Prosveshcheniye* was closed down by the tsarist government. It resumed publication in the autumn of 1917, but only one issue (a double one) appeared.

Lenin's reference to the journal's second name—*Kommunist*—implies an intention of resuming publication of the journal under the old name or that of *Kommunist*. p. 432

¹¹⁴ *Muzhik Vredny*—part of the pseudonym of the poet Y. A. Pridorov—Demyan Bedny, *Muzhik Vredny*. p. 436

¹¹⁵ *Izvestia of the All-Russia Soviet of Peasants' Deputies*—a daily newspaper, official organ of the All-Russia Soviet of Peasants' Deputies, published in Petrograd from May 9 (22) to December 1917. The paper was a mouthpiece of the Right wing of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. It took up a hostile attitude towards the October Revolution, and was closed down on account of its counter-revolutionary tendencies. p. 449

¹¹⁶ Lenin refers to his article "A Question of Principle" (see pp. 536-38 of this volume), in which he quotes from Engels's book "Zur Kritik des sozialdemokratischen Programmwurfes 1891" (See *Neue Zeit*, Jg. 20, I. Bd., Stuttgart, S. 12). p. 462

¹¹⁷ The *First All-Russia Congress of Peasants' Deputies* was held in Petrograd on May 4-28 (May 17-June 10), 1917. It was attended by 1,115 delegates from the provinces and army units. The Bolsheviks took an active part in the Congress proceedings, during which they exposed the imperialist policy of the bourgeois Provisional Government and the conciliatory policy of the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries. The Congress was dominated by the S.R.s, and this determined the nature of its decisions. The Congress approved the policy of the bourgeois Provisional Government and participation of "socialists" in that government. It went on record in favour of continuing the war "to the victorious end" and of launching an offensive at the front. The Congress declared against the immediate transfer of the landed estates to the peasants and postponed the land question pending the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. p. 481

¹¹⁸ The *Chief Land Committee* was set up by the Provisional Government in April 1917 under pressure of the growing peasant movement which demanded a solution of the land question. The overwhelming majority of the Committee's members were Cadets and Socialist-Revolutionaries. The Committee was to supervise the collection and working up of material for an agrarian reform, for which purpose local land committees were formed.

The formation of the Chief and local land committees was a political manoeuvre on the part of the Provisional Government designed to drag out the settlement of the land question as long as

possible, and to wean the peasant masses away from revolutionary forms of struggle by means of reforms from above that would preserve landed proprietorship intact. This was a method of struggle against the mounting peasant movement.

After the October Revolution the Chief Land Committee opposed the enforcement of Lenin's Decree on Land and was dissolved by a decision of the Council of People's Commissars in December 1917. p. 486

¹¹⁹ The peasants in Russia, as a class of feudal society, were divided into three major categories: (1) privately-owned (landowners') peasants, (2) state peasants, and (3) crown-land peasants (belonging to the tsar's family). Each of these categories, in turn, was split up into grades and special groups, which differed from one another in origin, forms of holdings and tenure, legal and agrarian status, etc. The Peasant Reform of 1861, carried out from above by the tsarist government in the interests of the feudalist landowners, kept this diversity of grades intact right up to the October Revolution of 1917. p. 499

¹²⁰ *Vedomosti Obshchestvennovo Gradonachalstva* (City Administration Recorder)—a daily newspaper, official publication of the Petrograd City Administration, appeared from March 8 (21), 1917 as a continuation of *Vedomosti Sanktpeterburgskoi Gorodskoi Politsii* (St. Petersburg Police Gazette), which was founded in 1839 and repeatedly changed its name. From June 22 (July 5), 1917 the paper assumed the name of *Vestnik Gorodskovo Samoupravleniya* (City Self-Government Herald). It fully supported the policy of the bourgeois Provisional Government. Was closed down after the October Revolution. p. 506

¹²¹ The *Yedinstvo* group—a small Social-Democratic group which, in 1917-18, united the extreme Right Menshevik defencists, former liquidators and others. It was organised in March 1917, and in addition to Petrograd, it had branch organisations in Moscow, Baku and several other cities. The group was headed by Plekhanov and the former liquidators Buryanov and Jordansky. The *Yedinstvo* group denied the possibility of a victorious socialist revolution in Russia and gave unqualified support to the bourgeois Provisional Government. It stood for the war being carried on to "complete victory" and joined the bourgeois and Black-Hundred press in hounding the Bolsheviks. At the Petrograd district council elections the group put forward independent lists, sometimes forming a bloc with the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and others, and took part in all patriotic manifestations; it greeted the June offensive; after the July events it campaigned for a "strong government", i.e., a military dictatorship. It published the newspaper *Yedinstvo* (Unity). p. 509

¹²² The *All-Russia Conference of Menshevik and Affiliated Organisations* was held in Petrograd on May 7-12 (20-25), 1917, and was

attended by 88 voting delegates and 35 delegates with a consultative voice representing a membership of 44,830. The agenda, among others, included the following items: the attitude to and participation in the Provisional Government, the attitude towards the war, the revival of the International, and the land question. The Conference took a counter-revolutionary, anti-socialist stand on all questions on the agenda. It approved of socialists joining the coalition government, and urged full support for it; it condemned fraternisation among the soldiers at the front, urged the need for strengthening the army's fighting capacity, shared the view of the bourgeois parties that the land reform could not be carried through until after the Constituent Assembly had met and called for "a vigorous struggle against anarchic seizures of land and all other lawless methods of solving the problem". The Conference approved the decision of the Petrograd Soviet to convene an international socialist conference, and instructed the Organising Committee to take an active part in the Third Zimmerwald Conference.

p. 510

¹²³ This refers to the decisions of the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) held in Petrograd on April 24-29 (May 7-12), 1917.

p. 513

¹²⁴ The reference is to two decrees of the Provisional Government published May 24 and 27 (June 6 and 9), 1917. The first stated that "the Provisional Government considers the situation in Kronstadt to be threatening and absolutely intolerable". The second made it known "to all the citizens of Kronstadt that the orders of the Provisional Government are to be obeyed without question".

The sailors, soldiers and workers of the military workshops in Kronstadt—a fortress protecting Petrograd from the sea and the chief rear base of the Baltic fleet—played a very important part in preparing the victory of the October armed uprising in Petrograd. The Kronstadt Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies followed the lead of the Bolsheviks from the very first day of its existence. This was due to the revolutionary traditions of Kronstadt (the mutinies of 1905 and 1906, the uprising on the battle-ship *Gangut* in 1915) and to the existence of a strong Bolshevik organisation there which carried on revolutionary work all through the war.

Owing to the conflict between the Kronstadt Soviet and the Commissar of the Provisional Government, Pepelyaev, a resolution moved by the non-party section of the Soviet and supported by the Bolsheviks was passed on May 17 (30), 1917 abolishing the office of Government Commissar and vesting all power in the Kronstadt Soviet. This resolution stated that the sole authority in the town of Kronstadt was the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which, on affairs of state concern, entered into direct contact with the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

The bourgeois, S.R. and Menshevik press raised a hue and cry against the men of Kronstadt and the Bolsheviks, declaring that Russia was on the verge of collapse and anarchy, that Kronstadt was seceding, and so on.

A delegation from the Petrograd Soviet (Chkheidze, Gotz and others) followed by one from the Provisional Government (Ministers Skobelev and Tsereteli) went out to settle the Kronstadt incident. The latter succeeded in getting a decision passed through the Kronstadt Soviet arranging a compromise settlement, under which the Commissar was to be elected by the Soviet and endorsed by the Provisional Government. In addition, a general political resolution was adopted in which the Kronstadt Soviet declared that it recognised the authority of the Provisional Government, but that this "recognition does not, of course, exclude criticism and the desire that revolutionary democracy should create a new organisation of central authority by vesting all power in the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies". The resolution also expressed the hope that the Bolsheviks would succeed in achieving this by means of ideological influence. It ended with a strong protest against attempts to ascribe to the Kronstadt Bolsheviks "the intention of separating Kronstadt from the rest of Russia".

Lenin considered the revolutionary action in Kronstadt to have been premature. The negotiations by the Bolshevik group of the Kronstadt Soviet to settle the conflict and the further work of the Kronstadt Party organisation were directed by Lenin. p. 533

¹²⁵ This is a quotation from Engels's "Zur Kritik des sozialdemokratischen Programmwurfes 1891" (See *Neue Zeit*, Jg. 20, I. Bd., Stuttgart, S. 12). p. 538

¹²⁶ *Russkaya Gazeta* (Russian Gazette) was published in St. Petersburg in 1904-06. p. 544

¹²⁷ This refers to the replies of the French and British governments to the declaration of the Provisional Government of March 27 (April 9), 1917, published in the newspapers on May 28 (June 10). The French Note (like the British) welcomed the intention of the Provisional Government to secure the independence of Poland, and mentioned France's desire to fight in order to "liberate" Alsace-Lorraine and obtain indemnities from Germany. The British Note tried to justify Britain's participation in the war. Both Notes expressed the hope of Russia's continued co-operation in fighting to win the war. p. 546

¹²⁸ See A. I. Herzen's article "Plach" (Weeping) published in the journal *Kolokol* (The Bell) in March 1863. p. 568

**THE LIFE AND WORK
OF
V. I. LENIN**

Outstanding Dates
(April-June 1917)

-
- April 3 (16)* Lenin returns to Russia from Switzerland. At Byelo-Ostrov railway station he is met by a delegation of Petrograd workers. Lenin makes a brief speech of greeting.
- Late in the evening Lenin arrives in Petrograd. He is given a grand welcome at the Finlandsky Railway Station by the Petrograd workers, soldiers and sailors. On the square facing the station Lenin makes a speech from an armoured car in which he greets the Russian revolutionary proletariat and the army and calls upon them to fight for the socialist revolution.
- April 3 (16) (night)* Lenin attends a celebration meeting in his honour organised by the Party workers of Petrograd at the Kshesinskaya mansion. He makes a speech concerning the new tasks of the Bolshevik Party.
- April 4 (17)* Lenin addresses a meeting of Bolshevik delegates to the All-Russia Conference of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, at which he announces and explains his theses concerning the tasks of the revolutionary proletariat (the April Theses).
- Lenin makes a second report and reads his Theses at a joint meeting of the Bolshevik and Menshevik delegates to the Conference of Soviets.
- April 5 (18)* *Pravda* No. 24 publishes Lenin's report to the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet under the title of "How We Arrived".
- April 6 (19)* *Pravda* No. 25 publishes a notice to the effect that Lenin, member of the Editorial Board of the Party's Central Organ, returned from abroad and joined the Editorial Board of *Pravda*.
- Lenin's article "Two Worlds" published in *Pravda* No. 25.
- April 7 (20)* Lenin's article "The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution" containing the famous April Theses published in *Pravda* No. 26.

- April 8 (21)* Lenin's article "Blancism" published in *Pravda* No. 27.
- April 9 (22)* Lenin's article "The Dual Power" published in *Pravda* No. 28.
- April, between 8 and 13 (21 and 26)* Lenin writes the pamphlet *Letters on Tactics*, which came off the press at the end of April 1917.
- April 10 (23)* Lenin finishes writing his pamphlet *The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution. Draft Platform for the Proletarian Party*. The pamphlet was published in September 1917.
 Lenin speaks on the current situation at a meeting of the Izmailovsky Regiment.
- Beginning of April* Lenin writes the pamphlet *Political Parties in Russia and the Tasks of the Proletariat* published in June 1917.
- April 12 (25)* Lenin's article "A Shameless Lie of the Capitalists" published in *Pravda* No. 30.
- April 13 (26)* Lenin's articles "The War and the Provisional Government" and "In the Footsteps of *Russkaya Volya*" published in *Pravda* No. 31.
- April 14 (27)* Lenin's articles "A Partnership of Lies", "Banks and Ministers" and "An Important Exposure" published in *Pravda* No. 32.
- April, between 11 and 12 (24 and 27)* Lenin writes his appeal "To the Soldiers and Sailors" in connection with the smear campaign started in the bourgeois press concerning the passage through Germany of the returning Russian political emigrants.
- April 15 (28)* *Pravda* No. 33 publishes Lenin's articles "Citizens! See What Methods the Capitalists of All Countries Are Using!", "A 'Voluntary Agreement' Between Landowners and the Peasants" and "An Honest Voice in a Chorus of Slanderers".
 Lenin's article "The Soldiers and the Land" published in *Soldatskaya Pravda* No. 1.
 Lenin addresses a meeting of soldiers of an armoured unit in the Mikhailovsky Manege, at which he exposes the imperialist policy of the Provisional Government which was continuing the aggressive war of conquest.

- April 14-22*
(April 27-May 5) The Petrograd City Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) is held. Lenin takes a leading part in the work of the Conference, of which he is elected honorary chairman.
- April 14 (27)* At the Conference's first meeting Lenin makes a report and winds up the debates on the current situation and on the attitude towards the Provisional Government.
- Lenin writes the appeal "Against the Riot-Mongers. To the Workers, Soldiers, and the Whole Population of Petrograd" which is adopted by the Conference and published in *Pravda* No. 33 for April 15 over the signatures of the Central and Petrograd Committees of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks).
- April 15 (28)* At the second meeting of the Conference Lenin takes the floor twice in support of the draft resolution concerning the attitude towards the Provisional Government. His resolution is adopted by the Conference.
- April 22 (May 5)* At the fourth meeting of the Conference Lenin takes part in the debate on the question of the municipal elections. His resolution is adopted by the Conference.
- Not later than April 22 (May 5)* Lenin writes the draft resolution for the Petrograd City Conference on the attitude towards the parties of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Menshevik Social-Democrats, the "non-factional" Social-Democrats and other kindred political trends. The resolution is adopted at the Conference's fourth meeting.
- April 22 (May 5)* Lenin's draft resolution on the war is accepted at the Conference's fourth meeting as a basis for submission to the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks).
- April 16 (29)* Lenin's articles "Congress of Peasants' Deputies" and "On the Return of the Emigrants" published in *Pravda* No. 34.
- April 17 (30)* Lenin makes a speech on the current situation at a meeting of the Soldiers' Section of the Petrograd Soviet.

April 18 (May
1)

Lenin's article "Our Views. A Reply to the Resolution of the Executive Commission of the Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies" published in *Pravda* No. 35,

Lenin speaks at a mass demonstration on Mar-sovo Polye on the significance of May Day and the tasks of the Russian revolution.

Lenin addresses a May Day meeting of the workers of the Okhta Works.

April 20 (May
3)

Lenin's articles "How They Tied Themselves to the Capitalists", "A Proletarian Militia" and "Bankruptcy?" published in *Pravda* No. 36.

The Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) adopts Lenin's resolution concerning the crisis caused by the Provisional Government's Note of April 18 (May 1), 1917, and his "Appeal to the Soldiers of All the Belligerent Countries" published in *Pravda* No. 37, for May 4 (April 21).

April 21 (May
4)

Pravda No. 37 publishes Lenin's articles: "The Provisional Government's Note", "A Basic Question. A Line of Argument Used by Socialists Who Have Gone Over to the Bourgeoisie", "Icons Versus Cannons, Phrases Versus Capital", "The Logic of Citizen V. Chernov" and "Mr. Plekhanov's Futile Attempts to Extricate Himself".

The Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) endorses Lenin's resolution concerning the tasks of the Party in connection with the crisis in the Provisional Government. The resolution is published in *Pravda* No. 38, for May 5 (April 22).

April 22 (May
5)

Pravda No. 38 publishes Lenin's articles: "Honest Defencism Reveals Itself", "Mad Capitalists or Weak-Minded Social-Democrats?" and "The Advice or Order of Shingaryov, and the Advice of a Local Soviet".

The Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) endorses Lenin's resolution concerning the results of the April crisis. The resolution is published in *Pravda* No. 39, for May 6 (April 23).

April 23 (May
6)

Pravda No. 39 publishes Lenin's articles: "Lessons of the Crisis", "How a Simple Question Can Be Confused" and "'Disgrace' as the Capitalists and the Proletarians Understand It".

Lenin interviewed by E. Tornainen, editor of *Työmies* (Worker), a Finnish Social-Democratic newspaper.

Lenin attends a preliminary meeting of delegates to the All-Russia Party Conference, at which he delivers a speech on the current situation.

April 25 (May 8)

Lenin's article "Foolish Gloating" published in *Pravda* No. 40.

April 24-29 (May 7-12)

The Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) is held. Lenin takes a leading part in the proceedings; he is elected to the presiding committee.

April 24 (May 7)

Lenin opens the Conference with a brief speech.

At the first session of the Conference Lenin makes a report on the current situation and presents draft resolutions on the attitude towards the Provisional Government and on the war.

At the evening session Lenin makes a speech winding up the debate on the question of the current situation.

Lenin is elected to the Resolution Editing Committee.

April 25 (May 8)

At the third session of the Conference Lenin delivers a speech on the proposed international socialist conference, and introduces a draft resolution which is endorsed by the Conference.

At the fourth session Lenin takes the floor twice in the debate on the question of the attitude towards the Soviets.

April 25-26 (May 8-9)

Lenin writes "Draft Theses to the Resolution on the Soviets".

April 26 and 27 (May 9 and 10)

Lenin takes part in the work of the Resolution Editing Committee.

April 27 (May 10)

Lenin takes part in the work of the committees; submits proposed changes to the theoretical and political sections of the Party's programme at the Programme Revision Committee.

At the Conference's sixth session Lenin, on behalf of the Resolution Committee, makes a speech in support of the resolution on the war. His resolution is adopted by the Conference.

- April 28*
(May 11) At the seventh session Lenin delivers two reports: on the question of revision of the Party programme and on the agrarian question; he introduces the resolutions on these questions drafted by him and endorsed by the respective committees, which the Conference adopts.
- April 29*
(May 12) At the eighth session the Conference adopts two resolutions of Lenin's on the unity of the internationalists against the petty-bourgeois defencist bloc, and on the Soviets.
- At the ninth session Lenin is elected to the Party's Central Committee.
- Lenin makes a speech on the national question; his resolution is adopted by the Conference.
- Lenin makes a speech opposing the resolution on the situation within the International proposed by Zinoviev.
- Lenin makes a speech in support of the resolution on the current situation. His resolution is adopted by the Conference.
- Lenin makes a closing speech.
- April 28*
(May 11) Lenin's articles "The Significance of Fraternisation" and "What the Counter-Revolutionary Steps of the Provisional Government Lead To" published in *Pravda* No. 43.
- April 29*
(May 12) Lenin's articles "Social-Chauvinists and Internationalists", "I. G. Tsereteli and the Class Struggle" and "Anxiety" published in *Pravda* No. 44.
- May 2 (15)* Lenin's articles "The 'Crisis of Power'" and "Finland and Russia" published in *Pravda* No. 46.
- May 3 (16)* Lenin's articles "Defence of Imperialism Cloaked with Specious Phrases" and "An Unfortunate Document" published in *Pravda* No. 47.
- Resolutions of the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) with an introduction by Lenin are published as a supplement to *Soldatskaya Pravda* No. 13.
- May 4 (17)* Lenin's article "Frightening the People with Bourgeois Terrors" published in *Pravda* No. 48.
- Not earlier than*
May 4 (17) Lenin writes his theses concerning the Provisional Government's declaration on foreign and domestic policies.

- May 5 (18)* Lenin's articles "On the Eve" and "They Have Forgotten the Main Thing. *The Municipal Platform of the Proletarian Party*" published in *Pravda* No. 49.
- Before May 7 (20)* Lenin writes the mandate to the deputies of the Soviet elected at factories and regiments.
- May 6 (19)* *Pravda* No. 50 publishes Lenin's articles: "Class Collaboration with Capital, or Class Struggle Against Capital?", "A Strong Revolutionary Government", "Titbits for the 'Newborn' Government" and "Already the 'New' Government Is Lagging Behind Even the Peasant Mass, Leave Alone the Revolutionary Workers".
- May 7 (20)* Lenin's article "Stealing a March on the Workers" published in *Pravda* No. 51.
 Lenin writes "An Open Letter to the Delegates to the All-Russia Congress of Peasants' Deputies", which is published in *Soldatskaya Pravda* No. 19, for May 24 (11), 1917.
- May 8 (21)* Lenin makes a report on the results of the April Conference at a meeting of Petrograd members of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.).
- May 9 (22)* Lenin's article "The 'Virtual Armistice'" published in *Pravda* No. 52.
- May 10 (23)* *Pravda* No. 53 publishes Lenin's articles: "Secrets of Foreign Policy", "One of the Secret Treaties", "Ministerial Tone" and "In Search of a Napoleon".
 Lenin addresses a conference of the Inter-District Organisation on the conditions of unity between the Social-Democratic groups and currents standing for internationalism and the Bolshevik Party.
- May 11 (24)* Lenin's article "Nothing Has Changed" published in *Pravda* No. 54.
- May 12 (25)* Lenin's articles "A Regrettable Deviation from the Principles of Democracy" and "On the Question of Convening an International, So-called Socialist Conference Jointly with the Social-Chauvinists" published in *Pravda* No. 55.
 Lenin makes a speech on the current situation at a meeting of Putilov workers.

Lenin makes a speech on the current situation at a meeting of workers of the Admiralty Shipyards, the Franco-Russian and other works.

- May 13 (26)* Lenin's articles "The Proletarian Party at the District Council Elections" and "Statements About the War Made by Our Party Before the Revolution" published by *Pravda* No. 56.
- May 14 (27)* Lenin's article "Impending Debacle" published in *Pravda* No. 57
 Lenin reads a lecture on the subject "War and Revolution".
- May 16 (29)* Lenin's article "Despicable Methods" published in *Pravda* No. 58.
- May 16 and 17 (29 and 30)* Lenin's article "Inevitable Catastrophe and Extravagant Promises" published in *Pravda* Nos. 58 and 59.
- May 17 (30)* Lenin makes a speech on the current situation at a meeting of workers of the Pipe Works and other factories.
- May 18 (31)* *Pravda* No. 60 publishes Lenin's articles: "The Question of Uniting the Internationalists", "Muddle-headedness. *More on the Subject of Annexations*", "Combating Economic Chaos by a Spate of Commissions" and "One More Departure from Democratic Principles".
- May 19 (June 1)* *Pravda* No. 61 publishes Lenin's articles: "How the Capitalists Are Trying to Scare the People", "One More Crime of the Capitalists" and "Still More Lies".
- Before May 20 (June 2)* Lenin prepares his pamphlet *Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme* for the press. The pamphlet is published in the first half of June 1917.
- May 20 (June 2)* Lenin writes the preface to the pamphlet *Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme*.
Pravda No. 62 publishes Lenin's articles: "Has Dual Power Disappeared?" and "On the 'Unauthorised Seizure' of Land. *Flimsy Arguments of the Socialist-Revolutionaries.*"

- May 21 (June 5)* Lenin makes a report on the current situation and the tasks of the proletariat at a meeting of workers of the Skorokhod and other factories in Moskovskaya Zastava District of Petrograd.
- May 22 (June 4)* Lenin addresses the First All-Russia Congress of Peasants' Deputies on the agrarian question; on behalf of the Bolshevik delegates he submits a draft resolution on the subject.
- May 24 (June 6)* Lenin's article "Parties in the Petrograd District Council Elections" published in *Pravda* No. 64.
- Before May 25 (June 7)* Lenin drafts the resolution on measures to cope with economic disorganisation for presentation to the First Petrograd Conference of Shop Committees. The resolution is published in the Moscow Bolshevik newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat* No. 64, for May 25 (June 7), over the signature of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party.
- May 25 (June 7)* Lenin's article "A Deal with the Capitalists or Overthrow of the Capitalists? *How to End the War*" published in *Pravda* No. 65.
- May 27 (June 9)* *Pravda* No. 67 publishes Lenin's articles: "The Chain Is No Stronger Than Its Weakest Link", "The Capitalists Must Be Exposed", "Reports on the Economic Debacle", and "'Sleight of Hand' and Unprincipled Politicians".
- May 28 (June 10)* *Pravda* No. 68 publishes Lenin's articles: "The Dark Forces Are for the Cadets, the Mensheviks and Narodniks Are in One Government with the Cadets", "The Shameful Menshevik-Narodnik Bloc with *Yedinstvo*", "Counter-Revolution Takes the Offensive. '*Jacobins Without the People*'", "A Question of Principle. '*Forgotten Words of Democracy*'" and "For Lack of a Clean Principled Weapon They Snatch at a Dirty One".
- Lenin writes the afterword to his pamphlet *The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution*.
- May 30 (June 12)* Lenin speaks at a meeting of the Petrograd Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) and submits draft resolutions on the question of a separate organ of the press for the Petrograd Committee.
- May 31 (June 13)* Lenin's articles "The Harm of Phrase-mongering" and "Capitalist Mockery of the People" published in *Pravda* No. 69.

Lenin writes his "Letter to the District Committee of the Petrograd Organisation of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) in connection with the decision of the Petrograd Committee to publish a press organ of its own.

Lenin addresses the First Petrograd Conference of Shop Committees on workers' control over industry. Lenin's resolution on measures to cope with economic disorganisation is adopted by the Conference.

Lenin makes a speech on the current situation at a meeting of the Bolshevik delegates to the First All-Russia Congress of the Soviets.

- June 1 (14)* Lenin's articles: "Infamy Justified", "The Petty-Bourgeois Stand on the Question of Economic Disorganisation" and "A Mote in the Eye" are published in *Pravda* No. 70.
- June 2 (15)* Lenin's article "It Is Undemocratic, Citizen Kerensky!" published in *Pravda* No. 71.
- Before June (4)* Lenin draws up the plan of a speech to be delivered at the First All-Russia Congress of the Soviets.
- June 3 (16)* Lenin's articles "Bolshevism and 'Demoralisation' of the Army" and "The Laugh Is on You!" published in *Pravda* No. 72.
-

В. И. ЛЕНИН
СОЧИНЕНИЯ
Том 24

На английскот языке

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

