

Vol. XII

14214

VOL. 12 OF LENIN'S COLLECTED WORKS, JAN-JUNE 1907

Vol. 12 shows that "in preparation" for the fifth "united" ~~RSDP~~ RSDLP, the draft resolution for the RSDLP was, in fact, the resolutions that would be presented to the RSDLP Congress, but whereas the draft resolution (pp. 133-142) (1) The Present Stage of the Democratic Revolution; 2) The attitude to Bourgeois Parties; 3) The Class Tasks of the Prolet. at the Present Stage of the Dem. Rev.; 4) Tactics of the ~~SD~~ SD in the State Duma; 5) The Intensification of Mass Destitution and the Economic Struggle; and 6) Non-party workers organization and the anarchist-syndicalist trend among the Prolet. -- was written and debated Feb. 15-18 (Feb. 28- Mar 3), but the Fifth Congress only met on April 30 to May 19 (May 13-June 1). That tells something about Lenin's practice of organization!

Handwritten notes: "This is the agenda of the Congress"

Now then, the speeches of VII at the Congress, and the summation following the Congress cover pp 437-510 and in following them, it will be seen what I meant about the months of preparation and the fact that, in essence, these were presented. That is to say, though some of the political, called by the Mensheviks, theoretical resolutions were "excluded" by the Mensheviks who insisted that the meeting was to be "business-like" and limited to tactics and practice and not be "abstract", when the one theoretical resolution -- attitude to the bourgeois parties -- was permitted, all the other subjects actually were broached. For that matter, the wrangling on the agenda already brought out the theoretical discussion. Thus, VII's speech during that discussion on the Congress agenda, on May 2 (15) asks: "Who would have thought that, under such circumstances, the proposal would be made to remove all questions of principle from the Congress agenda?" (p. 439) And in that same speech: "What is this but sophistry? What is this but a helpless shift from adherence to principle to lack of principle?" (440). And finally, "We must not remove theoretical questions from the agenda, but raise all the practical work of our party to the level of theoretical clarification of the tasks of a workers' party." (p. 441)

Handwritten notes: "Agenda", "Cautions", "Notes of the Congress"

Handwritten notes: "By the way", "HERE"

Handwritten note: "Look up p 459 (Of course I did)"

Even more true was that in the speeches on the activities of the Duma group. When we come to the speeches on the main resolution, that naturally comes out full force. The main speech on May 12 (25), pp 456-468 brings out not only the two major different trends, Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, but the objective course of the revolution itself, and in that course, the relationship of all the embryonic organs of the revolutionary power (the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, the Soviets of Peasants and Soldiers' Deputies, and so forth) representatives of the proletariat who are the main participants, followed by the most advanced of the insurgent peasantry. At the time of the 1st Duma the peasants immediately formed a democratic 'Trudovik' group, which was more to the left, in other words, more revolutionary than the liberals -- the Cadets. In the elections to the 2nd Duma, the peasants defeated the liberals outright. The proletariat marched ahead, the peasantry more or less resolutely following it against the autocracy and against the vacillating liberals. The Bolshevik draft is based on a definition of the class content of the principle types of bourgeois parties. " (p. 459) Who doubts that the theoretical question of social forces in a revolution, what is the motive force, and why it and are the

Handwritten note: "See VII"

Handwritten notes: "In embryo", "organ", "by the way"

Handwritten note: "Bourgeois not mentioned"

is that though this is a bourgeois democratic revolution, the bourgeoisie can be neither the motive force nor the leader of the revolution. Only the proletariat is capable of consummating that revolution, that is, achieving a complete

victory. But this victory can be achieved only provided the proletariat succeeds in getting a large section of the proletariat to follow its lead." (p.458)

Primary check

Who doubts, I ask, that in fact, they were discussing -- or Lenin was discussing -- the theoretical estimation not only of an attitude to bourgeois parties, but an analysis of the present course of the revolution, the class tasks of the proletariat in that revolution and the insistence that the proletariat, being the main motive force of revolution, and therefore will work against the bourgeoisie and get political power with the help of the peasantry? What VIL is accusing the Mensheviks of is, if not betrayal, subordination of the proletariat and the revolutionary peasantry to bourgeois aims. Furthermore, the Bolsheviks like the Mensheviks in this case are, from very opposite points of view, buttressing their arguments with historic examples, from both the 1848-49 revolution and the 1789-1793 revolution.

Crucial

In the concluding remarks on the same subject, on May 14 (27) he first appeals to the Polish comrades who had their own resolution, to vote for the Bolshevik resolution, precisely because the class content was analysed the same by both and the Bolshevik resolution had the advantage of being more specific in rejecting the bourgeois parties. "The socialist aims of the proletariat keep it distinct from all parties, even the most revolutionary and republican; then there is the proletariat leadership in the struggle of all revolutionary democrats in the present revolution - can it be denied that these are the fundamental and guiding ideas in both the Polish and Bolshevik resolutions?" (p.470) He also appeals to Trotsky to see that "quite apart from the question of uninterrupted revolution we have here solidarity on fundamental points in the question of the attitude towards bourgeois parties." (p.470)

And finally, in taking issue with the Mensheviks, Plekhanov's quotation about RL and Madonia (p. 471). He did get the resolution passed.

Madonia

As Lenin was found it was a tactic

Finally, in publishing "Results of the London Congress", he summarizes in his article, "The Attitude Towards Bourgeois Parties", the fact that it wasn't a tactic but "Marx's theory of the class struggle has disappeared" from the Menshevik resolution. And on the question of the peasantry he again refers back to Marx. "The German bourgeoisie have betrayed the peasants, wrote Marx in 1848. In 1907, we in Russia do not risk saying the same about our bourgeoisie and about our Cadets, if we cannot prove this to the masses, we shall be trampling the great banner of the Social Dem. in the mud." (p. 502) (Quote the last para. on p. 506 as the summation of the period before revolution "an epoch of vacillation" ~~was~~ on the part of the Mensheviks put to the test and failing in the actual 1905 revolution.

Class & Party

by coalition
Conclusions

PHH
disappeared

14215

P. we Bolsheviks have always seen eye to eye with the Poles on two fundamental questions. First of all we agree on the fact that, for the sake of its socialist tasks, the proletariat must categorically retain its class individuality with respect to all the other (bourgeois) parties, however revolutionary they may be, however democratic the republic they advocate. Secondly, we agree that *gm* it is the right and duty of the workers' party to assume leadership of the petty-bourgeois democratic parties, including the peasant parties, not only in the struggle against the autocracy, but also against the treacherous liberal bourgeoisie. (p. 469)

The full victory of the revolution, said the Bolsheviks, is possible only as a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. (Ftn. p. 490)

The German bourgeoisie have betrayed the peasants, wrote Marx in 1848. If, in 1907, we in Russia do not risk saying the same about our bourgeoisie and about our Cadets, if we cannot prove this to the masses, we shall be trampling the great banner of Social-Democracy in the mud. (p. 502)

The major distinguishing feature of this revolution is the acuteness of the agrarian question. This struggle for the land inevitably forces enormous masses of the peasantry into the democratic revolution... Such an alignment of social forces inevitably leads to the conclusion that the bourgeoisie can be neither the motive force nor the leader in the revolution. Only the proletariat is capable of consummating the revolution.... (p. 458)

In October 1905, at the very height of the revolution, the proletariat was at the head, the bourgeoisie wavered and vacillated, and the peasantry wrecked the landed estates. In all the embryonic organs of revolutionary power (the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, the Soviets of Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies, etc.) representatives of the proletariat were the main participants, followed by the most advanced of the insurgent peasantry...

The Bolshevik draft is based on a definition of the class content of the principal types of bourgeois parties. (p. 459)

The Mensheviks say that our bourgeoisie are "unprepared to fight". Actually, however, the bourgeoisie were prepared to fight, prepared to fight against the proletariat, to fight against the "excessive" victories of the revolution. (p.462)