

Stanger, Mark 17 (suspect) Rev

NY Murray 10/15/91
Sep 30 1991

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION OF 1905 (by Solomon M. Schwarz)
The Workers' Movement and the Formation of Bolshevism and Menshevism

University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, 1967
Hoover Institution Publication

This book by a Menshevik for the Inter-University Project on

the History of the Menshevik Movement, (Columbia University has a special Archives of the Menshevik Project; Protocols of the interview with Schwarz, p.144), is however, both a scholarly work and has some especially important theoretical and practical information of IT who was then a Menshevik, even though he acted and ~~was~~ developed the theory of the permanent revolution. It is especially anti-mininist though in his youth, Schwarz was evidently a Bolshevik and tries to make it appear that they, the Mensheviks, were for labor and the Bolsheviks were for either guerrillas or just dictatorship. Nevertheless, I want to make sure of several very valuable facts:

1. 1st is the Introduction on "The Basic Conception of the Revolution", where again, though it is not exactly precise on VIL's What is To Be Done?, nevertheless includes some new facts such as (p.5 fn.) that the Italian party in 1892 at Genoa and not the Erfurt Programme in 1891 in Germany is the one that ~~fix~~ made the division between programme maximum and programme minimum.

On p. 13, SMS again maligns Lenin on the question of "mistrust of spontaneity" in the very revolution where he certainly changed his mind totally on the organizational question and working with the spontaneous masses; claims that that is why Parvus and Trotsky "who strongly disagreed with the Mensheviks stand on participation in government, nevertheless continued to collaborate with the Mensheviks throughout 1905."

The most exciting part appears on p.18, and even though the particular quotation from Lenin is supposed to be just "atouch of bogadaccio" it actually shows hardly any difference between Lenin and Trotsky on permanent revolution. Indeed, here (and again in the Appendix on permanent revolution) there are more magnificent quotations from Lenin on that very subject of continuous revolution than all other places (and it took IT until Stalin expelled him before he made references to them in the History of the RR).

p.18: No! You step aside, you generals and magistrates, professors and capitalists! The proletariat is setting out to build your bourgeois revolution for you, and it will build it in a way that will make it easiest to rebuild on socialist lines when the longed-for hour comes." (BE SURE TO CHECK THE 3rd CONGRESS, LENIN'S SPEECHES, ESP. THE PAMPHLET, JUNE-JULY 1905 "The Tactics of the SD in the Democratic Revolution", and it appears in Vol. 9, p.14).(Russian).

See also Vol. 8 pp.254-255, which contains the article "For an Account of the RR" which was written in the Spring of 1907 for RL's POLISH paper "The victory of a bourgeois revolution is impossible in our country as a victory of the bourgeoisie. Paradoxical as it sounds, this is a fact. The preponderantly peasant population, its dreadful oppression by the semifeudal big landownership, the strength and consciousness of the proletariat already organized into a socialist party--all these circumstances give our bourgeois revolution a special character. This peculiarity does not eliminate the bourgeois character of the revolution...This peculiarity only makes for the counterrevolutionary character of our bourgeoisie and [creates] the need for a dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in this kind of revolution." (Vol. 15, p.41.) (Russian)

J. J. Tasso
10/21/91
1-6/190
Comm. Rev
p. 439
Agenda
p. 489
Results
Summary
p. 113
8/1907
12/1907
Agenda
Ch. 17
430

page
1
Tasso
10/6/1996
11/1/97

on page 18
10/15/91

means also 2 by 11 but on 1 page *Ken*

On p. 23, there is the Q from an April 1905 article, "SD and the Provisional Revolutionary Government" where Lenin advises "the Revolutionary Social Democrat to build ~~dreams~~ on the eve of revolution" and this continues on p. 24 where back again to June-July 1905 on the "Two Tactics" where the expression is even more precise: "The complete victory of the ~~present~~ revolution will be the end of the democratic overturn and the beginning of the decisive struggle for a socialist overturn."

Q
Q
Q

Q
Q

And, even more so 2 months later: "From the democratic revolution we shall at once begin to go on...to a socialist revolution. WE ARE FOR CONTINUOUS REVOLUTION. ~~WE~~ WE SHALL NOT STOP HALFWAY." And again in "Communication About the 3rd Congress": "The revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry ends with "We shall make the Russian Revolution the ~~mark~~ prologue to the European socialist revolution (Vol. 8, p.274)

And finally, "The Stages, the Direction and the Prospects of the Revolution" contains the expression that the struggle will be hopeless "UNLESS THE EUROPEAN SOCIALIST PROLETARIAT COMES TO THE AID OF THE RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT".

1907

On p.27, ftn 45, the author also refers to the Preface that Lenin wrote to "Development of Capitalism in Russia" (2nd edition of Development of Capitalism in Russia, reproduced in 1938 edition, Russian, p.7 says that if the development of agriculture will continue along "American" bourgeois democratic rather than Prussian or feudal way, and will thus create the "speediest and freest development of the productive forces, with the position of the working and peasant masses, then this will create the most favorable conditions for further development of the ~~the~~ working classes ~~for~~ for the present and basic conditions of socialist reconstruction."

How this man can end that chapter that the "chief inferences for the labor movement" about Bolsheviks is discipline, ~~iron~~ iron discipline on the lower levels, with the ultimate sentence reading "These divergencies in their basic orientations were at the bottom of all the disputes ~~known~~ about tactics between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in 1905" I will never understand.

* * * * *

JMS

"I'm skipping all the way to the chapter on "The Soviets of Workers' Deputies", p.190 (the subsection is called "Two Lenins") because though he correctly insists that the "opinion remained unassimilated in Bolshevik ideology" it nevertheless is Lenin, pure Lenin, and certainly is totally opposed to alleged opposition to spontaneity. "Should such a struggle be conducted only by Social-Democrats or only under the Social-Democratic flag? I would say no; I am still of the opinion which I expressed in What Is To Be Done? -- namely, that it is not expedient to limit the composition of trade unions, and consequently participation in the economic struggle, to members of the Social-Democratic Party alone.

That which wasn't published until 1940 actually contains both the question of not to limit the ~~membership~~ composition of the t.u. to members of the SDP and "at the risk of surprising my readers even more, I must however state from the outset that here too it seems inexpedient to me to demand that the Soviet adopt a SD programme."

(VII con'td):

"As I see it, the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, as a center of political revolutionary leadership, is not too ~~far~~ broad but on the contrary too narrow an organization. The Soviet must proclaim itself the provisional revolutionary government."

* * *

* *Schwarz* * *Appendix* * *1850/1851*

Now I'm skipping all the way to the ~~the~~ appendix on the permanent revolution: whereas the Appendix starts by trying to maintain that Marx talked about the permanent revolution in the 1850 Address to the Communist League but never returned to it, which is quite fantastic when you read both Civil War in France and especially the 1881 Preface to the Russian edition of CM, which actually predicts that Russia could actually initiate the revolution in ~~advance~~ ahead of all advanced countries, and whereas again in 1905, in Germany, he shows that the phrase was used even by Kautsky and surely by Mehring and RL, Schwarz gets down to facts at the end on the theory as expressed by Parvus and Trotsky and in that he had quite a few good insights:

1st, though that is secondary, he reveals that LT had some sort of ~~fight~~ fight with the Mensheviks in the Fall, 1905, and left Geneva for Munich, but never broke with the Mensheviks. In Munich he spoke to Parvus and that's where the theory was born, though the phrase itself does ~~not~~ get mentioned in the pamphlet, Before January 9th. In Parvus' foreword to it does have the elements of the theory, INCLUDING THE PEASANTS INCAPACITY FOR INDEPENDENT REVOLUTIONARY ACTION (p.249)

Endly and this is primary, the idea of permanent revolution with ~~the~~ proletariat leading is never separated from the incapacity of the peasantry and the petit bourgeoisie in general including the intelligentsia, incapable of playing an independent role.

In April, and here he refers to how LT relates that idea in My Life, which has to be ~~well~~ studied anew:

a) The reference to "a corrective to Lenin's resolution" which LT's friend L.B. Krasin was presenting to the legal CC of Subbotnik. b) Schwarz quotes LT's expression quite extensively, who quoted Krasin quite extensively, adding "this is formulated almost verbatim as in my thesis. Lenin, who had treated the question purely theoretically in his main speech, took a very favorable view of Krasin's approach... the resolution was revised accordingly."

c) Whereupon Schwarz really does in for the kill and quotes another part of Krasin's speech at the 3rd April-May 1905 Congress of the Bolsheviki as published in 1959: "We are all in agreement that the impending overturn will be only political and not socialist."

d) The part that LT himself quotes, however, in the 1905 book is important as it is his commentary on Lassalle's speech to the jury (pp.280-281).

* * * * *

pp.189-191 has a very fantastic thing about the fact that Lenin had written an article, "Our Tasks and the Soviets of Workers' Deputies" which was intended to be sent to Novaya Zhisn, but evidently wasn't, and somehow it supposedly got lost and wasn't published until Nov. 5, 1940 in Pravda. The article must have been read by Lenin to his Bolshevik comrades.

3rd version of my notes on Schwartz's The Revolution of 1905, this time, however, mainly not on different concepts of Bolsheviks, Mensheviks and LT, but on "facts, facts, facts."

1st to be seen is that the Appendices are almost as long as the text (20% of the 354 pages of the book, 245 are text, all the rest are appendices). Except for the one on Permanent Revolution, App. # 1, the appendices deal with very concrete things, all revolving around the question of Myth vs. Reality and all directed against the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Encyclopaedia; Stalinist

No. 2 is on the demonstration of Nov. 20, 1904; No. 3 is on the genesis of the Com. of the Majority.; No. 4, actually the only important one, is on the Zubatovism and Gaponism; No. 5 is on the SD and Zubatovism; No. 6 the Baku strike of ~~IBEX~~ Dec. 1904: Myth and Reality; No. 7 is on the Liberationists and trade union movement (actually the liberals and Peter Struve's organization; No. 8 Akimov and the relations of T.u. and Party; The only thing good about No. 9, ~~XXXX~~ entitled Lenin's theory of] Trade Unions, "Spontaneity" and "Consciousness" is that there is no doubt at all at the end that though he is the main opponent of Lenin and the main proponent that Lenin was always opposed to spontaneity, it is very clear that this is no "general principle" of spontaneity but a very specific, correct ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ attack by Lenin on the Economists and what they considered to be spontaneity, that is to say, that no radical must go beyond the spontaneous organization of trade unions; No. 10 is the Myth of the "Liberationists"; No. 11 is some more Myth and Reality of the Ivanevo-Voznesensk, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ No. 12 is the Myth and Reality of the Moscow workers, and here we definitely see women singled out because that's what the actual leaflets (this time of the Bolsheviks) were entitled: "The Men and Women Workers of the Printing Presses of the Cytin Co." (and it was the printing workers who made it into a general strike) — and the second leaflet "To all Men and Women workers in Moscow" (listevki moskevskikh bolshevikov).

The kind of news that Schwartz has that the others would just mention in passing are "zemstvo campaign of 1904". And in this activity — on the eve of 1905 — we get the description of the SD movement to the Gapon movement (NB to RD — Don't forget Jan. 9 is really Jan. 22, the very day of WSU). On p. 62 he quotes a witness account, Somev's reminiscences about "mystic, religious ecstasy reigned throughout the meeting" and that this Gapon was not the only one that was creating the spirit but that as each "tortured human soul" was speaking: 'we cannot endure anymore, better death than this kind of life' — so that everyone began calling the Gapon group "the Gapon Social Democrats". "Everywhere the initiative came from the local party workers."

P. 70 shows that the strikes began Jan. 3 at the Putilov plant.

The next "new" that Schwartz spends innumerable time on, but darned if I will, except to remember the name of the chapter: The Ghidlevskii Commission. (pp 75-128)

CH/3 is on the Strike and the Trade Unions and the Social Democracy, of which the only important part is pp. 147 - 149, where he does show correctly that the 3 roots in 1904-05 were: (1) that the Legal Mutual Aid society was so weak that they couldn't do anything and even they became transformed into trade unions; (2) that conditions were so bad objectively that even the remnants of the Police-fermed trade unions of Gapon shed their police origins; and (3) that though the intelligentsia was very small, they were there and helped the workers. p. 148 particularly has a very concise page on the notorious "creds" of 1899 which rejected the very notion of a trade union in Russia, which is exactly what Lenin began his work to attack.

The other chapter that may have some elements for 1905 without conceptualization is Ch. 4, The Soviet of Workers Deputies, which, once you get finished you can disregard as to how great the Mensheviks are -- but even here (p. 173) he manages to say that the Menshevik on whose reminiscences he bases himself -- "Kuzovlev (Zberevskii) emits mention that he was the 1st chairman of the soviet." even though that was exactly one day as he passed over the gavel to Khrustalev, who was so great he remained the chairman from then on. He also mentions LT's letter of Aug. 25, 1921, to the Institute of Party History, where he retells the 1905 events. The point is that Khrustalev in his book on the soviet also tells the story, and out of this actually, the only thing that is illuminating is fn. 34 on p. 182, which shows that there was such back and forth movement between Bela and Mensh in the actual rev'n that LT who was a Men. was present at the meeting of the Bol. center and Benin who was never anything but a Bol. "visited a Men. conference held in St. Petersburg in November...."

1/24/1905

The very telling section, despite its subtitle "Two Lenins" is the one which tells what Lenin did in Stockholm Nov 2-4, when he wrote his article, "Our Tasks and the Soviet of Workers Deputies", which was a letter to the editors of Novaya Zhizn. Evidently since he was then leaving in person for Russia, he did not mail it and that is the one that supposedly wasn't "found" until 1940. (Incidentally, it's included in Vol. 10 CH). Here are its central points:

- (1) "It is not expedient to limit the composition of trade unions and consequently participation in the economic struggle to the members of the SDP alone"
- (2) "At the risk of surprising my readers even more, I must, however state ~~from~~ from the outset that, here, too, it seems inexpedient to me to demand that the soviet of workers deputies adopt the SD program and join the Russian SD Labor Party. It seems to me that for leading political struggles the Soviet (referred in the direction described below) and the Party alike are indispensable at present."

14222

Now, what do you suppose the author concludes from all these quotations? which make it clear that Lenin's position was, and evidently what the hostility of the Bolsheviks themselves to that position was that Lenin bowed to that majority? Evidently, that Lenin returned to his original position of What is to be Done!!!

Chapter 5, The Organizational Problems of SD is even worse, and totally without reason or sense since it talks not of the 1905 revolution, but how everybody was against Lenin's dictatorial ways, and quoting at length both LT's 1904 attack on ~~EMMA~~ Lenin and RLs attack on Lenin also of 1904. This also was full of contradictions because the minute he does reach 1905 (p. 243) Lenin's very first article, "On Reorganizing the Party" (11/10, 11/15, 11/16) speaks about "It is absolutely necessary to create alongside of the secret apparatus more and more new overt and semi-overt Party organizations (and organizations associated with the Party). Without this work it is impossible to adapt our activity to the new conditions and to be able to solve new problems."

And it's precisely this period and this article and in this volume (10) that Lenin made that magnificent quotation that I use all over M&F: "

"The working class is instinctively, spontaneously Social-Democratic, and more than ten years of Social-Democratic work have done a great deal toward turning this spontaneity into consciousness. Do not imagine non-existing terrors, comrades."

Whereupon, of course, that Menshevik scholar concludes that this means the Mensheviks were democrats and Lenin was an autocrat, as is "proven" by the Bolsheviks in Oct. 1917, who, "put an end to the democratic development of the revolution."

Now then, the first appendix to which I refer, the Permanent Revolution, begins with trying to prove that Marx didn't really mean Permanent Revolution. On this one point, Draper is magnificent in his expose (Incidentally, Schwartz bases himself on Nicolaevsky, "who is distorting history" which he delivered to the American Philosophical Society in 1961.) After he supposedly proves that Marx didn't have a position on perm. rev'n he proceeds to show how much it really was in the air in 1905 that everyone from RL to KK to Mahrning were using the expression. Finally, p. 249, he gets to LT and Parvus.

And here what's interesting is that Parvus's foreword to IT's pamphlet ~~to~~ to ~~Jan. 1917~~ is the stress on the "peasants incapacity for revolutionary independent action." On p. 252, fn. 16, he exposes IT's claim in My Life that Krasin had presented Trotsky's view at the Bolshevik conference, that Lenin accepted it "as a corrective" of Lenin's position, and he quotes directly from the Protokolls of the 3rd Congress April-May 1905, which quotes Krasin in full, and no such "Trotskyist" position is seen there. However, Schwartz does catch himself long enough to say: "But the disagreement was not yet substantial enough to prevent Trotsky from feeling a basic solidarity with Krasin on the question of the provisional government." And again, he ends up with Lenin supposedly endorsing IT's position in 1917.

This book is part of the Inter-university Project on the History of the Menshevik Movement that is in the Columbia University but is sponsored by the Hoover Institution and published by the University of Chicago. The Preface is by Leopold Haimson. It came out ahead of the 1st volume projected, which was entitled The Making of a Workers Revolution: Russian Social-Democracy, 1891-1903 by Allen Wildman.