

V. b. b.

**SPECIAL NUMBER**

**English Edition**

**Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint**

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 76

26<sup>th</sup> October 1925

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliessfach 213, Vienna IX.  
Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

## *The Twentieth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution of 1905.*

### C O N T E N T S

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| N. Lenin: The Socialist Labour Party in the Present Situation.                 | Clara Zetkin: Effect of the Russian Revolution of 1905 on the West European Labour Movement. |
| N. L. R.: 1905 — 1917 — 1925.  | Paul Fröhlich: The Revolution of 1905 and the German Working Class.                          |
| Em. Jaroslavsky: The December Rising in 1905.                                  | Joseph Strasser: The Russian Revolution and the Austrian Franchise Struggle.                 |
| V. Nevsky: Soviets of Workers, Soldiers and Peasant Deputies in 1905.          | G. Bakalov: 1905 in Bulgaria.  |
| S. Dubrovsky: Lessons of the Peasant Movement in the First Russian Revolution. | Fritz Platten: The Effects of the 1905 Revolution on Switzerland.                            |
| P. Valetzky: 1905 in Poland.   | Lensner: The 1905 Revolution.  |
| Sen Katayama: The Russian Revolution of 1905 and Japan.                        | Calendar of the 1905—7 Revolution.   |

## *The Socialist Labour Party and its Tasks in the Present Situation.*

*By N. Lenin.*

The following article by comrade Lenin appeared for the first time in the "Molodaja Rossija" (Young Russia) of 4th January 1906. Ed.

Wherein consists the peculiarity of the situation of the great Russian Revolution? It consists in the fact that the further events have completely exposed with all its hollowness the Tsar's Manifesto of 17th October. The constitutional illusions have been destroyed. Reaction prevails all along the line. Despotism has been completely restored, it has even been "deepened" by the dictatorial rights of Eastern satrapism, beginning with Dubassov\*) right down to the lower police authorities.

Civil war is raging. The political strike, as such, is beginning to exhaust itself, it is beginning to be left behind as an obsolete form of the movement in the past. In St. Petersburg, for example, the exhausted and enfeebled workers were not able to carry through the December strike. On the other hand the movement, although it is stifled for the present by the reaction, has doubtless reached a much higher stage.

\*) Admiral Dubassov, General Governor of Moscow, who suppressed the Moscow revolt in December 1905.

The heroic Moscow proletariat showed that it is possible to conduct an active struggle, and drew along with it a mass of such sections of the population who have hitherto been politically indifferent, if not reactionary. The Moscow events, however, represent one of the most definite forms of the "tendency" which revealed itself in all the corners of Russia. The new form of action was confronted with tasks of such a gigantic character that they of course could not be solved at one stroke. These tasks are now, however, clearly confronting the entire people, the movement is being raised to a higher level, it is becoming steeled and consolidated. The revolution can no longer be deprived of these achievements.

Dubassov's cannons revolutionised enormous masses of fresh people. The new farce of the Duma encountered far greater hostility in the ranks of the advanced fighters and an incomparably greater scepticism in the ranks of the bourgeoisie than did the old Bulygin Duma.

What is the situation now?

We will look the facts straight in the face. A new task now confronts us of assimilating and analysing the lessons of recent

forms of struggle, a work of preparing and organising the forces in the chief centres of the movement.

It would be of great advantage to the government to suppress, as hitherto, the scattered and isolated actions of the proletariat. The government would very much like to provoke the workers in St. Petersburg to immediate struggle under the most disadvantageous conditions for the latter. The workers, however, will not respond to this provocation and will succeed in pursuing their own course of independent preparation for the further action which will extend over the whole country.

Forces are to hand for such an action: they are growing more quickly than we. Only a limited portion of these forces were drawn into the stream of the December events. The movement has not by a long way revealed its entire breadth and depth.

Let us cast a glance at the moderate bourgeois and the ultra-reactionary press. Nobody, not even the "Novoye Vremya" (The New Times, organ of the reactionary nobility. Ed.) places any belief in the boastings of the government that it will immediately nip any new action in the bud. Nobody doubts that the enormous inflammable material — the peasantry — will really blaze up next spring. Nobody believes that the government will or can honestly convene the Duma under the old system of repressions, of bureaucracy, of deprivation of rights etc.

Not irresponsible acts of revolutionaries, which in such a situation are a hundred times more dangerous than the decisive action, but obvious facts, which are even recognised by opponents of the revolution, go to prove that the "victory" of the government in Moscow has rendered its position more desperate than it was before October.

The peasants' revolt is growing. The financial collapse is approaching. The gold currency is losing its value. The deficit of

half a milliard Roubles cannot be made good even with all the help of the reactionary bourgeoisie of Europe who are hastening to the aid of despotism. All those troops who are ready to fight against the revolution have been called up, but the "pacification of the Caucasus and Siberia" is farther off than ever. The ferment in the army and in the fleet, which found clear expression after the 17th October, will of course not be stilled by the employment of force against the fighters for freedom throughout all Russia. The return of the war prisoners and the return of the Manchurian army will only increase this ferment. The mobilisation of fresh divisions of troops against the enemy at home only entails fresh dangers to despotism. The crisis has not only not been solved, on the contrary, it has only been extended by the Moscow "victory".

The Socialist Labour Party must be clear regarding its tasks. Down with the constitutional illusions! The "lessons" of the two great revolutionary months (November and December) must "be collected". Everywhere where it is necessary we must know how to go over into illegality. The enormous tasks of the new action must be faced more definitely, the preparations for the same must be carried out with more perseverance and more systematically, the forces of the proletariat, exhausted by the strikes, must, where possible, be preserved.

One wave is followed by another. The capital follows the provinces. The Border States are followed by the heart of Russia, the proletariat by the town petty bourgeoisie, the town by the village. The defeat of the reactionary government is unavoidable in the face of its widely divergent tasks. Upon our preparations for the spring 1906 depends to a great extent the issue of the first phase of the great Russian Revolution.

## 1905 — 1917 — 1925.

By N. L. R.

### I.

The 20 years that have elapsed since the time of the 1905 revolution have proved irrefutably that the first Russian revolution was a turning point in universal history. This was already clear to the contemporaries of 1905. "We will estimate the Russian revolution more correctly if we consider it as quite a peculiar process which is taking place during the transition from bourgeois to socialist society, which entails the abolition of the one and the preparation for the other, and which at any rate, promotes the development of entire humanity, of capitalist civilisation a tremendous distance." This is how Kautsky concluded his famous "Reply to Plekhanov".

Lenin, in his remarkable article "Historical Fate of K. Marx's Teachings", printed in 1913, pointed out that universal history from those days (1848) is divided up distinctly into three main periods:

1. From the 1848 revolution to the Paris Commune (1871).
2. From the Paris Commune to the Russian revolution (1905).
3. From the Russian revolution onwards\*).

What were the main features of the period preceding 1905 and subsequent to the Commune? The "Second period (1872 to 1904) differs from the first 'in its peaceful nature' and the absence of revolution. The West had finished with bourgeois revolutions, and the East had not yet awakened to them." (From same volume page 44. Italics ours.)

If we regard the epoch 1905—1925 from the same viewpoints, we can definitely say:

Firstly, that the epoch 1905—25 was an epoch of direct preparation and of the first stages of the realisation of Socialism in the West;

Secondly, that the 1905—1925 epoch was an epoch in which the East entered the sphere of national bourgeois revolutions;

Thirdly, that the epoch 1905—1925 was an epoch in which the proletarian revolutions of the West were linked up with the bourgeois revolutions of the East.

The transference of the revolution from Western Europe to Russia — the characteristic point of the entire epoch of 1905 to

1925 — created favourable conditions for realising this combination of East and West.

The linking up of the struggle of the Eastern peoples and the Western proletariat was a universal historic event and was a striking prologue to the liberation of entire humanity.

Whereas, the slogan of the two first epochs (1848—1871 and 1871—1905) was "Workers of the World Unite", the watchword of the new epoch was "Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples of the World Unite".

These are the three fundamental factors of the epoch 1905—1925.

### II.

The 20 years that have passed since the first Russian revolution are themselves divided up into two periods, of which October 1917 marked the rubicon.

The period 1905—1917 is the direct preparatory period of the proletarian revolution which distinguished the years 1917 to 1925.

The most important events of the first period were:

Firstly 1905 itself, which dealt the first powerful blow to the autocracy, placed the Russian proletariat at the head of the people's movement, aroused the peoples of the East and confronted the Western proletariat with the question of the "Way to Power".

Secondly the first dawn of national revolution in the East.

Thirdly, the imperialist war which ended with the victory of the Russian proletariat who opened up the field of revolution, in the period of the collapse of capitalism and the most acute class struggle in the West. One may say in parenthesis that the 1914 to 1918 war once more emphasised the universal historical significance of war as a factor of the revolution. The Franco-German war gave birth to the Commune, the Russo-Japanese war to 1905, and the imperialist war to October 1917.

During the period 1905—1918 imperialism was in its heyday and thereby approaching the eve of the Socialist revolutionary epoch. The latter is the fundamental feature determining the 1917—1925 period, thus this period is characterised by its peculiar form "merging" into Socialism. This "merging" proceeded on three main lines:

\* See Lenin's Works (Russian edition), Vol. 12, Chapter 2, pag. 43.

The aggravation of the class struggle in Western Europe which developed into tremendous conflicts between labour and capital.

The organic growth of Socialism in the Soviet Union, the precursor of which was the proletarian revolution in 1917.

Finally, the development of national revolutions in the East and their partial victory.

Let us examine the situation in a more detailed manner.

1. The first situation at first sight may seem paradoxical and horrify the "theoreticians" of the Second International. But the theses on the "merging" into Socialism through "tremendous conflicts between labour and capital" has only been borrowed by us from... Kautsky. This is what he wrote in his work "The Way to Power": "The merging into Socialism thus means the 'merging' into tremendous conflicts which will shake the very foundation of the State, which are bound to increase continually, and which can only end in the overthrow and the expropriation of the capitalist class. This is so because the proletariat is an integrate part of society: it may temporarily suffer defeat, but it can never be exterminated. On the contrary it is the capitalist class which becomes superfluous. The first big defeat that this class will suffer in the struggle for State power should lead to its complete disaster for a long time to come.

Those who do not wish to acknowledge these outcomes of our continual merging into Socialism must be blind to the basic fact of the life of our Society — The class contradictions of Capitalism and Labour. The merging into Socialism is only another Expression of the continual intensification of class contradictions, the merging into an epoch of tremendous and decisive class conflicts, which we term the Social Revolution."

The 1917-25 epoch reinforces this thesis even 10 times more than the pre-revolutionary epoch, the experience of which Kautsky applies to the above-mentioned thesis.

It will suffice to point out: the overthrow of the Monarchy in Germany, Austria, Hungary, etc., the Soviet Republics in Hungary and Bavaria in 1919; the stormy waves of the class struggle at the end of 1920 in Italy and October 1923 in Germany; the rapid approach of "tremendous conflicts" in England, which one may say now disclose a classic example of "merging" into Socialism through "tremendous conflicts"; the colonial revolutions undermining the power of European capitalism and thereby intensifying the class struggle in Europe.

2. The nature of the merging into Socialism in the Soviet Union is different in principle. Whereas in capitalist countries the driving forces of this movement are the increase of Antagonisms, decline of economic connections, civil wars and the breakdown of the bourgeois order; here, the driving forces are quite different, namely:

a) Restoration and reinforcement of economic connections on the basis of socialised industry and agriculture cleansed of any remnants of feudalism, regulation of the market through the apparatus of syndicates, trading exchanges, State commercial organisations, cooperation etc.

b) The union of the proletariat and peasantry based on economic collaboration. The line of development of this union is not an aggravation but a mitigation of the class antagonisms between the proletariat and the peasantry. This dictatorship of the proletariat not only does not increase these contradictions but is a condition for their gradual decrease, since the "dictatorship of the proletariat is: 1. a form of violence against the capitalists and landowners unrestricted by any law. 2. It is the leadership of the proletariat over the peasantry and 3. It is the construction of Socialism in regard of society as a whole". (Stalin: Questions and Answers).

c) The uninterrupted democratisation of the Soviet State, the uninterrupted attraction of still larger masses of workers and working women, peasants and peasant women into the work of construction, the uninterrupted increase in the thread which bind together the Soviet power and the masses of the people;

d) The increase in the self-activity of the workers and peasants, expressed in the growth of workers' and peasants' social organisations (societies such as "Down with Illiteracy", "Friends of the Radio", "Aviakhim", "Atheist League", workers and peasants correspondents, patronage societies over villages, International Class War Prisoners aid,) hundreds of thousands of men and women delegates to factory and workshop committees, millions of the youth organised in the Young Communist League and Pioneers, etc.

The process of "merging" into Socialism in both cases is not isolated. Between them a permanent inter-action exists. The period 1917—25 was accompanied by the uninterrupted struggle of the capitalist world against Soviet Russia. This struggle adopts various forms: intervention, economic blockade, etc. 1925, is in a certain sense the border line in the struggle. Why? Because the 1917—25 period Firstly, showed the impossibility of victory by means of an open attack on the U. S. S. R. It is a well-known fact that the three years intervention ended in complete failure.

Secondly, covered up the losses of the imperialist war and the revolution in a much more rapid period than was the case during the epoch of the French Revolution, as the result of this the U. S. S. R. is already approaching the end of the period of restoration of economy to the pre-war level.

Thirdly, proved the possibility of constructing Socialism in one country alone. As the result of eight years of proletarian dictatorship in Russia, more than 62% of the means of production have been nationalised and in the field of heavy industry up to 99%, about one quarter of the population of the Soviet Union is organised in cooperation and about 3/4 of the trading balance has been secured to State and cooperative organisations; the entire foreign trade has been monopolised by the proletarian State, and the banking and credit system and railway transport has been completely concentrated in its hands.

Fourthly, the 1917—25 period created a mutual necessity (both for the capitalist world and the U. S. S. R.) for close economic connections. One of the chief factors of the period following 1925 will be the economic struggle and the competition of the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union. The results of this struggle are determined not by one factor but by several: the trend of development of productive forces both there and here, the class struggle within the capitalist countries, the competition between the imperialist states, and the struggle between the colonies and the imperialist West, etc. During the preceding period the development of capitalism on the whole was on a downward trend, while the line of development of Socialism went up. We have no grounds for believing that during the present period these lines of development will proceed in the opposite direction.

3. The "merging" into Socialism of the Eastern countries during the preceding epoch was based upon the development of the national revolutions. The 1905 revolution awoke the suppressed nations of the East from their slumbers. Thanks to the imperialist war and the October revolution "The East is finally being dragged into the general whirlpool of the universal revolutionary movement"). The revolutions in the East were directed — a) against the yoke of foreign capital, b) against the relics of serfdom and feudalism. At this stage one cannot imagine the victory of Socialism in the East other than being the abolition of the social-economic domination of International imperialism and of its faithful allies — the native landowners, the military and civil bureaucrats. It cannot be realised otherwise than as the conquest of normal labour conditions by the workers and peasants within the framework of capitalism, their conquest of political freedom. Only this will create conditions for the transformation of the bourgeois democratic revolutions into the Social Revolution. At the same time one cannot think of the complete victory of Socialism in the countries of European imperialism without abolishing the domination of the latter in the Eastern countries.

Therefore those "leaders" of European "Socialism" who cry out about an "Eastern danger", and about "Soviet imperialism" leading "movements of Eastern barbarians" are openly serving European Imperialism. The union of the revolutionary East and the proletarian West is not a theory of the "Soviet imperialists" it is the elementary truth of Marxism which even now the Bauers & Co. still pretend to revere. Many years prior to the formation of the Soviet Power, Lenin developed the Marxian idea on the union of East and West. As far back as 1908 Lenin wrote in connection with the imperialist conspiracy in the Balkans and Persia:

"This is a plot against the proletariat and against democracy. It is a conspiracy for the open suppression of the revolution in Asia, or for indirect blows against this revolution. It is a plot to continue the colonial robbery and territorial conquests in the Balkans today, in Persia tomorrow, and after

\* Lenin — "Better Little and Good" (Russian Edition Lenin's works Vol. 18 chap. II. p. 136.)

tomorrow perhaps in Asia Minor, Egypt, etc. Only the world revolution of the proletariat is capable of overthrowing this united force of crowned robbers and international capitalists."

As far back as 1913, in greeting the Chinese revolution that was developing, Lenin declared:

"All the ruling forces of Europe, the entire European bourgeoisie is in alliance with all the forces of reaction and mediocrity in China.

But for all this, young Asia, i. e. hundreds of millions of toilers in Asia have a reliable ally in the proletariat of all civilised countries. No force in the world can stay this victory which will liberate the peoples of Europe and the peoples of Asia."

What is more, the teacher of Bauer, Hilferding & Co., Kautsky, "himself" wrote in "The Way to Power" in 1910:

"When Marx and Engels wrote the 'Communist Manifesto' they only had in mind Western Europe as an arena of the Proletarian Revolution. At the present time the battlefield is spreading over the whole world. Nowadays the struggle for freedom of the toilers and the exploited masses of humanity is proceeding not only on the shores of the Spree and the Seine, but also on the Hudson and the Mississippi, on the Neva and the Dardanelles, on the Ganges and the Hwang-Ho."

Let everyone remember well these words of Kautsky's. They illustrate clearly the treacherous, counter-revolutionary role of the recent decisions of the Marseilles Congress and the "Eastern danger."

### III.

In the above-mentioned article, Lenin shows how three historical steps of the class struggle correspond with three stages in the development of Marxism.

The first stage is the Marxism of Marx himself, the second stage is accompanied by an Extension of Marxist ideas. But the "dialectics of history is such that the theoretical victory of Marxism compelled its enemies to disguise themselves as Marxists. Liberalism which has inwardly decayed, tried to revive in the form of Socialist opportunism (Italics Lenins' XII Vol. Russian Edition chapt. 2. p. 45). The final result of the second stage was the vulgarising of Marxism. What does the third stage disclose? The third stage is accompanied by social storms. "The coming historical epoch will bring yet another great triumph to Marxism as the teaching of the proletariat" (Ibid p. 46) Lenin's prophecy came true. The 20 years following 1905, despite the treachery of the former pupils of Marx — Kautsky and others, demonstrated the triumph of Marxism. Marxism became the official science in the first proletarian State, Marxism dominated the minds of the advanced intellectuals and the workers of the Eastern countries.

The 1905—25 epoch brought triumph to Marxism, for it justifies its predictions as to the crash of capitalism, which the reformists sneered at — and its predictions as to the dictatorship of the proletariat as the transition stage between capitalism and Socialism. The 1905—25 epoch brought triumph to Marxism, for it enriched it by tremendous historical events and set moving and solidified its teachings concerning the Social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was Lenin who fulfilled this tremendous work of enriching Marxism, of making it more profound and of transforming it into living deeds. This work has continued during the entire epoch.

Leninism as the Marxism of the new epoch, the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution — arose not after the war not after 1917, but already arose during the epoch of the first Russian revolution. During the process of this revolution, the foundation of Leninism was laid. The imperialist war raised Leninism up to a new stage, and the experience of the proletarian dictatorship, the class struggle in post war Europe and of the colonial movements helped to complete the edifice of Leninism. The teachings of Lenin commenced and gained their first victories during the 1905—25 epoch. The subsequent period will bring still greater triumphs to Leninism, will conquer new millions for Leninism.

### IV.

As we have said the 1905—25 epoch was an epoch of direct preparation and of the first stages of the realisation of Socialism. In accordance with this the strategy of the struggle and the means of struggle also changed, compared with the previous epoch.

The strategy of struggle in the 1870—1904 epoch amounted to winning the maximum of reforms within the framework of capitalism. Social Democracy sought for allies just in so far as it needed them for obtaining such reforms as the general franchise, tax reductions, etc. It therefore sought for allies in the town, among the petty bourgeoisie and employees. The struggle for reforms was restricted to the framework of the bourgeois state of a given country and therefore the strategy was a national strategy in its substance. The nature of this strategy also determined the methods of struggle. These methods of struggle were election leaflets, the labour chambers, isolated strikes, etc.

The 1905—25 epoch brought radical changes to the strategy and methods of struggle. Already in 1905 Leninism was faced with the problem of permanent revolution, the peasantry not only as an ally of the democratic revolution but also of the Socialist revolution. Already in 1905 Leninism conducted mass strikes as part of the tactical means of struggle and faced the question of the armed rising. If we take the entire period as a whole, we see that,

firstly, the strategy of the struggle has its finale in the world Social Revolution. From this viewpoint the proletarian revolution in one country is only a partial fulfilment of the strategic plan. Two conclusions arise from this: 1) the proletarian state — the Soviet Union in this case — cannot remain compressed within national frameworks. Therefore the declarations of certain ultra-left Communists concerning "the nationalism" of the leaders of the Soviet regime are simply meaningless and show a lack of comprehension of the ABC of Leninist strategy. 2) The charge that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is "imperialistic" is absolutely ridiculous. Soviet foreign policy in the long run has — and can only have — the object of assisting the International proletarian revolution. This is an elementary truth for any international Socialist. But to draw a conclusion therefrom about "imperialism" can only be done by genuine servants of genuine imperialism. The policy of the Soviet Union is international through and through and is Socialistic through and through.

Secondly, the strategy of the struggle is also international. That is why the vanguard of the proletariat — the Communist Party — is now seeking an ally not only within the country among the Peasantry and partially among the urban petty-bourgeoisie, but is also endeavouring to form a world united front of the proletariat and is seeking an ally among the oppressed nations of the East. The International character of this strategy (and to a certain extent the tactics also), is seen in the international solidarity of the Communist Parties. Otto Bauer in an article written for the Marseilles Congress had good reason to acknowledge openly the existence of this solidarity dreaming of the same thing — although quite without any grounds — for the Second International.

Thirdly, in the sphere of the methods of struggle, election leaflets and the like have entirely receded into the background. The method of struggle has become more complicated; parliaments and the armed rising, the open meeting and the illegal nucleus, the "large newspaper" and the illegal leaflet. One cannot fail to remark that the methods of struggle in those countries where the proletariat has been victorious completely differ from the capitalist countries. The Social Democratic leaders absolutely fail to understand us, or rather they make no endeavour to understand us. In the latter case the proletariat utilises all methods of struggle, even including the armed rising, whilst in the former case it operates with compromise methods, methods of reform, for it is not in the interests of the proletariat as the ruling class to kindle the class struggle.

### V.

The International proletariat can sum up the results of the 1905—25 epoch with satisfaction. This epoch has with unprecedented rapidity brought the proletariat nearer to Socialism. The vanguard of the proletariat — international Bolshevism, may also sum up these results which equal satisfaction. Of course, the reformists can console themselves with the non-fulfilment of various predictions made by Lenin and some of his errors as regards the tempo of the revolution etc. We can only say to these people and their theoretical leaders what Kautsky said in his time with regard to the sneers of the bourgeoisie and the Social Democratic reformists:

"What appears to some of these philistines to be aimless conjecture over coffee grounds, is really the result of profound investigation and is therefore accompanied by an increased recognition of actuality.

Those who up to the present have too often led the struggling classes along a false path are not the politicians who have always aspired to a wide horizon, but the "real politicians" who do not see farther than their own noses, who only take for reality what they touch with their own noses, and who declare as tremendous and unstormutable any obstacle against which they happen to knock their noses".

## The December Rising of 1905.

By Em. Jaroslavsky.

"The premature political strike led to armed rising in Moscow, Rostov, etc. It soon became evident that the proletariat was not strong enough for victory. This could have been easily foreseen and therefore one should not have taken up arms."  
(G. V. Plekhanov, "Diary of a Social Democrat".)

"On the contrary one should have taken up arms more decisively and energetically and more for the purpose of an offensive. One should have explained to the masses the impossibility of a peaceful strike alone and the necessity of fearless and relentless struggle. The time has come at last for us to acknowledge openly and in the hearing of all the inadequacy of political strikes. One must agitate among the masses for an armed rising without camouflaging this question by any preliminary stages, without disguising it in any manner whatsoever. To conceal from the masses the necessity of a desperate, sanguinary war of extermination as the immediate task of the coming action is equivalent to deceiving the people and oneself."

(N. Lenin, "Lessons of the Moscow Rising".  
Col. Works Vol. 7, part 2, p. 49. Russian Edition.)

The December armed rising has become a part of the history of the proletarian world revolution; it is one of the vivid examples of the heroic self-sacrifice of the proletarian class struggle. If subsequent to the overthrow of this rising and the despair which took possession of the less stable ranks of revolutionaries, such pitiful words could be uttered as Plekhanov's — that one should not have taken up arms —, it is perfectly clear now to every conscious proletarian that the December rising of 1905 was not only an unavoidable rising, but that it was also absolutely necessary in the interests of the proletarian struggle. The December rising of 1905 was the first experiment of the proletariat in combining the political mass strike with barricade fighting. This rising brought the proletariat face to face with the practical question what form armed struggle should take under modern conditions. This rising brought home to the proletariat the necessity of drawing the army into the revolutionary struggle. This rising made the question of the strength and importance of peasant support loom big before the proletariat. This rising showed the bourgeois parties in their true colours, it destroyed the illusion of the progressive role of the bourgeoisie in the revolution which was taking place. This rising determined the strength and importance of all the existing political parties. Hence the enormous importance for the proletariat of this first "general rehearsal" of the proletarian revolution and of the lessons which it taught.

The December rising had an enormous world importance. It stirred up the proletarian masses of the capitalist countries, it stirred up still more the masses of the near and far East. The December armed rising is a landmark not only in the development of the proletarian revolution, but also of the liberation struggle of the workers throughout the world. That is why it is essential to purge this epoch of proletarian struggle from the legends which obscure. That is why it is so important to reconstruct a true picture of this rising and to study it.

"It is interesting to compare", said Lenin in one of his speeches dedicated to 1905, "the armed rising in Russia in 1905 with the armed rising of the Decembrists in 1825. At the time the leadership of the political movement was almost entirely in

the hands of officers, and especially of officers belonging to the nobility. They had become inoculated with the democratic ideas of Europe during the Napoleonic wars. Rank and file soldiers who at that time were peasant serfs, remained passive.

One may say that we have a true picture of the present leaders of the Second International. This last congress at Marseilles, with its pronouncements as to the League of Nations being the ideal of Social Democracy, with its programme of merging into... capitalism, with its appeal to realise the Guarantee Pact, with its declaration that a belief in the proximity of the proletarian revolution is Utopia — has shown that its leaders are real politicians in quotation marks.

Leninism has been and will be the only real policy of the International proletariat.

"The history of 1905 gives us an utterly different picture. Then the officers, with a very few exceptions, held either bourgeois-liberal-reformist or downright counter-revolutionary views. The workers and peasants in soldiers' uniforms were the soul of the rising, the movement became a people's movement. For the first time in the history of Russia it drew into its ranks the majority of the exploited. What this movement lacked was, on the one hand, stamina and determination on the part of the masses who were too much afflicted with the disease of "over credulity".

On the other hand there was no organisation of revolutionary Social Democratic workers in soldiers' uniforms: they did not possess the necessary skill to take leadership into their hands, to place themselves at the head of the revolutionary army and to take up the offensive against the government.

"By the by, — perhaps less rapidly than we should like it to be, but as sure as day — these two drawbacks will disappear not only through the general development of capitalism, but also by the present war"<sup>1</sup>).

The Moscow December rising cannot be considered separately from the revolutionary movement throughout the country, because according to Lenin the revolution of 1905 "reached its culminating point" in the Moscow December rising. What is important in the December armed rising in Moscow is the fact that "a handful of rebels organised and armed workers — their number did not exceed 8,000 —, and for nine days offered resistance to the tsarist government which could not trust the Moscow garrison, but had to confine it to barracks and could only crush the rising on the arrival of the Semionoff regiment from Petersburg"<sup>2</sup>).

This is our reason for dealing with this rising in connection with the entire revolutionary movement which found in it its highest expression. To our mind, it would be harmful to the interests of the proletarian revolution throughout the world, if we were not to attempt now, 20 years after the event, to deal in greater detail with the shortcomings, errors and omissions of the movement, of which there were many in 1905. Lenin, with his usual directness and outspokenness, pointed out many of them already in 1906 when the wounds were still bleeding, when others were defaming this movement, when the proletariat received from abroad the accusatory message of the leader of the Mensheviks, Plekhanov, that "one should not have taken up arms". Twenty years have passed since then, much material has accumulated which enables us to divulge the errors and shortcomings of the rising with greater objectiveness and more relentlessly than at that time. The glorious character of this rising and of the heroic struggle, the enormous positive importance of this workers' experimental rising, will not be detracted from by such scrutiny. For this reason we devote so much space to criticism of organisational and political mistakes made by our Party in those days. The proletariat of other countries has something to learn from

<sup>1</sup>) V. I. Lenin: "On the Revolution of 1905." Page 14. Russian Edition published by the Lenin Institute of the C. C. of the R. C. P. (B) in 1925. Leningrad State Publishing Department.

<sup>2</sup>) V. I. Lenin: "On the Revolution of 1905." Page 19. Russian Edition, published by the Lenin Institute of the C. C. of the R. C. P. (B) in 1925. Leningrad State Publishing Department.

us, from the working class of our country, even from the mistakes made in 1905. If under somewhat different conditions, when social differences were much more acute and class struggle more intense and when the correlation of forces was of course different, we were able in 1917 to avoid many of the mistakes and shortcomings of 1905, the proletariat of other countries has all the more reason to avoid these mistakes, for it has to struggle with the bourgeoisie which is much better organised, more strongly welded together, more experienced and better provided with technical resources.

Much extraneous matter of a bourgeois-cadet, Menshevik and S. P. type has been obscuring the history of 1905 and especially the history of the December rising. This makes it incumbent on us, participants and adherents of the proletarian revolution, to divest this history from misinterpretations and attempts to belittle it and to represent it in a ridiculous and pitiful light.

Lenin gave the lie to these attempts in a series of articles soon after the rising. In the speech which we have quoted he said:

"The bourgeoisie likes to refer to the Moscow rising as being something artificial, and ridicules it. For instance, in German so-called scientific literature, Prof. Weber termed the Moscow rising a "putsch" in his great work on political development in Russia. The Lenin group, and a section of Social Revolutionists, said this erudite professor, had been preparing this senseless rising for a long time. Lenin gave only one type of figures in January 1905 there were in Russia only 13,000 purely political strikes, in October — 330,000, and in December the maximum was reached, namely, 370,000 purely political strikes in the course of one month. If we recall to our minds the successes of the counter-revolution, the risings of the peasants and soldiers we cannot help coming to the conclusion: the judgement of bourgeois science on the December rising, is not only ridiculous, but is also an actual subterfuge of the representatives of the cowardly bourgeoisie which sees in the proletariat its most dangerous class enemy.

In reality, the entire development of the Russian revolution was such that armed and decisive struggle between the Tsarist government and the vanguard of the class conscious proletariat was inevitable".

Therefore, we have collected all the evidence of the participants of this movement, and of contemporaries who had something to do with it, including even Mensheviks. A comparison of this evidence shows clearly that the Moscow rising was meritable and unavoidable. And that is not all, for the Moscow rising, as we know now, was a mass movement which, it is true, lacked organisation, correct and adequate leadership and experience. The need of all this has grown enormously in the process of the working class struggle. It is ridiculous to imagine that the proletariat could have conquered the bourgeoisie without such experience. "Struggle alone educates the exploited class, reveals to it its own strength, widens its outlook, sharpens its wits, develops its capacities and its will to power. Therefore, even reactionaries must acknowledge that 1905, the year of struggle 'the mad year' sounded the death-knell of patriarchal Russia." (Lenin.)

We all of us know to what dangers the achievements of the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. are exposed in view of the capitalist surroundings, with bourgeois domination in the principal countries — the main strongholds of capitalism. We live in times when the struggle of the workers, the struggle of the proletariat throughout the world is rapidly developing, when on the one hand, through the development of capitalist relations, the un-

bearable exploitation of the working class which has come into being in the countries of the East and the unheard of insults heaped by the capitalists on these masses, and on the other hand under the influence of the successful proletarian revolution in our country, new forces millions strong are joining the struggle. We live in times when, after the first wave of proletarian revolution in the West which in its onward march met with fierce resistance on the part of the bourgeoisie, when, after relentless White Terror and Fascist regime, the treachery of the leaders of the proletarian organisations of the Second International and of the trade unions, the proletariat is reorganising its ranks, is rallying to the Communist International for renewed struggle, for the class war.

In 1905 the working class of our country suffered defeat. How many people lost courage in those days and left the movement! There were also some, and their number was considerable, who betrayed it, there were people who went over to the side of our class enemies. We went through a hard phase of reaction, of looking for new gods, of betrayals, treachery, liquidatorship, desertion of our ranks, and destruction of our organisations. But we kept intact the nucleus of our Bolshevik Party, we did not lose faith in the correctness of the revolutionary path. We knew that the day and hour would come when we would have the working and peasant masses behind us, when the army would be with us, when the glorious flame and the glorious whirlwind of revolution would sweep our country, when the masses would gain victory. Continuous serious study of the past experience of revolutionary struggle, the accumulation of this experience, its assimilation, faithful adherence to our revolutionary Communist policy, struggle with all groups, Parties, and tendencies which attempted to divert us from the only right path of revolutionary Marxism and Leninism — such were the guarantees for the ultimate victory of the working class. More than once cries of warning were raised, more than once we were pulled back, but through penal servitude, tsarist prisons and invisible, but steady underground work we formed connections with more and more sections of the working class, we lent an attentive ear to their needs, moods and requirements; we were with them every day of our lives, we went with them through their defeats and with them we marched on to new battles and victories and emerged with them in 1917 on to a wider path — the path of the October Revolution.

This path was also difficult, much more difficult even than the path of 1905. There is no gainsaying that many mistakes were made by us also in 1917, and that we were always ready to admit that from the moment of the October Revolution, during our first experiment at building up the Soviet State, in our unheard of and unprecedented attempt to construct a Socialist State in the midst of the hostile sea of capitalist elements, serious mistakes were made which the proletariat of other countries must avoid.

But there is one thing which the history of 1905 and the history of 1917 must teach the workers of all countries: In this or that case the Communist Party and the working class can commit mistakes. But if there is an organised force in the world which can lead the proletariat to victory, — this force is the Communist Party. And yet another deduction the proletariat must make: It cannot achieve victory unless it learns how to be victorious by the experience of the struggle of the proletariat of all countries, especially by the experience of the proletarian struggle in Russia, unless it goes itself through this experience, taking into consideration all the mistakes, shortcomings and inadequacies of the struggle through which we have gone.

# *Soviets of Workers, Soldiers and Peasant Deputies, in 1905.*

By V. Nevsky.

## I.

### Character of the Soviets.

V. I. Lenin gives a very exact definition of the character of the Soviets in 1905. He gives three main characteristics of this organisation: 1) it is a revolutionary organisation, 2) it is a self-constituted organisation from below and 3) it is a people's, a workers and peasants mass organisation.

The Soviet comes into being during revolution. It is an organ of the revolution, the result of original revolutionary creativeness on the part of the people. The Soviet comes into being as a fighting organ of the masses not by orders from above, but spontaneously from below, as a result of revolutionary creativeness. The Soviet is created by revolutionary workers and peasants, by rank and file soldiers — the revolutionary masses coming out into the struggle against the autocracy and the bourgeoisie.

In his more detailed analysis of the term Soviet in 1906. V. I. Lenin laid special stress on two more important characteristics which are the outcome of the already enumerated three characteristics of the new organisation created by the workers: 1) the Soviets of workers' deputies in 1906 were a fighting coalition, a fighting Entente of revolutionary Social Democrats (Bolsheviks), revolutionary petty-bourgeoisie (Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionists), and non-Party revolutionary workers, and 2) the Soviets are the embryo of the new revolutionary power, the embryo of that same dictatorship of the proletariat and the revolutionary peasantry so derided by the Mensheviks as a chimera which has become today a palpable historical reality.

This is the character of the Soviets of 1905 according to Lenin, and it is clear from the definition given by Lenin that historical facts have justified this analysis.

## II.

### The Origin of the Soviets of 1905.

How did the Soviets originate? The Mensheviks are inclined to imagine that they are the creators of the Soviets. But this is far from being the case. One must look for the origin of the Soviets in the history of 1905 as a whole, and as to the outcome they were the self-constituted revolutionary organisations which came into being immediately after the heroic action of the Petersburg proletariat on January 9th, 1905.

In Petersburg and also in all the other parts of the country the movement did not come to a standstill after January 9th. On the contrary it spread throughout Russia like a mighty stream leaving its bed, and in all the factories, great or small, revolutionary fighting organisations were formed for some definite task, — strikes, political campaigns, struggle against the administration, defence of workers' economic interests, organisation of boycott, etc., etc. The meetings of representatives for instance constituted such organisations; these came into being in Petersburg in connection with the establishment of the so-called commission of Senator Shidlovsky, which was to investigate the needs of the proletariat and to regulate the labour question. "The Commission of Government tricks" such was the name given to the Shidlovsky Commission, soon disappeared, but the workers' representatives elected to this commission remained, being the organ which connected the non-Party masses with the small, still illegal fighting Party organisations. Such organisations were the fighting strike committees, for instance, the Ekaterinoslav meeting of workers' deputies which was formed soon after the January days and developed in October into the Ekaterinoslav Soviet of workers' deputies. Further similar organisations were the railway bureaux or committees of meetings of railway deputies which also came into being soon after the January events, and which in October developed in many Russian and Siberian railways into Soviets of railwaymen's deputies. Such organisations

were the meetings of peasant and soldiers' deputies which began to spring up already in the spring, towards the end of summer and in the beginning of Autumn in the army, in the villages and regiments permeated with revolutionary ferment, especially in the Far East. These organisations were in the majority of cases fighting coalitions of revolutionary Social Democrats, revolutionary petty-bourgeoisie, and non-Party revolutionary workers and peasants. These organisations came into being in a revolutionary and sporadic manner not by orders from the office or study of some great man, but as a result of revolutionary creativeness. Already at the very beginning of their existence these organisations possessed great authority.

One should not imagine the creation of the Soviets, as something sudden, something which fell from the blue in October. The organisations which came into being in the spring following January 9th continued to spread and develop throughout the country. The experience gained by the workers in January, February, and March was intensified and enlarged upon already in the spring. In May the strike broke out of the weavers of Ivanovo-Voznessensk, a thoroughly Russian district of the textile industry. The strike soon became general, involving all other workers. During this strike a fighting organ was formed which fulfilled the functions of strike committee, which at the same time was not an ordinary strike committee. First of all this committee was elected by all the factories and works at a very large public meeting (about 30,000 people on the river Talka) and was given the name of Soviet of Workers' deputies. Then this Soviet elected a Presidium — a chairman and secretary, something like an embryo of the Executive Committee. The Soviet even appointed a commission to deal with unemployment, it organised corps for the protection of the factories and meetings. To all intents and purposes it ruled the town, without its permission not a single factory nor printing works could be set going. Not only local but even the central authorities submitted to the Soviet. The latter also adopted a purely political platform (it demanded the convocation of the Constituent Assembly and freedom of the press and of assembly, etc.).

This was not an ordinary strike committee, but neither was it a fully developed Soviet:

The experiment of the Ivanovo-Voznessensk workers was repeated in the same textile district, in the town of Kostroma during the July strike, when the Kostroma weavers also formed a Soviet of workers' deputies. This Soviet in addition to appointing a Presidium and an unemployment commission created new organs of a purely military character — its own workers' militia.

In the summer such organisations sprang up not only in the central district, but also here and there in other towns. They were not ordinary strike committees, but something wider and more revolutionary. Thus a Soviet of workers' deputies came into being in July in the Urals, in the large Nadezdinsky works. It remained in existence until November and subsequently disappeared together with other organisations of this type.

There was again an unprecedented high tide of the revolutionary movement in the summer of 1905: the workers' rising in Lodz with its barricade fighting and the sailors' rising in Odessa on the armoured cruiser "Prince Kotyomkin of Taurida". The former, as a purely workers' movement, was crushed by the soldier-peasants, and the latter as a soldiers' and peasants' movement was drowned in blood with the help of the same soldier-peasants. The experience of that summer showed clearly that for a successful revolution some sort of new methods are needed — combinations, so to speak, of all the various kinds of fighting forces, and also new fighting organs sufficiently comprehensive and mobile.

During the summer the centre of the revolutionary movement began to be shifted from the borders to the heart of the country, to Moscow, into the central industrial district where the real Muscovite, the purely Russian proletariat, was to be found.

In December there were in Moscow printers' strikes which soon developed into sanguinary encounters with the armed forces, demonstrations, meetings, on the boulevards, at street corners, and in squares, generally ended in collisions with the armed forces and regular barricade fighting.

To the leadership of this movement, the non-Party masses appointed the Moscow Printers' organisations which became the Soviet of Moscow printers' deputies. The Soviet idea became popular, this word was in the air and even our Bolshevik Party organisations, the Moscow Committee of the Bolsheviks, adopted this idea: in September a proclamation was issued signed by the committee calling upon the workers to organise a Moscow Soviet of workers' deputies. Moreover, deputies organisations, committees and bureaux came into being at that time also on all the railways. By their nature they did not differ from the Soviets which were springing up here and there and everywhere.

Thus at the time when the big October strike of 1905 broke out, when the life of the country came to a standstill — the railways, factories, works and workshops, stood idle, when banks, offices, social, municipal and rural institutions were closed, the Soviet idea did not remain only an idea, but had found practical application of course only in an embryonic form. Thus the Petersburg Soviet of workers deputies was so to speak, the summing up of the experience of the entire preceding period. More than that, it was the highest development which the organisational forms of the revolutionary workers mass movement had ever reached.

It is significant that the Petersburg Soviet bore traces of its fighting strike origin: the first nuclei from which the Petersburg Soviet was formed were elected for the management of strike struggles, and were called strike organisations. Moreover, the Soviet itself bore at first the title of workers' strike Committee.

It is true that another name was soon adopted and that the organisation received the title by which it is now known throughout the world: Soviet of Workers Deputies.

The Petersburg Soviet was no longer the fighting strike committee, it was something much more than that: existing side by side the "rightful" government the Soviet was in fact for a certain period the centre from which emanated impulses characteristic of power. The Soviet did not only lead the strike, it did not only close down and set going works and factories, it established the eight-hour day, it proclaimed freedom of the press, of assembly and of association, it published its own organ, advocated financial boycott of the government, it dismissed "rightful authorities", in a word, the Soviet was the embryo of the new power.

The authority of the Soviet was enormous, not only in Petersburg but throughout the country. There is no doubt whatever that under the influence of the Petersburg Soviet provincial Soviets began to spring up here and there in October.

But the Petersburg Soviet of workers' deputies, in spite of the important role it played in the October strike which exerted from the tsar the manifesto of October 17th was a fighting coalition in which revolutionary Social Democrats (Bolsheviks) did not play the leading role, and in which the revolutionary petty-bourgeoisie (Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists) exercised considerable influence.

The next great revolutionary achievement was the Moscow Soviet.

### III.

#### Soviets — The Organs of the Rising.

The October strike, in spite of its grandiose character was not the culminating point of the movement.

The wounded monster, autocracy, was wounded but not to the death: it had given in but only to get breathing time, and having received breathing time it was gathering strength to attack the enemy. The revolutionists knew that this was so and called also upon the proletariat and revolutionary peasantry to mobilise their forces. A general battle was pending. The distribution of forces was as follows: the autocracy, the big landowners, and the treacherous bourgeoisie on the one hand, and the proletariat and revolutionary petty bourgeoisie on the other hand. The question of victory was in fact a question of who will be able to enlist the support of the majority of the peas-

antry. This in its turn depended on the tactics adopted by the revolutionary parties. Unfortunately only the Bolsheviks issued the revolutionary slogan: armed rising of the workers and peasants in the struggle for land and freedom? Dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry as the organ of a victorious rising.

Agreement with the liberal bourgeoisie characterised the tactics of the Mensheviks, which found such an explicit expression in Plekhanov's words after the non-success of the Moscow rising: "One should not have taken up arms."

The September movement in Moscow merged directly into the October strike, and the latter, via the November strikes led to the December rising, when the Moscow Soviet of Workers Deputies became the organ of this rising.

The Moscow Soviet of workers deputies came into being late in the day, towards the end of November, when its colleague in Petersburg had already ceased to exist, and when it had become clear that the time for a decisive trial of strength was approaching. It would have been ridiculous under such conditions to create a Soviet in which the deputies indulged in impassionate and high-flown phraseology, without going further. The Bolsheviks who predominated in Moscow issued the slogan of the organisation of the Soviet, they predominated in the later and therefore, when on the decision of the Party organisations it became necessary to call the workers to armed struggle, the Moscow Soviet took upon itself this task. The Soviet of workers deputies in the provinces took the matter of the rising into its own hands through its members together with the fighting corps of the Party.

Thus the Moscow Soviet is the next highest stage of revolutionary organisation which the revolution of 1905 reached. It is a real sample and a bona fide realisation in 1905 of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, for we are sure that no one could be so ridiculous as to deny that the only power in Moscow in December, during the rising, was the power of the rebel workers and peasants and that the only organisational form of this power was the Moscow Soviet.

### IV.

#### The two Types of Soviets in 1905.

The Petersburg and Moscow Soviets are the two typical kinds of Soviets that were created in 1905. In St. Petersburg the Soviet was one where the revolutionary Social Democracy (Bolsheviks) in the ranks of the fighting coalition did not occupy a dominant position, and the Moscow type was that where revolutionary Social Democracy constituted the advanced dominating vanguard. The Soviets of the first type, despite all their tremendous significance did not develop into fighting organs of the proletarian dictatorship, while the Soviet of the second type were a real embodiment of the fighting revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

The Soviets of Odessa, Kiev, Reval, Riga, Libau, Nadezhensk, Sulín, Taganrod, Baku and others belong to the first type of Soviets, while those of Rostov, Tver, Novorossisk, Krasnoyarsk, Chita, Ekatarinoslav and Viatka belong to the second type of Soviets. Indeed we see that in Tver, Rostov on Don, Krasnoyarsk, Chita, Ekatarinoslav and in general in the Donetz Basin, where Soviets also existed in Uyzov and Mariupol, armed risings proceeded everywhere and the organs of these were the Soviets.

In such towns as Odessa, Kiev, Libau, Riga (here the Soviets developed from among the strike organisations), Baku, Taganrod, Sulín, Nadezhinsk, Orekhovo-Zuevo and others, the Soviets played a tremendous role, leading strikes, but did not decide to organise the proletariat to take armed action.

It is self-evident that there were intermediate phases between these two extreme types: such Soviets, for instance, as those in Nikolaevsk, Kostroma, or Ekatarinburg being under the leadership of Bolsheviks, helped to develop active operations before the rising owing to objective conditions; such Soviets as those in Ekatarinoslav and Rostov, where at first the Mensheviks dominated, ultimately passed into the hands of the Bolsheviks and joined the insurrection.

But in general it should not be accepted so schematically that all Soviets are sharply divided into the two afore-mentioned



types. The Soviets have undergone a peculiar and rapid revolutionary evolution in their development from an inaugural non-Party fighting committee at the commencement of 1905 to the fighting leading organ of the rising in December of that year.

Besides, the Soviets, in undergoing this evolution already in 1905, disclosed all the form known to us now: both Soviets of workers and Soviets of soldiers and Soviets of peasant deputies. Indeed, whilst such Soviets as those of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Rostov on Don, Novorossisk, Tver, etc. were purely proletarian organised, the Soviets such as in the town of Krasnoyarsk, Chita, Irkutsk, etc. were Soviets of workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, since the units of the Far Eastern army also formed their deputy organs and in November and December merged with the purely proletarian Soviets.

Finally, the Soviets of the purely peasant provinces which sprang up in the villages bore the imprint of their exclusively peasant origin.

## V.

### Structure of the Soviets of 1905.

What was the structure of the Soviets? Commencing with the very initial forms of the Ivanovo-Voznessensk Soviet through scores of transition forms such as the Krasnoyarsk Soviet, we find all the distinguishing elements of the Soviets as Organs of the New Regime. The Soviet not only had its Executive organ, its newspaper, ("Izvestia") but also troops and money at its disposal (Krasnoyarsk, endeavoured to direct economic and cultural life (hospitals, theatres, municipal economy in Krasnoyarsk) to organise new courts and organs of local justice (Novorossisk and Krasnoyarsk) confiscated and nationalised private property (Nationalisation of gold mines in Chita) administered the railways (all the Soviets without exceptions) or in short, the 1905 Soviet was an organ of revolutionary power in the full sense of the word.

The Soviets of 1905 united the overwhelming mass of the toiling population — workers employees, peasants, soldiers. The Petersburg Soviet for instance, included over 300,000 Petersburg workers, i. e. almost the entire toiling population of Petersburg if the workers, families are also included. The Moscow Soviet represented 120,000 of the working class population; the Rostov Soviet expressed the will of 30,000 workers of Rostov on Don. But not only the workers sent their representatives to the 1905 Soviet. The employees and semi-proletariat also sent their deputies (shopmen, clerks, domestic workers, and in certain cases even small shopkeepers found it possible to secure representation on the Soviets). Needless to mention that the Trade Unions and revolutionary Parties in certain cases, such as in Ekatarinoslav, (even the anarchists) had their representatives in the Soviets.

The Soviets had no exact and definite constitution: they were set up in the factories, in the workshops and sometimes at tremendous mass meetings. The constitution and electoral rights were only fixed when the Soviet began operation and a great many Soviets did not even succeed in drawing up these constitutions and rules.

Still one other interesting feature about the 1905 Soviets. It is necessary to emphasise their all-embracing and independent character. There were more or less well-formed Soviets in the following towns: Petersburg, Ivanovo-Voznessensk, Kostroma, Tver, Moscow, Orekhovo-Zuevo, Mytyshtch, Libau, Riga, Reval, Smolensk, Kiev, Odessa, Nikolaev, Ekatarinoslav, Mariupol, Taganov, Sulin, Rostov on Don, Novorossisk, Baku, Saratov,

Samara, Viatka, Nedezhinsk, Ekatarinburg, Krasnoyarsk, Irkutsk, Chita and probably many other districts where Soviets existed of which we have no record. If it be taken into consideration that there was not one large railway junction where an organisation of a Soviet nature did not exist, then it becomes quite apparent that the Soviet form organisation spread throughout the overwhelming majority of districts in the country.

If we glance at a chart showing the distribution of Soviets and taking into consideration the most remarkable Soviets in any respect, then the fact comes home to one that the Soviet, as V. I. Lenin maintained, is really a result of "Independent revolutionary national creation". Indeed Petersburg, Moscow, Ivanovo, Tver, Kostroma, Rostov on Don, Novorossisk, Ekatarinoslav, Yuzova, Mariupol, Krasnoyarsk, Chita, Irkutsk, Culin, Viatka, Ekatarinburg, Samara, Saratov, etc. or in other words the overwhelming majority of Soviets were town Soviets with an overwhelming number of or even exclusively composed of Russian workers and in addition the factory and workshop section of the population. In the Soviets of the Borderland they were in the minority or there was a minority of them in conjunction with the mixed or artisan composition of the working class population (Riga, Libau, Reval, Smolensk, Baku and Odessa).

In view of what has been said above the following conclusions may be drawn:

- 1) The 1905 Soviets sprung up in the process of the revolutionary struggle out of non-Party organisations formed by the proletariat.
- 2) The Soviets were formed spontaneously without any written rule or scheme.
- 3) The Soviets were formed by the revolutionary masses of the proletariat and peasantry.
- 4) From the Spring to December 1905 the Soviets passed through a rapid revolutionary evolution producing two types of Soviet forms in Petersburg and Moscow, (the first where the leading group is composed of non-Bolsheviks, and the second where the leadership is in the hands of the Bolsheviks).
- 5) In December the Soviets were the organs of armed rising.
- 6) Soviets were the embryo of new revolutionary power, a fore-runner of the present dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

The Soviets sprung up during the time of the first Russian revolution, it would appear, during the time of a bourgeois revolution; but is just because the Soviets were formed during the time of this bourgeois revolution, and because these Soviets were organs of the new proletarian power for this reason, the first Russian revolution was not only a bourgeois revolution, but already contained the new features of a purely proletarian revolution.

The tree of life is ever green, life is not stationary. After the Paris Commune the proletarian revolutionary movement had to step on to a higher plane and this it has already done. That plane was the Soviets of 1905.

After October 1917 we went immeasurably further forward as compared with the Soviets of 1905.

The new proletarian revolution in the West will step still further ahead, but this revolution just as ours has its roots in the 1905 Soviets and in the Paris Commune.

**Long live the Soviets, the world Commune of the Proletariat.**

# Lessons of the Peasant Movement in the First Russian Revolution.

By S. Dubrovsky.

We are now on the eve of peasant revolutions, particularly in the Colonial and semi-Colonial countries. Tactical and organisational problems of the peasant movement are becoming increasingly vital, and in this connection a study of the experience and lessons of the peasants' revolutionary movement of the first Russian Revolution in 1905-6 is of primary importance for the correct solution of these problems.

The most important point to be explained is what determines the peasants' revolutionary movements, and what factors produce a peasant revolution. At the commencement of the 20th. century, in 1902, and later 1905-6, the peasant movement spread throughout the whole of Russia like a huge wave. In order to explain the reasons for this revolution, it is important to determine why, for instance, in the seventies of the last century, at the time of a strong revolutionary wave among the urban petty-bourgeoisie, the peasants seized the revolutionary agitators who came to them from the towns and handed them over to the police, whereas in 1905 and 1906 the peasants themselves went to the towns in order to get agitators who would explain them the general political situation and help in the struggle against the landowners.

Both in the second half of the XIX century and at the commencement of the XX century an equally shameless dictatorship of the serf-owners reigned supreme. Nearly one hundred million dessiatins of land was owned by a small handful of serf-owners, while only 140 million dessiatins were divided among many millions of peasants. Semi-feudal relations prevailed in the countryside. The landowners generally leased out the land to the peasants or took half the harvest.

Under the influence of the development of capitalism in the countryside the semi-feudal structure commenced to disintegrate. With the development of the towns, with the growth of the railways which linked up Russian agriculture with the world market, it became more advantageous to the landowners to cultivate the land themselves with the aid of hired labourers and the application of more or less perfected machinery, instead of giving the land over to the peasants for cultivation. The landowners gradually began to give up leasing land for cultivation or use. This ultimately ruined the small peasants who had only been able to exist under this system, although this had been under conditions of absolute servitude. This ruined the peasantry just as the transition of enterprises from the pre-machine system — from the distribution of work among hand-workers in their homes, to factory production, ruined the petty artisans.

Influenced by the curtailment of leasing out land, and in general as a result of increased rents, the cost of leasing land steadily grew, and for the 50 years preceding the 1905 revolution increased ten-fold, while the purchase value of land also increased. Further, as a result of the ever-increasing labour supply from the proletarianised peasantry, wages also decreased, all the more as the landowners, especially in the South, began to abandon manual agricultural labour and to use machinery such as mowing, reaping, and other machines. To all this is added the fact that, in view of the advantage of cultivating the land themselves, the landowners commenced seizing larger and larger sections of the peasants' lands, seized these lands which until then had belonged to the peasants as pasture-land, grazing or forest land, which according to law belonged to the landowners, but which actually were used by the peasantry.

In other words, with the development of capitalism, and with the transition from the hand cultivation system to the capitalist system, with the growth of capitalist production of crops, the position of the main poor peasants and middle peasant masses began to grow worse and worse and thus they were pushed on to revolutionary actions.

If we take into consideration the fact that the highest stage of the development of Russian agriculture commenced in the latter years of the XIX century and the commencement of the XX century, it then becomes clear to us why the peasants were more or less politically passive in the seventies and in the eighties and why they became revolutionary in the nineties.

From this we make our first substantial conclusion in understanding the premise for the peasant movement. The main reason for the peasant movement was the domination of the landed serf-owners. This basis contains three contradictions which forced the peasantry into revolution. The development of capitalism and the transition from a semi-feudal system of agriculture to the capitalist system caused an intensification of these contradictions. This allows us to assert that the more Capitalism becomes "stabilised" the more it penetrates into the colonies, the more it dislocates the natural structure in vogue there, the sooner will the peasant revolution approach.

Such is the main conclusion with regard to the pre-requisite for the revolution and the factors which determined its commencement.

Now let us turn to the movement itself. We draw the reader's attention to the following table of the workers' and peasants' movement on the eve of and at the time of the 1905 Revolution.

Workers' and Peasants' Movement 1900—07.

Year	Month	Number of Revolutionary peasant Outbreaks	Number participating in strikes (in thousands)
1900		48	29
1901		50	32
1902		340	37
1903		141	87
1904		91	25
Total from 1900—1904		670	210
1905	January	17	414
	February	109	291
	March	103	72
	April	144	80
	May	299	220
	June	492	143
	July	248	150
	August	155	78
	September	71	37
	October	219	481
	November	796	323
	December	575	418
		3,228	2,709
1906	January	172	199
	February	34	27
	March	42	52
	April	48	221
	May	152	157
	June	748	101
	July	661	169
	August	236	40
	September	198	38
	October	123	32
	November	109	13
	December	77	17
		2,600	1,108
1907	January	55	65
	February	66	56
	March	130	25
	April	189	90
	May	214	213
	June	220	21
	July	189	36
	August	125	19
	September	64	23
	October	40	43
	November	23	142
	December	22	9
		1,337	742

If we make a diagram of these figures we get an extremely rich picture for our conclusions. The peasant movement just as the workers movement, and what is more, just as any revolutionary movement is by no means represented by one wave. It develops dialectically, in fits and starts. The periods of the most intensive rise are replaced by moments of decline. The conclusion we draw from this is that during the moments of revolution, and at the time of the decline in the movement there must be no panic nor should it be thought that the revolutionary movement has come to an end.

Further, a comparison of the curves of the workers' and peasant movement clearly shows the close contact between the struggle of the working class and peasantry. This of course does not exclude the possibility of separate outbreaks of peasant activities like those, for instances in 1902.

As one may see from the table, both the workers' and peasants movement reached the highest point of development at the commencement of 1905 in January and February, then in May, June and finally in October and December. However, whereas the main periods coincide in general, it may be observed that according to months this coincidence is lacking to a certain extent. As a rule the labour movement gets ahead of the peasant movement. At first there were large movements of workers, and afterwards the peasant movement jumped ahead and we had the strong working class movement in January 1905 and that of the peasants in February. The rise of the workers' movement took place in May 1905, and the peasants' movement in June. In the autumn the workers take action in October and the peasants in November. In 1906 the workers take action in April and the peasants in May and June. That is the picture we get if we take the table according to months. If we take it period by period, we find that the peasants and workers movements of the autumn of 1906 more or less coincide. In 1906 the workers' movement considerably falls off, while in the summer of 1906 the peasants movement reaches the level of the autumn move of 1905.

This disconnection of the workers' and peasants' movement, the straggling of the peasant movement is also one of the reasons of the defeat of the 1905 revolution. It will be opportune to remark here that in 1917, for instance, the situation was rather different. Then there was a much closer synchronisation of the workers and peasant movements insofar as there was a centralised party leading both these movements. Hence the evident importance of obtaining a revolutionary alliance with the working class and the peasantry at the moment of the revolution, and unity of their action for concentration on a more or less simultaneous blow at the ruling classes.

Besides the absence of combined action in the workers' and peasants' movements, the failure was also predestined by its own nature. The last peasant struggle was unorganised and isolated. The peasants entered the struggle in separate villages and rural districts, smashed up the estates of the neighbouring landowners and calmed down just as the movement in other districts had only started. This enabled the Government to hold down entire counties in subjection with small detachments of a few thousand men, and mercilessly suppress the movement of hundreds of thousands of the peasant masses.

The peasants did not attain what they got as a result of the experience of the October Revolution and the civil war. In the years 1917—19 the peasants formed parties and detachments which conducted the struggle, sometimes with separate landowners and sometimes with entire armies of landowners. In 1905—6 there were separate very large revolutionary movements which, however, did not develop into a revolutionary war. Hence it is obvious how important peasant organisation is for uniting separate outbreaks unconnected with each other into one mass armed movement. The absence of the latter also explained why in 1905—6 the peasants smashed up many landowners estates but

were unable to smash up the landowners' power itself, and to abolish landowners' rule as they succeeded in doing in the 1917 revolution in alliance with the proletariat.

Finally, the peasantry entered into the revolutionary struggle of 1905—6 as a class that was unorganised and which was politically a naive inexperienced class. It was still not clear to the peasantry with whom they should make an alliance and under whose leadership they should struggle. Just as under modern conditions, the most important question in 1905—6 was that of the leadership of the peasant movement. Would the peasantry make an alliance with the proletariat or with the petty-urban bourgeoisie which was a channel to the large bourgeoisie. The fate of the peasant movement and the fate of the revolution depended upon this question.

In 1905 there was no real leadership of the peasant movement at all, although the agitation and propaganda of both the workers' party and the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois parties undoubtedly played a considerable role. The peasant masses had not yet been embraced by any organisation. There had been an attempt at forming a peasant union, but this organisation, however, was extremely weak, and was actually in the hands of the urban petty bourgeoisie and the rich peasantry. A leadership of this movement on the part of the peasant union was non-existent. Without doubt, the absence of a peasant organisation, the absence of organised contact with the workers' party, and the confusion of political consciousness with regard to the tasks and method of the struggle constitute the reasons for the failure of the peasant movement. The experience of the 1917 revolution has shown clearly to the peasantry that only in alliance with the proletariat and under the leadership of the Communist Party can they really obtain a decisive and final victory over their class enemies.

In conclusion, we deem it necessary to refer to the suppression of the revolution and its results. A study of the landowners' terror shows us that the latter fell upon the peasantry at a time when the revolutionary movement was on the decline, and particularly at the time of the decline of the workers' movement. The peasantry was subjected to a particularly cruel terror after December, when the armed rising of the proletariat had been smashed. The landowners burnt down whole villages, subjected them to artillery fire and during their attacks were guilty of inhuman cruelties.

However, the landowners' government, frightened by the revolutionary movement, was compelled to resort to a partial land reform, i. e. what was known as the "Stolypin reform", strongly resembling those reforms which, after the war, were effected in a number of countries such as Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Jugoslavia and the Baltic and other countries.

Threatened by the revolution, the landowners began to sell their land to the agrarian bourgeoisie through peasant banks, although this was also done under the disguise of assistance to the peasantry. In addition, the government undertook extensive agricultural work in land distribution, with a view to raising and developing agriculture. Insofar as all these measures were conducted upon the basis of capitalist development, insofar as they more and more dislocated the semi-primitive structure of the countryside, insofar as these measures led to a strengthening of the agrarian bourgeoisie and to a mass impoverishment of the basic mass of the peasantry, all this not only did not abolish the pre-requisite for the peasant revolution, but merely sharpened the class contradictions in the countryside and paved the way for the advent of a new revolution.

In 1917 the Russian peasants, in alliance with the working class and under the leadership of the Communist Party, finished what they had commenced during the first Russian Revolution. The experience and lessons of the peasants' movement in 1905 had not been in vain.

# 1905 in Poland.

By P. Valetsky.

During the first two thirds of the 19th century the revolutionary outbursts in Poland (risings in 1830—31 and in 1863—64) were in the nature of national revolts against the foreign yoke. With respect to class this was mainly a struggle of the democrats belonging to the petty nobility and to the petty-bourgeoisie against the despotism of the Tsarist viceroys. The rapid development of capitalism and the birth of the labour movement which took place in the '80s of the 19th century brought a great change into the situation. Therefore in the 1905 revolution Poland appeared in the role of one of the advanced detachments in the All-Russian struggle against tsarist autocracy. In Poland this struggle was carried on mainly or almost entirely by the proletariat.

On the whole the trend of the revolution of 1905 was from start to finish surprisingly identical with the trend of the revolution in the other parts of the then tsarist empire. The Polish proletariat did not require its own January 9th for no sooner did the official news arrive concerning the Petersburg events than the workers of Warsaw, Lodz and the Dombrova Basin rose like one man, as though they had waited for a pre-arranged signal; in a few days time the country was in the grip of a general strike. The same harmony with respect to actions and slogans to which the demand for Polish autonomy was added was noticeable in October and December. May Day in 1905 brought into the open the entire working class of Poland and was celebrated by grandiose street demonstrations (frequently accompanied by bloodshed as in Warsaw). In June there was barricade fighting in Lodz and in August the answer to the manifesto on the pseudo "Bulygin" Duma was a general protest strike.

However, in spite of the general similarity with the trend of the revolution in the other parts of Russia, the revolution in Poland had a number of peculiarities arising from the difference in the class structure, the more acute stage of class differences and the national and historical conditions of the revolution in Poland.

In Poland the working class was relatively stronger, but on the other hand it was much more isolated in its struggle, than in Russia proper. Capitalist development was on a higher level and class differences more acute.

At that time the only big bourgeois Party which was active was the **National-Democratic Party** headed by the big bourgeoisie and the landowners, supported by the powerful organisation of the Catholic church which grouped around itself large sections of the petty-bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and also of the peasantry. On the strength of this, this Party assumed the role of "the general national Party". In the October "days of freedom" this Party was able to bring a hundred thousand demonstrators into the streets of Warsaw in opposition to the workers' revolution. In December it was able to convene in Warsaw a **peasant congress** attended by several thousand delegates. And on behalf of this Party its leader, **Dmovsky**, was able to offer in December to Count Witte active cooperation in the work of crushing the workers' revolution. The attempt to form progressive bourgeois groupings on the model of the Russian Cadets did not meet with any success, and the same may be said of the attempts to organise politically the more radical sections of the small peasantry.

Since there was no central State authority in Poland against which the struggle was directed, the centre of the revolution was and remained **Petersburg**. Moreover the extreme acuteness of the class struggle in Poland itself led to the intensification of the economic struggle of the workers. Economic strikes, which fully occupied the interval between big political actions did not only lead to the establishment of the eight-hour day (the nine-hour day had been won already in 1899), and to a rise in wages, but also to a complete revolution in the internal regime of factories and workshops themselves. It was only in 1907 after the famous **three months lockout in Lodz** that the Polish industrialists succeeded in re-establishing themselves as "masters in the factory."

\* \* \*

With respect to organisation, one of the peculiarities of the revolution of 1905 in Poland was the fact that the entire leadership in the struggle was in the hands of the political workers parties. There were no attempts to form **Soviets of Workers Deputies** on the Petersburg model. The trade unions which

sprang up at that time played again an auxiliary role and even economic strikes of a peaceful character were led by Party organisations. An overwhelming majority of the working class came under the influence of the Parties (illegal Party organisations had a membership of many thousands) who thought it unnecessary to hand over the leadership, even formally, to non-Party elective organisations.

The Polish Workers were organised in the Social Democratic Party of Poland and Lithuania (SDPL) and in the Polish Socialist Party (PPS), Jewish workers mainly in the Bund, whilst German workers in the Lodz district joined the Polish Party.

Ideologically, the SPDL, practically played the leading role.

The revolution of 1905 was a brilliant confirmation of the application of Marxist analysis to the development of social-political relations in Poland, connected with the name of **Rosa Luxemburg**. Already in 1893, on this analysis Rosa Luxemburg formulated the programme of the coming revolution in Poland; the common nature of the struggle of the Polish and Russian proletariat against the Polish bourgeoisie which had the support of the tsarist counter-revolution. She also demonstrated the Utopian and reactionary nature of all separatist, national aspirations. The Democratic Party which came into being at that time, in spite of the fact that it had been inactive for almost five years (1895—1899) — because of the destruction of its organisation and that the PPS appeared to be victorious during that period — was able to draw into its ranks on the eve of 1905 a considerable number of advanced Polish workers. In January 1905 the organisations of the SPDL, already played an ideologically leading role.

More than that, in the PPS, itself there was a revolt of working class rank and file members and Marxist elements against nationalist leadership. A left wing ("Levitza") was formed which set against the separatist aspirations of the former leaders the principle of unconditional unity of the Polish and Russian revolution. Having got rid of the old leadership the Left wing took the leadership of the Party into its hands (this struggle between the "Levitza" and the right PPS, ended in a definite split in November 1906).

\* \* \*

Whilst the development of the revolution of 1905 was on the whole of a "Bolshevik nature", a critical examination of the then tactics with respect to a whole series of important questions would, from the viewpoint of Bolshevism, undoubtedly divulge a number of historic errors which can be explained if not excused by the special conditions of Poland and the peculiarities of the "West European" development of revolutionary ideas in Poland. Unfortunately this work has not yet been done. The peasant and national questions and questions concerning the preparation of an armed rising must receive attention first and foremost.

An elementary agrarian movement analogous to the Russian, did certainly not exist among the Polish peasantry in 1905. The only sign of revolutionary struggle in the countryside was the movement of the agricultural labourers. All the efforts of the Social Democrats were directed towards the establishment of a connection between this movement and the general proletarian struggle. No agrarian slogans were adopted, for the idea prevailed that the peasantry as a whole was doomed to a counter-revolutionary role\*).

The question of armed rising treated correctly in theory and in agitation, was distorted in practice because the technical preparation was neglected. (Because of too great faith in "elemental forces") and because no differentiation was made between separate armed actions. The SPDL, — against the wishes and aspirations of its own rank and file — rejected all armed actions being prepared by the Party, at the time when there was within the PPS, a fierce struggle between the "rights" who put their own plans of a "Polish-Russian war" above preparations for

\*) At the Stockholm Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party in 1906 the Polish delegates supported the Menshevik programme of "Municipalisation", interpreted in the Polish press in its application to Poland as nationalisation within the precincts of Poland of all large landed property. We still find traces of this in the attitude of the CPP, in 1919—20.

armed mass actions and the practice of armed actions, and the "Levitza" who endeavoured to connect in every instance armed actions with the requirements of the existing mass struggle. The result thus brought about showed that on this question SDPL was with the Mensheviks and against the Bolsheviks at the London Congress in 1907.

In short the fact that it was essential to struggle against Polish nationalism in general and the nationalism of the right PPS. in

particular, and also because the attitude of the then "Levitza" was rather indefinite, prevented the Social Democrats from utilising their own struggle against national oppression by drawing into their ranks — or neutralising some sections — the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry and the intelligentsia.

The investigation of the history of the revolution of 1905 with respect to the historic errors which were then committed constitutes one of the tasks of Polish Communists.

## The Russian Revolution of 1905 and Japan.

By Sen Katayama.

The Russian Revolution of 1905 took place in the midst of the Russo-Japanese War. The moral connection between the Japanese Socialist Association and the Russian Socialist Labour Party was established by two resolutions passed and sent by the Japanese Socialist Association during the first year of the Russo-Japanese War. The first resolution, the greetings of the Japanese Socialists to the Russian comrades, was printed in the "Iskra" and replied to in the same paper. The resolution sent from the Japanese comrades was based on pacifist principles, but expressed the Marxian standpoint and emphasised that Russian workers have no quarrel with the Japanese workers, but on the contrary, they are all fellow workers, that there is no reason or cause for their fighting and killing each other, and that therefore the Japanese proletariat sent hearty greetings to the Russian proletariat. The resolution also pointed out that the war between two countries was an imperialist war. The "Iskra" in its reply, commented upon and admired the spirit of international solidarity of the Japanese Socialists and compared the act of theirs with the anti-annexation attitude assumed by Liebknecht and Bebel with regard to Alsace-Lorraine.

During the war, the Japanese Socialists made the most determined propaganda against war. The first anti-war demonstration was held in November 1904, at the Y. M. C. A., Hall Kanda, Tokyo. There was stiff opposition got up by the war party to break up the meeting. Speaker after speaker was silenced by the opposition, but we were able to hold out and finally silenced the opposition completely, and the demonstration was a great success. With this beginning, the Socialist Association earnestly led the anti-war propaganda and fought for the speedy conclusion of the bloody war.

Thus moral relations between the proletariat of two countries were established as soon as the actual war began, and this tie was strengthened at the International Socialist Congress in August 1904 at Amsterdam, by the appearance of representatives of the two belligerent countries on the same platform, on the opening of the Congress, and declaring jointly the solidarity of the workers of both countries. There is no doubt that the dramatic scene which took place on the platform made a lasting and profound impression upon the international aspect of the Congress. These events, of course, helped the Japanese Socialists in their anti-war and peace propaganda.

In the Russo-Japanese War, the Japanese militarists were able by various propaganda methods to get the people in such a firm national united front against the enemy, that for a while the authorities could disregard the Socialist propaganda in Japan; and the international greetings extended to the Russian comrades did not result in any persecution. It was in such an atmosphere that the news of the revolution of 1905 reached Japan. "Bloody Sunday" caused strong indignation against tsarism among the Socialists and Revolutionary workers throughout the world.

We had at that time a socialist weekly, called "Chokugen", which gave full views of the Russian Revolution and published editorials on it. The Japanese workers were profoundly interested in the development of the Russian Revolution, and the heroic fight and sacrifices of the Russian workers for the cause of revolution called forth the highest praise and admiration of the Japanese comrades.

The Chokugen in its editorial of February 19, 1905 under the title of "Lessons of the Russian Revolution", which gave a brief history of the revolutionary movement of the Russian Socialists and others, concluded with the following words:

"Revolution never comes in a day, and never succeeds in a day. It takes long years, and many sacrifices are made for it. Because of this, once the revolution starts the revolutionary thought will never be quenched, but must lead sooner or later to great conflict and great destruction.

"See how greatly the progress and spread of revolutionary education and knowledge have influenced the Russians! Look at what influence women's education has had on the revolutionary movement: There is a belief that it is possible to suppress the revolutionary movement, by suppressing the freedom of speech and press; but in Russia, there is no freedom for speech and press! This shows that in Russia the suppression of speech and press was without effect."

On the 19th March, Chokugen addressed an open letter to the Russian prisoners in Japan: there were over 700,000. During the war, a great deal of propaganda literature was sent from Europe and America, and Japanese comrades distributed this among the prisoners. The "Chokugen", after expressing its sympathy towards the Russian prisoners:

"You must realise yourselves that you have in the future a great duty towards your own country. Especially towards your comrades in arms who died in vain in the battle, you must, moreover, realise that you have a new and great responsibility. That is a problem what to do with Russia. When you were fighting the bloody battle in Manchuria with the Japanese army, you must have heard that in Petrograd, Moscow and other places, there were taking place great disturbances, which are still continuing to this day. We deeply sympathise with the revolutionary party and the workers in your country...

"... We urge and advise you, to grasp the ideal of human life, without hesitation; build it up in your country. Exalt social-democracy. Put socialism into practice! Don't take up arms and don't fight against your brothers! Do not allow yourselves again to become the shameful tools of autocratic governments.

"Remember comrades! Russia at the beginning of the 20th Century is just as was France at the beginning of the 19th century. As the Western European revolution always waited for the signal from France, so now the ruined countries of the East are waiting the signal of the Russian Revolution!"

Here the writer of the "Chokugen" expressed a true note of prophesy that has been fulfilled in the November revolution of 1917. One thing is certain: the writer understood the true meaning of the revolution of 1905.

The influence of the revolution of 1905 has been growing in the minds and thoughts of the workers of Japan and, strengthened by the November revolution, will bear fruit. The Russian Revolution of 1905, caused the first step in the development of the revolutionary movement in Japan, and which found expression in the great uprisings of 1918. The Japanese proletariat and poor peasantry are working for the November Revolution!

Long live the Revolutions of 1905 and 1918! Long live the Comintern!

# Effect of the Russian Revolution of 1905 on the West-European Labour Movement.

By Clara Zetkin.

"You should not have taken up arms". This was the priggish hectoring message which Plekhanov sent to the heroic champions of the Russian Revolution after the December events of 1905.

This appreciation reminds one strangely of Vollmar's notorious statement at the Stuttgart Party Congress of the German Social Democratic Party in 1898: "The Paris workers and lower middle class would have done better to go to bed than to set up the Commune." The same Vollmar spoke quite differently in the Autumn of 1882 when he was in the full bloom of his "radical" sinfulness. In a lecture on the Commune of 1871 at the German Social Democratic Club in Zurich he showered praises on "the bold and unprecedented rising of the Paris workers". In criticising the various practical errors and weaknesses of the Communards he claimed under the thunderous applause of his audience: "One should have made quit a different use of the guillotine than to burn it as was done in a sentimental theatrical scene." The striking difference between these two historical appreciations of the Commune, is a glaring illustration of Vollmar's transformation from a "radical" into a revisionist.

The witty Marxist, Plekhanov would have no doubt denied most energetically the assertion that in the appreciation of great revolutionary events he stood on the same level as the champion and leader of an anti-Marxist, lacking in faith, acquiescing in opportunism. However, without having the least intention to place the personality of Plekhanov on the same level as Vollmar, one cannot deny that there is a strange kinship in both their attitudes to a defeated revolution. Confronted with the defeat of the revolutionary forces, both of them lost the power to make a correct appreciation of the world events, a power which enables people to look with confidence to the future and to victories of tomorrow in the non-success of today. The tangible result of the moment prevented them from appreciating correctly the irresistible driving force of revolutionary eruptions, the outcome of social conditions — and their importance for the further development of society. It also prevented them from understanding the continuous creative power of such eruptions. The great historical significance, the challenging fertility of revolutionary mass initiative was lost to them. Plekhanov's judgement of the revolution of 1905 foreshadowed his later development, that is more: it contained as in a nut-shell the conception which led to the decline of the Menshevik party, to their betrayal of the October revolution of 1917.

Lenin, who had derived from the thorough study of history a great understanding of the substance of revolution, saw with his keen appreciation of facts and of any possibilities for development the danger lurking in Plekhanov's attitude to the revolution of 1905 for the strong and purposeful policy of the party, which wanted to be and could be the leader of the masses in future revolutionary struggles. For he was fully aware of the enormous and unique importance of revolutionary mass initiative as factor in history. He therefore opposed Plekhanov's condemnatory opinion with his usual determination and power. "You should not have taken up arms". This judgment was tantamount to ignoring and denying the importance of mass initiative at a time "when Russia was going through a formidable revolutionary change." Lenin's "Introduction" to Karl Marx's "Letters to Kugelmann" dated February 5, 1907 is a panegyric of "the historical initiative of the masses" which, like Marx in his appreciation of the Commune "he placed above everything else."

"Oh, if with respect to the appreciation of the historical initiative of the Russian workers and peasants in October and December 1905 our Russian Social Democrats would only learn from Marx", Lenin exclaimed and he added on the strength of the letters: "In September 1870 Marx called the rising madness. But when the masses rose Marx wants to march with them, to learn himself in the struggle together with them, and not to preach at them. He understands that any attempt to give a definite prognosis of the chances would be either charlatenerie or hopeless pedantry. He put before everything the fact that the working class is making world history heroically, resourcefully and with self-sacrifice... Marx could even recognise that there are moments in history when a desperate struggle of the masses

even for a hopeless cause is necessary for the further education of the masses and their preparation for the next struggle." Lenin urges "to learn from the theorist and leader of the proletariat to believe in the revolution, to learn how to rouse the working class to defend itself until the aim of their revolutionary tasks has been achieved, to learn to preserve the will to power which does not tolerate pusillanimous despair because of the temporary non-success of the revolution."

The proud and prophetic words with which Lenin concluded his "Introduction" have become reality: "The Russian working class has already shown once and will show again and again that it is capable to storm the heavens." The Russian working class has stormed the heavens. That its storming was translated into victory is the result of Lenin's life work. Guided by the clear recognition of the revolutionary character of the time and of the situation in Russia, inspired by the unshakable belief in the revolutionising power of mass initiative, he worked with iron logic and unflagging energy at the creation of the party, which armed with the right spirit, determination and organisation, acquired the capacity to raise volcanic mass initiative to purposeful revolutionary mass determination, and to be the brain, the backbone and the guiding hand of revolutionary mass struggles. A solid double chain consisting of strongly welded together links connects the working and peasant masses who fought and suffered a glorious defeat in the revolution of 1905, and the Bolsheviks who fought and learnt with them, the victorious proletariat and peasantry of the Red October of 1917 and their leading class party. But the creative spirit awakened by the defeated revolution made itself felt in the international labour movement at an earlier date than in Russia.

The hankering of the highly developed industrial states after a "place in the sun", the war made by Japan against China and by the U. S. A. on Spain, the Boer War, the campaign of the great Powers against China under Wilhelm's leadership, who bragged beforehand about the laurels which were to be reaped, the Russo-Japanese struggle for supremacy, — all this showed that capitalism had entered upon the era of imperialism. The differences between the great capitalist states increased in number and became more acute. These differences were fraught with the danger of sanguinary contests of arms on a large scale, of terrible destruction in which the proletariat could not consent to play the role of gladiators if they were intent on looking after their class interests and the social differences within the capitalist states had also grown and become more acute. The formidable gulf between exploiters and exploited has been widened. The bourgeois mode of living of the small labour aristocracy and of its political and trade union bureaucracy could not eradicate the fact that large sections of the proletariat vegetated — not only relatively but absolutely in want and misery and frequently went under. The fact that the proletariat had organised itself certainly increased its economic and political power, enabling it to defend itself against exploitation and enslavement. But at the other pole of society the economic and political power of the bourgeoisie had grown tremendously. The fighting methods and weapons hitherto used by the proletariat proved to be more and more ineffective against the deadly enemy of the workers. The fruit reaped from the nothing-but-trade union movement and from the parliamentarism was sour and far from plentiful, even where the bourgeois rule was a democratic rule.

The cry for bread, justice and liberty of the starving masses demanded as insistently as the theoretical perspicacity in the left wing of the Second International, new means and methods for the proletarian class struggle. The important role of the proletariat in the process of capitalist production pointed forcibly to the general strike, the political mass strike as an adequate weapon for the proletarian struggle. Herwegh's "Bundeslied" sung by evergrowing proletarian masses in which he called on the masses to awaken and realise their power to hold up the wheels of fate was a challenge to the bourgeois world.

The recognition, or rather the application of the mass strike, was for a long time the subject of heated discussion within the Second International. At first there was not a "clean cut" division

in the pros and cons, between reformists and revolutionary Marxists. A good few who claimed for parliamentarism the monopoly of all means of grace and the power to lead the proletariat along paths strewn with flowers to victory, were for the mass strike as a means for the defence or conquest of a democratic franchise. Their championship of the mass strike was certainly half-hearted, for if not consciously, at least instinctively the chieftains of opportunism and revisionism in the Second International felt the revolutionary, historical substance and the revolutionising effects of the general strike.

This contentious question had not yet been settled in theory by the Second International even as an expression in a pious resolution, when the mass strike confronted it challengingly in practice. The cause of it was the struggle of the Belgian proletariat for universal suffrage and the secret ballot. This struggle brought to light the self-sacrificing determination of revolutionary mass initiative and also the incapacity, weakness and treachery of the leading Vanderveldes. The spontaneous general rising of the mine slaves was called off in favour of parliamentary action, which on its part did not even make full use of the powers of parliamentarism, and ended shamefully by a whining letter to the royal "friend" of the dancer Cleo de Merode. The self-sacrificing mass strike in Holland was also not allowed to be brought to a successful issue.

Nevertheless the general strike remained on the agenda of history, for both these cases threw only light on the difficulties and perils of its application, but did not by any means prove its inadequacy as a weapon of the proletariat. The leaders of the Second International were compelled to place it on the agenda of the World Congress in Amsterdam in 1904 together with the question of ministerialism which kept the Social Democratic Parties on edge, in spite of the Paris compromise resolution or rather because of this accursed resolution. The great battle which raged around ministerialism for which Jaures fought with all his genius, power and brilliancy, relegated the interest in the general strike to a back seat. Among its most obstinate and impassioned champions was Aristide Briand who subsequently showed himself more able than the Sheidemanns and Eberts to make full use of a business coalition with the bourgeoisie. Just as in the question of ministerialism so in the question of the general strike one of those "unanimous" decisions was concocted which left in the end the matter undecided and gave in fact no satisfaction either to reformists or revolutionary Marxists. It is true the political mass strike, as a proletarian weapon, received the official blessing of the Second International. But its application was connected with so many reservations and was made dependent on so many precautions and considerations before and after that it was tantamount to a postponement till doomsday. The Congress of the German reformist trade unions held in Cologne in 1905 drew the practical conclusion from the Amsterdam decision. Under the influence of artful opportunist wire-pullers and dominated by the fears of shortsighted trembling bureaucrats, the Congress forbade propaganda of the political mass strike and absolved the trade unions from any obligation to support it.

The thick, stifling, paralysing atmosphere of those years was rent by the voice of the Russian Revolution: "I am". A voice which roused the masses and brought clarity and determination to the revolutionary Marxists in the Second International. Revolutionary mass initiative made itself powerfully felt in Russia. It made "world history" by mass strikes of various professional groups which sprang up like hot springs. It sent forth from the barricades deadly lead into the ranks of the enemy. The electrical spark of the revolutionary mass rising flew across the frontiers of Russia. The first most direct and powerful effect of the revolutionary struggles in Russia and Russian Poland on the proletarian masses was stunning, but soon there was joy at the fact that workers and peasants had taken up arms to fight for their freedom. For had not even good radical Marxists taught that through the technical development of firearms, modern town planning, etc., street and barricade fighting had become impossible and belonged so to speak to a stone age of revolutionary exposition. Engels' foreword to Marx's "Class Struggles in France", or rather its misinterpretation by the Party Committee had led them astray. But low and behold barricades which seemed to have grown out of the earth, rifle fire and the thunder of cannon proclaimed that the exploited workers can defend themselves with arms against their masters and tormentors. This recognition gave an impetus to the feeling of power and the proletarian masses gained therefrom determination to fight and to

attack. The superstitious belief in "lawfulness", "normal, peaceful development" and in the "gradual growing into Socialism" received a severe blow. The role of armed struggle, of mass power as an inevitable, revolutionary, historical factor was felt instinctively or in some cases realised consciously. "To want to speak Russian" with the exploiting and enslaving authorities was already then a quite usual form of speech at workers' meetings. The effect of the Russian Revolution did not evaporate in high-flown sentiment. It brought forth results. This was the case first of all and above all, wherever the masses were near to the revolutionary fighting centre and wherever the mass rising had severely shaken the hostile oppressive state power. In Finland the proletarian class struggle became part of the national independence movement. Led by the Social Democratic Party and supported by the national-bourgeoisie, the revolutionary proletariat extorted from Russian tsarism by a heroic general strike, the beginnings of national autonomy and the right to vote for the Landtag, which at that time could justly call itself the most democratic of all franchise systems. It was universal, direct, secret and equal and conferred active or passive rights both on men and women. The firebrand of the Russian revolution set alight the energy and will to fight of the Austrian proletariat and of its leader — the Social Democratic Party. It did not come to a general rising over there in the struggle for franchise. Strong determination to carry it out and thorough preparation for it were sufficient to deal a death blow to the hated limited system of franchise, and to win universal or rather manhood suffrage. The Social Democratic leaders of both countries seem to have forgotten the revolutionary origin of the "democracy" which they offer to the workers in lieu of revolution. They are among the most venomous haters and detractors of the Russian Revolution which developed into the conquest of State power and the establishment of the Soviet Republic with proletarian dictatorship. An irony of history and the indelible sign of the most vulgar bourgeoisisation.

\* \* \*

Could not one imagine that the Russian revolution of 1905 would as a matter of course produce great results in Germany? The objective historical pre-requisites were there. The deprivation of the franchise in Saxony, the interference of the supreme authorities with the right of association and assembly, the stubborn refusal of a democratic franchise in Prussia and the adventurous imperialist policy dictated by Wilhelm's vainglorious whims — all this combined added zest to the influence of the Russian revolution. Therefore the bold revolutionary attack of the workers and peasants on tsarism was welcomed by the German workers with great joy and enthusiasm. They felt it to be an example to be followed and a warning that the battle was imminent. But what was really lacking — was leadership by a proletarian class party, capable of intensifying, raising and welding together the revolutionary mood of the masses into an unshakable will to fight. But the Social Democratic Party lagged far behind the revolutionary mood of the masses, like the whilom Landsturm lagged behind the regular forces in the struggle for supremacy between Austria and Prussia in 1866.

The revolutionary vanguard of the German working class was filled with enthusiastic solidarity for the workers and peasants in Russia who wanted to break the chains which kept them so long enslaved. When the Social Democratic Party Congress met in Jena in 1905 the political resolution of the Party Committee did not originally contain even the least allusion to the Russian revolution. It was only when from the Left someone moved a resolution in keeping with the great event that the leaders "of the international liberating Social Democracy" were induced to add to the expressions of their adhesion to principle and of their political perspicacity, a few sentences to welcome the most important event of the times. Naturally on the supposition that the special resolution would not then be brought forward. More significant even than this episode "behind the scenes" was the explanation how it happened that the text of the official resolution had not mentioned the Russian revolution by a single word, namely because of excessive political wisdom and precaution. No information had as yet been received about the details of the rising and it was not certain what the issues of the revolutionary struggle would be. This simply meant: a brotherly handshake and a wreath of laurels for the avowedly victorious revolution, and at the same time an open door for the cowardly retreat from a brutally defeated revolution. The Marxist spirit of the historic understanding for the driving powers of revolu-

tionary mass initiative was just gone to the devil, there only remained philistine phlegma of an insipid opportunism, which only worships success from which it can make capital.

But in spite of everything the powerful breath of the revolution had stirred up the proletarian masses. The pusillanimous petty-bourgeois wisdom of the Social Democratic leaders who aped statesmanship could not but be to a certain extent influenced by the accomplished fact. It continually cropped up in the discussions on the political mass strike and helped the waverers and doubters to come to a decision which was decidedly "veering to the left". Contrary to the Cologne Trade Union Congress the Party Congress declared that in principle the mass rising was one of the best weapons in the struggle, a weapons for the liberation of the proletariat through the bestowal of rights such as universal franchise, the right of association, etc. The radicals were jubilant over this victory. However, a year later the **Mannheim Party Congress** put an end to this short summer joy, and the discomforts of winter ensued. The Party Congress brought the capitulation of the advocates of the revolutionary mass strike before the narrow reformist hostility of the general Commission of the trade unions. It did not rise to the occasion by issuing the slogan of the mass strike for the **franchise struggle in Prussia**. The defeat of the Russian Revolution overshadowed the decision and even had a damping effect on Bebel's temperament and attitude.

The decision which breathed resignation prevented the very necessary mobilisation of the Party for a far-reaching class struggle. But it did not extinguish the consciousness which the Russian Revolution had awakened in hundreds of thousands of brains, which were struggling and seeking for truth. Innumerable meetings throughout the Reich had turned their attention to the heroic struggle of the Russian workers and peasants and had expressed solidarity with them. At first this too met with resistance. Leading "radical" comrades in Berlin, which set the tone, would have nothing to do with such solidarity meetings. The reasons for their refusal were: such meetings would result in endless lawsuits for the Party and for every speaker in years of imprisonment. Meetings and demonstrations in sympathy with the Russian Revolution became only possible after the Berlin women comrades — the Prussian association law placed them at that time organisationally outside the Party — put the men comrades to shame by convening public meetings with the much dreaded agenda. This broke the spell, as is shown by the daily press of that epoch.

The scientific literature of the German Social Democrats benefited very much by the revolution of 1905. The "Neue Zeit" is a perfect mine of wealth in support of this. Kautsky's profound insight as the keeper of the holy grail of pure Marxism did not foresee at that time that the revolutionary Russian labour movement would hatch out the Basilisk egg of Bolshevism. He looked upon the Russian Revolution as a mountain spring which would give freshness and strength to the fighting energies of the West European proletariat and raved about the "revolutionary international hegemony of the Young Russian working class." He considered the Russian Revolution as a peculiar historical process on the border of bourgeois and Socialist society, as a process which accelerates the disintegration of the bourgeois order and also the advent of Socialism. One could still feel the heart beat of the Russian Revolution in the attitude to the situation and the task it created. The outcome of this attitude was Kautsky's first uncastrated edition of his pamphlet "The Way to Power". I should like to remind you of the following passage: "In a state with such a high industrial development as Germany or Great Britain, the proletariat would be probably already strong enough today to conquer State power, and it would find already today economic conditions enabling it to set up a state power capable of replacing capitalist enterprises by social enterprises." What Kautsky has written of the revolution of 1905 as an admirer and learner shows vividly how deep Kautsky, the hater and detractor of the revolution of 1917, has fallen as a theorist and as a man.

The ripest theoretical fruit of the first Russian Revolution in Germany was Rosa Luxemburg's pamphlet on the **political mass strike**. This pamphlet is the creation of a genius with Marxist

training. It breathes understanding of and enthusiasm for this revolution. In this pamphlet we do not only hear the voice of the scientific searcher for truth, but also the voice of the champion of revolution, who longs to give form to another social life. With a stroke of the pen Rosa threw aside in this pamphlet all the former definitions, classification, regulations, etc., on the general strike. She establishes its historical nature simply and yet distinctly as "the classical form which the proletariat moves in revolutionary situations." She shows that it is mansyided and continuous like life itself. For she had known of it as active life, she had observed it and helped self-sacrificingly to carry it out during the time when he did her revolutionary duty in Poland. Born of the revolutionary struggle of the Russian and Polish workers, this pamphlet, published by the then very radical Hamburg Party organisation, was to be an inspiring bugle call for the German proletariat to join the revolutionary struggle. It is such a bugle even now in spite of the fact that some of the arguments are out of date.

\* \* \*

But the influences which led to the growing bourgeoisisation of the Social Democracy and the trade unions and to their bankruptcy as organs of the proletarian class struggle had more to do with the shaping of conditions in Germany and the faith of the workers than the Russian Revolution of 1905. The more acute the class differences in state and economic affairs, the fiercer the exploitation of the masses by imperialist capitalism, the bolder the advance of reaction all along the lines, in a word the more insistently the situation demanded that the German proletariat should take up revolutionary fighting methods and weapons, drawing practical conclusions from the lessons of the Russian revolution, the more pacific was the action of the Social Democrats, the greater their belief in the efficacy of reform, the more determined were they to discourage every form of mass initiative. A contributing factor to this in the dialectical metamorphosis of historical life was the revolution of 1905. It increased the fear of the reformist leaders of mass movements which go ahead without the least respect whatever for bourgeois law and order. The so-much advertised action for the introduction of universal suffrage in Prussia resulted only in well-organised, but ineffective demonstrations. The Social Democrats with their usual lack of courage and fear of responsibility failed to call a general strike and thus give an impetus to the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie throughout the Reich and to lead the workers into the battle. Into a battle which from the historic viewpoint was of a much higher value for the conquest of state power than the bits of paper thrown into the ballot box. The renunciation of the revolutionary struggle of large masses for universal franchise was the prelude of the shameful pact of the Social Democrats with imperialism in the world war, of their treacherous coalition with the bourgeoisie in the post-war period and of their cowardly renunciation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But nevertheless the light emanating from the first Russian revolution has had its effect on the minds and trend of thought of the German proletariat, it roused their fighting enthusiasm. These emanations have joined forces with the bitter experiences of the imperialist contest for power of the capitalist states and its effect on the every day life of the proletariat, they have joined forces with the lessons of the victorious Russian revolution of 1917, developing into a mighty flame. And this flame brings light into the minds of the masses and rouses their enthusiasm. The German proletariat has much to make good. It will do this under the leadership of the Communist Party which through hard struggle must learn to fulfil its double task: To arouse revolutionary mass initiative and to develop it into a purposeful self-sacrificing will to fight, to acquire through the development of its own ideological and organisational activities, the capacity to lead and to have confidence in the leadership, faithful to revolutionary Marxism, in the spirit of Lenin. For this is the indispensable pre-requisite for that daily work and struggle which can create mass initiative and lead it. Mass initiative whose aim is: conquest of power and establishment of proletarian dictatorship. Not only mass initiative with the heroism of the Russian revolution of 1905, but mass initiative capable of emulating the triumph of the Red October of 1917.



# The Revolution of 1905 and the German Working-Class.

By Paul Frölich.

## The Mass Movement.

A decisive turning point in the history of German Social Democracy, a turning point in the direction of a real revolutionary party! This is what at that time seemed to us to be the immediate effect of the revolution of 1905 on German Social Democracy and the masses of the German proletariat. Had not the Party Conference at Dresden in 1903 finally overcome reformism? Had not the three million victory been a proof of the actual power of the German proletariat, and had not this victory demonstrated at the same time that parliamentary mandates have no decisive influence in class war, that the dice fall in the street, not on the parquet floor? It seemed to us that a period in the history of our party had been closed. And then the Russian revolution showed us the way that had to be trodden in the future. All we needed was to borrow from the experiences of the revolution against Czarism anything that fitted in to the revolution against the "civilised" capitalism of Western Europe and develop it further.

In any case the matter was very obscure. As regards one point however, we were right in our calculations. The German working class had, under the influence of the revolution, experienced a new intellectual revival. While itself lacking all revolutionary tradition, it had at least been a witness of this great historical birth pangs. An event which had been hoped for, doubted and dreaded, all at the same time, which had been playfully clothed by the imagination in lifeless romance, had become a reality that beggared all imagination. The German working class, it is true, like that of other countries, did not recognise the full import of the Russian revolution. The German proletariat was too conscious of the leading part it played itself, of the superiority of its own methods of fighting. The conception was too deeply rooted that the Russian revolution was merely catching up what was a matter of past history for Western Europe, the bourgeois revolution, and the forms it took, seemed to be a result of the barbarism of the Czarist regime. It was thought that they would vanish with the disappearance of Czarism and would leave way for Western European methods of fighting which they had newly fertilised. The permanent gain would be the strike of the masses as a means of bringing about a decisive fight. We have thus drawn in a few words a fair picture of the effect, the revolution of 1905 had on the minds of the Social Democracy workers.

We do not of course pretend to have given an exhaustive description of its total effect. The fact that the giant proletariat of Russia had stretched its limbs filled the German proletariat with the consciousness of its power, and stirred it on to activity. A study of the events directly reveals how the stormy waves of the revolution spread beyond the borders of Russia and started movements in Western Europe which, it is true, were much weaker, but which nevertheless had the same rhythm of ebb and flow. Even the first culminating point of the revolution, the great strikes, demonstrations and street-fights up to Jan. 9th 1905 were reflected in the **great miners' strike**. This broke out on Jan. 8th as a result of the indignation at the arbitrary curtailment of wages, the refusal to pay the wages agreed upon if the waggons contained coal of poor quality, the scandalous lack of safety precautions, the overwork and the autocratic behaviour of the coal magnates. The strike funds were used up in a fortnight, but the fight was continued till Feb. 10th when it broke down owing to exhaustion. So far the strike was not a revolutionary movement, but its force, the fact that it attacked one of the vital sources of economic life and that it was a reflection of the great Russian strike of the masses, made it a political strike from the beginning, a means of exercising pressure on the State. The strike at least gained a considerable moral victory in that the Government was obliged to promise new laws regulating the questions concerning the miners. Needless to say, as soon as the immediate pressure was relaxed, these regulations turned out to be absolutely inadequate, a mere mockery of the miners' demands.

During the whole summer, strikes increased in almost all occupations. This was partly due, it is true, to the growing possibility of making profits, but undoubtedly it was also a

demonstration of an increased sense of power and of a stronger will to fight. The Russian example took effect. It took such effect that even the "rocher de bronze" of German militarism received a few blows. This happened in July, during the "Kiel week", William II's usual great naval review. A short time previously, in the Black Sea, the "Potemkin" had delivered the first great revolutionary stroke, had hoisted the red flag and fired on Odessa. The crew of the cruiser "Frauenlob" mutinied in Kiel harbour during the great review, they locked up their officers, sank parts of their guns and hoisted what the first reports described as a "dirty rag", probably the red flag. The crew declared that they had resorted to these drastic measures as a protest against the despicable way they were treated by their officers, and in order to enforce improvements in their conditions. When Willie of Hohenzollern saw the flag of revolt waving on the "Frauenlob", he was beside himself with rage and he banished the ship from his august sight into the open sea. The action of the crew of the "Frauenlob" was in any case a powerful revolutionary gesture, and a revolutionary party leadership could have made considerably capital out of it. But the party contented itself with a few jibes at the naval administration and was glad to let the dangerous subject drop.

The Czar's October Manifesto brought in its immediate train the first great franchise movement in Germany. The movement started in Austria and this gave an impetus to the German workers. The German bourgeoisie had already responded in its own way to the Russian revolution. It tried to entrench itself behind new political privileges. In a number of the separate States, especially in the towns of Hamburg, Lübeck and Bremen, a further restriction of the franchise, with the object of preventing the threatened flooding of Parliament by Social Democracy was discussed. In South Germany on the other hand some concessions had been made to the workers. This only made the contrast all the more marked in the two chief States of North Germany, Prussia, where the Parliament of Junkers barred the way to any political progress like a bronze bastion, and Saxony, where in 1896 the three classes franchise had been introduced with the result that in the "red kingdom" it was just one social democrat who was elected. The first street demonstrations in Saxony took place on November 19th and, from that time onwards, they recurred every week with steadily increasing violence. The movement spread beyond Saxony. On Jan. 17th, the first half-day demonstration strike took place in Hamburg. It made a great impression. All the workers of Hamburg left the works at one blow. Traffic was at a standstill in harbour and town. Large numbers marched in enormous processions to the meetings which were called to protest against the robbery of the franchise.

The culminating point of the mass movement was on the anniversary of the great massacre in St. Petersburg, Jan. 22nd 1906 (Jan. 9th Russian style.) In the whole Empire meetings and demonstrations were held at which the Russian revolution was celebrated and the will of the proletariat to conquer democratic rights for itself, was proclaimed. "Red Sunday" gave the German workers a faint glimmering recognition of their own power. This recognition however was not followed up. In Russia the power of the revolution was broken by the suppression of the Moscow insurrection, and the mass movement in Germany was nipped in the bud.

These mass movements of the year of revolution appear very moderate when looked back upon from this distance and, when compared with the raging sea of Russia, they are only a slight ripple on the surface of German political life. Things must be looked at from the point of view of their own day, and viewed in this light, the huge strikes and the first great street demonstrations mark an enormous step forward. Here was the possibility of fostering and furthering the revolutionary spirit of the German workers. But — the authorities! That clumsy block-brake!

## The Party Authorities and the Revolution.

The impetus and will of the German proletariat would undoubtedly have sufficed for much more powerful blows if the party itself had not so fatally failed to come up to the scratch. The

small group of revolutionary socialists, gathered round Rosa Luxemburg, Clara Zetkin and Franz Mehring, it is true, did everything in their power to promote understanding of the international significance of the Russian revolution, to stimulate inspiration and to spur on to action. The "Gleichheit" (Women's organ of Clara Zetkin) and the "Leipziger Volkszeitung" reached a summit of revolutionary journalism. Some other papers did very good work, but on the whole we are shocked at the lack of understanding, pusillanimity and weakness shown.

A few characteristic examples. On July 5th 1905, 6 months after the outbreak of the revolution, the party leaders, in a proclamation, called the attention of the eagerly listening world to the great event. They declared that the German proletariat must rush to the assistance of its fighting brothers by — collecting money. The International bureau had at least in February demanded that "a share be taken in the work of liberation in the form of action, influence and propaganda." The "Vorwärts" had at that time printed the proclamation without drawing any conclusions, without even a word of encouragement, as though by merely printing it they were fulfilling an irksome task. When the bourgeois Press made use of the proclamation of the party leaders in an agitation against the terribly revolutionary German Social Democrats, the central organ had the pitiful courage to rage against the "forgery", as though the German party had the intention "to proceed in the same way, if the Russian revolution took the favourable course which was hoped for." (The money collections for the revolution brought in more than 300,000 Marks.)

In Jan. 1905 that disgraceful secret alliance trial took place in Königsberg in which the Prussian vassal performed a labour of love for his Czarist master. The affair had its echo in the Reichstag! It was one of those numerous opportunities of joyfully confessing one's faith in the Russian revolution and of exerting influence in favour of the revolution from the Parliamentary platform. What a disgrace! Hugo Hasse held a juridical lecture in which he demanded — that the Prusso-Russian extradition treaty should be terminated by notice!

The German Government of course openly took the side of the blood-guilty Czar. No opportunity was taken (Chancellor's budget etc.) to pillory it.

In Jan. 1905 it was announced that the German troops on the Eastern frontier had been alarmed. The "Vorwärts" wrote: "Surely it is out of the question, in spite of everything, that Germany should go to the help of the Czar." In the summer attempts were made to recruit White Guards for the Baltic barons. This is merely reported, that is all! In March the Russian workers on strike issued an appeal to the comrades in Western Europe to hinder munitions being supplied to the Czarist Government. The "Vorwärts" found it very difficult to discover where munitions for Russia were being produced. Altogether a supply of this kind is a violation of International Law. The German Government therefore should be the first to be on the watch.

This was the pitiable policy of the central organ and of the papers allied to it, as well as of the party leaders. It should be pointed out that the authorities and the Reformists instead of making use of the recent lessons, made every effort to make it seem impossible that the German working class would ever begin "to speak Russian." This was due not merely to considerations for the public prosecutor. The idea that certain things which no one dared say openly could be expressed in illegal publications, did not even occur to them. Even then the party showed its true character although it was not yet recognised.

The picture would however give a false impression if only this sad side was seen. The more the efforts made to hush things up were evident, the greater became the contrast between Reformists and Radicals; as for instance when Clara Zetkin in her speeches ridiculed "the awe of the word legality"; as in the inspired speeches and writings of our Rosa; as in the great discussion after the mass strike. So strong was the pressure of these Radicals, that something unprecedented in German Social Democracy happened, that the party leaders pulled themselves together and turned the Reformists out of the "Vorwärts". The attitude of the "Vorwärts" to the Russian Revolution was thus not the only but the chief cause. The "revolt of the journalists" ended in a reconstruction of the editorial staff. (Oct. 23rd, 1905.) Rosa Luxemburg also became one of the new directors of the paper, and wrote on the Russian question until, early in December 1905, she plunged into the whirlpool of revolution and took over the leadership in Warsaw.

This victory of Marxism and Centralism over Reformism and the professional privileges of journalism would certainly not have been possible without the Russian revolution which in this case also had led the party beyond itself and its innermost nature. It was and continues to be the only victory of this kind, and very soon afterwards the "Vorwärts" under the leadership of Cunow who was joined later by Hilferding, descended to being a willing tool of the dull policy of the authorities.

#### The Debate on Mass Strikes.

The great debate on mass Strikes is another example of a very promising rise and a deplorable fall. The radicalism of German Social Democracy culminated in it, and the Russian revolution assisted at its birth. The great Russian strikes in 1904 had already fertilized the idea of a general strike. At the Party Conference in 1904, Karl Liebknecht had proposed that the subject should be discussed the following year, but the suggestion met with very little encouragement. The great strike in January broke the ice. At the same time Henriette Roland-Holst's epoch making book on the general strike appeared. After that the authorities could no longer stand aloof from the idea.

The old radical majority of the party was unanimously in favour of the general strike, though they had different opinions as to its significance and the possibility of putting it into practice. The Reformists were divided. One group under the leadership of Bernstein and Ludwig Frank was enthusiastic for the general strike as a means of defence or of conquering the universal franchise, not as a revolutionary weapon but for the creation of a solid basis for the Reformist policy. Another group of Reformists, which included practically all the trade union leaders, was against the general strike.

The first decision on the question was made at the Trade Union Congress at Cologne in May 1905. Bömelburg, one of the best types of trade union organisers, made the chief speech. It was full of the counter-revolutionary spirit and a demand for peace. The Congress, with tumultuous applause, passed the following resolutions: "The Congress condemns all attempts to fix on definite tactics by propagating the political general strike, and recommends organised workers to oppose such endeavours with all energy. The Congress considers the general strike, as it is represented by anarchists and persons without any experiences in the sphere of the economic struggle, beneath discussion. He warns the workers against allowing themselves to be distracted from the daily detail work for the strengthening of Labour organisations, by accepting and spreading such ideas." Only 30 delegates voted against this resolution.

The "Vorwärts" wrote, entirely in the spirit of these timid enemies of revolution: "There is a danger that the imagination of the workers will be directed towards uncertain hopes and distracted from their more important and immediate tasks by a zealous study and discussion of such questions — quite apart from the fact that continuous talking about and threatening with revolution is more likely to increase the reactionary hostilities against social democracy than to educate the working class to firmness of purpose." This spirit was also a fruit of the revolution, but a rotten fruit.

The conspiracy against the idea of the general strike was thus the first to hold the field, and it represented a strong bloc of Labour bureaucracy. It was paralysed however by the fresh advance of the Russian revolution in the summer of 1905, the new wave of strikes, the barricade fights in Poland etc. The consequence was that they hardly dared to take an active part in the Party Conference at Jena. With tremendous enthusiasm and tumultuous applause, the general strike was recognised as a means of struggle by the whole party.

After the zenith of the Russian revolution was passed, a secret conference of trade union leaders was held in the Spring of 1906, at which war was declared on the party and especially on the radical wing round Rosa Luxemburg and the "Leipziger Volkszeitung". At this conference the communication was made that the leaders of the party had capitulated to the General Commission of the trade unions. In the course of negotiations between the two authorities, Bebel had made the following statement: "The party leaders have no intention of propagating a political general strike at present. Should it become necessary to do so, the party leaders will previously come to an agreement with the General Commission." At the party conference at Mannheim in 1906, there was a scene of reconciliation between the party and the trade unions. The trade union leaders made a show of sub-

mitting because they actually had victory in their pockets. The deception was exposed by a proposal of Legien in which it was established that the resolutions of Jena (the general strike as the strongest weapon) and of Cologne (prohibition even to discuss the general strike) do not contradict one another. Nowadays we recognise clearly that the Mannheim Party Conference had already shown the incapability of German Social Democracy ever to carry out a great political strike of this nature, and that the party had learned practically nothing from the Russian revolution.

#### The Attitude of the German Party to the Tactical Questions of the Russian Revolution.

In general it may be said that the German party had very little understanding for the internal questions of dissension among the revolutionary parties of Russia. They did not even understand the differentiation of the parties. They regarded it as the result of the squabbles of the emigrants. All the same, the individual groups of German Social Democracy spontaneously took up the attitude corresponding to their character. Thus Kurt Eisner in the "Vorwärts" openly sided with the Social Revolutionary Party. The Reformists greatly regretted that Russian Social Democracy declined to fraternize with the bourgeois opposition, the Cadets etc. The German Party hardly distinguished between the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks. Their essential differences were not understood but the Bolsheviks were condemned as narrow-minded, intolerant secessionists and separatists. In the most important tactical questions, Rosa Luxemburg sided with the Bolsheviks against the Mensheviks.

Karl Kautsky's attitude deserves to be described in greater detail. He was among the few who had begun early to concern himself with Russian party questions and with the question of the Russian revolution in general. He arrived at a point of view which was closely allied to that of the Bolsheviks. As early as in 1902, he combated the conception that the proletarian revolution would be most likely to break out in the country which was economically most highly developed. He saw the approach of the revolution in Russia and recognised that the proletariat would play such an important part in it, that even in the International the Russian proletariat would take the lead. In an article on the American worker, written in February 1906, he wrote: "The Russian proletariat shows us our future."

The revolution of 1905 was in general regarded as the last bourgeois revolution. But the Bolsheviks, and with them Kautsky, went a step further. Kautsky replied to a questionnaire of Plechanow's ("Neue Zeit" 1906/7, No. 9): "The bourgeoisie does not belong to the driving forces of the present day revolutionary movement in Russia, which therefore cannot be described as a bourgeois movement. This does not however justify anyone in saying that it is a socialist one. It is incapable in any case of procuring for the proletariat the sole rule, the dictatorship; the proletariat in Russia is too weak and too undeveloped for that." He was nevertheless prepared to admit the possibility of Social Democracy becoming so strong in the course of the revolution as to gain the victory. This led Kautsky on to answer Plechanow's second question, that concerning the allies: "It will however be impossible for Social Democracy to gain the victory through the proletariat alone without the help of another class, as the victorious party therefore, it will not be able to carry out its programme any further than is compatible with the interests of the party supporting the proletariat... It is only between the proletariat and the peasantry however that a solid community of interests for the whole period of the revolutionary struggle exists... Co-operation with liberalism must only be taken into consideration where and in so far as it does not interfere with co-operation with the peasantry. The revolutionary power of Russian Social Democracy and the possibility of its victory are

based on the community of interests of the industrial proletariat and the peasantry." He admits indeed that this puts a limit on the revolution; even if Social Democracy were temporarily in power, socialist production could not be introduced. "And yet", he continues, "we may still experience many surprises. We do not know how long the Russian revolution may continue, and in view of the forms it has now assumed, it does not seem likely that it will come to an end very quickly. Neither do we know what influence it may have, and in what way it may fertilize the political movements in Western Europe."

Kautsky considers that the solution of the agrarian problem is the central question of the revolution, and with this object in view he recommends that strong dictatorial measures be taken: the confiscation and distribution of landed property, confiscation of the whole of the private property of the Imperial family and of the monasteries, national bankruptcy, confiscation of the great monopolies such as the railways, oil-wells, mines, foundries etc.

In the "Neue Zeit" 1904/5, No. 41, Kautsky, referring to the theme under discussion, says:

"Had the will of the Liberals of past days been fulfilled and had the revolution come to an end with the transformation of the General Estates into the National Assembly in order to make way for a regime of law and order, briefly, had the revolution remained so "fine" according to bourgeois notions, as it is glorified in Schiller's "Wilhelm Tell", and had the French revolution not been "blemished" by the "reign of terror", the lower classes in France would have remained absolutely immature and impotent politically, there would have been no 1848 and the fight of the French, and with them of the international proletariat for emancipation would have been indefinitely delayed."

Here then we have a glorification of dictatorship and, by its context it is evidently recommended for Russia. There still remained the question of insurrection. After the Moscow insurrection, the party maintained an embarrassed silence. The "Leipziger Volkszeitung" (Paul Lensch) stated that insurrection is not a weapon in the proletarian struggle, that this had been proved in Moscow. Kautsky nevertheless, on Jan. 28th 1906 wrote in the "Vorwärts":

"Should there again be a general insurrection as in October, it will probably not be limited to a general strike. And here we see another difference between the Battle of June in Paris and the Battle of December in Moscow: both were barricade fights, the former however was a catastrophe, the end of the old barricade tactics, the latter the inauguration of new barricade tactics. And in this respect we must revise the opinion expressed by Friedrich Engels in his preface to Marx' "Class War", the opinion that the era of barricade fights has come to an end. It is only the time of the old barricade tactics which is past. This was proved in the battle of Moscow in which a handful of insurgents held at bay for a fortnight superior troops armed with the equipment of modern artillery."

There is hardly any gap in this descriptions of Bolshevik tactics. Every sentence shatters what the same Kautsky has said about the Bolsheviks since 1917. At the time Kautsky stood alone in the German party in the firmness of his point of view. But it is significant for the Kautsky of those days that, for the German Labour movement, he only drew the conclusions, the practical carrying out of which did not have actually to be faced. Even in those days, facts showed that neither Kautsky nor the German party was capable of drawing the real conclusions from the experiences of the Russian revolution, and that, should revolution appear on the agenda in Germany itself, both would fail. Kautsky had to become a traitor, German Social Democracy had to become a counter-revolutionary party. The Russian proletariat had to give a new and more powerful example, and a revolutionary party had to be called into being in Germany.

# The Russian Revolution and the Austrian Franchise Struggle.

By Joseph Strasser.

In his Zürich speech on the revolution of 1905\*) Lenin said: "Indirectly the Russian Revolution has exercised its influence also on the Western countries. For it must be recalled that when on October 30th, 1905 the telegram concerning the constitutional manifesto of the Tsar reached Vienna, this piece of news contributed considerably to the definite victory of universal suffrage in Austria". This is no mere exaggeration. The news of the Tsar's manifesto aroused the Austrian workers. If the endlessness of the franchise struggle, the disproportion between the energy expended in this struggle and its results had made Austrian workers, and not the worst among them, disgusted and sceptical, the conversion of the Tsar to constitutionalism, this palpable proof that the proletariat can fight successfully even under the most difficult and seemingly hopeless conditions, immediately restored their former élan to the Austrian proletariat. And this élan brought about the election reform.

There are, of course, people who pretend to know better, who can swear to it that the statesmen-like cleverness of the leading Social Democrats was responsible for the introduction of universal suffrage in Austria. For are not the Austrian Social Democrats of to-day, without exception, convinced that the method of class struggle is not only barbarous but also obsolete, ineffective and harmful, that opponents must not be defeated but persuaded, and that the Social Democratic Party owes its successes primarily to the practical application of this conviction.

This superstition arose during the agitation for universal suffrage, but not right at the beginning. Even in the nineties of the past century the Social Democratic workers of Austria would have laughed to scorn anyone telling them that the main object of the electoral reform movement was to prove to opponents the correctness of the idea of electoral reform. At that time they felt their growing strength, and it was their ardent wish to test this strength by participation in the struggle. At that time the suffrage movement was a struggle conducted with enthusiasm, temerity, self-sacrifice and above all with unshakable conviction. But a change took place in the course of time. The economic development of Austria had not only strengthened the self-confidence of the proletariat but also of the nations within the Empire. If the proletariat demanded political equality with ever-growing insistence, the oppressed nations showed an increasing disinclination to conceal the fact that they did not look upon the Austrian state as their state, but rather as a cage. In the second half of the nineties the national controversies became so acute that they paralysed Parliament and made doubtful the existence of the Empire in the then form, and consequently also the introduction of the reforms demanded by the workers and above all the electoral reform. The Austrian working class found itself suddenly confronted by the national problem and by the question of its relation to the State.

At that time the Austrian form of reformism, of Austro-Marxism came into being. Karl Renner initiated it. He subjected the old Austria to a Marxist analysis — at least he thought he did. In reality it was the old Austria which subjected its Marxist analysts. It had grown old and weak, it was in a state of dissolution, it was already falling into decay, but it was still strong enough to paralyse the courage of its Marxists at a price. Austro-Marxism was nothing but capitulation, and a willing capitulation to the House of Habsburg! This Marxism had become hopelessly afflicted with loyalism to the State. Because the national struggle disturbed the franchise struggle and brought it to a standstill, the Austrian "Marxists" lost faith in the proletariat. They no longer believed that the workers could succeed in winning the franchise reform, not to mention Socialism. Consequently, if they did not want to give up Socialism and the labour movement, their hopes had to be concentrated on bringing into harmony the interests of the working class with the interests of the State, by placing the proletariat at the service of the State ("We Social Democrats are the only Party in Austria working for the preservation of the State") and on being able to place the State at the service of the proletariat. They had to

set their hopes on Austria, on a new Austria of course, a federation of free peoples.

A new Austria — this was uppermost in the minds of the Austro-Marxists. But how was this to be brought about? Through electoral reform of course. That the electoral reform struggle seemed to have become hopeless because of the nationalist controversy was merely a detail. For it was not written anywhere except in the obsolete works of Marx that the proletariat could reach the ultimate aim only by fighting. One can win the electoral reform, and of course every other reform, by persuading the opponents of its necessity, usefulness and advantages. This was the second thought of the Austro-Marxists.

Then came a new phase in the franchise movement. It was attempted to prove that universal suffrage is a panacea for all evils (this attempt always being introduced with the remark: we know perfectly well that universal suffrage is not a panacea for all evils). It is essential not only to the proletariat, but also to other classes, the capitalists, the new middle class, the artisans, and the peasants. It will give all nations the opportunity to develop of which they stand so much in need. Loyalty to the State, which cannot exist as long as there are privileged nations with regard to electoral rights, will then become a matter of course for all nations, a dictate of national self-preservation. Austria will again become great and mighty, therefore universal suffrage is also in the interests of the crown, whose supreme aim of course is the greatness and power of the State.

This argument was used for many years with ever-growing discernment and persuasiveness. But the powers behind the throne, the big landowners, the German middle class, would not be prevailed upon, the advocates at last had recourse to entreaties — just as utopists had appealed not only to the discernment but also to the good heart of the high and mighty. It came to such a pass that the advocates of universal suffrage almost went down on their knees to the Emperor to grant the reform. But nothing was of any avail.

On October 30th 1905, when the Party Congress of the Austrian Social Democrats was in session in Vienna, the news of the Tsar's Manifesto arrived. The effect was astounding. The Party Congress of the same Party whose leaders had patiently presented petition after petition to the Emperor for the introduction of electoral reform, adopted the following resolution: "The Party Congress demands the immediate convocation of the Austrian Reichsrat, whose house of representatives has at present no other task to fulfil than to expiate the great injustice of its prolonged existence and to substitute for the abominable privilege-Parliament a real representation of the people based on the principle of universal suffrage and secret ballot. The Party Congress declares that, after the glorious victory of the Russian revolution, the Austrian proletariat of all tongues emphatically demands the introduction of universal suffrage and secret ballot and is determined to use even extreme measures against any attempted delay." On the same evening monster demonstrations were held in Vienna and also in Bruenn, and on the days which followed the workers held demonstrations in all the industrial towns of Austria. The police thought that they could stop the movement by brutality: on November 2nd the police made an armed attack on the workers. But the government had already recognised that the workers were no longer willing to depend — as was the wish of their spokesmen — on the persuasive power of the electoral reform idea, but rather on its fighting capacity. On November 4th the Premier Gautsch, a confirmed reactionary, clerical bureaucrat, and bitter enemy of the working class, who had a few weeks previously protested against the introduction of universal suffrage in Hungary — on the plea that it might be dragged into Austria — ordered the publication of the declaration that the Government would give its attention to the question of electoral reform. He did not even conceal what had made him change his mind so suddenly. "It must not be left out of account", ran the declaration, "that these wishes (for electoral reform) have received considerable support through events in other States." Thus Gautsch said quite openly that he had not been converted to electoral reform because of the testimony of the excellence of universal suffrage and secret ballot, but because of the revolutionary actions of the Russian workers

\*) Lenin: "Speech on the Revolution of 1905" published in "Literatur und Politik" Vienna.

which had inspired the Austrian workers. He of course declared at the same time that the introduction of the reform needed "calm and thorough consideration". But on the following day, Suffrage Sunday, the workers expressed their will so emphatically — in Prague it came to actual street-fighting and erection of barricades — that the Government decided to shorten the period of consideration. On November 11th Gautsch announced electoral reform "on a modern basis", and on November 28th, the day of the opening of Parliament, when the Austrian proletariat organised a gigantic demonstration, (in Vienna alone a quarter of a million of workers took part in the demonstration), his declarations were still more precise. But one could see clearly by all his sayings and actions that inwardly he had remained the same, and that he would be only too pleased to make use of any opportunity to delay and bungle the question of electoral reform. The workers had to goad the government and the other opponents of the electoral reform step by step to the point of action. It was uphill work. Only in May 1907 did the people of Austria vote for the first time on the

basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. The opponents of electoral reform capitulated not because they had become convinced of the usefulness of this reform, but because they had begun to realise that the proletariat was determined to break down their resistance to the electoral reform if necessary by force. It was not the weapon of criticism which defeated the enemies of the workers, they only gave in because they feared the criticism of weapons.

The Austrian workers have forgotten the lesson which the Russian revolution taught them. Soon, very soon, after they had obtained the electoral reform, they allowed themselves to be misled by the superstition of seeking salvation in democracy. War and the overthrow of the old regime did not make any change: During the great capitalist crisis the Austrian workers allowed themselves to be persuaded of the value of bourgeois democracy and of collaboration with the bourgeois parties. But they will soon recollect that their true successes have always been achieved by fighting; for that which the Social Democrats fail to do: to enlighten their adherents, is being done by the Entente.

## 1905 in Bulgaria.

By G. Vakilov.

The Russian Revolution of 1905 was greeted with enthusiasm by the Bulgarian workers, who hoped that it was the beginning of the end of the existing bourgeois order throughout the world. The Russian Revolution had always been looked upon as the prelude of the revolution of the West European proletariat.

The Workers' Party came into being in Bulgaria under the direct influence of the Russian revolutionary movement. We imbibed from Russian literature pre-Marxian as well as Marxian Socialism. This had a very salutary effect on the development of the Labour movement of Bulgaria. The Bulgarian workers were interested in, and agitated by the same questions which were part of the life of the Russian workers. Ideologically, the Bulgarian Labour movement was an abridged edition of the Russian labour movement. Much of the Russian Marxist literature was translated, commented upon and expounded in the Bulgarian language. We lived by the ideological life of the Russian Marxists.

The Bulgarian Party sprang up at a time when the "Iskra" came into being. The progress of the labour movement in Russia was felt in Bulgaria as our own progress. Apart from the dissemination of Russian publications in Bulgaria itself, their transfer from Varna to Odessa was also organised. There was also an organisation to supply Russian comrades abroad with Bulgarian passports. The victory of revolutionary Marxism which was heralded with the first number of the "Iskra" helped us to settle our own quarrels as to tactics.

In this respect Lenin's pamphlet, "What is to be Done" played a particularly brilliant role.

It was just during this rise of the revolutionary movement of the Russian workers that the Bulgarian Party, influenced by it, freed itself from the opportunist elements, ejected from its midst the so-called "broad" socialists, and became the Party of revolutionary Marxism. The revolution of 1905 finally determined the position of our Party.

There were no mass movements at that time in Bulgaria. The workers were unable to rise and to exact better conditions for themselves by common action. This was the time when the Bulgarian workers were severing from the petty-bourgeoisie and were establishing their own class party. 1905 could not play in the

Bulgarian movement the role which 1917 was destined to play. But it did its work in Bulgaria in rousing revolutionary feeling and pointing to revolution as the only way to liberation. Through it, revolutionary Marxism became the ideology of the working class of Bulgaria.

But it would be wrong to imagine that the influence of 1905 found its reflection only in the upper strata of the working class of Bulgaria. It spread gradually to ever-growing sections of workers. There had never before been so many workers assemblies and meetings. The masses, on learning about the deeds of their Russian brothers, were filled with enthusiasm and faith in a speedy victory of labour.

For a whole year, Bulgarian comrades followed with intense attention the events in Russia. They rejoiced and were saddened in turn at the joys and sufferings of the Russian workers. I well remember with what excitement they were expecting the "floating Socialist Republic" — the arrival of the "Potiemkin" at the shores of Bulgaria. Night after night comrades watched on the shore in Varna, waiting in vain for the vessel which subsequently cast anchor in the port of Constance in Roumania. Many of its sailors came to Bulgaria, but the Bulgarian Government of Stambulist Petkoff issued a secret circular ordering that they be taken across the frontier of Bulgaria. At that time the Bulgarian Government was of an anti-Russian nature, which, however, did not prevent it from interference in the interests of the tsarist government. The class interests of the Bulgarian bourgeoisie were evidently stronger than the anti-Russian tendencies of the government. Our Party has always fought against the tsarist policy of conquest in the Balkans. The revolution of 1905 called for an enormous number of workers meetings in Bulgaria to protest against the tsarist policy. The attitude of the Bulgarian government to the Potiemkin rebels gave the Party an opportunity to expose the class nature of the policy of this government and to call the masses to the revolutionary struggle for Socialism.

From the very beginning the Bulgarian revolutionary movement was connected with the Russian movement. 1905 strengthened this indissoluble connection for all time.

# The Effects of the 1905 Revolution on Switzerland.

By Fritz Platten.

Towards the end of 1904 the Zurich Russian Colony showed signs of increased nervous tension and in the first days of 1905 the whole Russian colony in that town was astir. There was meeting after meeting, newspapers and any news were eagerly snapped up and the centre of all conversations was the **Russian Revolution**. In the Russian reading room, there was continuous coming and going, and ceaseless discussions in the club house "Eintracht", the rendez-vous of all the revolutionary sections of the Zurich labour movement. Frequently all the available halls of this club house were occupied, and the administration could not even satisfy the demand for halls of the various Russian fractions. In the middle of January came the news about the shooting of the Petersburg demonstrators and this news was rapidly followed by news of strikes, risings, attempts on the lives of various people, etc. These events made a very deep impression on the Swiss workers. There was a flood of strikes in Switzerland, the workers were in a buoyant mood, a bold and belligerent spirit had taken hold of them, and one can truly say that this event brought a fundamental change into the psychology of the **Swiss workers**. We are ready to admit that only in a very few cases this psychological change was the outcome of a clear recognition of the importance of events in the East. It was a question of mood, the workers became suddenly imbued with an overwhelming feeling of their own strength and went joyfully into the offensive against capitalism. The Eastern problem was alien to the Swiss workers, there was only one desire expressed by all: **Down with the Czar, long live Revolution!** There were but few people who took into account the **Character** of the revolution in the East. The workers gave vent to their sympathies in powerful demonstrations held in halls and in the open. The Russian proletariat, as we know, suffered defeat in the street fighting at the hands of the czarist troops because of the treachery of the liberals who joined the counter-revolutionary camp. The revolutionary power of the Russian workers was broken and this also sealed the fate of the "democratic" revolution. Reaction raised its head throughout Europe and damped the spirit of the workers in Western Europe. On the strength of the historic events in 1905, two influences established themselves permanently in Switzerland: one from France and the other from Germany. The revolution of 1905 gave an impetus to syndicalism in France, from there came the slogan: **Direct action is the workers' weapon**. French Switzerland which had always been under the influence of the Paris Labour movement took up this slogan and spread its influence to East Switzerland. The fundamental idea of direct action culminated in the conviction that only economic struggle can lead to the liberation of the working class from wage slavery. Anti-parliamentarism began to flourish, anti-election propaganda was introduced, passive resistance in the places of employment, the use of sabotage on machinery and other means of production were advocated as the best weapons of the workers. The latter were urged to begin on a certain day to work only 8 hours in the factories, the establishment of strike funds was derided and the general strike was extolled as the panacea of the revolutionary class struggle.

This movement took hold of the masses, attempts were actually made to bring passive resistance into play and there were also isolated acts of sabotage. In the labour movement anarchists gained ground. For instance even the upper strata of the Swiss Trade Union movement were entirely dominated by this French movement. But this domination had not come to stay. The influence of German Social Democracy on the workers of East Switzerland was more enduring. In fact, the Swiss workers were very much influenced by the revolutionary wing of the German Social Democratic Party. Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and the Kautsky of those days became, if not the direct, the indirect leaders of a young tendency in the Swiss Social Democratic Party. Every year tens of thousands of German workers go through the Swiss cantons, and as it happens that it is not the most stupid, but rather the cleverest workers who are seized by "Wanderlust", these immigrant workers exercised a wholesome influence on the Swiss Labour movement. There came into being in Switzerland a new revolutionary leader guard which very soon put an end to the influence of the revisionist leaders in the most important industrial centres of Switzerland, which was able to give a revolutionary character to the labour movement.

How strong was the influence of these driving elements in the labour movement could be ascertained in Zurich in 1912. In connection with a prolonged strike there was an encounter between the workers and the police, which resulted in the formation of regular fighting leagues. The Government provoked the workers by appointing Canton police, by making arrests and introducing in general a regime of violence dictated by the interests of the capitalists. The oldest democracy of the world appeared in its true colours. There was great excitement among the workers and the revolutionary-Marxist elements within the ranks of the workers were spoiling for a trial of strength and propagated the application of the general strike. Taking into consideration the idyllic conditions of Switzerland the general strike, when it came had the effect of a bomb. This general strike was brought about against the will of the Social Democratic leaders. In these circles there was the conviction that the workers would be sane enough not to follow a couple of muddled hot-heads — the epithet bestowed on the revolutionary-Marxist comrades. The then chief of police in the town was a member of the Social Democratic Party. He was already getting on in years and took the whole matter very calmly. According to his want he retired to bed at 9 p. m. and was thus not among the 167 Social Democratic leaders who voted against the general strike at the municipal cartel. But over 450 workers from the factories declared themselves for the general strike. Herr Vogelsanger, the Social Democratic Chief of Police, in his reliance on Providence, had not only slept the meeting, but also all preparations which he as the chief of police of the town should have made.

It is superfluous here to give further details. But it is worth mentioning that already at that time fractional trade union work was done by the revolutionary leaders of the labour movement. They were so sure of victory that they brought with them to the legislative assembly 20,000 leaflets saying: "The Zurich Labour Union has decided on the general strike. Workers do your duty!" Half an hour after the famous session of the Zurich Labour Union at which the general strike was decided upon, windows were flung open and the leaflets were showered on the 10,000 strong crowd waiting below. A thunderous shout of joy was the reply. On the day of the general strike there were no tramway cars, no vehicles, no motor cars, except the strike motor cars. This was the first practical application in Zurich and in Switzerland of a weapon of the Petersburg workers in 1905. On this memorable day, the power of the opportunist wing of the Social Democratic Party was broken. The leadership of the entire Zurich Labour movement slipped out of their hands.

The direct and indirect influence of members of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (Bolshevik) made itself felt already in connection with this event, and even more so in the period which followed. August 1914 was a trial by fire and the Zurich workers stood the test. At that time 40,000 Germans were domiciled in Zurich. The gentlemen in the German Consulate and in the Committee for "Bismark glorification and Sedan celebration" looked already upon the Zurich Canton as a German province and at the outbreak of war paraded the Bahnhofstrasse singing "Heil dir im Siegerkranz", "Deutschland, Deutschland über alles" and "Die Wacht am Rhein". It was not the Government nor the Municipal Council who put a stop to this patriotic exuberance, but again the Zurich workers who invited all the workers to make counter-demonstrations. The invitation alone sufficed, — to put an end to the national manifestations. The Zurich Labour Movement was undoubtedly under the firm leadership of revolutionary Marxist comrades. But the towns of Basle, Berne, and Schaffhausen came also gradually under the spell of this movement. In spite of the fanatic efforts of the opportunists, the Swiss Party voted for Zimmerwald and Kiental. In the midst of war, in 1918, the national general strike broke out which was carried out with admirable tenacity. The entire railway and postal traffic was paralysed. Post and telegraph workers went on strike, the industrial enterprises of the town came to a standstill, over 400,000 workers were out. After four days, the strike was broken off by the strike committee against the will of the workers. Thirty seven out of forty members voted for the cessation of the strike because of the alleged peril of

invasion by French troops. Grimm, Schneider and Phatten were against the cessation and became victims of military persecution. There was no doubt whatever that the Swiss labour movement was still very much under the influence of the revolution of 1905.

If Russia and Germany formerly gave prominent and capable revolutionists to Switzerland, the practice in the Swiss Labour movement was on the other hand, both for good and for evil, an excellent school. At the time of its establishment the Spartakus

Bund (Germany) had over 70% of former active workers in the Swiss labour movement among its members. Free as they were of nationalist prejudice, familiar with fraction struggles and with conspiracy methods, they were destined to pave the way for a Communist movement in Germany. The West-European revolutionary movement owes its existence and its spiritual equipment, to a far greater extent than it is generally suspected, to Russian influences and to the Russian Bolsheviks.

## The 1905 Revolution.

(Its Reasons, Course, Significance and Lessons.)

By N. Lensner.

### 1. Causes of the Revolution.

Twenty years ago a revolution took place in Russia, destined not only to become the "dress rehearsal" of October, but also the forerunner of the national revolutions of the Eastern countries, and a powerful stimulus to the class-struggle of the European proletariat. Already forty years ago the country, still feudal, experienced a revolution, bourgeois in its social-economic composition, but whose methods may be truly considered to have been proletarian.

In order to understand the revolution that took place, it is necessary to understand the following points:

1. Russia after the peasant reform of 1861 "freed" many peasants from the land and formed a great agrarian reserve army. It underwent a colossal industrial revolution, as a result of which entire industrial districts sprang up in the South (Donbas), Caucasus (Baku) and an industrial ring around both capitals (Petrograd and Moscow). During these 20 years (1897—1918) the number of workers increased from 1,300,000 to 2,700,000. Russian industry, which in the majority of instances was created with foreign loans or the resources of foreign industrialists, was equipped with the most up-to-date technique, and surpassed such countries as America and Germany by its high degree of concentration.

A relatively numerous working class, concentrated in the centre of Russia, was experiencing incredibly difficult economic and political conditions. Wages on an average were 15 roubles per month for a textile worker, 25 roubles per month for a metal worker (15 roubles for apprentices). Even according to the 1897 law, working hours were 11—12 per day but in reality were still longer. The 10 hour working day was a rare exception. Even in the opinion of bourgeois investigators the housing conditions of the Russian workers were terrible. Workers used to sleep on dining tables, several families in the same room. As the premises in most cases belonged to the factory owners, barrack discipline prevailed in most places (for instance, it was forbidden to receive visitors after certain hours). In the factory the worker was completely in the power of the boss. Numerous fins, roughness on the part of the foremen, the permanent threat of discharge for the slightest misdemeanour, and absolute lack of labour protection, the existence of paid and unpaid spies — such were the "labour" conditions of the workers. They were without protection before the law, and deprived of the most elementary forms of organisation (Trade Unions could not even be thought of). The factory owners, however, were organised in their unions and syndicates. The workers were deprived of elementary political rights, and of elementary political freedom. Was it surprising, then, that the labour movement in Russia immediately acquired a stormy character, that economic demands were interwoven with political demands, and that a Social Democratic Party was already formed after the first spontaneous outbreaks? Was it surprising that before the revolution (1902—1903) strike waves swept over Russia, unprecedented for their vigour in the whole of Europe. The attempts of tsarism to direct the labour movement along the desired channel ended in failure. The metal workers union organised by the Moscow gendarme Zubatoff for cultural-education purposes, with the object of detracting the workers' attention from politics, soon became the centre of economic class struggle with the bosses. The latter used their pressure for removing Zubatoff, and the working class went forward along its own path to ... revolution. When Zubatoff agents asked a workers' meeting in Odessa what they desired, "to break their heads against the wall, or to bore through it", they unanimously answered, "Break our heads!"

The extent of working class demands was characterised by the slogan for the 8-hour day. Such was the first prerequisite for the revolution.

2. Beneath the current of the labour movement there was a less powerful but much deeper current — that of the peasant movement. The peasant reform of 1861, which juridically liberated the peasantry, only aggravated their economic position. Firstly, by liberating the peasantry, the landowners "cut off" the best pieces of land for themselves and barred the peasants access to horsepods, fields and pasture land, etc... Secondly, the peasants had to render endless payments for their liberation; by 1902 they paid 1,400,000,000 roubles and had still to pay another 400,000,000 roubles. Thirdly, the land plots granted to the peasants by their former masters were reduced. On an average during the second half of the XIX century these holdings were reduced by not less than one third. Therefore, land shortage was one of the chief miseries of the peasantry. It is sufficient to say that in the black-soil region of Central Russia, from 44—1/2 million peasants only 11—1/2 million were provided with land. Extensive areas of land were at the disposal of the landowners. For instance, 30,000 large landowners owned 70,000,000 dessiatines of land, whereas 10—1/2 million peasant families owned only 75,000,000 dessiatines. This land shortage compelled the peasantry to obtain land from the landowners on lease. In a number of provinces this leasing was almost in the nature of servitude; the peasants paid the rent by working on the landowners' land, coming to work with their own implements (horses, etc...). This system of cultivating the landowners' land by way of payment was one of the worst forms of exploitation of the peasants. It was almost twice as cheap for the landowner, than voluntary hired labour.

In addition to the buying out payments already mentioned, insupportable taxes were added, levied on the peasants by the tsarist government, which wasted tremendous sums on tsarist estates, on the bureaucracy, the church, the army and in payment of foreign loans. In certain districts of the black-soil region, the total sum of all taxes and payments was five times in excess of the value of the land. The inevitable result of this condition of affairs was that there was a great accumulation of unpaid taxes which, despite the absolute robbery of the peasantry on the part of the tsarist tax collectors grew from 37,000,000 roubles (annually) at the end of the 19th century to 100,000,000 roubles (annually).

Feudal relations in the countryside may also be observed from the fact that communes existed. The commune attached the peasant to the village, making every peasant responsible for the non-payment of the taxes of the particular village to which he was attached. It would thus seem that this was a weapon of tsarist fiscal policy. The commune, holding up the development of capitalist relations in the countryside, if anything, was rather advantageous for the rich peasants, for with these communes, taxes were not progressive, and therefore the assessment on kulak farms amounted to only 1—1/2 per cent of the gross income, but more than 15% of the poor farmers.

All power in the provinces and countries belonged to the landowners. After the governor and the district police chief, the most important person was the "marshal of nobility". The judges were exclusively nobles. This system of landed nobility's power was supplemented by a system of education which handed the higher schools over to the clergy.

Peasant Russia was pregnant with inflammatory material. Its maladies could only be healed by confiscation of the landowners estates and the abolition of the relics of servitude in

the countryside (cultivating land to pay off landowners, communes, old holdings, etc.) and by abolishing the landowners' yoke and thus getting rid of the innumerable taxes. This programme for liberating the peasant could only be fulfilled by the destruction of the autocracy. Such was the second prerequisite for the revolution.

The peasantry itself attempted to solve this problem even before the 1905 revolution, by rebellions against individual landowners. The peasant movements in 1902 were the forerunners of a tremendous storm. A certain Voronezh landowner had good reason to write in 1901: "There is something which forebode evil in the air; every day the glow of fire may be seen on the horizon; a red mist covers the ground; it is difficult either to breathe or to live; just as before a storm. The mujiks sulk silently, and if they speak it makes one's flesh creep".

The above mentioned two prerequisites for the revolution also determined its historic nature and its driving forces. The revolution was bound to be a bourgeois-democratic one, for its tasks were:

1. To destroy the tsarist regime and establish power such as would secure for the toilers complete political freedom, and would secure, to use the words, of Lenin "a self governing people" and a radical agrarian revolution.

2. As we have already said the abolition of relics of servitude in the countryside and the transfer of the landowners' estates to the peasantry, the liberation of the countryside from innumerable payments.

3. The winning of normal labour conditions for the workers (under an order where hired labour still existed), in other words, conquest of the 8-hour day, the right of free coalition, organisation of labour protection, etc. . . .

After having fulfilled these tasks the revolution would still not be a socialist one. But these tasks could also only be fulfilled by those classes which were absolutely interested in them, i. e. the proletariat and the peasantry. These two classes were also the driving forces of the revolution.

To these mighty streams of the workers and peasants movement, the current of the opposition movement of the intellectuals had also to be added. Whereas the big industrial bourgeoisie were given considerable sops, and the revolution but confirmed this with the counter revolution — the extensive strata of the bourgeois intellectuals, above all the students, had every ground for being discontented with the order of boundless autocracy. The discontent of the students was particularly strikingly displayed in acts that were customary for that epoch terroristic acts against the tsarist bureaucrats. As the despotism of the autocracy was most of all personified in the eyes of the students by the Minister of Education and by the chiefs of the gendarmierie, the attack was directed against the latter. For instance, in 1901, the Minister of Education Bogolepoff was killed, and in 1902 the Minister for Home Affairs, Sipiagin, while in 1904 Plehve, the pillar of Romanoff reaction was assassinated.

This was the social atmosphere that existed at the commencement of the 20th century on the eve of the Russo-Japanese War. The war with Japan, commenced by tsarism with the intention, firstly, of procuring the rich regions of Manchuria and Korea for the Russian trading-industrial bourgeoisie, and dealers of the tsars Palace, and secondly, to drown the revolutionary movement in a wave of chauvinism, evoked by a victorious war, only succeeded in disintegrating the autocratic order. Within a few months, the Army suffered a number of general defeats, while the Navy lost two squadrons.

The fall of Port Arthur, the most important tsarist fortress in the Far East at the end of Decemebr 1904 was the last link in these defeats. The significance of the fall of Port Arthur was strikingly characterised by Lenin in the following phrase: "The capitulation of Port Arthur is the beginning of the capitulation of tsarism". Two or three weeks later came "Bloody Sunday".

### The Main Stages of the Revolution.

The first Russian revolution extended over a period of two years. January 9th (old style) 1905 marked its beginning, the end of 1905 its climax and the dissolution of the second Duma by Stolypin on June 3rd, 1907, its finish.

The revolution developed spasmodically. Stormy tides gave place to temporary ebbs. Separate currents of the revolutionary movement — workers, sailors, peasants, etc., at times merged together and more often followed one another. If we illustrate the process of revolutionary events in a schematic manner, we may observe the following nine stages of the revolution: 1. Janu-

ary 9th, 2. the Spring movement of 1905, 3. the temporary lull in the summer of 1905, 4. a new great revolutionary tide in October-December, 1905, 5. Ebb of the revolutionary wave at the beginning of 1906. 6. Another rise of the wave — although weaker than the former stages — of the mass movement in the second quarter of 1906. 7. The counter revolutionary offensive in the second half of 1906. 8. A new and final wave of the revolutionary movement still weaker and more short-lived, in the first quarter of 1907. 9. Dissolution of the second Duma and subsequent destruction of the revolutionary organisation.

1. January 9th arose directly from a movement that goes down into history as the "Gapon Movement". The secret police department, in its endeavour to paralyse the revolutionary movement of the working class, formed early in 1904 a special union "Meeting of Russian Factory Workers" in Petrograd, with the aid of its agent, the Priest Gapon. The object of this organisation is clearly illustrated in its constitution 1. "a sober and reasonable instruction of members during their spare time, which will be of real advantage to them both spiritually, morally and materially, 2. the instilling and fortifying of the spirit of Russian nationalism among the members".

But the class struggle has its laws, unperceived by the gendarmes. The Petersburg workers entered this Union in masses. It was the only primitive form of workers' union that existed and soon compelled the leaders of this union to stand at the head of the economic struggle. The turning point came when a conflict broke out at the Putilov works where three workers, who were members of the Gapon Union, were sacked on account of a row with the foreman. This conflict brought all the workers of Petersburg to their feet and became the central question at the meetings of the Gapon Union. The unyielding attitude of the Putilov management, Smirnov, which led to a strike at the factory, caused unprecedented excitement among the rank and file workers. In such a tense atmosphere Gapon's appeal to go to the Czar with a petition called forth great enthusiasm among the workers, "Let us go to the Little Father and tell him how these knaves of ours are tormenting us; we will say to him — Father, receive us, help us, help your children for we know you are glad to give your life for us and only live for us. But you know nothing about how we are beaten and tormented, about how we starve, and how being always tormented we are at the same time as ignorant as cattle and almost all illiterate". This spirit of naive faith in the Tsar, this naive belief that the czar's officials were robbing the people without his knowledge, also ran like a red thread through the famous petition which the Petersburg workers took to the Winter Palace on January 9th. Space only permits us to reproduce the most characteristic parts:

"Sire, we workers and inhabitants of St. Petersburg of various classes, our wives and children and helpless aged relative, have come to you, Sire, to seek the truth and your protection. Here we seek our last salvation. Do not refuse help to your people. Deliver them from the depths of justice, poverty and ignorance, give them the possibility of deciding their own destiny.

Free them from the insufferable yoke of the officials. Break down the wall that stands between you and your people, and let them rule the country together with you. You stand for the happiness of the people but the officials are trying to snatch this happiness from our hands.

. . . . Give orders and promise to execute our demands, and make Russia both happy and glorious, and your name will be imprinted in our hearts, and in the hearts of our sons for all eternity. If you do not so ordain if you do not accede to our prayer, we will die here on this square before your palace. We have nowhere else to go and nothing to go for. We have only two paths — either to freedom and happiness or to the grave. Let our lives be a sacrifice for suffering Russia. We do not regret the sacrifice, we will make it willingly."

The last words reflected the real mood of the masses. All the leaflets of the Petrograd Committee of the Bolsheviks could not prevent this terrible experience of the workers — the procession to the Tsar's Winter Palace. Despite the fact that this demonstration of tens of thousands of workers was met by large patrols from the very commencement, it proceeded without stopping, carrying standards and portraits of the Tsar and singing religious hymns, sanctifying his name. In another hour the streets of Petrograd were stained with the blood of the workers.

It is difficult to describe the revolution in thought caused by Bloody Sunday. One of Gapon's close collaborators, writes for instance that when the latter's supporters returned they were



convinced that an end had come to the Tsar and God... Old men who were formerly believers stamped on portraits of the Tsar and ikons and those who stamped and spat with the greatest gusto were they who formerly used to see that lamps were permanently burning before the ikons, and that they were always kept filled with oil".

On January 9th Gapon also underwent a temporary change. "We have no longer a Tsar. Rivers of blood have separated the Tsar from the people. Long live the struggle for freedom!" These words of Gapon, millions were now echoing. January 9th caused the first wave of strike protests. During January 1905 there was hardly one large workers' district where the proletariat did not organise mass strikes of class solidarity.

II. The following months represented the stormy period for the peoples' movement. The revolution grew more extensive and deeper. Those who had commenced the revolution in Petersburg went to the provinces, to the border countries and brought millions of workers, employees and artisans out on to the streets. They penetrated into the countryside, aroused the peasantry and led them on to smash up the landowners' estates.

The working class of Russia gave proof of miracles of energy, self-denial, heroism, patience and self-restraint. The number of strikers in 1905 exceeded the number of strikers in Germany and America tenfold. During the year 1905 alone there were 11 times more strikes than during the whole preceding 10 years. Political strikes were interwoven with economic strikes: side by side with the demand for the eight-hour day and wage increases, the strike slogans also called for a republic and the arming of the people. In 1905 the percentage of successful strikes was much higher than in Germany or other countries where the proletariat had already their strong trade unions for scores of years. Out of every 100 strikes, the workers won 24, while 47 ended in compromise with the bosses and only 29 were lost.

The strike wave drew all trades and districts of Russia into the movement. Printers (Bielostok, Kharkov, Poltava), shop assistants, who at first addressed a petition to the commercial town Duma and having seen the futility of the latter, resorted to a strike (Rostov, Nizhny-Novgorod, Ekaterinoslav), artisan workers (tailors, barbers), municipal workers, carters, all strata of the proletariat followed the example of the Petersburg metal workers. In the Caucasus the movement in the spring involved even domestic servants. Particular note should be made of the following episodes of this first revolutionary wave:

1. The strike of the Ivanovo-Voznessensk textile workers which lasted for more than a month and a half, was led by a specially elected delegate council. This strike, despite its unsuccessful results, was of tremendous revolutionary significance, having aroused the textile workers of the entire Central industrial region to the struggle.

2. Mass struggle in Poland, which, in Lodz, one of the main working class centres, led to a barricade struggle and succeeded in rallying together the proletariat of various nationalities.

3. Disturbances in Odessa, where the strike ended with a bloody collision with the police as a result of their provocative conduct. The events in Odessa should be noted particularly in view of the fact that they directly preceded the first rising of the Black Sea sailors on the famous warship "Potyomkin".

The wave of workers' strikes also swept over the countryside. During the first half of 1905 the first serious outbreaks took place in the Ukraine, and then spread to the Volga.

The peasant movement was in the main a movement of the poor and middle peasants, for it was just these elements which suffered most from land shortage, inability to pay rent, and from the system of working on the landowners' estates. The fury of the peasantry was mainly directed against the landowners' estates. The latter were either smashed up or set on fire. ("We will give the landowners a smoke.") The biggest disorders of all occurred in the central Black soil region where the peasants suffered most of all from land shortage and arrears of tax payment. In localities where certain kinds of agricultural factories existed, (Northern Caucasus, Western Ukraine, and the Western border countries), the main method of struggle was the strike. In the Ukrainian districts peasants even celebrated May 1st. In the Northern provinces the method most frequently resorted to was to cut down the woods. It was mainly the rich peasants who participated in this, as it was only they who had the means of carrying away the wood cut down in the landowners' corn-fields, by carrying away hay and straw and seizing land and woods.

In attacking the landowners, the peasants naturally came up against the local authorities. Therefore, the peasant revolts often

led to changes in the regime, and in the election of their own peasant committees, or the refusal to fulfill public obligations.

The peasant movement, despite its mass character, did not play such a role as the movement of the urban workers. The main reason for this lies in the fact that the peasants were not organised but were scattered in tens of thousands of villages. Peasant demands most frequently bore a local character. Having seized an estate and kicked out the village policeman, the village quieted down and sat peacefully at home, whereas in another county the troops dealt with the peasantry. Therefore, it was not surprising that it was very easy to suppress the peasant revolts with small detachments of troops.

But despite the lack of organisation and the scattered nature of the peasantry, their movement had tremendous significance as it showed that the countryside was commencing to rise up against the landowners and gendarmes and that with time it would resume with redoubled strength.

During the first half of 1905 there were already symptoms of disintegration in the ranks of tsarist armed forces. We allude to the rebellion on the Black Sea warship, "Potyomkin". The sailors, who were the most conscious and proletarian section of the Navy, in this revolutionary movement had all the more reason for rebelling against tsarist orders, which in the Navy were particularly severely felt, owing to the severe discipline, enforced by the aristocratic officers. The revolt of the "Potyomkin" took on a very serious character: a section of the Ship's Command was thrown into the sea and new commanders were elected from among the sailors. On June 14th a warship entered Odessa port flying the red flag. But in the subsequent trend of events, the chief shortcoming of the revolution became apparent: the absence of sufficient organisation, the lack of big leaders, which was expressed in the fact that the sailors were unable to assist the revolting workers in Odessa, and the latter to draw the sailors into the struggle. The end of the strike in Odessa, the decisive measures of the tsarist naval command in the struggle against "sedition on other ships" and the defection that began to take place among the higher command on the warship, compelled the "Potyomkin" to take to the open sea, and after a short while it surrendered to the Rumanian authorities in Constantza.

The revolutionary wave in the first half of 1905 was so strong that it swept with it also extensive strata of intellectuals. Engineers, doctors, lawyers, etc. now spoke the language of revolution. Before they were afraid to speak about the constitution, but now they demanded the convention of the Constituent Assembly, threatening... political strike. The "mutiny of the educational societies" went down in the history of the intellectual movement under this name.

III. The revolutionary wave in 1905 only flagged during one period — from July to September. The first wave proceeded mainly on the lines of the economic struggle. The revolution in October and December gained still more strength than at the commencement of 1905; its main resources were now the All-Russian mass strike, numerous armed attacks, increasingly frequent revolts, in the army, "red roosters" in the countryside — all these resources slackened temporarily during the autumn months and gathered forces for a further more powerful on-sweep. The autocracy endeavoured to utilise this lull and concluded the Portsmouth peace with the Japanese, demobilised the army, published a decree for the convention of a constitutional Duma to which only the landowners and bourgeoisie had the right of election... The peasantry also had electoral rights for this Duma, but in granting them this tsarism counted on splitting away the peasantry from the Revolution. In granting the franchise to nine and one half thousand out of the two million population of Petrograd, and to eleven thousand out of the one and a half million Moscow population, tsarism only pushed the urban petty-bourgeois strata in the camp of the revolution. It is not surprising that the reply to this decree was an appeal to boycott the new Duma not only on the part of Lenin, but also Milukov. It was only the Mensheviks Martov, Axelrod, and Dan, true to their opportunistic nature, who opposed this boycott. It is worth remarking that the Bolshevik attitude on this question not only met with the support of Rosa Luxemburg, but also of Kautsky and Bebel.

IV. But tsarism only succeeded in announcing the summoning of the Bulygin Duma\*) Subsequent events compelled it

\*) This stillborn Duma was named the Bulygin Duma because the Tsar's decree was issued in the name of the Minister for Home Affairs, Bulygin.

to forget the Duma projects. The new revolutionary wave received its stimulus from Moscow. At the end of September, the printers struck in Moscow and at the commencement of October, the railwaymen on the Moscow lines left off work in response to rumours that were circulating as to the arrest of the Railwaymen's Mutual Aid Society Congress which had passed a resolution... on political liberties. After the Moscow workers, the railwaymen of nearly all lines struck work.

The All-Russian Railway strike which broke out for the first time after the nine months of revolution, signified a new and further mighty impetus to the revolutionary tide. This strike roused the entire working class of Russia. During the first quarter of 1905 810,000 workers were on strike, and the number of strikers during the October-December period reached 1,277,000. Whereas the number of participants in the economic strikes during the first quarter of the year was three times the number of participants in the political, now the picture was just the reverse. The number of participants in political strikes was double the number of participants in economic strikes.

The October strike was the climax in the rise of the revolutionary wave. There was not a town, not a large factory which did not stop working and demand the overthrow of the autocracy.

"The strike was not restricted to the railways. It was striving to become a general strike. Having let off steam and put out the station lights, the strikers with a crowd of railway workers went into the town, held up the tramways, carriage horses and turned the passengers out, closed shops, restaurants, cafes, and inns and confidently approached the doors of the factories. There they were already awaited. Alarm whistles were given, work ceased, and the crowd in the streets at once began to grow. It proceeds further and already carries the Red Flag. The banners proclaim that the crowd desires the Constituent Assembly and a Republic, that it is fighting for Socialism.

"The movement brings all resources into action: it appeals, it persuades, it adjures, it prays on its knees, — as a woman speaker once did in Moscow on the platform of the Kursk railway station — it threatens, terrifies, throws stones, and finally fires from a browning. It wants to achieve its object at all costs. It lays too great a wager. An entire class accepts it, and if an insignificant section of it, perverted by those against whom it is fighting, stand in its path, is it not wise to thrust the obstacle aside with a rough kick." (Trotzky, "1905".)

The October strike gave birth to a new type of organisation in the history of the labour movement — the **Soviet of Workers deputies**, after which sprang up the Soviets of soldiers deputies, peasant committees, etc.

The first of these to spring up was the Petersburg Soviet, on October 13th\*). Within a few days this Soviet became the acknowledged leader of the masses of the people. Tradesmen, cab drivers, and intellectuals all obeyed its orders, and those factories and workshops not yet on strike closed down.

The endeavours of tsarism to paralyse the revolution by means of introducing "freedom" in its manifesto of October 17th, only increased the influence of the Soviets. This manifesto was correctly estimated as being a sign of the weakness of tsarism, expressed by the way, in the appointment of the disgraced Count Witte as Prime Minister reputed to be a liberal bureaucrat. The end of October and the first half of November marked the apotheosis in the activity of the Soviets. The Soviet issued the slogan of an independent introduction of the eight-hour working day by the workers themselves. Soviet control of the work of the post and telegraph at the end of November even brings about (not without success) a boycott of the tsarist financial institution. The Petrograd Soviet became the revolutionary centre of the whole country, a kind of **second government**.

The Petrograd Soviet grew up out of the All-Russian October strike, but a strike cannot last for months. It is destined to arouse the masses. The actual overthrow of the autocracy could only be done by an **armed rising**. The Petrograd Soviet did not set itself the task of organising this rising, and therein lies one of the direct reasons for its fall. The Petrograd Soviet did not set itself this task because its leading group consisted of Mensheviks who all the time were trying to sit on two stools, the stool of revolutionary local self-government and that of the revolutionary government.

Meanwhile, the strike struggle already in the first half of November began to devolve into a cul de sac, while in the second half of November it clearly commenced to decline. The lockouts on the part of the owners, who undertook an attack on the eight-hour day resulted in the exhaustion of the proletarian forces. At the end of November the Government already found it possible to arrest the chairman of the Soviet — Khrustalov, and at the commencement of December, arrested the entire Soviet.

After the Petrograd workers had been smashed the centre of the revolution was transferred to Moscow. This was rendered favourable owing to the fact that by the end of 1905 the textile workers of the Moscow district were only just being brought into the struggle and therefore their revolutionary energy was not expended to the extent of the Petrograd workers. To this must be added the fact that in Moscow the garrison was more democratic in its composition, and more sympathetic to revolution. The distintegration of this garrison in November already went so far that the soldiers, who stood on guard at the factories, openly said to the workers "No sooner will you rise than we will also rise up and open the arsenals for you". On December 4th even a Soviet of soldier's deputies sprang into being.

Unfortunately for the revolution this discontent among the garrison came to a head too soon, — just a few days before the workers' insurrection: at the end of November mutinies took place in certain regiments. The officers succeeded in disarming them, in shutting the mutineers up in the barracks and thus **depriving the future workers' insurrection of a powerful ally**. This rising broke out on December 7th. On December 4th news was received of the dissolution of the Petrograd Soviets, on the 6th a general strike was declared, and on the 7th fighting with the troops commenced.

As distinct from Petersburg, the Moscow Soviet led by Bolsheviks, was able to arm a section of the workers even in the preceding months, and to form a centre of the insurrection in the form of a committee which contained in addition to Bolsheviks also railwaymen and S. R. s. The heroic struggle of the Moscow proletarians continued for more than one week. Several hundreds of workers' detachments fought against several thousand well-armed tsarist troops. Particular heroism was displayed by the Krassnays Pressnays, the main working class district in Moscow. The entire district was enclosed by barricades; and it would have been uncertain as to how the struggle would finish had not admiral Ubasov, commander-in-chief of the Moscow troops received **reinforcements from Petersburg**. In this respect the weakness of the revolution made itself felt: in the first place since the workers of Petersburg had been outnumbered and beaten and could not assist Moscow, tsarism sent detachments of guards.

The Petersburg and Moscow Soviets were no isolated instances. The October strike led to the formation of Soviets of workers' deputies in many workers' centres. These included Rostov, Odessa, Baku, Samara, Novorossisk, Nikolaevsk, etc. The only exceptions were the Western and border lands (Poland etc.) where the labour movement was exclusively under the influence and leadership of Social Democracy, and did not feel such a need for organisations like the Soviets as the rest of Russia. The December rising in Moscow had repercussions in many towns (Rostov) where an armed struggle between the proletariat and the tsarist authorities took place.

In many towns the Soviets were real organs of **People's power** during the November-December period. "In Rostov for instance, people began to apply to the Soviets for the solution of nearly all housing questions. The radical bourgeoisie, having organised into their intellectual unions, announced their desire to enter the Soviet. The old authorities were silenced, but felt that they still existed". In December, Rostov had had just the same experiences as Moscow. In the working class districts, workers' detachments reigned supreme, while at the centre the old authorities. Only the victory of tsarism in Moscow undermined the fighting spirit of the workers and brought the down fall of the workers in Rostov.

The activity of the Novorossisk\*) Soviet was still more striking. In November a Novorossisk Republic was declared. Supported by the armed workers, the Soviet drove out the former authorities — the Governor chief of police, etc. and replaced them by their own representatives. The Soviet established the most capable political freedom. In the economic field the Soviet adopted

\*) All dates, old style.

\*) Novorossisk is a port on the Caucasian Coast on the Black Sea.

the principle of public aid to the unemployed and assessed the bourgeoisie—people receiving incomes of 1000—2000 roubles per year, paying 2½% and those receiving more paying 4%. Workers' detachments were sent out against all resisters. Revolutionary order was enforced by 500 workers' guards and only the break-up of the rising in Moscow and Rostov led to the smashing of the Novorossisk Republic which lasted for more than one month.

In other large towns, such as Baku, Odessa, etc., the Soviets did not play such an important role, for the Mensheviks who dominated them did not decide on such definite measures as in Novorossisk. The role of such Soviets did not extend much beyond that of strike committees.

**October—December 1905**, was a period of ascendancy not only of the labour movement. During these months, a new wave of the peasants' movement surged up. During a very short period the peasants destroyed more than 2000 of the landowners' estates. In November sailors rebellions also broke out in Sevastopol and Kronstadt. The former movement was led by the non-Party Lieutenant Schmidt. But in both cases the absence of firm political leadership and contact with the labour movement led to a suppression of the movement.

The peasant movement and the sailors' rebellion were certainly indications as to how the depth of the penetration of the revolution was. However, they were not sufficiently powerful to support the workers' revolution. And the lack of agreement with the labour movement led to tsarism being able to smash both the working class and the peasantry in turn.

The overthrow of the Petersburg Soviet, the Moscow and other risings already meant a **decisive turning point** in the process of revolution. For the time being, tsarism proved to be stronger than the proletariat. After December 1905 an ebb commenced in the revolution. Small temporary rises in the revolution did not change the trend of events.

The first quarter of the year 1906 showed a sharp decline in the activity of the working class. But the entire year 1906 in general disclosed the same state of affairs. In 1905, about 3 million workers struck altogether, while in 1906 only just over one million. In 1905 it was the Moscow and Petersburg districts which mainly went on strike. In 1906 the strikes took place most often in the provinces. In 1916 the number of strikers in the Petersburg district was almost 4 times less than in 1905: in Moscow this figure fell more than threefold. In 1905 from January to the following months the number of strikers increased, while in 1906 we had a completely opposite picture. In 1905 the metal workers played the main part in the strike movement, as they were the most conscious and fighting section of the proletariat. In 1906 the textile workers assumed this leading role. The textile workers were not so advanced in their literacy and development as the metal workers, who had long ago broken with the countryside. The results of the 1906 strikes were less favourable for the workers than in 1905. Simultaneously the government smashed up workers organisations everywhere, suppressed workers' papers, and arrested thousands of Socialists and revolutionary non-Party workers.

The second quarter of 1906 was characterised by a certain rise in the mass movement. The proletariat, which in December 1906 had not been smashed but had only retreated from fighting — attempted to start a new offensive. It is true that its attack was not so strong as in 1906. But nevertheless, the awakening of the mass movement produced conditions for the convention of the first State Duma, for the appearance of new workers' newspapers, trade-unions, etc. The reason for this "deference" on the part of tsarism is explained by the fact that the second quarter of 1906 coincided with an increase in the onslaught of the peasant movement, which was the most powerful during the whole process of the revolution. Whereas in the autumn of 1905 one third of the counties in Russia "revolted" now the movement embraced a half of the counties. The rise of the peasants found its repercussion among the peasant elements of the Petersburg garrison. But these movements were doomed to failure in advance, insofar as the main herald of the revolution — the proletariat was already worn out and was not in a condition to enter upon a new wave of armed risings. The tsarist regime suppressed the peasants movement with unprecedented cruelty. "Blood is flowing all around us, everything is wrapped in flames, we smash, we cut, we shoot" — that is how a certain officer described this bloody vengeance upon the peasantry.

The decline of the revolutionary wave in the second half of 1906, at once led to the dissolution of the first Duma and to a wave of White Terror. It became more and more clear the revolu-

tionary ebb would be continuous. The Bolsheviks who had called for a boycott of the Duma (not without success) now decided to utilise the elections to the Second Duma for the purpose of revolutionary agitation. This was all the more successful insofar as the first quarter of 1907 — during which the election campaign for the Duma was conducted — was characterised by a certain reviving of the labour movement by an increase of strikes, and by the appearance of new trade unions etc. Despite the merciless curtailment of the workers' franchise, the uninterrupted terror, the elections to the second Duma ended in the disgrace of tsarism. The second Duma proved to be "redder" in its composition than the first one. There were more than 50 Social Democrats alone, but the new Duma did not have such great support among the mass movement as was the case in 1906. The wave of strikes in 1907 did not last for long. Therefore, already on June 3rd, the Government, headed by Stolypin, dissolved the Duma. An epoch of reaction, terror and merciless struggle against the revolutionary movement commenced. After the events of June 3rd, 1907, the mass movement did not revive until in 1912.

### Causes of the Defeat of the Revolution.

The first Russian Revolution despite all the heroism and stubborn struggle put up by the people, suffered defeat. What were the main causes of this defeat?

Firstly, these causes should be sought for in the lack of unity between the workers and peasants movements. This disunity was most clearly reflected in the conduct of the army, which on the whole remained neutral, but to a certain extent even fulfilled the role of strangling the revolution. The overwhelmingly greater part of the army however, was composed of young peasants. In 1917 the position was just the reverse, then the conduct of the Petrograd garrison decided the fate of Tsarism.

This disunity between the workers and peasants movement was also demonstrated by the fact that the apex of these movements did not coincide. Whereas the climax in the worker's movement occurred at the end of 1905, that of the peasant rising took place in the spring of 1906. The peasantry was unable to organise their movement by the time the decisive struggle between tsarism and the working class was taking place.

The fact cannot, of course, be overlooked that Social Democracy as leader of the proletariat, had not been sufficiently active and effective in linking up the slogans of struggle of both workers and peasants. The slogan of nationalising the land for instance, mainly belonged to the petty-bourgeois S. R. Party. These errors become comprehensible if we remember that at that time the Mensheviks were almost as strong as the Bolsheviks and their tactics by no means amounted to forming an alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry.

Secondly, the weakness of the revolution lay in the domination of an element of spontaneity in the labour movement of that time, and inadequate guidance of the movement on the part of the Social Democratic Party, the exclusive domination of the Mensheviks in the various working class centres (Petrograd, Odessa, and to a certain extent Rostov, etc.). Working class organisations (trade unions, Soviets, etc.) were now already being formed in the very thick of the fight between Tsarism and the proletariat. The idea of "organising the revolution", the idea of the "armed rising", which Lenin had so persistently preached since the time of the January disturbances, did not become general owing to the domination of the theory of spontaneity of the mass movement in the other camp of Social Democracy. Hence the Menshevik viewpoint met with success for a certain period in view of the fact that nearly the whole of 1905 was a period of uninterrupted strike waves. But in November-December, when the strike movement culminated in a blind alley, life itself spurred on the workers to armed insurrection. But now it was too late since all energy had been expended and the working class was not ready for the armed struggle, and the leading groups were also unprepared for this struggle.

Thirdly, tsarism received support — either direct or indirect from — both the Russian and foreign bourgeoisie. The treacherous role of the bourgeoisie was clear for instance during the lockout of the Petrograd workers in November 1905, at the height of the struggle of the Soviet against Tsarism. These tactics on the part of the factory owners brought disintegration into the vacillating ranks of the workers and was a stab in the back to the whole working class army of Petrograd. In Moscow also, during the December insurrection, the Moscow merchants and factory owners, headed by Gutchkov, formed a special council at the disposition of Admiral Dubassev

to give moral and material aid in the task of suppressing the rising.

The liberal Party of constitutional democrats (Cadets) as far as their forces would allow them, endeavoured to spread among the masses the illusion of constitutional victory over tsarism just at a moment when it was necessary to overthrow the autocracy. The first Duma, in which the Cadets were in the majority, helped the tsar to receive a loan abroad, and thus strengthened the force of tsarism.

The support of foreign capital for the Russian counter-revolution proved to be more active than that of the European proletariat for the revolution. Foreign capital was directly interested in preserving tsarism, for the latter favoured the penetration of foreign capital into Russia, maintained slavish labour conditions which brought colossal surplus profit to French, Belgian and other capitalists. On the other hand foreign capital was interested in preserving the autocracy just as a creditor, the life of a debtor. The assistance rendered by foreigners, in the main French capitalists, was very considerable. Tsarism received nearly 1 milliard roubles. With this sum it was able to restore the standard of the rouble and at the same time remove the threat of soaring prices and thus temporarily relieve the pressure on the peasants' pocket, or in other words remove a number of pretexts for mass discontent.

### III. Bolshevism and Menshevism in the 1905 Revolution.

Up to the 1905 revolution the differences between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks were mainly of an organisational nature. The 1905 revolution fully brought out all revolutionary problems and demanded clear solutions for all strategical and tactical problems of the revolutionary struggle. The 1905 revolution created a gulf between Bolshevism and Menshevism.

Firstly, their estimations of the driving forces of the revolution were sharply opposed to one another. The strategical plan of struggle was quite different. The Mensheviks, basing their arguments on an appreciation of the Russian revolution as a bourgeois revolution, put forward the following strategic plan: The bourgeoisie is conducting a struggle against Tsarism, supported and egged on by the proletariat. In the event of victory, political power will pass into the hands of the bourgeoisie, and the proletariat will obtain definite political and economic liberties. Social Democracy throughout the whole period of the revolution is simply an opposition party. Participation in the government is impermissible as it would be opportunist and is contrary to the decisions of the Amsterdam Congress.

The Russian revolution — replied the Bolsheviks, is a bourgeois revolution in its social-economic composition, because it is first and foremost an agrarian revolution. But its driving forces are not the bourgeoisie, but the proletariat and peasantry, for the bourgeoisie is incapable of conducting a struggle for the confiscation of the land, it is disadvantageous to the bourgeoisie to destroy the tsarist apparatus of oppression, the bourgeoisie fears the people more than the tsar, the bourgeoisie will betray the revolution at the most critical moment. The great task of the bourgeois revolution — the confiscation of the landowners' land, the abolition of autocracy and the conquest of the eight-hour day, can only be fulfilled by an alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry establishing a democratic dictatorship, or in other words, by the creation of a new revolutionary régime.

This victory will be a dictatorship. In other words, it must inevitably be based on armed force, on the armed masses, on an insurrection and not on one or other kind of institution formed by "legal" or "peaceful methods". This can only be a dictatorship because the setting up of the new governmental forms, necessary and essential for the proletariat and peasantry, evokes the desperate resistance of the landowners, the powerful bourgeoisie and tsarism. Without the dictatorship, it is impossible to break down this resistance, and impossible to withstand counter-revolutionary attempts. (Lenin.)

Social Democracy is obliged to participate in this government of democratic dictatorship, for such a government grows out of the very womb of the revolution and has nothing in common with the capitalist, bourgeois governments of Europe. The hegemony of the revolution does not belong to the bourgeoisie but to the proletariat. The strategic plan is: "The proletariat must carry the democratic revolution right through to the end in alliance with the peasant masses, in order to break the forces of resistance of autocracy and paralyse the vacillation of the bourgeoisie. The proletariat must bring about a Socialist upheaval,

ally itself with the mass of semi-proletarian elements of the population, in order to break the force of resistance of the bourgeoisie and paralyse the vacillation of the peasantry and petty-bourgeoisie." (Lenin.)

Secondly, there were profound differences in the appreciation of the agrarian programme on the part of both fractions. The Mensheviks stereotyped the Russian revolution, and brought to the fore a point common to all former revolutions — the transition of political power to the bourgeoisie. They regarded the agrarian question more as a problem of the Socialist revolution\*) Unlike the Bolsheviks, they under-estimated the extent of the agrarian revolution as the main spring of the 1905 revolution. Hence also their underestimation of the dimensions of the political revolution. It is well known that the programme of municipalising the land put forward by the Mensheviks was mainly based on the thesis of the reactionary nature of the central authorities, and the democratic nature of the local organs.

Thirdly, this difference in the strategic plan pre-determines the distinction in tactics. Let us take the main points:

a) When, for instance, autocracy published the decree on the Bulygin Duma, the Bolsheviks called upon the people to declare boycott and link up the latter with the slogan for an armed rising. The Mensheviks opposed the boycott and put forward the vague idea of "independent" elections as a result of which they imagined a People's Duma would ensue. Lenin correctly characterised this plan of "People's" elections, under the autocratic order as an example of constitutional illusions.

b) The differences of opinion with regard to the Soviets were still more characteristic, for the Mensheviks' Soviets were simply a form of self-government under the bourgeois régime, a supplement to the latter. Being opposed to the establishment of the democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants, the Mensheviks naturally had to oppose the transformation of the Soviets into organs of power.

For the Bolsheviks, who as far back as their May Congress adopted the slogan of the Revolutionary Provisional Government, the Soviets actually were the inaugural organs of the People's power, the State form of the democratic dictatorship. In 1906 Lenin visualised in the Soviets a new form of people's power. "This power is open for all, everything it does can be seen by the masses, it is accessible to the masses, and has its direct origin in the masses. It is the direct and indirect organ of the masses of the people and of their will," wrote Lenin in his famous pamphlet: "The Victory of the Cadets and the Task of the Workers' Party."

c) The discussions arising from the December rising show that even in 1906 the Mensheviks had lost their revolutionary instinct. The appreciation of the results of the rising was given by the Mensheviks in Plekhanov's famous phrase "We should not have resorted to arms". Later, this same thesis runs through the work of the Mensheviks Cherevanin and others. It would appear that Menshevism condemned the insurrection, and was consistent after its own fashion insofar as it opposed the democratic dictatorship. But in doing so the Mensheviks actually denied the entire revolutionary struggle, for the rising was an inevitable grande finale to the ten months strike struggle and the only way of facing the question. It was either a case of struggle to a victorious end, which meant an insurrection, or else the struggle should not have been commenced in general.

The Bolsheviks took quite a different stand. For them December was the apex of the proletarian struggle. Lenin reproached the Party only because of its bad leadership of the rising and weak preparatory work. Lenin only criticised the tactical errors during the rising especially the lack of audacity in attacking the enemy. Lenin taught the Bolsheviks the necessity of an exhaustive study of December with respect to the utilisation of barricades, the role of artillery, etc. and instilled belief in the imminence of the future insurrection.

In short the Mensheviks calculated the results of this heroic insurrection just like Philistines, whereas the Bolsheviks treated it as commanders, responsible for the struggle to the million strong army of toilers.

d) The defeat of the December rising robbed the Mensheviks of the last remnants of their revolutionary instinct, therefore, it was sufficient for autocracy to hold out a bait and summon the

\*) The material published in No. 3 of the Leninist collection on the discussion of the agrarian programme of 1903 brings out this point very clearly.

first Duma, and the Mensheviks at once caught in the net and fell victims to constitutional illusions. Their tactical plan amounted to the following: the Duma must become the leader of the masses. The object of the struggle should now be to form a Ministry responsible to the Duma. Within the Duma itself the Social Democrats should support the Cadet majority. This tactical plan transformed the working class into a political supplement for the bourgeoisie. Therefore, it was natural that the Bolsheviks submitted this plan to the most merciless criticism. The Cadet Duma incapable of fighting, did not desire a struggle, for the bourgeoisie feared the revolution more than counter-revolution. The Duma ministry was simply a comedy insofar as the tsarist rule existed side by side. The Menshevik policy was nothing but deception of the people and treachery to the revolution. The method of struggle ought not to be the Duma, but the mass movement, the armed insurrection. The leader of the people is not the Duma but the proletariat. The object of the struggle is not a Cadet ministry but a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

It is interesting to note that these tactical disputes in 1906 resulted in the workers leaving the Mensheviks.

e) What was the outcome of the 1905 revolution for the Mensheviks and for the Bolsheviks. The Mensheviks had already collapsed at that time as a Party of the Revolution. Even then they showed that they were only capable of one thing, and that was to follow at the tail of the bourgeoisie. And with the Bolsheviks we find that just the opposite was the case. During the process of the revolution, during the period following December, they proved themselves to be a Party striving to bring about the hegemony of the proletariat, to struggle mercilessly against all attempts of the bourgeoisie to deceive the people and to divert them from the task of overthrowing autocracy.

What was the attitude of European Social Democracy towards the discussions within the Russian Social Democratic Party? Here it is interesting to observe the decisive moral support given by the European reformists to the Mensheviks. At the same time it is equally interesting to note the agreement in the estimate of the nature of the motive forces of the revolution and of the various tactical campaigns of the Bolsheviks on the part of the revolutionary European Social Democracy, above all the Germans, in the person of Rosa Luxemburg, Kautsky, and others.

The European Reformists such as Jaurès in France, Bernstein and the editors of the "Sozialistische Monatschrift" in Germany, etc. just like the Mensheviks stereotyped the bourgeois revolution in Russia (forgetting its historical peculiarities) operated with abstract formulae, did not analyse concrete conditions, referring to the general formulae of Marxism. Bernstein for instance, (see "Soz. Monat. 1906, pp. 289—295) on the assumption that according to Marxism political institutions are determined by economic development, arrived at the conclusion that the economic development in Russia is such that the proletariat in Russia cannot become the Ruling class even with the aid of the peasantry, which taken as a whole, "must be considered as a highly unreliable political ally."

The reformists represented the bourgeoisie as being the motive force of the revolution, saw the object of the revolution in the establishment of bourgeois power, and considered proletarian support for the bourgeois to be a definite pre-requisite for the whole Social Democratic tactics\*). They thought it the height of doctrinairism to discuss whether the Cadet Party represented the large bourgeoisie, they considered the tactics which rejected unity with Cadets\*\*) as being simply child's play.\*\*\*

They openly declared (see "Soz. Monat." 1906, Vol. II, 3645) that the Cadet agrarian programme was nearer to Social Democracy than the S. R. programme. The Bernsteinites dismissed the peasantry as allies of the revolution. What is more, Kautsky, for instance, openly reproached the reformist editors of the "Vorwaerts" with fearing the peasant's insurrection\*\*\*).

We see the same affinity between the Reformists and the Mensheviks on various tactical questions. The Bernsteinites for instance condemned the December rising, and considered it exclusively as being the defeat of the proletariat, reproaching the

Russian Social Democrats for deciding on the rising without having sufficient prerequisites and mainly that the rising almost drove the liberals into the arms of reaction. At the same time the Bernsteinites christened the first Duma as the "New era in the history of the liberation movement in Russia\*) and considered it a crime to boycott it.

In view of this question it is not surprising that the Reformists met the victory of the Bolsheviks at the Fifth (London) Congress of the RSDLP. with very wry faces.

Revolutionary Social Democracy in general took up a position near to the Bolsheviks. This is true above all in respect to Kautsky, although the latter is now proving at all street corners that he was against the Bolsheviks as far back as 1905. The Russian proverb "What is written with the pen cannot be undone" is very appropriate in this case. "The reply to Pleckhanov", "Revolutionary Perspectives", "The Agrarian Question in Russia", and the Foreword to "Ethics" as well as scores of articles in "Neue Zeit" and other journals — all this still remains. And what do we read in these works?

Firstly, a concrete analysis of classes in Russia, the recognition of the agrarian problem as the pivot of the revolution.

Secondly, the denial of liberalism as the driving force of the revolution, for liberalism subsists on the landowners, the recognition of the proletarian hegemony in the revolution, the recognition of the peasantry as a true ally of the revolution and propaganda of the idea of the workers and peasants alliance as a guarantee of the victory of the revolution.

Thirdly, recognition of the necessity of a struggle for power for the workers and peasants, the adoption of a programme the kernel of which is the confiscation of the landed estates and even the nationalisation of the railways, mines, etc.

Fourthly a revolutionary attitude in respect of various tactical problems such for instance as a) defence of the boycott of the Bulygin Duma, b) recognition of the historical significance of the December rising and the necessity to reconsider views as to the role of the barricade, c) defence of boycott tactics in the elections to the First Duma, d) defence of refusal of coalition with Cadets.

Thus, Kautsky, in the better days of his revolutionary activity supported the view point of the Bolsheviks. Then the mensheviks had good reason to Polemize with Kautsky. If Kautsky is so forgetful, we may remind him that the article of Martoff in the collection "Repercussions" where the latter proved the capitulation of Kautsky before the Bolsheviks, attempts to prove the lack of foundation for Kautsky's belief in the stability of the Union between the proletariat and the peasantry after the victory.

History we know, has justified Kautsky's "belief" and not that of Martoff. And it is only Kautsky himself who has renounced his belief in the victory of the workers and peasants' alliance.

#### Historical Significance of 1905 Revolution.

The first Russian revolution was stangled by tsarism. But the victory of tsarism was a Pyrrhic victory, for the 1905 revolution played a tremendous role in the subsequent victorious struggle of the Russian proletariat and the International revolutionary movement.

#### Direct Achievements of the Revolution.

The 1905 revolution, despite its temporary defeat was such an onslaught on the stronghold of autocracy that the latter was even then compelled to make a number of substantial concessions. A clear instance of this was the State Duma, which may be correctly termed an offspring of the revolution. During a period of two years Tsarism had to tolerate political freedom. One of the historical results of the revolution was the appearance of Trade Unions, which were impossible before 1905, but which in 1907 included up to 200,000 organised workers and employees. The powerful strike wave of 1905-6 compelled the employers to curtail the working hours. Many categories of workers secured a 9 hour working day, while as a general rule the working day was curtailed to 10 hours. At the same time a definite increase of wages was granted. For instance an average worker received an annual wage of 213 roubles 92 copeks in 1904 and 231 r. 69 k. in 1906.

\*) The French Reformists were so eager to defend the idea of coalition with bourgeois Parties that even Dan was compelled to polemic with them at the commencement of 1905 and to cool their ardour somewhat.

\*\*) See article by Gumplovitch "The Russian Autocracy and the Revolution"

\*\*\*) See "Neue Zeit", Vol. I. 1904—5. "Soz. Monat" 1906, Vol. I.

\*) See "Die Duma und die Sozialisten", "Soz. Monat." 1906, Vol. I.

During the years of the revolution the workers recognised the value of labour democracy in the factories and workshops. The revolution originated the institution known as Factory Delegates. It was naturally stamped out by the reaction but the revolutionising effect it had on the minds of the workers was noticeable during the second revolution.

The peasant revolution compelled the landowners to lower rents and to increase the wages of farm labourers, thereby in the black-soil region alone saving 25 million roubles per year. Autocracy was compelled to abandon a section of the mortgage payments and arrears. The biggest result of the revolution was the refusal of tsarism to approve the system of communes, and the attempt to divide them up into farms among the richer peasants, and thus securing the social support of the latter. This policy did not save tsarism, but rather played its part in dislocating the old servitude relations in the countryside.

### 1. The 1905 Revolution, the "Dress Rehearsal of October".

The whole world was astounded at the amazing energy and consciousness of the toilers of Russia in 1917 and by the gigantic success achieved by the Bolsheviks during the period February—October 1917. A country which some 50 years back had been feudal, afterwards became the first Soviet Republic in the world. It is impossible to understand this unprecedented success in the struggle of a young class in the whole of history, without considering the role of 1905 as the historic introduction to the October Revolution.

What did the first revolution do?

Firstly it brought millions into the movement. During its process the widest strata of the toiling masses received a sound revolutionary tempering. "The real training of the masses can never be separated from an independent, political and in particular, revolutionary struggle of the masses. Only the struggle trains the exploited classes, only the struggle discloses to them the real extent of their strength, extent of their aspirations, increases their capability, clarifies their minds, and forges their will" (Lenin).

For a year or two political freedom in Russia had been won; freedom of meeting, of Unions, of the press. Throughout the immense territory of Russia the masses rose up against tsarism; the workers, the farm labourers, the sailors, the peasants. The mass movement of the latter was particularly remarkable. The peasant movement of 1905-6 which spread to almost half of the counties throughout the entire country was the first big movement during 125 years after the famous Pugatchoff rebellion. The revolution planted the spirit of revolt into such backward strata of the people as the wachmen, cab drivers and policemen. The revolution witnessed mass meetings of the latter: The revolution aroused millions of small nationalities against the Great Russian tyrant. These included the Poles, Jews, Finns, Letts and others: The revolution demonstrated the tremendous revolutionary self-restraint, enthusiasm, self-sacrifice, and astonishing solidarity of the toilers. The strikes lasted for weeks, strikes broke out as a sign of solidarity with the sailors rising and as a mark of protest against the oppression of small nationalities. Small groups of armed workers resisted the regular tsarist troops for whole weeks.

Could tsarism strangle such a movement once and for all? Of course it could not. This "revolt" of millions could be suppressed for the time being, but 1905 signalled the inevitability of the approaching collapse of tsarist Russia.

Secondly, the revolution divided up Russia into two camps. On the one side were the toilers, while on the other side there were the tsar, the landowners and the bourgeoisie. Having compelled the bourgeoisie to make a bargain with tsarism, the revolution at the same time disclosed the counter-revolutionary nature of the bourgeoisie and thus undermined the slightest possibility of the bourgeoisie deceiving the masses of the people which is such a frequent phenomenon in the West. At the same time the revolution pushed forward the proletariat as leader of the workers and peasants bloc. After the 1905 revolution, discussion as to who could be the leader of the people (the proletariat or the bourgeoisie) in the struggle against tsarism became absolutely ludicrous. The revolution brilliantly justified Leninist strategy based on the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry.

Thirdly, the revolution was accompanied by an unprecedented increase in the degree of organisation of the toilers. Up to 1905 not only the peasantry, but the workers also were deprived of the most elementary forms of organisation. Here also the revolution opened very extensive possibilities. During the years 1905—7 the most varied trades formed their own professional organisation. At the end of 1905 in Petrograd alone 40 Trade Unions sprung up and in Moscow more than 50. More than 209,000 organised Trade Union workers — such was the result of the revolution. The reaction that followed, only temporarily destroyed these organisations. The peasants formed their own organisations — peasant unions, which at one time grew unusually rapidly. Despite the short duration of the revolutionary wave, these unions were able to unite into an All-Russian centre.

A still clearer proof of the growth in the degree of organisation of the masses was the growth of party membership. Before the revolution the Social Democratic Party was more a Union of revolutionary intellectuals, than a workers' party as to composition. The revolution abruptly changed this state of affairs. The Social Democratic Party became a real proletarian party. At its Fifth Congress held in 1907, 150,000 members were represented, a figure which could only be compared with that of the German Social Democrats who had 15 years of legal work behind them. This growth of Party membership among the peasantry was in the first place expressed in the entry of advanced peasants into the S.D. Party in certain provinces (Curland, Latvia, etc) and secondly by the growth of the S.R. Party, thirdly in the appearance of the "Trudoviks" and of the Duma Parties who mainly consisted of peasant deputies.

Fourthly, the revolution turned the Social Democrats not only into a mass workers Party, but also made its historic voice heard in the dispute between Bolshevism and Menshevism.

One of the most convincing results of the first revolution was the discrediting of Menshevism as a revolutionary tendency, and its denunciation as an agent of the bourgeoisie (at first, lack of consciousness) in the Labour Movement, the determination of menshevism as a Party struggling for the bourgeoisie and not for Workers' and Peasants' Democracy.

Fifthly, the revolution created the beginnings of a new workers and peasants Power — The Soviets. The Soviets were a real creation of the people. It was not mere chance that in 1905 not one type of Soviet but many types were formed. The workers formed Workers' Soviets, the soldiers of Moscow a Soldiers' Soviet and the peasants, peasants committees. In a number of towns (Petrograd, Novorossisk, etc) these Soviets showed their true colours, as a regime of the people by assessing the bourgeoisie, introducing the 8-hour day, arming the people etc.

Without arousing millions, without forming an alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, without preparatory work in organising the masses and the formation of a strong proletarian vanguard — the October victory could not have been contemplated. The 1905 revolution played a tremendous role in creating these pre-requisites. That is why Lenin correctly characterised the historic role of 1905 in the following lines: "without the 'dress rehearsal' of 1905 the victory of the October Revolution would have been impossible".

### The 1905 Revolution and the Western Workers.

The 1905 revolution was a most important event in the life of the international proletariat. The revolutionary role of Russia was clear for the leaders of the International long before 1905. Everyone knew of the article by Kautsky: "The Slavs, and the Revolution", in which he openly declared that the coming Russian Revolution would brighten up the gloomy atmosphere which had been formed in the Labour Movement in Europe during the years of parliamentarism.

The 1905 revolution was met with great enthusiasm on the part of the working masses. During many months the events in Russia were the centre of attention of the working class of Europe.

The reasons for this lie in the following:

Firstly, in that the proletariat in a number of European countries was struggling against the same remnants of feudalism against which the Russian proletariat had risen. It is a well-known fact that in Austria the workers were practically deprived

of the franchise, the peasantry were in the power of the landowners and small nationalities were oppressed by the Empire of the Hapsburgs. It is well-known that a three class electoral system existed in Saxony which in reality annulled all representation of the working class.

Secondly, the reason for the Russian Revolution of 1905 being the centre of the attention of the working class of Europe was due to the fact that the revolution coincided with the intensification of the class struggle in Europe, with a certain decline in parliamentarism, and with a definite disappointment on the part of the masses in view of the peaceful compromising methods of struggle adopted by the Trade Unions, as against the growth of the revolutionary mood of the working masses which was partially reflected by waves of anti-parliamentarian and syndicalist activities in France and to a certain extent in Germany.

Thirdly, this reason lies in the fact that from the commencement of the 20th century the question as to the method of struggle for power stood before the proletariat of European countries as a question of the historic future.

The 1905 revolution on all the main questions that effected the European proletariat spoke its weighty word.

Its victorious development compelled the Hapsburgs to make concessions, and to give the proletariat the franchise. The mass movement in Austria Hungary did not by mere chance coincide with the climax of the revolution in Russia of October-December 1905. The extended franchise for the British proletariat was also an echo of the Russian Revolution.

The 1905 revolution strikingly proved to the workers of the West what the proletariat can achieve by revolutionary methods. During a period of two years of revolution the Russian working class traversed the path which had taken the German, French and other workers ten years. The 1905 revolution gave birth to a new and mighty weapon of proletarian struggle — the mass strike. The Jena Congress of the Social Democratic Party in 1905 had good reason to include this weapon in the arsenal of its fighting resources, and the Austrian Social Democratic Congress (October 1905) acknowledged this as a decisive weapon in the struggle for the liberation of the proletariat.

The 1905 revolution pointed out the path to power to the workers of the West — through a combination of mass strikes and the armed insurrection. The 1905 revolution compelled the

best elements of working-class Europe to re-examine critically the value of the customary social democratic tactics. **The revolutionary opposition of the European Social Democracy**, primarily commenced from the time of the 1905 revolution. The first offshoots of European Bolshevism were born during the epoch of the first Russian revolution.

Just as during the epoch 1871—1905 the Paris Commune was the standard of the advanced fighters of the international proletariat, so in the epoch 1905—1917, the 1905 revolution became the banner of all revolutionary advanced workers of Europe. From the 1905 revolution through October 1917 the threads extend to the coming world October.

#### IV. The 1905 Revolution and the Oppressed East.

The 1905 Revolution also opened up the era of the **national revolutionary movement in the Orient**. Social-economic relations in the East, and the class struggle there greatly resembled Russia. Therefore, the Russian Revolution was bound to arouse the oppressed nations of China, Persia, Turkey etc., was bound to act as a signal for the revolution in the East. Kautsky soon after 1905 openly asserted this. "From the time of the Russo-Japanese War Eastern Asia and the entire Mahomedan world had risen up to refute European capitalism . . . A revolutionary period for the East has started, a period of *cours d'état*, risings, reaction, new insurrections, permanent revolutions, which will continue until the East obtains conditions of tranquil development and national independence endangered by nobody".

Indeed, hardly two years after the Russian revolution, a revolution broke out in Persia, whilst a year later came the revolution in Turkey, and in 1911 the many million masses in China rose up. Everywhere the revolution signalled the struggle against the remnants of serfdom, the struggle for a self-determined national bourgeois state. This struggle has to this very day not yet ended. Present day China is still aflame, Persia has not yet liberated herself from the "guardianship" of the British imperialists. Turkey is continuously threatened with the loss of her national independence.

But now they have a more powerful ally than 10—15 years ago. They have the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which have resulted from the October Revolution which, in turn, had its "dress rehearsal" in the heroic year of 1905.

## Calendar of the 1905—7 Revolution.

1905.

**January 22nd.** Tens of thousands of Petrograd workers under the leadership of the priest Gapon go to the Tsar with the intention of begging for aid for improving their economic and political position. Despite the fact that the demonstrators bear standards and portraits of the Tsar they are shot at on the way to the palace by troops sent by the Tsar's uncle Vladimir. January 22nd marks the commencement of the revolution.

**End of January.** Mass strikes in all towns throughout Russia in protest against the Petrograd shooting.

**March.** Commencement of peasant revolts in the Ukrainian Provinces, peasants invade the estates, lead away the cattle, burn buildings and stables.

**May 10.** The first Bolshevik Congress opens in London. For the first time in the history of the Labour Movement the question of the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry in the struggle for power, is concretely presented and the slogan is issued for an armed rising, and a provisional Revolutionary Government for workers and peasants.

**May 14. (1st)** For the first time in history of the Russian Labour Movement, the proletariat celebrates the 1st of May holiday by huge demonstrations and meetings.

**May 25.** A general strike of textile workers breaks out in Ivanovo-Voznessensk (The Russian "Manchester") on the grounds of economic demands. The strike continues for more than one month and a half and reveals the unprecedented solidarity of the workers, who for the first time form a strike committee. Despite the negative results of the strike it exercised a tremendous revolutionising influence on the surrounding textile districts.

**May 27.** The Russian front suffers its final and decisive defeat at Tsushima. This defeat was correctly estimated as the military and political failure of Tsarism.

**The middle of June.** Bloody disturbances in Lodz, the biggest textile centre of Russia and Poland causing repercussions among the working masses throughout the whole of Russia.

**End of June.** Civil war in Odessa, the largest Black Sea port. The police fire into a strikers' meeting causing an armed rising of the working masses.

**June 27.** Revolt of sailors on the "Potyomkin", the largest battle ship of the Black Sea Fleet. This revolt greatly influences the revolutionary movement throughout the whole of Russia, for it is raised by the masses as the first point in the decay of the Tsarist Army and Fleet. Unsupported by the workers on shore and the other warships, the "Potyomkin" after a protracted sea cruise was eventually compelled to surrender.

**August 19.** The Tsarist Government publishes an ukas signed by the Minister Bulygin re the summoning of a constitutional State Duma intending thereby to split away the liberal bourgeoisie and the peasantry from the revolution. Subsequent revolutionary events compel the Tsarist Government to abandon the summoning of this Duma.

**October 3.** Strike of printing workers breaks out in Moscow, the forerunner of the famous October General strike.

**October 20.** Railway strike commences drawing millions of workers and employees throughout the whole of Russia into the movement. This October strike marks the first wave in the revolutionary movement at the end of the year 1905. It compels the Government to issue October 17 (Oct. 30th old style) manifesto with promises of political concessions, which compels the factory owners to grant a number of economic concessions and also exercises a revolutionary influence over the Army and Navy.

**October 26.** First meeting of Petrograd Soviet of Workers' Deputies, the first Soviet in the history of the International Labour Movement.

**October 29.** Petrograd Soviet declares an All-Russian political strike.

**November 11.** Soviet passes resolution on the introduction of eight-hour working day. This resolution is adopted at the demand of the masses themselves and merely registers the independent introduction of the eight-hour working day on the part of the factory workers themselves.

**November 27.** Mutiny of Black Sea sailors (including also "the Potyomkin" headed by Lieutenant Schmidt). This rising was by way of response to the October movement of the working masses.

**December 9.** Tsarist Government commences attacking the centre of the revolutionary movement — the Petrograd Soviet. The chairman of same — Khrustaliev — Nosar is arrested.

**December 16.** Reaction deals its second blow. The entire Plenary sitting of the Petrograd Soviet is arrested.

**End of December.** Rising of Moscow workers, one week's fighting with picked Tsarist troops. Suppression of this rising marks the commencement of the revolutionary ebb.

#### 1906.

**End of April.** IV Congress of Social Democratic Party (united) commences its labours. The Mensheviks receive majority of votes. Subsequent processes of revolutionary struggle show error of Congress decisions and of Menshevik policy and at V. Congress in the Spring, Bolsheviks already obtain majority.

**May 10.** First State Duma opens and is boycotted by the proletariat at the instance of the Bolsheviks. As Lenin foretold, this Duma, comprised mainly of deputies of the opposition parties, was dissolved by the Tsarist Government within 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  months.

**July 21.** First State Duma dissolved and Cabinet formed headed by the famous Stolypin.

**August-October.** Increase of government terror and terrorist revolutionary acts assassination of notorious General Mina, suppression of the Kharkov rising and others).

#### 1907.

**February 20.** Second State Duma opens, more revolutionary in its composition than the first.

**May.** V. London Congress Russian S. D. L. P. Party representing 150,000 organised workers. Congress is conducted under Bolshevik influence.

**June 3.** Tsarist Government dissolves Second Duma and inaugurates an epoch of terror. Simultaneously Stolypin endeavours to extend the social basis of Tsarism by means of creating a class of rich peasants. However, as the future showed this met with failure. The new regime went down in history under the title "June 3rd" regime.

With the dissolution of the Second State Duma the epoch of the first Russian revolution is terminated.