

Stages of the Russian Revolution

Relevance: In foreign affairs
Balance of social forces contended in Europe
General sympathy ~~was~~ ^{was} with the human comedy.

Two revolutions separated by a clear gap of several years, (made by different people) yet conceived & regarded as parts of one & the same Russian Revolution, and represented by Stalin.

I. 1917-1924 the first Russian Revol.

The continuation of the French Engl. & American and French on Russian soil. with its aims
(a) abolishment of absolutism
(b) the destruction of feudal remnants & power of landholding
(c) and liberation from national oppression

of the revolution
of transformation.

In spite of its influence on Central & Western Europe it has received an essentially ^{European} Russian element ^{on Russian soil} for the establishment of socialism.

II. 1929-39: the five year plans where Russia was the first to engage in the social transformation, which became the

more or less the
Communist of all great countries

the 1st Russian. This 2nd revolution
is a World Event - the first

FIRST REVOLUTION - 2 -

The First Russian Revolution aimed at the overthrow of Tsarism, and the establishment of an advanced type of liberal capitalism under a democratic constitution.

actually, in spite of this aim, the revolution soon took on a socialist character, a fact which led to numerous contradictions.

Take the Bolshevik tenets in regard to land, the cash payments a revenue or the industrial policy.

(A) The Agrarian question was of course prime importance. Lenin had written an article in 1908 ~~on~~ on this subject of his thesis was accepted.

It was the nationalization of the ~~land~~ land - "landlordism without landlords." The State should own the land, and lease it to peasant tenant farmers. The lease (a) corn ^{a competitive} market in being, and yet abolishes the remnants of feudalism.

No private ownership in land would be instituted.

What came of this? The SR programme

Read 179 Lenin: "by charging us with stealing their land programme... If that was so, we bow to them... It is good enough for us."

October 30 1917 (In answer to the accusations of the SR)

I'm a Russian encyclopedia. He incorporated it 1912 in a book.

2 any
1917
October 26

Lenin:

RSB - 2a-

"I have heard some people interject that both the law and the instructions (242 of them) were drafted by the S.R. Let us say so. And what if they were? It is of us account who ~~drafted~~ drafted ^{them}. ^{Being} A democratic govt we cannot ignore the desires of the lowest strata of the population, even though we may not agree with them. We must follow the dictates ^{needs} of real life and must give full scope to the creative endeavours of the people. We have full confidence that the peasants themselves know better than we do how to solve the question. It is immaterial whether the text expresses the spirit of the S.R. or our own. The real point is, that the peasantry should feel convinced that there exist no landlords anymore and that it is for the peasants themselves to decide about their own way of life. . . . (p. 17) ^{of the} ^{land}

Moscow, 1920. ^{the} ^{land}

What was it all about? —

Desse nationalisierung ist die
konsequenteste mögliches Maßnahme.
wie Marx schon lange nachgewiesen
hat." (p. 78) — no need to explain
to after as view of the Liberal Party's
programme in this country.

— "Solange der Warenmarkt besteht ist
es töricht von Sozialisten zu
sprechen".

Argues precisely in the way the Liberal
do: "Bei der freien Pacht des Bodens
vom Staate — und damit führt die
Nationalisierung in der bürgerlichen
Gesellschaft ihrem Wesen entsprechend
der Boden stärker in den Warenumlauf
hinein, es bei der Herrschaft
des Privateigentums, als
Grund und Boden. Die
Nationalisierung des freien Bodens
ist sozialer Landlordismus ohne
Landlords". (p. 80)

Lynn's - 26
~~This~~ ~~speech~~ (at midnight 25
October) in defense of the decree of the
Nationalisation of the land which
exempted the peasant property
from nationalisation. Confiscation
(but later on it was added: that
private property ceases i.e. no
sales are allowed etc. On the
supposedly crucial question of
the Revolution a tacitly
Compromise was the result
of which the success of
pseudo-historians might
be proud. (à la mode)

What to think of history writing
which impartially speaks of
nationalization as of the original
Populism had been upheld.

Actually - by N
And what to think of the sum
total of Western European criticism
of Kalschovian which was mostly
entirely ignorant of these details.

(3) The Constituent was a traditional
facet of the French Revolution type of
political upheaval.

The Bolsheviks held to it right
up to the October Revolution (Oct 25) although
this weakened their position very much
since the Mensheviks & SRs
argued that the Constituent was
imminent, why decide about anything?

Kalinin & Co. argued that they
didn't really want a Constituent at
all. Read Trotsky's ~~small~~ booklet

the 'Russian Revolution' (appeared in
English in this country in 1920), here
you will find his ~~defense~~ explanation
why the Constituent could not
be called. The reasons were very
good ones. The SRs had were the
biggest party, and in the course of the
revolution they had split; immediately
after ~~the~~ the October revolution the new represented
party of Left SR was now represented
in the Constituent... The Bolsheviks dis-
banded the Constituent and they
argued that the Soviets were a more
advanced type of democracy (which
was not the point).

(C) ~~Be~~ No interference with the ownership of the means of production — no expropriation of factories — not even working class demands in respect to hours & wages should be raised.

This proved impossible. The word material came to be used in more than one way in the connection with the Revolution. The mere fact that a socialist party was taking the lead in it need not of course, have made this necessary. This party — like the Mensheviks — was a Marxist party in acting on a definite appreciation of the historical situation. Since that appreciation — and this had been never called in doubt — called for a middle class revolution in Russia in order to overthrow Tsarism and the feudal remnants, the socialist character of the Revolution ~~has~~ did not follow ~~at all~~, rather the opposite.

The one thing it ~~could~~ ^{not} mean was that socialism is going to be established in Russia. It might mean

- (a) that an international socialist revolution was being started, which would begin in the West
- (b) that a proletarian democracy was being established with the three safeguards of anti-bureaucracy (a) recall (b) no preferential payment to delegates (c) joint legislative & executive functions of the Representative Body.
- (c) working class decrees were being varied ~~in~~ in respect to food supplies or control of industry or lastly that
- (d) the preconditions for the establishment of a socialist economy were being achieved (a vague formula which to a Marxist could only mean the attainment of an advanced form of capitalism as the first precondition of the establishment of a socialist economy.

This explains the violent denials of Lenin & Stalin that they were trying to establish socialism. (a) April 1917 Resolves of Lenin plus Oct 12 slogans. "Catastrophe" by Aug 1917 Report of Stalin

But this explains also the extreme rigidity with which the project of a world revolution was maintained and all efforts were concentrated towards its achievement.

The socialist demands of the Revolution was re-interpreted in this sense:

The human Revolution is an international event. Its localisation should be discouraged. Its greatest weakness ^{thus becomes} turns into its greatest strength.

This theory was not discarded anywhere.

By the time of Lenin's death the NEP had fulfilled all expectations, but the world revolution was as far off as ever.

This constituted the Crisis of the Revolution which lasted from 1924 to 1928. Called the NEP it was an INTERIM (Russian word for 'stoppage') Measurably: Months

Trotsky's hold over the Party explained by the theory of the Permanent Revolution, developed in 1905.

This theory fitted the facts.

And yet he was wrong on everything else, especially on the question of the peasantry.

Second 1924 - 1928

Stage

Struggle between

Left - Trotsky - was Concessionist

Right - Mikhail Tukhachevsky -

Right wing NEP?

Stalin's Line absolutely original and "right off the map".

'Socialism in one country' - perhaps, but not Socialism in Russia first.

Second Revolution forced by

Dissolution of the Cullery system.

(a) Russia - anti-anti-anti.

(b) industrialization with the help of raw material exports

(c) agricultural depression - 1926

(d) Rumia pressed to industrial anarchy
 [Conflict with peasants sharpened]
 (e) Balance of Power system broke
 down. Rumia unsafe
 in spite of alliance with
 Germany. : forced rearmament. Mr. Scissors!

ff. No way of joining up.
 Alternative facile corrupe-
revolution or socialism.

(g) Stalin's conclusion —

Russia's foreign policy reversed;
 All out for "getting in" "collective
 security" of cooperation with France
 & Britain.

The essence of the popular front policy
 was the assurance Stalin gave the
 the French, Communists and support
 national defence. And so they
 did, until France's refusal to
 support Munich.

The dissolution ^{seems} of the C. I. was a
 concession to America; actually, it was
 a freeing of R. foreign policy from the
 necessity of supporting revolutionary
 action anywhere.

The Russian foreign policy is conscious of the limitations of a class war policy yet it refused to scrap it altogether ~~but~~ unless it perceived the assurance of its safety.

BT. Sumner: Survey of Russian History,
1926 - 1938
1928 - 1934