

Chapter 1 : Bolsheviks - Wikipedia

*The Political Theory of Bolshevism [Hans Kelsen] on blog.quintoapp.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. THE CONTRADICTIONARY NATURE OF COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT. Written during a tense period of the Cold War, this study observed that Bolshevism was a system that embraces anarchism in theory and totalitarianism in practice.*

I do not mean, of course, that a man could not be a Communist without accepting it, but that in fact it is accepted by the Communist Party, and that it profoundly influences their views as to politics and tactics. The name does not convey at all accurately what is meant by the theory. It means that all the mass-phenomena of history are determined by economic motives. This view has no essential connection with materialism in the philosophic sense. Materialism in the philosophic sense may be defined as the theory that all apparently mental occurrences either are really physical, or at any rate have purely physical causes. Materialism in this sense also was preached by Marx, and is accepted by all orthodox Marxians. The arguments for and against it are long and complicated, and need not concern us, since, in fact, its truth or falsehood has little or no bearing on politics. In particular, philosophic materialism does not prove that economic causes are fundamental in politics. The view of Buckle, for example, according to which climate is one of the decisive factors, is equally compatible with materialism. So is the Freudian view, which traces everything to sex. There are innumerable ways of viewing history which are materialistic in the philosophic sense without being economic or falling within the Marxian formula. Thus the "materialistic conception of history" may be false even if materialism in the philosophic sense should be true. On the other hand, economic causes might be at the bottom of all political events even if philosophic materialism were false. There is, therefore, no logical connection either way between philosophic materialism and what is called the "materialistic conception of history. This mixture damages both philosophy and politics, and is therefore important to avoid. For another reason, also, the attempt to base a political theory upon a philosophical doctrine is undesirable. The philosophical doctrine of materialism, if true at all, is true everywhere and always; we cannot expect exceptions to it, say, in Buddhism or in the Hussite movement. And so it comes about that people whose politics are supposed to be a consequence of their metaphysics grow absolute and sweeping, unable to admit that a general theory of history is likely, at best, to be only true on the whole and in the main. The dogmatic character of Marxian Communism finds support in the supposed philosophic basis of the doctrine; it has the fixed certainty of Catholic theology, not the changing fluidity and sceptical practicality of modern science. Treated as a practical approximation, not as an exact metaphysical law, the materialistic conception of history has a very large measure of truth. Take, as an instance of its truth, the influence of industrialism upon ideas. It is industrialism, rather than the arguments of Darwinians and Biblical critics, that has led to the decay of religious belief in the urban working class. At the same time, industrialism has revived religious belief among the rich. In the eighteenth century French aristocrats mostly became free-thinkers; now their descendants are mostly Catholics, because it has become necessary for all the forces of reaction to unite against the revolutionary proletariat. Take, again, the emancipation of women. Plato, Mary Wolstonecraft, and John Stuart Mill produced admirable arguments, but influenced only a few impotent idealists. The war came, leading to the employment of women in industry on a large scale, and instantly the arguments in favour of votes for women were seen to be irresistible. More than that, traditional sexual morality collapsed, because its whole basis was the economic dependence of women upon their fathers and husbands. Changes in such a matter as sexual morality bring with them profound alterations in the thoughts and feelings of ordinary men and women; they modify law, literature, art, and all kinds of institutions that seem remote from economics. Such facts as these justify Marxians in speaking, as they do, of "bourgeois ideology," meaning that kind of morality which has been imposed upon the world by the possessors of capital. They honestly believe it is a virtue--at any rate they did formerly. The more religious among the poor also believed it, partly from the influence of authority, partly from an impulse to submission, what MacDougall calls "negative self-feeling," which is commoner than some people think. Similarly men preached the virtue of female chastity, and women usually accepted their teaching; both really believed the doctrine, but its persistence was only possible through the economic power

of men. This led erring women to punishment here on earth, which made further punishment hereafter seem probable. When the economic penalty ceased, the conviction of sinfulness gradually decayed. In such changes we see the collapse of "bourgeois ideology. The most obvious non-economic factor, and the one the neglect of which has led Socialists most astray, is nationalism. Of course a nation, once formed, has economic interests which largely determine its politics; but it is not, as a rule, economic motives that decide what group of human beings shall form a nation. Trieste, before the war, considered itself Italian, although its whole prosperity as a port depended upon its belonging to Austria. No economic motive can account for the opposition between Ulster and the rest of Ireland. In Eastern Europe, the Balkanization produced by self-determination has been obviously disastrous from an economic point of view, and was demanded for reasons which were in essence sentimental. Throughout the war wage-earners, with only a few exceptions, allowed themselves to be governed by nationalist feeling, and ignored the traditional Communist exhortation: But to any one capable of observing psychological facts, it is obvious that this is largely a myth. Immense numbers of capitalists were ruined by the war; those who were young were just as liable to be killed as the proletarians were. No doubt commercial rivalry between England and Germany had a great deal to do with causing the war; but rivalry is a different thing from profit-seeking. Probably by combination English and German capitalists could have made more than they did out of rivalry, but the rivalry was instinctive, and its economic form was accidental. The capitalists were in the grip of nationalist instinct as much as their proletarian "dupes. It was produced by a different set of instincts, and one which Marxian psychology fails to recognize adequately. This is only very partially true in fact. Even now a Catholic working man will vote for a Catholic capitalist rather than for an unbelieving Socialist. In America the divisions in local elections are mainly on religious lines. This is no doubt convenient for the capitalists, and tends to make them religious men; but the capitalists alone could not produce the result. The result is produced by the fact that many working men prefer the advancement of their creed to the improvement of their livelihood. However deplorable such a state of mind may be, it is not necessarily due to capitalist lies. All politics are governed by human desires. The materialist theory of history, in the last analysis, requires the assumption that every politically conscious person is governed by one single desire--the desire to increase his own share of commodities; and, further, that his method of achieving this desire will usually be to seek to increase the share of his class, not only his own individual share. But this assumption is very far from the truth. Men desire power, they desire satisfactions for their pride and their self-respect. They desire victory over rivals so profoundly that they will invent a rivalry for the unconscious purpose of making a victory possible. All these motives cut across the pure economic motive in ways that are practically important. There is need of a treatment of political motives by the methods of psycho-analysis. In politics, as in private life, men invent myths to rationalize their conduct. If a man thinks that the only reasonable motive in politics is economic self-advancement, he will persuade himself that the things he wishes to do will make him rich. When he wants to fight the Germans, he tells himself that their competition is ruining his trade. If, on the other hand, he is an "idealist," who holds that his politics should aim at the advancement of the human race, he will tell himself that the crimes of the Germans demand their humiliation. The Marxian sees through this latter camouflage, but not through the former. But modern psychology has dived much deeper into the ocean of insanity upon which the little barque of human reason insecurely floats. The intellectual optimism of a bygone age is no longer possible to the modern student of human nature. Yet it lingers in Marxism, making Marxians rigid and Procrustean in their treatment of the life of instinct. Of this rigidity the materialistic conception of history is a prominent instance. In the next chapter I shall attempt to outline a political psychology which seems to me more nearly true than that of Marx.

Chapter 2 : The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism/Chapter II 5 - Wikisource, the free online library

Routing the Opposition: Social Movements, Public Policy, and by David S. Meyer PDF. On one part are the coverage makers, at the different, the pursuits and organisations that problem public coverage. the place and the way the 2 meet is a severe juncture within the democratic method.

Eric Blanc is an independent researcher in Oakland, California. In this pamphlet he argued, among other things, that the Bolshevik party under the leadership of Stalin and Lev Kamenev was mired in de-facto Menshevism before Lenin arrived in April and re-armed the party with an entirely new political strategy. In their view, such a regime was needed to lead the democratic revolution to victory – to confiscate the landed estates, pass the eight-hour day, establish a democratic republic, etc. Bolshevik strategy certainly evolved during and following April. Given the complexities of the post-Tsarist political situation, it is not surprising that there were sharp tactical debates among Bolsheviks during these early months – and throughout. A certain conception of the driving forces of the revolution did not provide easy answers to the challenging tactical questions posed day-by-day – or even hour-by-hour – in the whirlwind of revolution. Even with the benefit of hindsight it is often far from clear which tactic was best suited for the particular moment. This was mostly the case in March, as will be discussed in the next article in this series. The reason why it is important to re-examine the February-March debates goes beyond just setting the historical record straight. This dynamic becomes far more evident in the provincial towns and outlying regions of the empire, where the political and organisational attachment of the local committees to Lenin and the Petrograd-based leadership was often tenuous. One hundred years after the revolution, it is well past time for Marxists to take a fresh look at what Bolsheviks said and did on the ground in *The February Revolution Before* delving into the theory and practice of Bolshevism, it may be helpful to briefly sketch out the basic sequence of the February upheaval. Working-class women in Petrograd struck, took to the streets to demand bread, and called upon workers in their neighbouring workplaces to join in. Hundreds of thousands of workers took to the streets the following day and by 25 February the capital was paralysed by a general strike. On 26 February, the state ordered troops to fire upon the protestors: Only on 27 February did the liberals finally side with the revolution, though they simultaneously sought to preserve the monarchy. The Tsar abdicated on 2 March and called upon his younger brother to take the throne – yet protests from workers and socialists against the preservation of the monarchy obliged the latter to step down as well. After a reign of more than three hundred years, the much-hated Romanov regime had been toppled by working people. What should replace Tsarism? Moderate and radical socialists gave very different answers to this question during the February Revolution. Indeed, the course of events in Petrograd was inseparable from conflicts between different socialist currents over the fundamental strategic choice of. Whereas moderates sought to channel the upsurge into a bloc with the liberal State Duma, radicals upheld the tradition of and called for the establishment of a provisional revolutionary government of working people, with no participation of the propertied classes. The ability of the moderate socialists to impose their vision was decisive for the particular shape of the power that replaced Tsarism. By 27 February, Tsarist authority had collapsed, and the liberal Duma was left floating in mid-air with little support on the ground. Since the insurgent workers and soldiers looked to the new Petrograd Soviet as the legitimate authority, it easily could have taken full power had it been so inclined. But their call on workers to gather at the Finland Station to form a soviet and their own provisional revolutionary government fell flat. The Menshevik leaders of the new Soviet were intent on a bloc with the liberals: At the first session of the Soviet, on 27 February, the moderates thus proposed the establishment of a purely bourgeois government through negotiations with the liberal leaders. At the same time, however, the Soviet leadership distrusted the liberals and worried about losing its hold over the radicalised workers and soldiers. Menshevik and liberal leaders met on the evening of 1 March. Significantly, the crucial questions of war and land reform were absent from the agreement. Bolshevik Theory and Practice The Bolsheviks upheld a militant orientation throughout the February uprising. In sharp contrast with the Mensheviks, their strategy opposed any blocs with the bourgeoisie. Bolshevik leaflets declared that a regime of workers and soldiers was needed to bring peace,

bread, agrarian reform, the eight-hour day, and a democratically elected Constituent Assembly. The immediate urgent task of the Provisional Revolutionary Government is to establish relations with the proletariat of the belligerent countries with a view to the struggle of the proletariat of all countries against their oppressors and their slave masters, against the Governments of Tsarist type and the Capitalist cliques, and with a view to the immediate cessation of the bloody slaughter inflicted on the enslaved people. The workers of the factories and plants as well as the insurgent troops must choose, without delay, their representatives to the Provisional Revolutionary Government which must be established by the Revolutionary Insurgent people and the Army. There is no turning back! Follow the Red Flag of the Revolution! Long live the Democratic Republic! Long live the Revolutionary working class! Comrades, the long-awaited hour has arrived! The people are taking power into their own hands, the revolution has begun; do not lose a single moment, create a Provisional Revolutionary Government today. Only organisation can strengthen our forces. First of all, elect deputies, have them make contact with one another and create, under the protection of the armed forces, a Soviet of Deputies. Bring over to our side all soldiers still lagging behind, go to the barracks themselves and summon them. Let Finland Station be the centre where the revolutionary headquarters will gather. Seize all buildings that can serve as strongholds for our struggle. Comrade soldiers and workers! Elect deputies, forge them into an organisation for the victory over autocracy! The Russian Revolution – taking place in the midst of the world conflict [WWI] and in the era of a colossal intensification of class contradictions in the West – will give a new push to the upsurge in proletarian struggle in the countries of finance capital for the full expropriation of the capitalist class. The Russian Social Democracy must strive to ensure that the democratic revolution in Russia serves as the signal for the proletarian revolution in the West and it must call on all internationalists in the warring countries to coordinate their actions to fight capitalism. On the eve of February, the Ekaterinoslav Committee distributed a typical party leaflet: Who besides workers can stop the production of cannon and shells and end the carnage? Who else can raise high the glorious banner of the Russian Revolution? The final denouement is near, as is the final judgment on the perpetrators of the greatest crime in history against mankind. Our common enemy is behind our backs. Bolshevik tactics regarding the creation of a revolutionary regime, in contrast, were generally cautious during late February and early March. From 27 February onwards, the party did not in practice fight for power. Though the district Bolshevik Vyborg Committee advocated a more offensive tactic, the top Petrograd party leadership – the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee led by Alexander Shlyapnikov – felt that conditions were not yet ripe for such an approach. But, as we have seen, the radicals lost the battle on 27 February when the moderates succeeded in leading the masses to the Tauride Palace. Moreover, it is far from evident that a revolutionary government in Petrograd would have found sufficient support among workers and soldiers outside the capital, where political polarisation at this moment was much less developed. On 2 March, as the process of setting up a liberal Provisional Government was underway, various Bolshevik delegates in the Soviet raised the need for a revolutionary provisional government and criticised the decision to pass over power to the bourgeoisie. Zalutskii decried the fact that central demands of the revolution land, peace, the eight-hour day were not addressed in the Soviet-liberal agreement: Guchkov, factory owners, Rodzianko, and Konovalov would make a mockery out of the people. Instead of land they will throw rocks at the peasants. We express no confidence in Kerenskii. Also we recognize that only the Provisional Revolutionary Government can fulfil the popular demands. Sharp debates over how and when to replace the Provisional Government – as well as divergences concerning how much it and the moderate socialists could be pressured from below – continued in all levels and regions of the Bolshevik party throughout the rest of March. Explaining Bolshevik Actions An assessment of Bolshevik policy and practice in February must answer two distinct questions. After February, various Bolsheviks explained that seizing power in Petrograd would have been a mistake since the revolutionary mood in rest of the empire lagged behind the capital. One party militant in April explained: When the Soviet of deputies was formed – then state power was proposed, but the workers did not consider it possible to take power into their hands I consider that it did. To take power into our hands would have been an unsuccessful policy, since Petrograd is not all of Russia. There, in Russia, is a different correlation of forces. Having just emerged from underground conditions, their committees were fragile and atomised, making it more difficult to

push back against the prevailing current and fight for power. The party had been decimated in the recent period by countless arrests of its members. Especially in the first days of the movement, the disorganisation was terrible, a circumstance that the various opportunistic leaderships took advantage of. We were too weak organisationally, our leading comrades were in jails, exile and emigration. Over the coming months, Bolshevik leaders, including Lenin, would have to frequently push back against the tendency of the Vyborg Committee and other Bolshevik radicals to fight for power before a majority of the Soviet was won to this position. Another possible explanation for Bolshevik cautiousness in February is that various party members felt that the danger of immanent counter-revolution obliged limited cooperation with the liberal elite. During the upheaval, a fear that right-wing generals would march on Petrograd to depose a new revolutionary government was one of the central factors pushing the Soviet leadership into seeking a legitimising bloc with the propertied classes. As Hasegawa notes, this fear was not misplaced; the perceived threat was in fact a very real one. Traditionally the Bolsheviks had envisioned that the Marxist proletarian party would lead the seizure of power and establish a democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasantry. Which social class and party, if any, should be the dominant current in the revolutionary government was left open-ended. Neither the Menshevik Social Democrats nor the Socialist Revolutionaries wanted to take power, they were afraid of it. The question of whether the SRs and Mensheviks could be convinced or cajoled to break with the bourgeoisie had major practical implications and it remained an on-going debate in the Bolshevik party throughout. And when it became clear to Bolshevik militants such as Shlyapnikov that the moderate socialists would not break from the bourgeoisie, most promptly adjusted their tactics accordingly. The aforementioned factors explain why the Bolsheviks did not immediately fight in practice for soviet power in February. It would appear that the main factor here was a straightforward adaptation to the mood of the majority of workers and their moderate socialist representatives. It was understandable that Bolshevik militants who envisioned the establishment of a revolutionary government through an agreement with the Mensheviks and SRs might be wary of engaging in a sharp political battle that could lead to a rupture with these necessary allies. Conclusion By way of conclusion, three points should be underscored in relation to Bolshevik theory and practice in the February Revolution. Bolsheviks rejected blocs with liberals, denounced the war, demanded land to the peasants, and called for a revolutionary government based on the Soviet. The overthrow of the Tsar had not accomplished these fundamental objectives – the democratic revolution, in Bolshevik eyes, had not yet been completed. As such, even after the downfall of the autocracy, the top party leadership in March continued to uphold the general strategic orientation raised in February. Read our first document during the Revolution, the [27 February] manifesto of our party, and you will see that our picture of the revolution and our tactics did not diverge from the theses of comrade Lenin. Of course, the picture sketched out by comrade Lenin is whole, complete, but its method of thinking is that of an Old Bolshevik, which can cope with the originalities of this revolution. Some aspects of his April Theses e. In practice, this helped orient the Bolsheviks to independently vie for political power and to more antagonistically approach the moderate socialists.

Chapter 3 : The Political Theory of Bolshevism : Hans Kelsen :

** Written during a tense period of the Cold War, this study observed that Bolshevism was a system that embraces anarchism in theory and totalitarianism in practice. In order to survive, the My Account | Cart.*

Milyukov waged a bitter war against Trotskyism "as early as ". Petersburg Soviet during the Russian Revolution. He pursued a policy of proletarian revolution at a time when other socialist trends advocated a transition to a "bourgeois" capitalist regime to replace the essentially feudal Romanov state. It was during this year that Trotsky developed the theory of permanent revolution , as it later became known see below. Those who reproach the Kadets with failure to protest at that time, by organising meetings, against the "revolutionary illusions" of Trotskyism and the relapse into Blanquism , simply do not understand [All practical work in connection with the organisation of the uprising was done under the immediate direction of Comrade Trotsky, the President of the Petrograd Soviet. It can be stated with certainty that the Party is indebted primarily and principally to Comrade Trotsky for the rapid going over of the garrison to the side of the Soviet and the efficient manner in which the work of the Military Revolutionary Committee was organized. The Russian revolution of was marked by two revolutions: Before the February Russian revolution, Lenin had formulated a slogan calling for the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry", but after the February revolution through his April Theses, Lenin instead called for "all power to the Soviets". Lenin nevertheless continued to emphasise as did Trotsky also the classical Marxist position that the peasantry formed a basis for the development of capitalism, not socialism. Once the February Russian revolution had broken out, Trotsky admitted the importance of a Bolshevik organisation and joined the Bolsheviks in July As a result, since Trotskyism as a political theory is fully committed to a Leninist style of democratic centralist party organisation, which Trotskyists argue must not be confused with the party organisation as it later developed under Stalin. We have stressed in a good many written works, in all our public utterances, and in all our statements in the press that [First, if it is given timely support by a socialist revolution in one or several advanced countries. Trotskyism meant the idea that the Russian proletariat might win the power in advance of the Western proletariat, and that in that case it could not confine itself within the limits of a democratic dictatorship but would be compelled to undertake the initial socialist measures. It is not surprising, then, that the April theses of Lenin were condemned as Trotskyist. Before his death in , while describing Trotsky as "distinguished not only by his exceptional abilitiesâ€”personally he is, to be sure, the most able man in the present Central Committee" and also maintaining that "his non-Bolshevik past should not be held against him", Lenin criticized him for "showing excessive preoccupation with the purely administrative side of the work" and also requested that Stalin be removed from his position of General Secretary, but his notes remained suppressed until The grand total of relationships which have arisen in Europe leads to this inevitable conclusion. Thus, the permanent revolution in Russia is passing into the European proletarian revolution". During the first ten years of its struggle, the Left Opposition did not abandon the program of ideological conquest of the party for that of conquest of power against the party. The bureaucracy, however, even in those times, was ready for any revolution in order to defend itself against a democratic reform. In , when the struggle reached an especially bitter stage, Stalin declared at a session of the Central Committee, addressing himself to the Opposition: The road of reform was turned into a road of revolution. He further accused Stalin of derailing the Chinese revolution and causing the massacre of the Chinese workers: In the year , Stalin, at the very outset of his campaign against me, found it necessary, as we have already learned, to write the following words: Trotsky was sent into internal exile and his supporters were jailed. For instance, Victor Serge first "spent six weeks in a cell" after a visit at midnight, then 85 days in an inner GPU cell, most of it in solitary confinement. He details the jailings of the Left Opposition. Most Trotskyists defend the economic achievements of the planned economy in the Soviet Union during the s and s, despite the "misleadership" of the soviet bureaucracy and what they claim to be the loss of democracy. Anyone who disagreed with the party line was labeled a Trotskyist and even a fascist. In , Stalin again unleashed what Trotskyists say was a political terror against their Left Opposition and many of the remaining Old Bolsheviks those who had played key roles

in the October Revolution in the face of increased opposition, particularly in the army. It was meant to be an opposition group within the Comintern, but anyone who joined or was suspected of joining the ILO was immediately expelled from the Comintern. Trotsky argued that the defeat of the German working class and the coming to power of Hitler in was due in part to the mistakes of the Third Period policy of the Communist International and that the subsequent failure of the Communist Parties to draw the correct lessons from those defeats showed that they were no longer capable of reform and a new international organisation of the working class must be organised. The transitional demand tactic had to be a key element. At the time of the founding of the Fourth International in , Trotskyism was a mass political current in Vietnam , Sri Lanka and slightly later Bolivia. There was also a substantial Trotskyist movement in China which included the founding father of the Chinese communist movement, Chen Duxiu , amongst its number. Wherever Stalinists gained power, they made it a priority to hunt down Trotskyists and treated them as the worst of enemies. After , Trotskyism was smashed as a mass movement in Vietnam and marginalised in a number of other countries. The International Secretariat of the Fourth International ISFI organised an international conference in and then World Congresses in and to assess the expropriation of the capitalists in Eastern Europe and Yugoslavia, the threat of a Third World War and the tasks for revolutionaries. The Eastern European Communist-led governments which came into being after World War II without a social revolution were described by a resolution of the congress as presiding over capitalist economies. The Congress argued that Trotskyists should start to conduct systematic work inside those Communist Parties which were followed by the majority of the working class. The Congress argued that the Soviet Union took over these countries because of the military and political results of World War II and instituted nationalized property relations only after its attempts at placating capitalism failed to protect those countries from the threat of incursion by the West. Pablo began expelling large numbers of people who did not agree with his thesis and who did not want to dissolve their organizations within the Communist Parties. For instance, he expelled the majority of the French section and replaced its leadership. The Fourth International split in into two public factions.

Chapter 4 : The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism/Chapter II 1 - Wikisource, the free online library

*The Political Theory of Bolshevism: A Critical Analysis. [Hans Kelsen] on blog.quintoapp.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. THE CONTRADICTIONARY NATURE OF COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT Written during a tense period of the Cold War, this study observed that Bolshevism was a system that embraces anarchism in theory and totalitarianism in practice.*

Lenin advocated limiting party membership to a smaller core of active members as opposed to "card carriers" who might only be active in party branches from time to time or not at all. It was the loyalty that he had to his own self-envisioned utopia that caused the party split. Lenin was seen even by fellow party members as being so narrow minded that he believed that there were only two types of people: In Germany, the book was published in In Russia, strict censorship outlawed its publication and distribution. After the proposed revolution had successfully overthrown the government, this individual leader must release power to allow socialism to fully encompass the nation. Lenin also wrote that revolutionary leaders must dedicate their entire lives to the cause in order for it to be successful. For example, Lenin agreed with the Marxist idea of eliminating social classes, but in his utopian society there would still be visible distinctions between those in politics and the common worker. Although the party split of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks would not become official until , the differences originally began to surface with the publication of *What Is To Be Done?*. Lenin wanted to nationalize to aid in collectivization whereas Plekhanov thought worker motivation would remain higher if individuals were able to maintain their own property. Those who opposed Lenin and wanted to continue on the Marxist path towards complete socialism and disagreed with his strict party membership guidelines became known as "softs" while Lenin supporters became known as "hards". Sympathizers would be left outside and the party would be organised based on the concept of democratic centralism. Martov, until then a close friend of Lenin, agreed with him that the core of the party should consist of professional revolutionaries, but he argued that party membership should be open to sympathizers, revolutionary workers and other fellow travelers. The two had disagreed on the issue as early as March 1917, but it was not until the Congress that their differences became irreconcilable and split the party. Neither Lenin nor Martov had a firm majority throughout the Congress as delegates left or switched sides. At the end, the Congress was evenly split between the two factions. From on, English language articles sometimes used the term "Maximalist" for "Bolshevik" and "Minimalist" for "Menshevik", which proved confusing since there was also a "Maximalist" faction within the Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party in 1917 which after formed a separate Union of Socialists-Revolutionaries Maximalists and then again after Total membership was 8, in 1918, 13, in 1919 and 46, by 1920, 18, and 38, for the Mensheviks. By 1921, both factions together had fewer than 10, members. The founder of Russian Marxism, Georgy Plekhanov, who was at first allied with Lenin and the Bolsheviks, parted ways with them by 1923. Trotsky at first supported the Mensheviks, but he left them in September over their insistence on an alliance with Russian liberals and their opposition to a reconciliation with Lenin and the Bolsheviks. He remained a self-described "non-factional social democrat" until August 1923, when he joined Lenin and the Bolsheviks as their positions assembled and he came to believe that Lenin was right on the issue of the party. All but one member of the Central Committee were arrested in Moscow in early 1924. The remaining member, with the power of appointing a new one, was won over by the Bolsheviks. The Mensheviks organised a rival conference and the split was thus formalised. However, the less significant Moscow Soviet was dominated by the Bolsheviks. These soviets became the model for those formed in 1925. This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. When the Mensheviks struck an alliance with the Jewish Bund in 1926, the Bolsheviks found themselves in a minority. However, all factions retained their respective factional structure and the Bolsheviks formed the Bolshevik Centre in 1927, the de facto governing body of the Bolshevik faction within the RSDLP. At the Fifth Congress held in London in May 1927, the Bolsheviks were in the majority, but the two factions continued functioning mostly independently of each other. Split between Lenin and Bogdanov 1928 [edit] Tensions had existed between Lenin and Alexander Bogdanov as early as 1920. Lenin, Grigory Zinoviev,

Lev Kamenev and others argued for participating in the Duma while Bogdanov, Anatoly Lunacharsky, Mikhail Pokrovsky and others argued that the social democratic faction in the Duma should be recalled. A smaller group within the Bolshevik faction demanded that the RSDLP central committee should give its sometimes unruly Duma faction an ultimatum, demanding complete subordination to all party decisions. This group became known as " ultimatists " and was generally allied with the recallists. However, this was not accepted and Lenin tried to expel him from the Bolshevik faction. Kamenev and Zinoviev were dubious about the idea, but they were willing to give it a try under pressure from "conciliator" Bolsheviks like Victor Nogin. One of the more underlying reasons that aided in preventing any reunification of the party was the Russian police. In turn, it prevented them from uniting on common ground which could have possibly sped up the entire revolution. Lenin was firmly opposed to any re-unification, but was outvoted within the Bolshevik leadership. Forming a separate party [edit] The factions permanently broke off relations in January after the Bolsheviks organised a Bolsheviks-only Prague Party Conference and formally expelled Mensheviks and recallists from the party. Unofficially, the party has been referred to as the Bolshevik Party. Throughout the century, the party adopted a number of different names. As the party split became permanent and politically recognized in due to an all Bolshevik meeting of Congress, further divisions became evident. One of the most notable differences was how each faction decided to fund its revolution. The Mensheviks decided to fund their revolution through membership dues while Lenin often resorted to much more drastic measures since he required a higher budget. To compensate, he awarded them with salaries for their sacrifice and dedication. This measure was taken to help ensure that the revolutionists stayed focused on their duties and motivated them to perform their jobs. Lenin also used the party money to print and copy pamphlets which were distributed in cities and at political rallies in attempts to expand their operations. This was an obvious difference between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks party beliefs. Both factions also managed to gain funds simply by receiving donations from wealthy supporters. The elections to the Russian Constituent Assembly took place in November in which the Bolsheviks came second with Joseph Stalin was especially eager for the start of the war, hoping that it would turn into a war between classes or essentially a Russian Civil War. Through the increase in support Russia would then be forced to withdraw from the Allied powers in order to resolve her internal conflict. When the first meeting of the Fourth Duma was convened in late , only one out of six Bolshevik deputies, Matvei Muranov another one, Roman Malinovsky, was later exposed as an Okhrana agent , voted to break away from the Menshevik faction within the Duma on 15 December One final difference between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks was simply how ferocious and tenacious the party was willing to be in order to achieve its goals. Lenin was open minded to retreating on political ideas if he saw the guarantee of long term gains benefiting the party. This practice was commonly seen trying to recruit peasants and uneducated workers by promising them how glorious life would be after the revolution. His approach was "land seizure for the peasants and national self-determination for the minorities " as nothing more than temporary concessions". Derogatory usage of "Bolshevik"[edit] "Down with Bolshevism. Bolshevism brings war and destruction, hunger and death", anti-Bolshevik German propaganda, "Bolo" was a derogatory expression for Bolsheviks used by British service personnel in the North Russian Expeditionary Force which intervened against the Red Army during the Russian Civil War. The usage is roughly equivalent to the term " commie ", " Red ", or " pinko " in the United States during the same period. The term "Bolshie" later became a slang term for anyone who was rebellious, aggressive, or truculent.

Chapter 5 : This website is currently unavailable.

A deep-cutting analysis of some of the fundamental contradictions in Communist theory and practice, particularly in regard to democracy and the dictatorial function of the state.

The difficulty of answering this question is what chiefly attracts idealists to the dictatorship of the proletariat. If, as I have argued, the method of violent revolution and Communist rule is not likely to have the results which idealists desire, we are reduced to despair unless we can see hope in other methods. The Bolshevik arguments against all other methods are powerful. I confess that, when the spectacle of present-day Russia forced me to disbelieve in Bolshevik methods, I was at first unable to see any way of curing the essential evils of capitalism. My first impulse was to abandon political thinking as a bad job, and to conclude that the strong and ruthless must always exploit the weaker and kinder sections of the population. But this is not an attitude that can be long maintained by any vigorous and temperamentally hopeful person. Of course, if it were the truth, one would have to acquiesce. Some people believe that by living on sour milk one can achieve immortality. Such optimists are answered by a mere refutation; it is not necessary to go on and point out some other way of escaping death. Similarly an argument that Bolshevism will not lead to the millennium would remain valid even if it could be shown that the millennium cannot be reached by any other road. Optimism tends to verify itself by making people impatient of avoidable evils; while despair, on the other hand, makes the world as bad as it believes it to be. It is therefore imperative for those who do not believe in Bolshevism to put some other hope in its place. I think there are two things that must be admitted: What are the chief evils of the present system? I do not think that mere inequality of wealth, in itself, is a very grave evil. If everybody had enough, the fact that some have more than enough would be unimportant. With a very moderate improvement in methods of production, it would be easy to ensure that everybody should have enough, even under capitalism, if wars and preparations for wars were abolished. The problem of poverty is by no means insoluble within the existing system, except when account is taken of psychological factors and the uneven distribution of power. The graver evils of the capitalist system all arise from its uneven distribution of power. The possessors of capital wield an influence quite out of proportion to their numbers or their services to the community. They control almost the whole of education and the press; they decide what the average man shall know or not know; the cinema has given them a new method of propaganda, by which they enlist the support of those who are too frivolous even for illustrated papers. Very little of the intelligence of the world is really free: To satisfy capitalist interests, men are compelled to work much harder and more monotonously than they ought to work, and their education is scamped. Wherever, as in barbarous or semi-civilized countries, labour is too weak or too disorganized to protect itself, appalling cruelties are practised for private profit. Economic and political organizations become more and more vast, leaving less and less room for individual development and initiative. It is this sacrifice of the individual to the machine that is the fundamental evil of the modern world. To cure this evil is not easy, because efficiency is promoted, at any given moment, though not in the long run, by sacrificing the individual to the smooth working of a vast organization, whether military or industrial. In war and in commercial competition, it is necessary to control individual impulses, to treat men as so many "bayonets" or "sabres" or "hands," not as a society of separate people with separate tastes and capacities. But what is demanded in a highly militarized or industrialized nation goes far beyond this very moderate degree. A society which is to allow much freedom to the individual must be strong enough to be not anxious about home defence, moderate enough to refrain from difficult external conquests, and rich enough to value leisure and a civilized existence more than an increase of consumable commodities. But where the material conditions for such a state of affairs exist, the psychological conditions are not likely to exist unless power is very widely diffused throughout the community. Where power is concentrated in a few, it will happen, unless those few are very exceptional people, that they will value tangible achievements in the way of increase in trade or empire more than the slow and less obvious improvements that would result from better education combined with more leisure. The joys of victory are especially great to the holders of power, while the evils of a mechanical organization fall almost exclusively upon the less influential. For these reasons, I do not believe

that any community in which power is much concentrated will long refrain from conflicts of the kind involving a sacrifice of what is most valuable in the individual. In Russia at this moment, the sacrifice of the individual is largely inevitable, because of the severity of the economic and military struggle. But I did not feel, in the Bolsheviks, any consciousness of the magnitude of this misfortune, or any realization of the importance of the individual as against the State. Nor do I believe that men who do realize this are likely to succeed, or to come to the top, in times when everything has to be done against personal liberty. The Bolshevik theory requires that every country, sooner or later, should go through what Russia is going through now. And in every country in such a condition we may expect to find the government falling into the hands of ruthless men, who have not by nature any love for freedom, and who will see little importance in hastening the transition from dictatorship to freedom. It is far more likely that such men will be tempted to embark upon new enterprises, requiring further concentration of forces, and postponing indefinitely the liberation of the populations which they use as their material. For these reasons, equalization of wealth without equalization of power seems to me a rather small and unstable achievement. But equalization of power is not a thing that can be achieved in a day. It requires a considerable level of moral, intellectual, and technical education. It requires a long period without extreme crises, in order that habits of tolerance and good nature may become common. It requires vigour on the part of those who are acquiring power, without a too desperate resistance on the part of those whose share is diminishing. This is only possible if those who are acquiring power are not very fierce, and do not terrify their opponents by threats of ruin and death. It cannot be done quickly, because quick methods require that very mechanism and subordination of the individual which we should struggle to prevent. But even equalization of power is not the whole of what is needed politically. The right grouping of men for different purposes is also essential. Self-government in industry, for example, is an indispensable condition of a good society. Those acts of an individual or a group which have no very great importance for outsiders ought to be freely decided by that individual or group. This is recognized as regards religion, but ought to be recognized over a much wider field. Bolshevik theory seems to me to err by concentrating its attention upon one evil, namely inequality of wealth, which it believes to be at the bottom of all others. I do not believe any one evil can be thus isolated, but if I had to select one as the greatest of political evils, I should select inequality of power. And I should deny that this is likely to be cured by the class-war and the dictatorship of the Communist party. Only peace and a long period of gradual improvement can bring it about. Good relations between individuals, freedom from hatred and violence and oppression, general diffusion of education, leisure rationally employed, the progress of art and science--these seem to me among the most important ends that a political theory ought to have in view. I do not believe that they can be furthered, except very rarely, by revolution and war; and I am convinced that at the present moment they can only be promoted by a diminution in the spirit of ruthlessness generated by the war. For these reasons, while admitting the necessity and even utility of Bolshevism in Russia, I do not wish to see it spread, or to encourage the adoption of its philosophy by advanced parties in the Western nations.

Chapter 6 : Before Lenin: Bolshevik Theory and Practice in February Revisited | Historical Materialism

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Chapter 7 : The Psychology of Bolshevism

the political theory of bolshevism Download the political theory of bolshevism or read online here in PDF or EPUB. Please click button to get the political theory of bolshevism book now.

Chapter 8 : Trotskyism - Wikipedia

DOWNLOAD PDF THE POLITICAL THEORY OF BOLSHEVISM

Lenin, Bolshevism, and Social-Democratic Political Theory Historical Materialism () However, serious methodological flaws bedevil this advance in knowledge.

Chapter 9 : the political theory of bolshevism | Download eBook PDF/EPUB

The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism at Project Gutenberg by Bertrand Russell, November Bobrovskaya, Cecilia, Twenty Years in Underground Russia: Memoirs of a Rank-and-File Bolshevik, Marxists, archived from the original on 25 February