

Summary Notes on "Marx and Engels and the Concept of the Party" by Monty Johnson Socialist Register, 1967 and on "Marx, Engels and the Party" by John Cunliffe History of Political Thought Vol. II No. 2 Summer. June 1981. *Read 260 - ed*

Not a review - probably 9/11/81 The party period 53-15 Johnson

I am putting these two articles together because they seem to me the two which best talk about Marx and the Party in a way that gives us introduction to some sources to follow up on which is much more than can be said for the stupidities of John Molyneux's Marxism and the Party.

Johnson's article is a valuable summary if for no other reasons than 1) the large body of references to writings of Marx and Engels on the Party and 2) a critique of some interpretations of M&E on the party --notably on Rubel.

One difficulty is the fact that much of the presentation is Marx and Engels on the Party: "I have chosen to examine the views of Marx and Engels together for they were in fundamental agreement on all the questions discussed here; and over an important period, in keeping with a division of labour agreed between them, Engels dealt on behalf of both of them with requests for political advice from all over the world, continuing and extending this work after Marx's death into the era of the Second International." p. 122.

The form of Johnstone's article is to examine "the major 'models' of the party in their work, each of which corresponds to a stage or stages in the development of the working class movement in a given period or in given countries... a) the small international Communist cadres' organization (the League of Communists--1847-52); b) the 'party' without an organization (during the ebb of the labor movement--1850s and early 60s); c) the broad international federation of workers' organizations (the First International--1864-72); d) the Marxist national mass party (German Social Democracy--1870s, '80s and early '90s); e) the broad national labour party (Britain and America--1880s and early '90s) based on the Chartist model.

The earlier parts seem the more valuable. Johnstone begins with the International Communist ~~Correspondence~~ Correspondence Committees--based in Brussels and writing to Belgium, Britain, France and Germany. He says they issued lithographic circulars and pamphlets which were sent to among others the League of the Just that had been founded in 1836 as a secret Society of German artisans. League of Just reorganized in 1847 as League of Communists. This communist league was an international association of workers in a number of European countries in which Germans predominated. Johnstone quotes Engels from 1892 on ~~the two independent currents~~ "two independent currents": on the one hand "a pure workers' movement" and, on the other, "a theoretical movement, stemming from the disintegration of Hegelian philosophy" associated predominately with Marx. "The Communist Manifesto of 1848," he goes on, "marks the fusion of both currents" (p. 123)

"In the Manifesto are set out some of the basic ingredients of Marx's and Engels' conception of the party." (p.123) He now quotes from the C.M. ~~Manifesto~~ I would think we might want to consider ourselves returning to look at CM anew on question of organization.

*4/1/52
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900*

Johnstone briefly discusses the CL in relation to 1848. How they returned to Cologne and founded NRZ. It may be important here to look at Engels writing on "Marx and the NRZ" in Selected Works Vol II. Some controversy about League in this period. Some "Marxist historians" try and make this period almost "Leninist" with editorial staff the "political center of leadership of proletarian party in Germany". Of course I remember some others who want to dismiss this (Luxemburg among others) as just working with the Democracy movement and thus not fully revolutionary. In April of '49 Marx and other Communists issued a statement "announcing their resignation from the Rhineland District Committee of the Democratic Associations and urging 'a closer union of workers' association' of which a national congress was planned." Marx critiques the Democrats for "indecision, weakness and cowardice."

Leaders of the league in exile in London in fall of '49, reconstituted the Central Committee and in March of '50 there is address to Central Committee. What is interesting here is the Johnstone hits out at Bernstein and then Lichtheim and Bertram Wolfe for describing the address as Blanquist.

In the next section on the period after the dissolution of CL, Johnstone tries to take up the "party in the great historical sense" that is the quote from the Freiligrath letter of 1860. "even in their years in the wilderness Marx and Engels retained and sought to realize where possible their basic concept of the party as an organization in which Socialist theory fuses with the labour movement."

In the next section on first international, though Johnstone calls attention to fact that Marx worked from '64 and Engels only from '70, he makes no category out of this. The rest of section is fairly straightforward nothing special.

The section on German organization--although "Critique of Gotha Program" is mentioned, it doesn't raise any of the questions you raise.

He quotes Engels in to Bernstein in Nov. 1882 "To be for a moment in a minority with a correct programme--good organization-- is still better than to have a big but thereby almost nominal semblance of a following."

In the section on a broad labour party Johnstone argues that actions in France and Germany on the one hand were for a more theoretically ~~correct~~ correct party where in U.S. and Britain Marx and Engels favored a broader concept of a party. Johnstone quotes Engels as follows "our theory is not a dogma but the exposition of a process of evolution, and that process involves successive phases" which certain argues in a very different manner than Marx, though Johnstone does not mention this.

In the conclusion Johnstone writes "Theoretical consciousness and the Selbsttatigkeit (spontaneous self-activity) of the working class are present, as the key elements in their conception of the proletarian party, in all periods of Marx's and Engels' thought and activity from 1844 on, combining in different proportions in different conditions."

Now follows p. 141)

a critique of Rubel for ahistorical quoting.

John Cunliffe's piece begins with a major problem. There is no uniform concept of the 'party' in the writings of Marx and Engels; not merely because the issue was one of the many which they failed to develop through a lack of time, but more significantly because there is no place for one within the general corpus of their work." (p.349)

Cunliffe organizes his article not chronologically as does Johnstone, but on different usages of the term party:

"The first and most extended usage is where 'party' is to be interpreted in 'the great historical sense.' In this sense, 'party' simply designates what was termed the 'real' or 'spontaneous' working-class movement, including each and every instance of political organization considered a manifestation of it."

"The second usage of the term 'party', while maintaining or implying the criteria employed in the previous usage, adds further specifications. In this sense, the term 'party' is to be applied only to those formal organizations possessing a programme which expresses the aspiration to the conquest of political power by the working class.

"The third usage of the term 'party' retains the criteria stipulated by both previous usages whilst adding a further consideration. In this sense the term is to be applied only when the conditions implied by a national organization, a national programme, and a national framework of political power are met. Here, the designation 'party' necessarily entails a national party.

"The final usage of the term 'party' designates a more or less coherent group aspiring to a more or less adequate understanding of Marxian theory. In this informal sense the term does not involve any of the organizational criteria presented in the second and third usages, although in a manner to be specified it retains the substance of the first usage."

"What is common to each usage is a basic contrast between 'party' and 'sect'."

"The purpose of this paper is to unpack and refine these various usages of the term in the light of a fundamental contrast between 'party' and 'sect'."

"For Marx, self-emancipation required independent working-class organization, independent not only of other classes, but also of any sectarian elite." (p.350)

Cunliffe now proceeds to discuss each of the levels. Quoting Marx on party in the great historical sense Cunliffe continues "The initial contrast, then, is between two usages of the term; with 'party' in an extended sense denoting a historical movement, and 'party' in a restricted sense denoting the organizations issuing from it. What really mattered was the former." (p. 351)

"Marx and Engels repeatedly affirmed the 'inherent opposition' between sectarian organizations and the emerging 'spontaneous' movement with its organization expressions."

Cunliffe has a number of references to some of Marx's correspondence that would be important to follow through on.

On general, I think we need to survey the correspondence from Marx which appears to have many of his comments on organization.

17332

Handwritten notes on the left margin: "No place for org.", "The first and most extended usage is where 'party' is to be interpreted in 'the great historical sense.'", "The second usage of the term 'party', while maintaining or implying the criteria employed in the previous usage, adds further specifications.", "The third usage of the term 'party' retains the criteria stipulated by both previous usages whilst adding a further consideration.", "The final usage of the term 'party' designates a more or less coherent group aspiring to a more or less adequate understanding of Marxian theory.", "What is common to each usage is a basic contrast between 'party' and 'sect'." "The purpose of this paper is to unpack and refine these various usages of the term in the light of a fundamental contrast between 'party' and 'sect'." "For Marx, self-emancipation required independent working-class organization, independent not only of other classes, but also of any sectarian elite." (p.350)

Handwritten notes at the top: "John Cunliffe's piece begins with a major problem. There is no uniform concept of the 'party' in the writings of Marx and Engels; not merely because the issue was one of the many which they failed to develop through a lack of time, but more significantly because there is no place for one within the general corpus of their work." (p.349)

Part 1 / 11/11/4
Under the second usage there is to be "organization, a programme, and the aspiration to the conquest of political power" "the term 'party' was becoming associated with organizations rather than movements"

Cunliffe quotes Marx here as follows "the economical emancipation of the working class by the conquest of political power. The use of that political power to the attainment of social ends." (p. 355) (from Marx "The Curtain Raised") The First International and After

Cunliffe here rises the question of "tendencies", saying that here party is here "an expression of tendencies already manifested in the 'real' movement and its organizations, rather than a sectarian prescription"

Cunliffe in speaking about the Communist League and the First International says that neither could be regarded as a party in the "relevant sense," since they were international organizations and would not be parties. Rays here on page 357 you have a lot of notations about looking up foot not mater, especially from Marx and one book R. Hunt, The Political Ideas of Marx and Engels, that Cunliffe refers to.

In part III Cunliffe moves to national workers' parties -- the Chartists and the SPD.

"The Chartist were considered by Marx as the first historical instance of a working class organized as a class for itself, or to employ Engels' later designation, 'The first modern working mens' party'... What Marx and Engels were affirming was that this was a uniquely new general form of political party emerging from the conditions first created by capitalism in Britain... for Marx and Engels, the Chartists demonstrated that the future belonged to parties not sects." (p. 358-359)

Moving to the SPD "In the SPD, Marx--and especially Engels--came to recognize a national workers' party which was not only a unified mass organization issuing from the class, but also possessing an advanced programme. Indeed, for Engels the designation 'Social-Democratic' was a misnomer for a party whose programme after 1891 was not generally 'Socialist' but specifically 'Communist'." (359)

Now follows a discussion on the SPD which should not be summarized but looked at. See pages 360-361. Cunliffe contrasts the private and public views of Marx on SPD here.

page 362 has some very beautiful expressions trying to grasp Marx on the party. Cunliffe certainly realizes that party is not other from theory, (but of course he doesn't go to philosophy.

"Rather than engaging in direct political activity, Marx concentrated on theoretical studies and urged his immediate entourage to do likewise. The immediate objective as he put it was to achieve a scientific victory for our party" (p.362)

"Without claiming to be an exhaustive list, the term 'party' is used in an informal sense to denote not only a group but also its theoretical works or the medium through which they are expressed." (p.362)

17333

"The 'Marx party' was not to assume the role of a replacement in this sense for the 'historical party' regarded as temporarily defunct in that it lacked any contemporary practical expression." 364

"With respect to their form both the League and the International¹ were seen as the spontaneous products of the 'real' movement, though within each of them the 'Marx party' came to play a leading but never unchallenged role."

"The absence of any extended analysis of the relationship between 'class' and a 'party' is not an unfortunate omission to be repaired by others. For Marx and Engels such analysis was superfluous because 'parties' were nothing more than temporary expressions of the 'class' as it matured toward self-emancipation" p. 367. *Not yet full mental/marx*

"The necessary content (of political parties) was to be supplied by the class movement as it developed its own organization forms..." 367

Cunliffe ends as follows: "There could be no theory of the 'party' as an immutable organization form because there was no place for one given the principle of the self-emancipation of the class and the rejection of sectarianism."

ORC. // From Lagone (?)
"Class and Party" Rossana Rossanda from El Manifiesto #4. Translated from
the French version which appeared in Temp Modernes Jan. 1970. Published in
Socialist Register 1970 edited by Ralph Miliband and John Savile The Merlin
Press London 1970 pp. 217-231

The introductory section looks at Marx and organization after Hobbes Family and
German Ideology against secret societies. "However what separates Marx from Lenin
(who far from filling in Marx's outlines, oriented himself in a different direction)
is that the organization is never considered by Marx as anything but an essentially
practical matter, a flexible and changing instrument, an expression of the real
subject of the revolution, namely the proletariat." (p. 218) But Rossanda adds:

"The organization expresses the revolution, but does not precede it; even less
does it anticipate its objectives and its actions." Rossanda quotes a beautiful
statement by Marx. ("One can understand"), he wrote scathingly, why these conspirators
are not content to organize the revolutionary proletariat. Their occupation consists in
anticipating the development of the revolutionary process, to push it deli-

berately towards a crisis, to make the revolution on the spot, without the condition
of revolution being present. The only condition for them is that the insurrection
should be sufficiently organized. They are the alchemists of the revolution, and

they share confused ideas with the alchemists of old. Obsessed by their own
anticipations, they have no other aim but the next overthrow of the existing government
and they have profound contempt for activity of a more theoretic kind, which consists
in explaining to the workers what their real interests are. To the degree that
the Paris proletariat advanced directly to the center of the stage as a party, so
did these conspirators see their influence wane." (p. 218) Rossanda wants to

argue that between the proletariat and the party of the proletariat, the terms
are almost interchangeable. The party as the proletariat's self-expression.

This introductory section ends with a quote from The Eighteenth Brumaire on the
revolution is thoroughgoing. (p. 219) But since it is rev. in permanence

Section 2 is entitled "The Model of the Commune". Here Rossanda is investigating
the relation of social being and consciousness: "With Marx, the fusion between
social being and consciousness is obviously based on praxis." (p. 220) The highest
practical

17335

expression of this is the Commune of ~~1871~~ "In the Commune...direct democracy thus appeared ~~not~~ as an elementary form of proletarian power, but as its specific form." (p.220). Rossanda concludes in this section: "If, that is to say, one does not find a ~~party~~ theory of the party in Marx, the reason is that, in his theory of revolution, there is neither need nor room for it." (p.221) *not quite*

Section 3 "Lenin's Horizon" (p.221) "The question and the theory of the revolutionary party only arise with Lenin. Their birth is historically specific."

Rossanda says that at turn of century Lenin's horizon delimited by two facts:
1. capitalist had entered imperialist phase *not July 14 1902 when it had to be done*
2. crisis more complex than had been foreseen. The period 1872-1905 had been marked by absence of revolution. Then

came 1905. Rossanda says two questions arose which marked the revolutions of 20th century and also characterized Leninism. 1. capitalism and imperialism defeated in areas which according to the the Marxian schema were not "ripe" for communism.

not only see his theory 002-03

Here Rossanda says that the thesis of "backward" countries having to pass through stages lasted to the fifties/ ~~until~~ Chinese Communists and some revolutionary currents in 3rd World proposed theory of "zones of revolutionary storm." s. political organization no longer presents itself in terms of the spontaneous formation. The more a society lacks "maturity" the more important a vanguard should provoke the telescoping of objective conditions and a revolutionary explosion -- making the exploited revolutionaries. An external vanguard. A revolutionary party is bearer of the analysis and ideas of Marx, ~~yet foreign~~ to the process of struggle-consciousness which Marx had sketched out. Even in Europe the crisis of social democracy and incapacity to oppose to social-democracy a non-Leninist model (only Gramsci and Luxemburg made the attempt) rendered impossible a practical adherence to Marxist method. *unfortunately also not on basis of K M*

23
23
23

Section 4 "What Is To Be Done" -- must read text as polemic against gradualism and economism and against the ideological accoutrements of opportunism of 2nd International. But text constitutes a radical revision of the relationship between class and party, class and class consciousness. Lenin quotes Kautsky on social consciousness from outside. Rossanda says "Lenin's objective was to liberate social democracy from economism" and then says Lenin "didn't get bogged down in a philosophical

discussion" but claims Lenin provided "a crucially idealistic reconstruction of the birth of Marxism as a product of culture and of ~~nothing else~~." (p.223) The Marxian dialectic here is one in which ~~the~~ the proletariat has the capacity of an "objective quantity" while party is the focus of "revolutionary initiative".

Part 5 "Rosa Luxemburg's approach" Luxemburg did not deny need for organized vanguard which Rossanda says came not from her viewing absence of a political dimension in working class struggle but from the objective fragmentation of the struggles. Rossanda quotes RL on showing that it was ~~not~~ social-democracy that began education of proletariat, but proletariat that brought into being the social-democracy. Link of spontaneity and organization resided in the "laws" of historical development of the class struggle, that is to say of the material base. Rossanda quotes RL's expression on Thalass, the eternal sea (p. 225) Rossanda ends this section first by saying RL's position condemned by international and that had to do with question of

Section 5 "Gramsci's Itinerary" Gramsci on the councils emphasizes self-government of the producers based on "growth of the class as the direct political subject." Political expression does not require mediations. (But) 10 years later Notes of Machiavelli the accent is placed on the vanguard. Intervention of vanguard need for reality to take shape, to release realities yet imprecise, potentialities. Machiavelli's "discovery" -- the autonomy of the political movement. It has implications for a

Dec. 1, 1985

Dear Raya,

I want to begin with the 30 Year Retrospective in terms of the 1980s. This half decade strikes me as tremendously rich in M-H thought and developments, as much so as any full decade under review. In N&L the year 1980 begins with publishing the two draft chapters from RLWLKM (Jan.-Feb and April) and ends with the publication of 25 years of Marxist-Humanism in the U.S. (Aug.-Sept., Oct., Nov., Dec, Jan-Feb.81) which launches our move to a 12-pager on a regular basis. Inbetween is the publication of essay articles -- mine on Marx's revolutionary journalism (May 1980) and Olga's on women's liberation in search of a theory (June, 1980).

Although RLWLKM won't come off the press to end of '82, as early as 1980 or perhaps 1979 when you published the draft chapter on Marx and Engels contrasted (Jan.-Feb.), the influence of the new book-to-be is felt within N&L's pages. Saying it another way, we had an intertwining of your work on the new book, a new sense of M-H organization/philosophy and its relation to objectivity with your writing of the 25 Year History and a new form for the newspaper with its expansion to 12 pages and the beginning of Essay articles.

By the end of 1980 we were greeted with Reagan. Reaganism together with revolution/counter revolution in Iran, in Central America, in Poland, and now in South Africa dominated the objective events in this half decade. Throughout the last five years one can see the interaction between these events and Marxist-Humanism in numerous leads, T/P and other articles in the paper.

The years 1982-82 for N&L can be said to be our "years of the essay" For 1981 we had Nike writing on Peasant Dimension in Latin America (April), Peter on youth (May), Neda on Iranian women, (June) Margaret on Italy (July), Kevin on French Edition of Capital (Oct), and myself on Latin America (Jan.-Feb.) and M-H Archives (Nov.) Unfortunately, although '82 had a number of essays, we have certainly not written regularly in other years. In both '80 and '81 your writings on Iran (May, April, Nov.) and on China (Jan.-Feb., May, Aug.-Sept.) are strongly represented in the paper. And of course we began a steady stream of articles on Reaganism.

Poland began off '82 with your lead-editorial article on continued resistance (Jan.-Feb), Ursula's essay on Polish women (March), and your T/P with Poland and all of East Europe discussed in relation to the trilogy (March). Essay articles that year are by Ron on Marx and the party in the 1850s (Jan.-Feb.), Cyrus on Kurds (April) Nizeria by Ukokwe (July), Margarete from Italy (Nov.) and myself on Marx and Non-capitalist lands (Dec.).

What is striking to 1982 to me is that the introduction to all three works are published - (PAR (May), MEF (June) and RLWLKM (November). The year ends with RLWLKM off the press and ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ with your new analysis of Russia, Andropov's Ascending (Dec). Other dimensions which were important in this period: the Black Dimension in the South was carried in June, in Aug.-Sept. and in Nov. As well it is articles throughout '81-82 on Guatemala, in-person reports, that we then used to create the Guatemala Revolutionaries Speak pamphlet, just as our pamphlet

on

17339

on Latin America's Revolutions come primarily from the essay type articles that we had in N&L.

1983 is of course the Marx Centenary with our special issue and your tour. The March issue has all the special articles and the ad for the first part of the tour. April continues the tour ad. Your sum-up of that tour appears in the June issue.

1983 ends with our new edition of ACOT announced and then with Denby's death and our in memoriam issue (Nov.) and finally with our front page article on Grenada invasion, including announcement of PPL to come on Grenada.

1984 Jan-Feb presents the new front page with Workshop Talks and Black World and includes your new introduction to ACOT. March as both your introduction to Afro-Asian and Terry's essay article on Eleanor Marx (something we should use or perhaps reissue for the Centenary 1986). April has Alan's essay on Black opposition to U.S. imperialism in the 19th century. The "N&L year" ends in May with Draft Perspectives announcing the proposed move to Chicago.

Finally is the period of the paper being in Chicago. The high point in one sense is the "return" back to Detroit for the Archives Lecture and Exhibition. March carries the front page announcement of it, April, the special Archives lecture-exhibit-readers' views section. Second is the 30 Year Retrospective itself in the July and November issues. And third is publication of WLDOR with reviews by Terry in March and Ida Fuller in May, as well as special ad in Oct. and special sections of RV including this Dec. What is interesting about these three points to me is that they are involve explicitly M-H as a body of ideas, our willingness to speak directly on that in a more open comprehensive manner than ever before. It seems that this flows out of the 1984 Perspectives section on Not by Practice Alone, the Movement from Theory, and that everything is in one way or another a reformulation of that -- from the full Archives talk and exhibit, to the fact of the 30 year retrospective. After all, we never did a 25 year retrospective, and I suspect that it is within this last half decade that we are finally working out a fuller appreciation of ourselves. And of course as many have noted, the new book is so explicitly Marxist-Humanist.

All of this is not unrelated to what is happening around the objective situation, especially to how we as Marxist-Humanists have written about South Africa in the most recent period, and how we have written about that whole category of post-Marx Marxism within the pages in of N&L. Mike's review of Shanin's book (June '84) yours on Dupre (Oct. '84) Grenada PPL excerpts (Nov) Kevin's on Levine St (Dec), your presentation to expanded REB Jan.-Feb., to name some of the most recent. Also on Objective situation are two important political analysis as they were happening -- Bitburg, and then Summit.

This last half decade coincided with so much new in Marxist-Humanism: 1) your final working out of RIMM, especially post-Marx Marxists and a 1980s view of Marx's last decade. 2) the reorganisation and new presentation of the Archives in 1981 and now their new presentation of 81-85 and a full addition of much other material at the beginning of next year. 3) the expansion of N&L to 12 pages with full time and my coming to Center to be managing editor 4) Denby's death and the reorganisation of the front page of N&L as workshop talks and especially as Black World 5) the new 4th book WLDOR 6) and now the proposal for transforming N&L into a biweekly.

* * *

The second topic I wanted to write about here but just briefly is on the Party. I just finished Robert Service's first volume Lenin A Political Life and while this is not presented here as any kind of review, but just a few random thoughts while reading. The book which certainly has much on the Party and Lenin from 1902 to 1910 made me think about how much we have changed in our thinking about Lenin and our thinking about Marx on the question of the Party. The book certainly shows that

17340

Lenin was no all powerful force in his own party in those years. He was quite, quite often in the minority. So he was forever fighting a battle, and while you can certainly be sympathetic with his fight many times, the greater truth is that there absolutely does not appear to be any whiff of a philosophy in his battles. So no matter how much you admire Lenin on his battles, you realize that the ground they are fought on is completely lacking philosophy. So no matter how good Lenin is politically, he has very little to teach us on the Party even when he is "right" because the ground is wrong. Now more than a decade ago, you had already said Lenin as a ~~Marx~~ Lassaléan, so of course much of this is not at all new. What is new is the view you have developed on Marx on organization. It shows on a title ~~the~~ Dialectic of the Party. Because to jam dialectic with party means as a Marxist you cannot take the simple route of returning only to Lenin as organization man and dismissing Marx because he supposedly had no theory of the party. Chapter 11 of RLWLKM is the ~~major~~ point of departure for us in thinking about the new book. One thing it made me think about was the 2nd International. In M&F until HM insisted, you did not see anything on 2nd, and then refused to call it a party. I am wondering if the vantage point of the Dialectics of the Party means that the 2nd will end up in a more prominent place in your discussions. Are we in part dealing with a "history" of the party from Marx's time to our own, or is the centenary since Marx a mere diversion in terms of the party? In one sense I am sure it is, as I mentioned last week reading about American Trotskyism seems so empty, and even the disputes within the RSDLP in the first decade of the 20th century seem in many ways devoid of much for us, and yet, the Party, the Party still attracts so much of the Left. The mass struggles historically have come up with so many creative forms, and yet the Left seems still to live in one or another version of party tactics and strategy as their own answer.

Eugene

17341

17342

For Eugene 12/12/1985

AB Check Ch. 6

TON Plus + Some pp 143-67

Lenin A Political Life Volume I The Strengths Of Contradiction Robert Service Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1985. (Service is lecturer in Russian History at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London and author of The Bolshevik Party in Revolution, 1917-1923)

The non-Marxist Robert Service's first volume of a projected 3 volume study of Lenin covers from his birth to the year 1910 after the Jan. 1910 Central Committee Plenum, is a valuable, serious study of Lenin's political life, chronological in presentation, and, what is of particular concern to us, covers the debates of the RSDLP throughout the first decade of the 20th century, that is through the 5th (1907) Party Congress.

In the 10 page "Prologue: The Enigma of Lenin" Service briefly reviews the scholarship on Lenin both inside Russia and in the West. He critiques the out and out falsification in Russia of the 1930s, noting: "Stalin's self-identification with Lenin, moreover, was not wholly unwelcome to the Soviet government's external enemies. It was used by several commentators to propagate the notion that the entire epoch of Russian history after 1917 had been filled with unrelieved, inexorable horror." (p.4)

As for the West, Service does not comment a great deal, mostly listing studies such as Wolfe, Carr, Deutscher, Schapiro for the 1950s; Richard Pipes and Neil Harding for the 60s and 70s. A number of times he notes his disagreements with Hardings work and most especially with Pipes. On Harding see p. 209 footnote 9 on Plekhanov's attitude to The Development of Capitalism; on Pipes see p. 211-12 footnote 65 for his critique of Lenin being close to ideas of German S-D at the end of the 19th century. Service is cognizant of the dismissal of Lenin as philosopher (p.6) but offers no particular opinion of his own on this question in this volume.

Chapters 1-3 (pp. 11-64) deal with mostly background material Ch. 1 "Cross Currents" both with background material on Lenin's family and on Russia after "the great reform." Ch. 2 "Roads to Freedom" with Lenin's life at university, early political activity, discussion of Russian Marxists vs. Russian populism and Plehanov's Marxism. Ch. 3 "Arrivals" with Lenin's first arrival and work in St. Petersburg, his first meeting with Plehanov and his imprisonment and exile in 1897.

Ch 4 "Capitalism in One Country" begins with a discussion of Lenin's The Development of Capitalism and with its Russian critics, particularly that of P.N. Skvortsov arguing

that some of Lenin's categories were not necessarily specifically capitalist. The question of the Party is first discussed in this chapter, beginning with the Minsk Congress of 1998 attended by 9 delegates. But followed by a wave of arrests of social-democratic supporters with 500 under arrest by Jan. 1899. Lenin was in Siberia at the time, but before finishing The Development of Capitalism he had written in 1897 "The Tasks of Russian Social-Deomcrats" and in 1899 "produced a series of draft articles ending with his Project for Our Party's Program". From the outset, he re-affirmed his admiration for the earlier attempts by Plekhanov and Akselrod; his own aim was only to offer 'particular editorial changes, corrections and additions'." (p74) "As early at 1897, in The Tasks of Russian Social-Democrats, he asserted that 'the struggle with the government is impossible without a strengthening and development of revolutionary organisation and conspirativeness.' In The Essential Question, written in 1899, he refined his proposals. It was his belief that the party's overriding priority should be to introduce a 'division of labour' into its affairs."

Covered here as well is Lenin's first fight over publication of Iskra finally settled with its being published in Munich under Lenin.

Ch. 5 "Strengthening Sticks" begins with the first issues of Iskra "Ulyanov, writing for Iskra, poured his greatest effort into consideration of the party's

condition The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement appeared in the first issue; it resumed the organisational proposals of his Siberian period. But he wanted to expand his argument in a full book. The result was What Is To Be Done? It was printed in spring 1902. Its contents have frequently been ^{mis} understood. What Is To Be Done? has been viewed, by numbers of apologists and detractors alike, as a universal practical blueprint. Ulyanov has been said to have tendered a schema of organisational mechanics fit for all socialist parties in all times and in all countries. In fact he announced restricted aims. His immediate recommendations were addressed specifically to Russia and presented not as an eternal panacea but as solutions to 'the painful questions of our movement.'" (p. 88). Thus Service catches some of the misinterpretations of What is to be done? pp. 89-91 deal with some of the reaction and debate among RSDIP leaders. The principle opponents were A.S. Mortsnov and V.P. Akimov.

3 1914-16-17
On "Socialist"

At turn of century two trends other than RSDLP were present (1) liberals were moving to form own party. (2) agrarian socialism gained a new life with organization of Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries. A move was on for a Party Congress. Lenin's attitude; "A fight perhaps causes irritation to a few person, but thereby it clears the air; it defines relations directly and precisely; it defines which disagreements are basic and which secondary, defines where there are people taking a completely different road and where there are true party comrades dissenting only about particularities." (p.96)

The Iskra board was to draft a party program. Plehanov offered draft and (Jan. 8, 1902) the (6) editors met to discuss draft. Lenin launched a full critique (p. 97-100) Ch. 5 ends with a discussion on 2nd party Congress which doesn't seem to contain anything new.

ch. 6 "From this accursed Distance" deals with the debates and party wrangling that followed 2nd Party Congress from Lenin's "One Step Forward, 2 Steps Backward" to Trotsky's "Our Political Tasks" to Luxemburg's "Organization Questions of RSD" to the opposition within Lenin's own Bolshevik faction. What seems to emerge here and in fact what you find over and over still later is that Lenin has anything but a majority even in his own Bolsheviks. Something is clearly driving him. A desire for a certain kind of party --but for us as Marxist-Humanism he have to ask what ~~is~~ drive grounded in? Does it have a relevance for today?

Here one see Lenin's alliance with Bogdanov against the Bolshevik "conciliators" lead by Noskov. Vpered began to be published. Lenin worked to win the social-democrats inside Russia. The year is 1904 and on the objective scene is the Russo-Japan War.

ch. 7 "Sturm und Drang" begins with a discussion of 1905 in Russia. Lenin is depicted here (first part of 1905) as being against any alignment with Mensheviks and even willing to break with many Bolsheviks who do not agree with in, in particular by Noskov. "Two Tasks of S-D in the Democratic Revolution" is written.

ch 7 and 8 look at Lenin in period of 1905 Revolution Ch. 8 "Predicting the Tide" writes of the philosophic disagreement with Bogdanov but "Nevertheless Lenin and Bogdanov concurred that philosophical disagreements need not affect their political alliance. They ~~xxx~~ made epistemology a truce zone." What is interesting in ch. 8 is that Service

1914-16-17
On "Socialist"
1914-16-17
On "Socialist"
1914-16-17
On "Socialist"
1914-16-17
On "Socialist"

tries to present the type of war Lenin is having with himself on relation of party to mass, on attitude to soviets, of attitude to other factions such as Bagdanov. The particular section where this is happening is "On Philosophy and On The Soviets" pp143-146

Or take the following statement: "If Lenin's thinking in 1905 was more tension-laden than was customary even for him, it must be appreciated that Russian politics changed with bewildering rapidity inside a few months. But there is a further difficulty. Lenin was an active politician, not an armchair commentator. He wrote to achieve impact over his party and through his party. Rhetorical flourish and exaggeration were fair play. Since Lenin was concerned lest the Bolsheviks might float adrift of working-class opinion, it was natural for him to make a strong case for the instinctive virtues of the factory labourer. No statement of theory made by him was unaffected by his immediate political goals. His 'political thought' is therefore mishandled when, as was done in his day and is still done today, it is treated as a thing unto itself. The parts lack ultimate definition; they are constantly in motion. The system of his ideas is an interplay of tendencies; it is not a static, particularised code." (p. 146-147)

April 1906 is 4th Congress Lenin for land nationalization. Mensheviks argued that this to be oriental despotism, therefore don't wish any kind of centralized authority. But other Bolsheviks did not support Lenin's position especially S. A Suvorov. "even on a major question of policy such as land tenure, Lenin was not the master of the Bolshevik faction." (p. 153) As well Lenin had to fight an insurrectionist tendency in his own party.

chp. 9 "For the Good of the Cause" includes a report of the 5th Party Congress of 1907.

disappear from the political centre-stage; but, at the slightest revivification, the basic political forces will again reveal themselves, give no sign of themselves,

character and direction of activity, until the objective problems of a revolution which has suggested this or that defeat has been revolted.'

Such thoughts yielded the conclusion that revolutionary leadership in times of unfreedom was better undertaken by a few men with correct theory than by many who united around a "hotchpotch" of incorrect ideas." (pp. 173-174)

ch. 10 "Doubts and Certainties" Deals with Lenin's fight against Bogdanov. And Services conclusion that at beginning of 1910 Lenin was quite isolated within his own Bolshevik faction.

Eugene
Dec. 12, 1985