

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री प्रशासन अकादमी

Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy

of Administration

मसूरी

MUSSOORIE

पुस्तकालय

LIBRARY

अवाप्ति संख्या

Accession No. ~~3111~~ 104619

वर्ग संख्या

Class No. 320.9479

पुस्तक संख्या

Book No. Ber

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!



И. Гамбург.

L. B E R I A

**ON THE HISTORY
OF THE BOLESHEVIK
ORGANIZATIONS
in
TRANSCAUCASIA**

**A LECTURE
DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF ACTIVE WORKERS
OF THE TBILISI PARTY ORGANIZATION
JULY 21-22, 1935**

*Translated from the Seventh
Russian edition*

**FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE
M O S C O W 1 9 4 9**

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. ON THE HISTORY OF THE INCEPTION AND FORMATION OF THE BOLSHEVIK ORGANIZATIONS IN TRANSCAUCASIA (1897-1904)	13
II. ON THE HISTORY OF THE BOLSHEVIK ORGANIZATIONS OF TRANSCAUCASIA IN THE PERIOD OF THE FIRST RUSSIAN REVOLUTION (1905-1907).	67
III. ON THE HISTORY OF THE BOLSHEVIK ORGANIZATIONS OF TRANSCAUCASIA IN THE PERIOD OF REACTION AND OF THE NEW RISE OF THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT (1907-1913).	191
IV. ON THE HISTORY OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST NATIONALIST DEVIATIONISM (1913-1924)	275

APPENDIX

ON THE QUESTION OF THE PRAGUE CONFERENCE <i>A Reply to Various Comrades by Lavrenti Beria</i>	321
CHRONOLOGY OF COMRADE STALIN'S ARRESTS, EXILES AND ESCAPES	335
EXPLANATORY NOTES	337



L. B E R I A

Comrades!

The study and understanding of the history of our Party is a most important means for the Marxist-Leninist education of the members of the Party and the Young Communist League.

In 1931, Comrade Stalin, in his historic article "Some Questions Concerning the History of Bolshevism," focussed the attention of the Party organizations on the task of studying the history of our Party in a Bolshevik way.

Comrade Stalin wrote at that time of the need:

"... to raise the questions concerning the history of Bolshevism to the proper level, to put the study of the history of our Party on scientific, Bolshevik lines, and to concentrate attention against the Trotskyite and all other falsifiers of the history of our Party by systematically tearing off their masks."*

This task requires that the teaching of the history of the Party, the study of the anti-Party groupings in the history of our Party and of their methods of

* J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, p. 389.

References are to Russian editions unless otherwise stated.

struggle against the Party line should be raised to the proper level.

This task requires that Party members should know not only how the Party fought and overcame the Constitutional-Democrats (Cadets), the Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks and the Anarchists, but also how the Party fought and overcame the Trotskyites, the "Democratic Centralists," the "Workers' Opposition," the Zinovievites, the Rights, the Rightist-"Leftist" freaks, etc.

To raise Bolshevik vigilance to the proper level and to arm Communists against all enemies of our Party it is necessary that every member of the Party should know the heroic experience of how the Lenin-Stalin Party was built and how it fought; it is necessary that he should know and understand not only the successes and victories of the Party but also how they were won by the Party in the struggle against all the enemies of Leninism.

In view of the victory of Socialism, the enormous cultural and political development of the broad masses of the working people and the intensification of resistance on the part of the remnants of the defeated class enemy, it is essential in every way to raise the level of Marxist-Leninist education and, first and foremost, the level of knowledge of the Bolshevik history of our Party.

The study of the history of the Party must be organized in such a way that it shall not be restricted to a bare description of events and facts in the heroic history of Bolshevism, but provide knowledge of the economic and political situation of the coun-

try, give a complete picture of the intricate and multifarious struggle of all classes in pre-revolutionary Russia and of the struggle of the oppressed nations for national liberation under the leadership of the working class and its Bolshevik Party.

The history of the Party must be set forth in such a way as to give the Marxist explanation of the history of our Party's fight against anti-Bolshevik trends and factions within the Party and the working class, to demonstrate the supreme importance in principle of this struggle for Leninism.

What we need now is that the members of the Party and the Young Communist League should more seriously and deeply study the history of Bolshevism, the history of the Party's struggle against all sorts of anti-Leninist deviations and trends, the concrete situation in which the Party of Lenin and Stalin worked.

The history of our Party must be studied in such a way as will ensure the assimilation of the heroic experience of the Bolsheviks' struggle against the numerous enemies of Leninism and arm the members of the Party and the Young Communist League for the fight against the enemies of the Party, against the survivals of the ideas and views of all the defeated counter-revolutionary, anti-Party groups.

In recent years the Party organizations in Transcaucasia have done considerable work in the propagation and study of the history of the Party. But our achievements in this field are obviously inadequate. *We are lagging behind especially in the*

Bolshevik analysis and study of the Bolshevik organizations in Transcaucasia and Georgia, in the study of the struggle of the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks for the cause of Lenin and Stalin.

The Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia have acquired enormous historical experience in the struggle to build the Leninist Party, a struggle which went on for decades under the direct guidance of the leader of our Party, Comrade Stalin.

The whole history of the Transcaucasian Bolshevik organizations and the entire revolutionary movement in Transcaucasia and in Georgia from its inception, have been inseparably associated with the work and name of Comrade Stalin. (*Loud applause.*)

The question of analyzing and studying the history of the communist organizations in Transcaucasia and in Georgia received the special attention of the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of Georgia and the Seventh Congress of the communist organizations of Transcaucasia.

At these congresses the mistakes and distortions committed in their works by some communist historians were severely criticized.

In its decisions, the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of Georgia gave the following instruction:

“Noting the distortions of the history of the Party and the revolutionary movement in Georgia and Transcaucasia occurring in the works of a number of communist historians, the Congress deems it necessary still further to concentrate the attention of all Party organizations of Georgia

against attempts to falsify the history of Bolshevism."

After the Congress our organizations took up the work of collecting and analyzing material on the history of the Bolshevik organizations and the revolutionary movement of Transcaucasia in a better way than before.

However, *very little has been done as yet*; a great deal of data and numerous documents have not yet been collected.

To this day the Tbilisi branch of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.) has failed to issue a collection of documents and data on the history of the Party organizations and the revolutionary movement in Transcaucasia, nor has it published a single original work on this subject.

It must be admitted that the history of the Party organizations in Transcaucasia and in Georgia is still far from having been fully investigated and adequately treated.

As for the way in which the struggle of the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks is treated in the writings of Ph. Makharadze (*The History of the Working-Class Movement in Georgia, The Year 1905 in Transcaucasia, The Thirtieth Anniversary of the Tiflis Organization, Outlines of the Revolutionary Movement in Transcaucasia*, and others), it must be said that they contain a number of errors in matters of principle and history; they distort historical facts and events and present a number of points in the history of the Party *dishonestly*.

So far Comrade Makharadze has not taken the trouble to revise his works and correct the mistakes and distortions they contain.

A. Yenukidze and M. Orakhelashvili, since exposed as enemies of the people, smuggled deliberate distortion and falsification of the history of the Transcaucasian organization into their books.

Members of the Party and of the Y.C.L., non-party workers and collective farmers are showing tremendous interest in the study of the history of the Bolshevik organizations and of the revolutionary movement in Transcaucasia.

The Party organizations are pressing us for historical literature that will correctly present the history of our Party organizations.

Since the Seventh Congress of the Communist Organizations in Transcaucasia and the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Georgia, we have already collected a quantity of data and documents on the history of our Party organizations.

The Transcaucasian Territorial Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.) and the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Georgia have commissioned me to clarify *several of the questions* (facts and events) concerning the history of the Bolshevik organizations of Transcaucasia and Georgia on the basis of these data and documents.

I
ON THE HISTORY OF THE INCEPTION
AND FORMATION OF THE BOLSHEVIK
ORGANIZATIONS IN TRANSCAUCASIA
(1897-1904)

The first seeds of Marxism were brought into Transcaucasia in the first half of the 'nineties by Russian Social-Democrats who had been exiled by the tsarist government from the central regions of Russia (Joseph Kogan, Ivan Luzin, G. Francheski and others), on the one hand, and, on the other, by the "legal Marxists" of Georgia who had been abroad (Noah Jordania, Karlo Chkheidze, and others).

The first Marxist, Social-Democratic organization in Georgia was the "Messameh Dassy." Noah Jordania's group (1893-98) was the principal group of the "Messameh Dassy," which propagated Marxism through the Georgian legal press (the newspapers *Kvali** and *Moambeh****) in Tiflis, then the centre of all Transcaucasia.

* *Kvali* (*The Furrow*)—a weekly newspaper in the Georgian language, an organ of the liberal-nationalist trend.

The name "Messameh Dassy" (which means "third group") was given to it by the writer G. Tsereteli¹ in his speech at the funeral of the writer Ignatius Ninoshvili² in Guria, on which occasion the program of the Marxist youth was publicly set forth (by S. Jibladze and others).

In naming this rising Social-Democratic movement the "Messameh Dassy," Georgi Tsereteli considered that the new generation—the Marxist youth—was the continuator of the work of the two preceding political trends of the Georgian intelligentsia in the second half of the nineteenth century: the national-liberation trend, headed by the writer I. Chavchavadze,³ and the liberal-bourgeois trend headed by G. Tsereteli himself. In his opinion, the new trend was to be the political successor of the bourgeois-liberal trend.

In an editorial on the "Messameh Dassy" the *Kvali* wrote:

"Since the 'nineties a progressive breeze has been blowing again. Since 1893 individuals

Between 1893 and 1897 it was under the editorship of G. Tsereteli. At the end of 1897 it was acquired by the majority group of the "Messameh Dassy" (N. Jordania and others) and thenceforth became the mouthpiece of legal Marxism.

After the Bolshevik and Menshevik factions appeared within the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, *Kvali* became the organ of the Georgian Mensheviks.

It was suppressed by the tsarist government in 1904.

** *Moambeh* (*The Herald*)—a monthly magazine of the liberal-nationalist trend. It appeared from 1894 to 1908, in the Georgian language.

¹ Superior numbers indicate the explanatory notes to be found in the appendix.—*Tr.*

from among the youth, with an unusual trend and an original program of their own, have appeared in Georgian literature through the columns of the journal *Kvali*. They are adherents of the theory of economic materialism. I. Ninoshvili must be considered the leader of this 'Dassy' (group) in *belles-lettres* and N. Jordania in journalism. The honour of noticing this new progressive phenomenon in our lives sooner than anyone else belongs to one of the representatives of the 'Meoredassists,' Mr. G. Tsereteli, and it was he who baptized the new group the 'Messameh Dassy.' That this group is to become the real successor of the 'Meoredassists' . . . is clearly shown by the literary and journalistic facts of the past."*

The "Messameh Dassy" began to arise in 1893. One of its founders, S. Jibladze, formulated its main ideas as follows:

"We say that

"1) During these 25-30 years a new epoch has begun in our lives. Its characteristic feature is manifest in special economic relations, which means commodity exchange, trade. Here the old master gives way to the new, money. Money destroys the old and builds the new; it divides the people into two parts; two classes arise—the rich and the poor. The old distinction of estates is a fiction. Exchange is brought about by the division of labour, by the production of com-

* *Kvali*, No. 46, 1897.

modities. The production of commodities means capitalism in general.

"2) In its development capitalism passes through several stages or phases. The last stage of capitalism is 'large-scale production'. We have entered this stage but are not yet entrenched.

"3) If the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in our country have not yet taken sufficiently definite shape, that does not mean that we have had neither the one nor the other. Inasmuch as our big landowners grow rich from land incomes they are bourgeois. Add to them the manufacturer, the usurer, the merchant and other producers. Our proletariat is a mixed organism. The majority have small allotments which give them the mere title of property owners, but in reality they are proletarianized elements (Bogano). They are working people whose fate depends on both the commodity and labour markets. They are on the way to complete proletarianization.

"4) In our literature a new (third) group ('dassy') has arisen. This group (dassy) is the exact opposite of the old group (dassy), which has no basis. It is progressive, whereas the latter is retrogressive. So far the bourgeoisie has no organization of its own in our literature, has no group (dassy) in it to express its interests, if we leave out of account the reviews by Mr. N. Nikoladze in *Moambe*. The bourgeoisie functions in life. In so far as it destroys the old patriarchal

system by its activity, it is progressive; in so far as it ruins the people, it is retrogressive. The motto of the new group (dassy) is: 'Scientific investigation of the new trend of life, and struggle, not against its tendencies—that goes on independently of us—but against those consequences which corrupt people.' In this respect struggle means enlightening the oppressed and fighting for their interests. The enemy of this new trend is also the enemy of the oppressed.

"This is our outlook upon our life in general and upon literature in particular."*

Thus the "Messameh Dassy" recognized capitalism as being progressive and advocated the idea of class differentiation and class struggle as the content of social and political life.

The majority of the "Messameh Dassy," however, never carried the idea of the class struggle as far as the Marxist conception of the class struggle of the proletariat.

The ideologist and author of all the programmatic works of the "Messameh Dassy" was Noah Jordania.

In his writings Jordania maintained that capitalist development was necessary and progressive; he advocated an alliance between the proletariat and the liberal bourgeoisie and preached the idea of a national renaissance of Georgia.

Noah Jordania never reached the Marxist con-

* *Kvali*, No. 14, March 26, 1895, p. 15.

ception of the class struggle of the proletariat. From the very beginning Noah Jordania maintained and propagated the bourgeois-nationalist thesis that the economic life of capitalism, national culture and national character unite all the classes of society in a single national organism, and that all classes of a nation are equally interested in the regeneration of the nation.

He wrote:

"The Georgian nation has entered upon this historical path" (the capitalist path of development.—*L. B.*) "So far it has taken only the first step in this direction, and has thereby established itself on new ground. This has given the Georgian nation a firm foundation. The nation¹ has been harnessed in a common yoke, has grown accustomed to joint life and joint activity. The ground has been prepared for a common consciousness."*

The "Messameh Dassy" did not have a homogeneous political line. Its majority, headed by Jordania, constituted the "legal Marxism" group, which, in its writings on a number of fundamental questions of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, distorted the teachings of revolutionary Marxism, vulgarized Marxism and painted it in nationalist colours.

Noah Jordania and the majority of the "Messameh Dassy" rejected the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement

* N. Jordania, "Economic Development and Nationality" (1894), *Selected Works*, Kultura Publishing House, 1911, p. 27.

and denied the necessity of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

From the very beginning Jordania's group adopted a nationalist position on the national question.

Noah Jordania advanced and maintained the theory that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat stood on common ground and should engage in common national activity.

He wrote:

"A nation that is united materially is also united ideologically. Everyone strives to develop the national labour, to strengthen the nation. . . . The bourgeois-merchant, the peasant and the worker are all equally interested in the greatness of the nation."*

Or:

"It is a rare thing to come across a Georgian who does not desire the improvement and development of our life. . . . Here, on this question, all sincere and honest workers are united, and, inspired with one aim, bravely devote themselves to the public cause."**

The majority of the "Messameh Dassy," headed by Jordania, maintaining that the capitalist development of Georgia was necessary and inevitable, and sharply criticizing the feudal-noble and Narodnik ideological trends of the Georgian intelligentsia, saw for the most part only the positive, progressive side of capitalism; they admired the capitalist

* *Ibid.*, p. 9.

** N. Jordania, "Our Disagreement," *Selected Works*, p. 257.

process which they expected would regenerate the Georgian people and did not raise the question of waging a revolutionary struggle against capitalism and of overthrowing the bourgeois system.

Jordania wrote:

“Europeanization is proceeding on Georgian soil, on the basis of Georgian culture. Our country and foreign countries, Georgia and Europe. To be a Georgian and a European is the new motto. The historical task of our time is to understand this phenomenon and to make the people conscious of it.”*

The majority of the “Messameh Dassy” and Noah Jordania did not go beyond the opportunist conception of the class struggle of the proletariat, and claimed to be the representatives of the Georgian people as a whole.

“The democratic group (dassy) must find a new soil for itself and so become the continuator of the old progressive group. ‘Iberia’ found such a soil among the princes and nobles. We seek this soil among the majority of the nation, irrespective of social status.”**

Proceeding from the thesis that the nation is a united whole, Noah Jordania put the class struggle in a secondary position in the national movement, subordinating the class struggle of the proletariat to the interests of the bourgeois-national movement.

* N. Jordania, “Iberia and Nationality,” 1897, *Selected Works*, p. 114.

** *Ibid.*, p. 66.

He wrote:

"This trend acquired two forms: the inner, i. e., class, form and the outer, i. e., national, form, the struggle between classes and between nations. The first" (the struggle between classes. —*L. B.*), "no matter how fierce, has a limit where those who are fighting stand together, are harnessed in one cultural and historical yoke. This creates what is called a nation, national strength. Here is a common border, beyond this there is another nation, within it there are classes, but around it there is national strength, national culture, a national edifice."*

As far back as 1898-99, Noah Jordania came out openly as an apologist for West European imperialism; he supported the idea that capitalism had a civilizing mission in the colonial and backward countries and maintained that backward colonial peoples must acknowledge the rule of foreign capital as historically necessary and progressive, and appreciate the services of capitalism accordingly.

Jordania openly preached a social-imperialist thesis with regard to the Anglo-Boer War.

This is what he wrote at the time:

"But sympathy for the Boers does not at all demand hatred towards the English. We sympathize with the Boers because they are a small nation and are defending their country and their freedom. England? We must love England and

* N. Jordania, "The Men of the 'Sixties," *Selected Works*, 165.

sympathize with her in many respects. England is the cradle of everything that civilized mankind is proud of today.

“Let the Boers defend their small nation . . . but at the same time let Britain remain a great Britain, the apostle of a new life, the bearer of a new standard. Let her be the leader and the standard bearer of civilization.”*

Between 1893 and 1897 the following were among the members of the “Messameh Dassy”: Noah Jordania, S. Jibladze, Ignatius Ninoshvili, Isidor Ramishvili, Mikha Tskhakaya, Philip Makharadze, A. Tsulukidze, Karlo Chkheidze, Y. Vatsadze, Severian Jugeli, V. Tsabadze, D. Kalandarishvili, L. Darchiashvili, R. Kaladze, I. Kakabadze, Pyotr Geleishvili, A. Tsitlidze and I. Kvitsaridze.

In 1897 Lado Ketskhoveli joined this group, and in 1898 Comrade Stalin joined it, bringing a new, revolutionary element into the life of the group.

The “Messameh Dassy,” and its majority headed by Jordania, played a certain positive part in the period of 1893 to 1898. It was this group that initiated the spread of Marxist ideas in Georgia and Transcaucasia and, notwithstanding all its defects, stimulated the revolutionary youth and leading workers to make the acquaintance of Marxism and study it.

The “Messameh Dassy” made a practice of sending young Marxists to foreign countries and to the central regions of Russia for the purpose of studying

* N. Jordania, “The Boers,” *Kvali*, No. 51, 1899.

Marxism. Noah Jordania, Karlo Chkheidze and Akaky Chkhenkeli were among those who were sent abroad by the "Messameh Dassy."

However, the majority of the "Messameh Dassy," headed by N. Jordania, limited itself to the peaceful, legal propagation of Marxist ideas and to narrow propagandist work in circles among the workers. The majority of the "Messameh Dassy" did not recognize the necessity for an illegal revolutionary press, mass political agitation and the organization of a revolutionary political struggle of the working class against tsarism and the bourgeoisie.

In 1898 a revolutionary Marxist group, consisting of A. Tsulukidze, Lado Ketskhoveri and J. Stalin, arose and took shape within the "Messameh Dassy." This group constituted a minority in the "Messameh Dassy" and differed from the majority on a number of fundamental questions.

The first serious disagreement arose in 1898 on the question of an illegal press.

The minority of the "Messameh Dassy" held that an illegal press was highly important for the propagation and dissemination of revolutionary Marxism, for political agitation against the autocracy and capitalism, for the organization of the political struggle of the working class and the building of a genuine proletarian revolutionary party, and they proposed that an illegal newspaper be established.

The majority of the "Messameh Dassy" headed by N. Jordania denied the need for an illegal press.

The second serious disagreement arose in the summer of 1900 on the question whether activity should

be confined to work in study circles or whether the time was not ripe to start mass agitation and an open struggle against the autocracy. This question became exceptionally acute in the autumn of 1900 with the arrival of V. Kurnatovsky,* a Russian Social-Democrat and follower of *Iskra*.

Comrade V. Kurnatovsky was a great help to the Georgian Social-Democrats in the application of the line of Lenin's *Iskra*.

Workingmen of Tiflis who knew Kurnatovsky through his work and who shared his imprisonment in Tiflis jail in 1902 recall the following about him:

* Victor Kurnatovsky was a trained, educated Marxist, a staunch and consistent supporter of Lenin's *Iskra*.

He began his revolutionary career as a member of the "Narodnaya Volya" (People's Will) party. Because of his connection with this organization he served a term of three years in exile in Archangel Gubernia, and in October 1892 he went abroad. In Zurich he graduated from the Polytechnical Institute as a chemical engineer. In 1893 he joined Plekhanov's "Emancipation of Labour" group. In August 1893 he participated in the work of the Zurich Congress of the Second International. In 1896 Kurnatovsky returned to work in Russia, but he was arrested while crossing the border and exiled to Minusinsk District for three years. Here, in exile, V. Kurnatovsky first made the acquaintance of V. I. Lenin, who was in exile from May 20, 1897, to February 11, 1900, in the village of Shushenskoye in the Minusinsk District. Kurnatovsky became a proletarian revolutionary, a consistent adherent of Lenin, for the rest of his life. He was one of the seventeen Social-Democrats who signed Lenin's "A Protest by Russian Social-Democrats" against the "Credo" of the Economists. In the summer of 1900, after his term of exile had expired, the Party transferred Kurnatovsky to revolutionary work in Tiflis.

After his arrival at Tiflis, he established close contact with Comrade Stalin and became his intimate friend and co-worker.

"It must be said that all the comrades went to Kurnatovsky with their disagreements and disputes. His opinions and conclusions were always accepted without objections. Kurnatovsky was a staunch and unyielding revolutionary."*

The minority demanded that the group proceed from activity in workers' study circles to leadership of the mass struggle of the working class, from propaganda to open forms of political struggle against the autocracy. They advanced the task of diverting economic strikes to political lines, of organizing and carrying out workers' demonstrations, of making more use of the streets in the political struggle to overthrow the autocracy.

The majority of the "Messameh Dassy," headed by N. Jordania, said there was no need to go over to mass agitation and an open struggle against the autocracy.

Waging a determined struggle against the majority of the "Messameh Dassy," the minority (Comrades Stalin, Ketskhoveri, Tsulukidze), extended its influence in the workers' Social-Democratic circles, and succeeded, in 1899-1900, in getting the Tiflis Social-Democratic organization to go over from narrow propaganda work in circles to mass agitation and a political struggle against the autocracy.

This group (the minority of the "Messameh Dassy") was the embryo of revolutionary Social-Democracy.

* Georgian Branch of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, Folio 34, File No. 175.

Later we shall deal in more detail with the enormous revolutionary work conducted by the comrades of the minority in the "Messameh Dassy."

The disagreements which had arisen between the majority and the minority of the "Messameh Dassy" in 1898-1900 became general differences of opinion on the questions of Bolshevism and Menshevism after the Second Party Congress, mainly towards the end of 1904 and the beginning of 1905.

The majority of the "Messameh Dassy," headed by N. Jordania, adopted the position of Menshevism, especially after Plekhanov went over to the Mensheviks; the minority, the group in the "Messameh Dassy" supporting Lenin's *Iskra*, took the Bolshevik position, and at the end of 1904, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, it took shape as a Leninist, Bolshevik organization.

At the end of 1904 and the beginning of 1905 the membership of the Tiflis Bolshevik organization included the following comrades among others: Comrades J. Stalin, A. Tsulukidze, M. Tskhakaya, A. Japaridze, St. Shaumyan, M. Davitashvili, S. Intskirveli, S. Spandaryan, Ph. Makharadze, and also leading workingmen like M. Bochoridze, V. Sturua, G. Telia, Z. Chodrishvili, Y. Kochetkov and G. Aznaurashvili.

Thus, in a resolute and uncompromising struggle against Georgian "legal Marxism," against the majority of the "Messameh Dassy" headed by N. Jordania, a revolutionary, Social-Democratic Bolshevik organization that supported Lenin's

"Iskra" arose, took shape and grew in Transcaucasia under the leadership of Comrade Stalin. (Applause.)

And yet, in a number of his works Comrade Ph. Makharadze gives an incorrect exposition of the history of the "Messameh Dassy" and a false estimation of its role and significance.

Comrade Makharadze represents the "Messameh Dassy" as a homogeneous, consistently revolutionary, Marxist, Social-Democratic organization, and says nothing about the great and serious disagreements and strife within it.

Makharadze writes about the "Messameh Dassy":

"This was an absolutely new trend, a new ideology which opposed the ideology of all the ruling classes and which declared a merciless struggle, a life-and-death struggle, against all oppressing classes."*

"In the Transcaucasian Social-Democratic organizations of that time" (Comrade Makharadze is dealing with the period of 1893-1904—*L. B.*), "opportunistic and revisionist tendencies were rarely encountered in general; we may even say they did not exist at all."**

"There was practically no need here for the Marxist trend to carry on a struggle against any other trend in the working class, as had to be done in other countries. . . ."***

* Ph. Makharadze, "The Thirtieth Anniversary of the Tiflis Organization," 1925, p. 25.

** Ph. Makharadze, Introduction to A. Tsulukidze's book, 1927.

*** Ph. Makharadze, "The Thirtieth Anniversary of the Tiflis Organization," 1925, pp. 42-43.

In the first place, Comrade Makharadze declares that the "Messameh Dassy" as a whole was a genuinely revolutionary, Marxist Social-Democratic organization, thus idealizing the role and significance of the "Messameh Dassy." In the second place, he hushes up the struggle that Lenin's *Iskra* group waged against the majority of the "Messameh Dassy."

And this despite the fact that as far back as 1904 even the Menshevik *Iskra* (the new *Iskra*) had to admit that the majority of the "Messameh Dassy" and their theoretical organ, *Kvali*, were "legal Marxist" and opportunist in character.

This is what the Menshevik *Iskra* said about the *Kvali* of the 'nineties:

"However, an inclination towards theoretical schemes, abstractness, the prevalence of a general idea about an 'economic factor'—if you like, a certain lifelessness,—already characterized *Kvali* at that time. In this respect, *Kvali* was, to some extent, following in the footsteps of the Russian 'legal Marxists' of the early 'nineties, whose theory this newspaper reflected."*

In 1898-1900 a leading, central Social-Democratic group of the Tiflis organization arose and took shape. Its membership included: Sylvester Jibladze, A. Tsulukidze, L. Ketskhoveri,** J. Stalin, Sev. Jugeli and leading workingmen of Tiflis like M. Bochoridze, Z. Chodrishvili and V. Sturua.

* *Iskra*, No. 60, 1904.

** Lado Ketskhoveri was murdered by tsarist thugs in Metekhy Castle in 1903.

As we have already noted, Comrades Stalin, Tsulukidze, Ketskhoveli and the others were greatly assisted in the propagation of revolutionary Marxism and the formation of a Social-Democratic organization by the revolutionary Social-Democrats in Tiflis who had been exiled from Russia. Among these were Victor Kurnatovsky, Ivan Luzin, G. Francheski, J. Kogan, Rodzevich, M. Kalinin, S. Alliluyev, I. Levashkevich, N. Kazarenko and Anna Krassnova.

In the period of 1898-1900 the central Social-Democratic group of Tiflis did an enormous amount of revolutionary propagandist and organizational work for the formation of an illegal Social-Democratic Party organization. The members of the central Party group carried on intensive revolutionary propaganda work. All of them were in charge of workers' study circles. Comrade Stalin alone conducted more than eight workers' Social-Democratic circles.*

* In 1896 and 1897 Comrade Stalin conducted two revolutionary Marxist circles of students in the Tiflis Seminary.

The first revolutionary Marxist circle, called the "Senior" circle, was attended by the following students of the Tiflis Seminary: Misha Davitashvili (Davidov), Archil Dolidze (Rostom), Gutsa Parkadze, Grigori Glurjidze, Simon Natroshvili, Guigo Razmadze, Lado Akhmetelov and Joseph Iremashvili.

The second, "Junior" circle, as it was called, was attended by Georgi Yelisabedashvili, Alexander Svanidze, Dmitri Gurgenidze, Datiko Suliashvili, Vasso Berdzenishvili, Vanno Ketskhoveli, D. Oniashvili and others.

At the beginning of 1898 Comrade Stalin became closely associated with M. Bochoridze, Z. Chodrishvili, V. Sturua, S. Jibladze, G. Ninua and other leading workers who were organizers

Besides propagating the ideas of revolutionary Social-Democracy, the Tiflis central Party group led the strikes and political struggle of the Tiflis proletariat.

In 1898 a big strike was organized for the first time in the railway workshops of Tiflis, following which, up to 1900, a series of big strikes were organized and carried through at the Bozarjyants factory, on the horse tramway, at the Adelpkhanov leather works, in printing plants, etc., as well as a number of May Day celebrations and demonstrations of Tiflis workers. Mainly through the efforts of Comrades Stalin, Ketskhoveli and the advanced workers, the illegal printing of leaflets

of circles; and in January of that year he began to conduct Social-Democratic workers' circles.

Comrade Stalin has said:

"I recall 1898 when I was first given a circle of railway depot workers. That was about 28 years ago. I remember how I received lessons in practical work at Comrade Sturua's house in the presence of Sylvester Jibladze (at that time he, too, was one of my teachers), Zakro Chodrishvili, Mikho Bochorishvili, Ninua and other leading workers of Tiflis." (*Zarya Vostoka (Dawn of the East)*, June 10, 1926.)

One of these workers' circles was attended by Nikolai Macharadze, Leonti Mamaladze, Georgi Rtveladze, G. Telia and others.

Another circle (of young workers) included Yegor Torikashvili, Georgi Lelashvili and F. Jatiev among others.

A third circle was attended by D. Guldedava, Pyotr Khurtsilava, K. Shengelia, N. Tomaradze, R. Sturua, Sandro Merabishvili and others.

A fourth (Russian) circle was attended by Alexei Zakomoldin, V. Bazhanov, Leonti Zolotaryov, Pyotr Montin and others.

A fifth (Russian) circle was attended by Dombrovsky, Y. Kochetkov, P. Skorobogatko and others.

and manifestoes was organized, as well as their distribution among the workers of Tiflis and in a number of other districts of Transcaucasia.

In 1900, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, between four and five hundred Tiflis workers celebrated May Day (April 23, Old Style). They gathered outside the city near Salt Lake, carrying portraits of Marx and Engels and revolutionary slogans.

At the meeting Comrade Stalin delivered a rousing speech and urged the workers to fight against the tsar and the capitalists.

Between May and July of 1900 a wave of strikes swept through the factories of Tiflis. In August 1900 a huge strike of the railway shop and depot workers took place under the leadership of Comrade

At the same time, in 1898, Comrade Stalin led Social-Democratic circles at the Bozarjyants and Enfiñjyants tobacco factories, the Karapetyants bridge masonry yard, the Adelkhanov boot and shoe factory, the Mirzoyev weaving mill, the Tolle vegetable oil factory, and among the workers employed in small workshops, printing plants, etc.

Comrade Stalin's circle at the Bozarjyants tobacco factory was attended by Artem Litanov, Ivan Manjavidze, Sandro Bajiashvili, Grikur Mikirtumov, Shakro Mailov and Georgi Aznaurov; the latter was the organizer of all the workers' circles in the east side of Tiflis.

Comrade Stalin's circle at the Enfiñjyants tobacco factory was attended by Arshak Megrabyants, Vasso Mamatsashvili, Gabbo Garibov, Pogos Pilosyan and Kiknadze.

The circle at the Adelkhanov boot factory was attended by Yegor Nozadze (Yegor Rizhi), Joseph Usinashvili, Semyon Zoidze, David Chutlashvili and Shakro Revazov.

Among the printing plant workers in the circle led by Comrade Stalin were Jamlet Salukvadze, A. Vadachkoria, V. Tsuladze, G. Chelidze and Y. Chantladze.

Stalin. M. I. Kalinin was also active in this strike. About four thousand men downed tools.

In 1901 the Tiflis workers paraded the streets in their first public May Day demonstration. Under the guidance of Comrade Stalin and V. Kurnatovsky the leading Social-Democratic group in Tiflis carried on a tremendous amount of agitational and organizational work in preparation for this demonstration.

On the eve of March 22, 1901, Victor Kurnatovsky* was arrested. That very night a search was made in the Physics Observatory where Comrade Stalin was employed. The search took place in the absence of Comrade Stalin. The day after

* V. Kurnatovsky spent two years in the Tiflis military prison and Metekhy Castle, and on June 9, 1903, he was exiled to the Yakutsk Region in East Siberia.

V. Kurnatovsky was the initiator and most active participant of a protest and armed resistance on the part of political exiles in 1904. For this he was sentenced to penal servitude. He served seven months and at the beginning of 1905 he escaped to Chita.

In Chita, 1905, V. Kurnatovsky was the organizer of the Soviet of Workers', Soldiers' and Cossacks' Deputies and editor of the newspaper *Zabaikalsky Rabochy* (*Transbaikalian Worker*).

At the beginning of 1906 V. Kurnatovsky was arrested and sentenced to death. The sentence was later commuted to penal servitude for life. V. Kurnatovsky succeeded in escaping and set out first to Japan and then to Australia.

In the summer of 1910 V. Kurnatovsky came to Paris, a sick man. Here V. I. Lenin devoted special care and attention to him, helped him with money, got him placed in a hospital and had the best doctors to attend him.

But he could not be saved. V. Kurnatovsky died on September 19, 1912.

the search the Gendarmerie Department adopted a decision to

“... prosecute the said Joseph Jugashvili and examine the accused persons on the evidence of the investigation, conducted by me in pursuance of the State Security Regulations, of the degree of political unreliability of the members of the Social-Democratic circle of intellectuals in the city of Tiflis.”*

After the search Comrade Stalin went “underground.”

Comrade Stalin did an enormous amount of work in preparation for the May Day demonstration of the Tiflis proletariat. On his initiative the leading Party group issued a number of leaflets.

One of these leaflets declared:

“The workers of the whole of Russia have decided to celebrate the First of May openly—in the best thoroughfares of the city. They have proudly declared to the authorities that Cossack whips and sabres, torture by the police and the gendarmerie hold no terrors for them!

“Friends, let us too join our Russian comrades! Let us join hands, Georgians, Russians, Armenians; let us gather, raise the scarlet banner and celebrate our only holiday—the First of May!”**

On April 22, 1901, about two thousand Tiflis

* Archives of the Georgian Branch of the M.E.L.I., Folio 31, File No. 23, Vol. III, Leaf 2.

** Archives Board of the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Georgian S.S.R., Folio 158, File No. 355, 1901, Leaf 47.

factory workers demonstrated on the Soldatsky Bazaar near the former Alexander Garden in the centre of the city. The demonstrators were attacked by police and Cossacks. During the clash fourteen workers were injured and over fifty demonstrators were arrested.

Comrade Stalin took part in this demonstration and led it personally.

The workers' demonstration on the streets of Tiflis—the Caucasian stronghold of the Russian autocracy—was a major political event and had an enormous revolutionary effect on the whole Caucasus.

Concerning this demonstration Lenin's *Iskra* wrote in 1901:

“The event that took place on Sunday, April 22 (Old Style) in Tiflis is of historic import for the entire Caucasus: this day marks the beginning of an open revolutionary movement in the Caucasus.”*

The political and organizational work of the central Tiflis Party group culminated with the organization in 1901 of the Tiflis Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (R.S.D.L.P.) of the Leninist “Iskra”-ist trend.

On the initiative of Comrade Stalin the first Tiflis conference of the Social-Democratic organization was held on November 11, 1901. The twenty-five delegates at this conference represented almost all the Social-Democratic circles.

* *Iskra*, No. 6, July 1901.

The conference elected the first Tiflis Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., consisting of nine members and several alternates. The committee included Comrades Stalin,* Vasso Tsabadze, Sylvester Jibladze, Zachariah Chodrishvili, Calistrat Gogua and Severian Jugeli. (At that time Lado Ketskhoveri was on Party work in Baku and A. Tsulukidze was under medical treatment in Batum.)

In 1900-01 Batum did not feel the influence of the Tiflis Social-Democratic organization.

Batum was an important industrial centre in 1900. The Transcaucasian railway, between Batum and Baku, had been completed in 1883. By 1898 Batum already had over ten big industrial enterprises: the petrol container works of Rothschild, Mantashev, Nobel and others, two tobacco factories, an iron foundry, a nail works, a mineral water bottling works and several oil loading stations. In 1900 a kerosene pipe line was laid between Baku and Batum. There were altogether 11,000 workers in Batum. Their conditions were extremely hard. The economic exploitation of the Batum proletariat was aggravated by the vicious policy of national-colonial oppression. The working day in the factories

* A letter dated July 1, 1902, File No. 2040, from the Tiflis Gendarmerie Department to the assistant chief of the Kutais Gendarmerie Department, Batum District, says: "According to information received from our agents, in the autumn of the same year, 1901, Jugashvili was elected to the Tiflis Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, took part in two meetings of this committee and at the end of 1901 was sent to Batum for propaganda work. . . ."

amounted to fourteen hours and, with compulsory overtime, to sixteen or seventeen hours. The workers' wages varied from 60 kopeks to a ruble per day.

All this aroused the Batum workers to outbursts of protest, but these were spontaneous, sporadic and unorganized.

In 1896 the Russian Social-Democrats Luzin and Francheski organized a small Social-Democratic circle in Batum, which was broken up and suppressed by the tsar's police at the beginning of 1898. In 1899-1900 Karlo Chkheidze and Isidor Ramishvili were in Batum. These two adhered to the majority of the "Messameh Dassy," advocated "legal Marxism" and denied the need for an illegal Party organization and a revolutionary political struggle on the part of the working class. They carried on legal work of a cultural and educational nature among a small group of Batum workers, mainly delivering lectures at a workers' school for general education. In other words, they practised the line of the majority of the "Messameh Dassy."

Since Batum was one of the biggest industrial and workers' centres in Transcaucasia, the Tiflis Committee tried to establish a Social-Democratic organization there, for which purpose it sent one of its members to Batum. On arriving he asked Karlo Chkheidze and Isidor Ramishvili for their cooperation, but they refused to help him, claiming that it was impossible to carry on illegal revolutionary work under the conditions then existing in Batum.

Here is what is related about the incident:

"Before Comrade Stalin came to Batum there was no workers' Social-Democratic organization whatever. Prior to Comrade Stalin's arrival the Tiflis Committee had delegated one of its members to Batum to start a Social-Democratic circle there. He got in touch with Karlo Chkheidze, who was in Batum at that time, and asked him for his cooperation; but the latter declared that in Batum everything was literally exposed to view, that it was impossible to form any revolutionary organization, and he advised him to go back."*

Such being the position in Batum, Comrade Stalin, on the instructions of the Tiflis Committee, left for that city at the end of November 1901. As soon as he arrived, Comrade Stalin got in touch with the advanced workers, and at the end of December 1901 he succeeded in organizing Social-Democratic circles in a number of large Batum factories.

The Batum Social-Democratic organization was formally constituted on December 31, 1901, at a conference of circle representatives from the principal enterprises. (For purposes of secrecy the meeting was held under the guise of a New Year's party in the apartment of S. Lomjaria, a worker.)

At this conference Comrade Stalin delivered four or five brilliant speeches on the tasks of revolutionary Social-Democracy.

The conference selected a leading Party group, headed by Comrade Stalin, which, in fact, acted as

* Georgian Branch of the M.E.L.I., Folio 34, File No. 175'

the Batum Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. of the Leninist "Iskra"-ist trend. After the election of the committee the work was carried on with greater vigour than ever.

In January and February 1902, eleven Social-Democratic workers' circles began to function actively in Batum under the leadership of Comrade Stalin. These circles were organized at the plants of Mantashev, Rothschild and Sideridis.

At that time Sylvester Lomjaria, Illarion Darakhvelidze, Sylvester Todria, Mikhail Gabunia, Porphyry Lomjaria, Prokofy Gogiberidze, Darispan Darakhvelidze, Varlam Kalandadze, Geronty Kalandadze, Mosay Pirtskhelashvili, Theophil Gogiberidze, Khachik Kazaryan, Porphyry Kuridze, Mirian Khomeriki, Koté Kalantarov, Osman Gurgenedze, Natalia Kirtadze, Desmine Shapatava and other such leading Batum workers were members of the Batum Social-Democratic organization.

In January 1902 Comrade Stalin managed to organize a small illegal printing press. At first the press was a very primitive affair, housed in Comrade Stalin's own lodgings, but later Comrade Stalin extended and improved the printery. A press was brought from Tiflis with cases and type.

Already in January 1902 Comrade Stalin and the leading workers organized a strike at Mantashev's. This was Batum's first big strike and ended in a victory for the workers. The management was forced to make concessions, meet the demands of the workers and take back those who had been discharged.

On February 27, 1902, a strike broke out at Rothschild's over the discharge of 389 workers whom the management and police suspected of belonging to the revolutionary movement.

Comrade Stalin himself led the work of the strike committee, drew up the workers' demands for presentation to the factory management, wrote leaflets and manifestoes and organized their printing and distribution.

The growth of the strike movement, the good organization, staunchness and exceptional determination displayed by the workers alarmed the tsarist authorities. The military governor of Kutais arrived in Batum. He tried to stop the strikes with threats, but without effect.

On the night of March 7-8 the police arrested thirty-two strikers.

Comrade Stalin retaliated by organizing on March 8 a mass turnout of workers demanding the release of all those arrested. The police succeeded in arresting over 300 demonstrators and imprisoned them in the deportation barracks. In response to this, on the next day, March 9, Comrade Stalin organized a huge demonstration of Batum workers from the Rothschild and Mantashev factories, the docks, the railway and other enterprises, in all, about 6,000 people.

The demonstrators set out for the deportation barracks carrying red banners, singing revolutionary songs and demanding the release of the prisoners. At the deportation barracks the troops opened fire on the demonstration. Fifteen workers were

killed and fifty-four wounded. About 500 revolutionary workers who had marched in the demonstration were arrested and deported from Batum.

Iskra, No. 26, of October 15, 1902, reported the events in Batum as follows:

"The military governor of Kutais, who had just arrived in Batum, called the strikers together and threatened that all those who did not return to work would be deported to their home villages under convoy. When it was seen that the admonition had no effect, the police, acting 'on the information of the Rothschild factory management,' arrested thirty-two workers on the night of March 7, with the object of deporting them. On March 8, a crowd of 400 people appeared at police headquarters, demanding 'the release of the arrested comrades.' From police headquarters the crowd made its way to the prison. The assistant military governor, Colonel Dryagin, who arrived just after the crowd, called out a company of the 7th Caucasian Rifle Battalion. The crowd demanded that either the prisoners be freed, or that *all be arrested*. Colonel Dryagin took the second alternative, arrested *348 people* and conveyed all of them, including the thirty-two already in custody, to the deportation prison. The next morning, March 9, 'at nine o'clock, an enormous crowd of workers, headed by their leaders, came to the deportation prison, marching in regular ranks, singing, shouting and whistling.' On behalf of the crowd, the workers Mikhail Khirimyantz and Theophil Gogiberidze,

who were in front, demanded of Colonel Dryagin, who had come out to meet them, that he should either release the prisoners or arrest all. This time the colonel answered with an order to disperse. When the crowd refused to obey his order Colonel Dryagin called out a company of the 7th Caucasian Rifle Battalion to reinforce the fort battalion detachment stationed there. When the soldiers tried to clear the square the workers responded with a shower of stones. The workers tried to wrest the rifles from the soldiers and cries were heard: 'Beat 'em up, grab their rifles, they can't shoot!' The prisoners inside the prison began to throw stones; finally they succeeded in breaking out of the prison yard and joined the workers in the square. Then the troops opened fire, killing fourteen workers and wounding many others."*

During these days Comrade Stalin carried on a tremendous amount of political work, wrote manifestoes and slogans and organized both the printing of this literature in the illegal printing shop and its distribution among the Batum workers;

* On October 16, 1905, File No. 1134, Captain Jakeli, acting chief of the Kutais Gubernia Gendarmerie Department for the Batum Region, in a report to the chief of the Kutais Gendarmerie Department on the activities of the Batum Social-Democratic Committee of which Comrade Stalin was the head in 1901-02, wrote as follows: "... On March 9 the first clash between the troops and the mob took place at the deportation prison, fifteen workers being killed and about twenty persons wounded."

It must be noted that the most despicable part in the shooting of the workers was played by an officer named Antadze.

he also saw to it that the literature was sent to the neighbouring districts of Georgia (Guria, Imeretia and Mingrelia).

The leaflet written by Comrade Stalin on the Batum events of March 9, 1902, calling on the workers and peasants to wage a revolutionary struggle to overthrow tsarism, was particularly widely distributed.

On the day of the funeral of the victims of March 9, Stalin organized a procession which swelled into a huge political demonstration.

The events in Batum were the harbingers of a revolutionary wave that swept the whole of Transcaucasia. They exercised enormous revolutionary influence on the Georgian countryside (West Georgia).

It should be noted that Karlo Chkheidze and Isidor Ramishvili, who were in Batum at the time, not only took no hand in the revolutionary struggle of the Batum workers but sent their friends to Stalin time and again and came in person to urge him to leave Batum, giving as their reason that he, i. e., Stalin, would not be able to found an illegal Social-Democratic organization or rouse the Batum workers to a political struggle. But their main reason for doing this was their fear of trouble and persecution for themselves as a result of Comrade Stalin's underground work.

Finding that their urging was in vain, I. Ramishvili and K. Chkheidze tried direct attacks, provocative, slanderous thrusts at Comrade Stalin, calling him "madcap" and "disrupter." They even

tried to dissuade individual workers from listening to Comrade Stalin, to intimidate them with statements to the effect that Comrade Stalin was putting the workers in mortal peril!

But the future Mensheviks suffered utter defeat in their efforts to disrupt the enormous political work of Comrade Stalin and the leading workers of Batum.

Thus, the Batum Social-Democratic organization was established by Comrade Stalin, and he was the first to rouse the Batum workers for a revolutionary struggle against the autocracy and capitalism. Comrade Stalin, together with the leading workers of Batum, succeeded in drawing the broad masses of the Batum workers into the revolutionary movement.

Here is a tsarist secret police report on Comrade Stalin's work in Batum:

"In autumn 1901 the Tiflis Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. sent one of its members, Joseph Vissarionovich Jugashvili, formerly a pupil in the sixth form of the Tiflis Seminary, to Batum for the purpose of carrying on propaganda among the factory workers. As a result of Jugashvili's activities . . . Social-Democratic organizations, headed in the beginning by the Tiflis Committee, began to spring up in all the factories of Batum. The results of the Social-Democratic propaganda could already be seen in 1902 in the prolonged strike at the Rothschild plant at Batum and in street disturbances."*

* Archives Board of the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Georgian S.S.R. Report of the assistant chief of the Kutais Gubernia Gendarmerie Department for the Batum Region, File No. 1011.

During his work in Batum Comrade Stalin maintained close contact with the Tiflis Party organization, often visited Tiflis and directed the work of the Tiflis Social-Democratic organization.

On April 5 (April 18), 1902, Comrade Stalin was arrested at a meeting of the leading Party group of Batum, together with the workers D. Darakhvelidze and others, and imprisoned in the Batum jail.

While in prison Comrade Stalin managed to establish connections with the members of the Social-Democratic organization outside and to direct their work. At the same time he carried on a great deal of political work among the prisoners.

Comrade Stalin was confined in the Batum jail from April 5, 1902, to April 19, 1903, when he was transferred to the Kutais jail.

There, as in the Batum jail, Comrade Stalin carried on a considerable amount of political work among the prisoners. He made contact with all the political prisoners' cells and spread the ideas of Lenin's *Iskra* among the inmates. He sharply exposed the opportunism of the "Messameh Dassy" majority, of the newspaper *Kvali* and Noah Jordania, and propagated the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat and the necessity of proletarian leadership in the peasant movement.

In November 1903, Comrade Stalin was transferred back to the Batum jail, from which he was exiled to Siberia (Irkutsk Gubernia) at the end of the month.

An outstanding role in creating the Leninist *Iskra*-ist Social-Democratic organization in Trans-

caucasia was played by Comrade Alexander (Sasha) Tsulukidze. He began his activities and his struggle against the majority of the "Messameh Dassy" before the other comrades of the minority. Comrade Tsulukidze joined the "Messameh Dassy" in 1895. He devoted his whole life to the revolutionary struggle of the working class. However, Comrade Tsulukidze was not destined to attain his fullest development since he was seriously ill with tuberculosis, which often kept him from practical revolutionary work.

Comrade Tsulukidze was one of the educated Marxists of that time, a gifted propagandist and journalist, a revolutionary who was wholly devoted to the cause of the working class, the closest friend of Comrade Stalin and of L. Ketskaveli.

Comrade Tsulukidze was the author of a number of Marxist works: *The New Type in Our Life*, published in 1898; *A Conversation with Readers*, 1899; *From the History of Economic Science*, 1899; *Our Differences*, 1900; *A Dream and Reality*, 1903; *Excerpts from Political Economy*, 1904; *A Little Remark on a Big Question*, 1905; *Autonomy and the Interests of the Proletariat*, 1905, and others.

In these works, Comrade Tsulukidze developed the Marxist views on the class struggle of the proletariat, political economy, the necessity of a political party for the working class, the national question, etc., with profound learning and consistency.

In 1903 Comrade Tsulukidze published the pamphlet *A Dream and Reality*, in which he subjected to annihilating criticism the "common

ground" theory which had been advanced by the leader of the Georgian Social-Federalists, Archil Jorjadze, and the leader of the Georgian "legal Marxists," Noah Jordania.

This pamphlet completely shattered the bourgeois theory of a "common ground," exposing and proving with iron logic its bourgeois-nationalist character.

Comrade Tsulukidze proved that language is not the ground for the joint action of classes and parties, as Jorjadze asserted, but a weapon in the class struggle.

"It is easy to take language for a 'common ground.' Since it is used by everyone it represents a 'common ground,' just as a battlefield does; but inasmuch as this spiritual weapon serves to express a hidden social contradiction, it is a weapon of mutual conflict. Needless to say, everybody wants to sharpen this weapon, improve it; however, this development does not become a 'ground for common action,' but a weapon for the abolition of this ground. So long as the present conditions of life prevail, so long as the basic contradiction is not uprooted, language cannot serve as a 'common ground.' Only the future is preparing one great 'ground' for 'common action,' upon which all the 'foundations' will be changed and hatred and hostility eliminated."*

* A. Tsulukidze, *Collected Works*, "A Dream and Reality," 1927, pp. 157-58.

Comrade Tsulukidze further wrote that the development of capitalism, of capitalist trade and industry, does not create ground for the joint action of classes and parties, but creates a gulf between them.

“Wherever trade and industry are developed and the bourgeoisie grows strong, another social class inevitably exists, and it needs the efforts of the intellectuals precisely in this first period more than later on, when the very conditions of life, the combination of manual and mental labour, will produce a reliable social force which will be able to cope with even the strong. The ideologists of the bourgeoisie have always hoodwinked the public in this way, assuring the working class: ‘it is in your interests to have stronger and richer merchants and industrialists, because you can be sure they will not forget you either and will serve the common “national” cause.’ European democracy has heard these refrains more than once. Mr. Archil Jorjadze repeats them today in our country.”*

Comrade Tsulukidze upheld the Marxist thesis of class differentiation in the countryside and flatly rejected the idea of a “common ground” either between the nobility and the peasantry or among the peasantry itself.

“In the countryside, too, we observe the economic differentiation which is the inevitable result of and condition for the development of industry. In the countryside, too, appear our

* *Ibid.*, p. 155.

Droidzes who take advantage of every new invention designed to strengthen their helpless fellow [countrymen, to promote their own ends; and here, too, there has arisen and is becoming more acute that contradiction which has thrown light on the real relation and in doing so has made the 'common ground' a still more distant dream and has chanted its requiem once and for all. . . .

"The peasant bank . . . will not help the [small owner in the village, will not improve his farm, will not stop the increasing economic need of the peasantry, will not do away with the economic contradiction and, consequently, will never serve as a 'common ground' either."*

Comrade Tsulukidze exposed Jorjadze as a bard of capitalism and bourgeois nationalism, and, pointing out how the development of capitalism in the West was actually proceeding, he further developed the thesis that class peace and class collaboration were impossible.

"Not one of the European nations has avoided the class struggle, and not one of them has been able to keep to 'the ground of joint action' although they have had preachers who were no worse than Jorjadze. Bastiat alone was worth several Jorjadzes, but even his theory of concord was not able to do away with the class struggle, and life went on, passing him by."**

* A. Tsulukidze, *Collected Works*, "A Dream and Reality," 1927, p. 168.

** *Ibid.*, p. 147.

* Comrade Tsulukidze substantiated the Marxist thesis of the aggravation of the contradictions of capitalism and the intensification of the class struggle:

“Present-day capitalist production is based on surplus value which represents unpaid labour, the labour of the toiler appropriated gratis. Labour is the only source of value, and in order to multiply and increase the latter it is necessary to increase the former. As much labour as possible for as little pay as possible is what the owner of the instruments of production strives for. As little labour as possible for as much pay as possible is what the producer is constantly striving for. This interrelation between the two elements of society constitutes the characteristic feature of the capitalist mode of production, the essential condition of its existence; and that is why the development of trade and industry is at the same time a development of this contradiction.”*

Comrade Tsulukidze died on June 8, 1905, at the age of 29, after a prolonged illness (tuberculosis). He was buried in Khoni on June 12, 1905. Comrade Tsulukidze's funeral, which, eyewitnesses say, was attended by over ten thousand people, turned into a huge political demonstration against the autocracy.

At the funeral Comrade Stalin delivered a magnificent speech in which, after appraising the work

* *Ibid.*

of Sasha Tsulukidze, he outlined the tasks and drew a picture of the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants against the autocracy. This was a speech of enormous Bolshevik, revolutionary significance.

Comrade Stalin's address evoked extreme dissatisfaction among the Mensheviks and raised the Bolsheviks' struggle against the Mensheviks throughout Georgia and Transcaucasia to a new and higher plane.

Comrade Lado Ketskhoveli was also one of the prominent organizers of Leninist *Iskra*-ist revolutionary Social-Democracy. As we have already pointed out, Comrades Tsulukidze, Ketskhoveli and Stalin were the first to begin the struggle against the majority of the "Messamch Dassy" and their newspaper, *Kvali*. They organized and guided the Social-Democratic circles, rearranged their work along illegal lines, switched the Social-Democratic organizations over to mass political agitation, organized the publication of illegal literature, including the newspaper *Brdzola* (*The Struggle*), etc.

The revolutionary activity of Comrade Lado Ketskhoveli began in 1893 in the Tiflis Seminary from which he was expelled for participation in a students' "riot." In order to continue his education he was compelled, in 1894, to move to Kiev.

Between 1894 and 1896 Comrade L. Ketskhoveli took an active part in the revolutionary Marxist circles of Kiev. In 1896 the police arrested him and after three months' imprisonment he was sent to

his birthplace (in Georgia) to be kept under police surveillance.

Evading police persecution L. Ketskhoveli removed to Baku for illegal Party work in January 1900 on the instructions of the central Party group of Tiflis (Comrades Stalin and S. Jibladze). In 1900 and 1901 Comrade L. Ketskhoveli did a great deal to strengthen the Social-Democratic organization in Baku.

The first Social-Democratic circles in Baku had originated in 1896 and 1897. Comrade Ketskhoveli put new life and strength into the Social-Democratic circles, organized the work of political agitation among the oil workers and railwaymen and organized the first Baku Committee of the Leninist *Iskra*-ist trend.

At the beginning of 1901, with the help of the leading group of the Tiflis Social-Democratic organization, Comrade Ketskhoveli succeeded in organizing an illegal printing shop in Baku.

On the initiative of Comrade Stalin, the leading group in Tiflis supplied Comrade Ketskhoveli with type, equipment and money for this purpose.

The arrival of Comrade Ketskhoveli in Baku and the organization of an illegal printing shop there made it possible for the Tiflis Committee to publish its own illegal newspaper.

As we know, the idea of publishing an illegal revolutionary newspaper for the purpose of spreading revolutionary Marxism and combating the majority of the Georgian "Messameh Dassy" and their legal newspaper *Kvali* had already been

proposed by Comrades Stalin and Ketskhoveli in 1898.

In September 1901, in Baku, Comrade Ketskhoveli published the first issue of *Brdzola* (*The Struggle*), the organ of the Tiflis Social-Democratic organization.

The publication of illegal literature called for extraordinary daring, energy, persistence and a great deal of work. Lado Ketskhoveli, living in the printing shop, devoted himself wholly to this work. For months Lado toiled night and day, practically without rest. He regularly received articles and other material for *Brdzola* from Comrade Stalin and other members of the leading Social-Democratic group in Tiflis. Lado himself wrote a number of the articles, simultaneously acting as editor, proof-reader, typesetter and printer, and carrying out his intricate and risky work with enthusiasm.

Lado coupled his strenuous work in the printing shop with great organizational activity. He led the Baku Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. and guided all the Social-Democratic work in Baku, training active workingmen revolutionaries in the spirit of Lenin's *Iskra* and rallying them round the ideas of Lenin.

In all his versatile revolutionary activities in Baku Ketskhoveli followed the instructions of the Tiflis leading R.S.D.L.P. group and of Comrade Stalin. Lado kept in constant correspondence with Comrade Stalin, and to get instructions and advice on vital questions he went to Comrade Stalin in Tiflis and Batum.

V. Tsuladze, who worked as a compositor in the illegal Baku printing shop, writes in his reminiscences:

"At that time Comrade Stalin was the best trained and most active man in the leading Party group of the Tiflis Social-Democrats. I know that he personally led the revolutionary Social-Democratic workers' circles and we activists went to him for advice and instructions on all difficult questions.

"I remember on one occasion an Anarchist undergraduate came to us and got the best of us in an argument; we went to Comrade Stalin for help. Comrade Stalin came to us and after a short argument literally put this Anarchist to flight.

"I also remember this Anarchist undergraduate meeting us angrily and abusing us for crossing him with Stalin.

"On Comrade Ketskhoveli's recommendation, some time around June 1901, I was sent to Baku for work in the illegal printing shop. When I got there I found a small, decently equipped illegal printing shop. . . .

"During its entire period of existence, Comrade Ketskhoveli, myself and another compositor were the only ones to work in this printing shop.

"The printing shop published four issues of *Brdzola*, the organ of the Tiflis revolutionary Social-Democratic organization, a few issues of the *Iskra* newspaper, various pamphlets such

as *The Four Brothers, Spiders and Flies*, many manifestoes, leaflets, etc.”*

A. Yenukidze, later exposed as a mortal enemy of the people, deliberately and with hostile intent falsified the history of the Bolshevik organizations of Transcaucasia in his authorized biography and in his pamphlet *Our Illegal Printing Shops in the Caucasus*, cynically and brazenly distorted well-known historical facts, crediting himself with alleged services in the establishment of the first illegal printing shop in Baku.

As we know, in view of the imminent danger that his falsification and distortion of historical facts would be exposed, A. Yenukidze was obliged to admit these “mistakes” in the columns of *Pravda* of January 16, 1935.

Brdzola—the first illegal newspaper of the Tiflis Social-Democratic organization, the organ of the Leninist *Iskra*-ist group, upheld the theoretical principles of revolutionary Marxism and the tasks of the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat.

Brdzola substantiated and developed the idea that the Social-Democratic organizations must pass to mass political agitation, to the organization of the revolutionary political struggle of the working class against the autocracy; it substantiated and developed the Leninist idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Brdzola regarded itself as the local organ of the all-Russian Social-Democratic movement; it stood

* From the Reminiscences of V. Tsuladze.

for the maintenance of inseverable ties between the revolutionary struggle of the Transcaucasian proletariat and the revolutionary struggle of the entire working class of Russia.

Brdzola took as its guiding principle *Iskra's* standpoint of the organization of a united revolutionary party based on widespread political agitation and propagation of the ideas of revolutionary Marxism.

Following *Iskra*, which in an editorial written by Lenin had declared: "We Russian Social-Democrats must combine and direct all our efforts towards the formation of a strong party that will fight under the united banner of revolutionary Social-Democracy." *Brdzola* set itself the task of conducting widespread agitation and propaganda for a revolutionary struggle of the proletariat.

In its very first issue, in an editorial article written by Comrade Stalin, *Brdzola* declared:

"It goes without saying that the principal means at the command of the organized Social-Democratic movement is the extensive propaganda of and agitation for revolutionary ideas. . . .

"The Georgian Social-Democratic movement is not a separate, exclusively Georgian, labour movement with its own separate program; it goes hand in hand with the entire Russian movement and, consequently, submits to the Russian Social-Democratic Party—hence it is clear that a Georgian Social-Democratic newspaper should serve only as a local organ that deals mainly

with local questions and reflects the local movement. . . .

“The Georgian newspaper must simultaneously play the part of an all-Party and a regional, or local, organ. As the majority of Georgian working-class readers cannot freely read the Russian newspaper, the directors of the Georgian newspaper have no right to leave undealt with those questions which the all-Party Russian newspaper is discussing, and should discuss. Thus, the Georgian newspaper must inform its readers about all questions of principle concerning theory and tactics. At the same time it must lead the local movement and throw proper light on every event, without leaving a single fact unexplained, and providing answers for all questions that excite the local workers. The Georgian newspaper must link up and unite the Georgian and Russian militant workers. The newspaper must inform its readers about everything that interests them at home, in Russia, and abroad. . . .

“Clearly, only the working-class movement stands on solid ground, and it alone is free from all sorts of utopian fairy tales. Consequently, the newspaper, as the organ of the Social-Democrats, should lead the working-class movement, point the road for it, and safeguard it from error. In short, the primary duty of the newspaper is to be as close to the masses of the workers as possible, to be able constantly to influence them and serve as their conscious and guiding centre. . . .

"Thus, the Georgian Social-Democratic newspaper must provide plain answers to all questions connected with the working-class movement, explain questions of principle, explain theoretically the role the working class plays in the struggle, and throw the light of scientific Socialism upon every phenomenon the workers encounter."*

Iskra squarely put the question of dissociation from the Economists and "legal Marxism," stating:

"Before we can unite, and in order that we may unite, we must first of all draw firm and definite lines of demarcation."**

Brdzola set analogous objectives for the revolutionary struggle:

"The only thing here is not to forget Social-Democratic principles and revolutionary methods of fighting. If we measure every movement with this yardstick, we shall keep free of all Bernsteinian blather."***

From its very first issue *Brdzola*, unlike *Kvali* (the organ of the Right wing of the "Messameh Dassy"), determinedly upheld and propagated the Leninist principle of the hegemony of the proletariat in the Russian revolutionary movement.

This is what Comrade Stalin wrote in *Brdzola* in an article entitled "The Russian Social-Democratic Party and Its Immediate Tasks":

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 4, 6-7, 8, 9.

** *Iskra*, No. 1, "Declaration by the Editorial Board."

*** J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, p. 9.

"The bourgeoisie live in constant dread of the 'red spectre' of Communism, and in all revolutions they try to put a stop to things when they are only just beginning. After receiving a tiny concession in their favour they, terrified by the workers, stretch out a hand of conciliation to the government and shamelessly betray the cause of freedom. . . .

"The working class alone is a reliable bulwark of genuine democracy. It alone cannot compromise with the autocracy for the sake of some concession, and it will not allow itself to be lulled by sweet songs sung to the accompaniment of the constitutional lute.

"Hence, the question as to whether the working class will succeed in taking the lead in the general democratic movement, or whether it will drag at the tail of the movement in the capacity of an auxiliary force of the 'intelligentsia,' i. e., of the bourgeoisie, is an extremely important one for the cause of democracy in Russia. In the former case, the overthrow of the autocracy will result in a broad *democratic constitution*, which will grant equal rights to the workers, to the downtrodden peasantry and to the capitalists. In the latter case, we shall have that 'plucked constitution,' which will be able, no less than absolutism, to trample upon the demands of the workers and grant the *people* the mere shadow of freedom.

"But in order to be able to play this leading role, the working class must organize in an

independent political party. If it does that, no betrayal or treachery on the part of its temporary ally—‘society’—will have any terrors for it in the struggle against absolutism. The moment this ‘society’ betrays the cause of democracy, the working class itself will lead that cause forward by its own efforts—the independent political party will give it the necessary strength to do so.”*

Comrade Lado Ketskhoveli was the tried comrade-in-arms of Comrade Stalin at the dawn of Bolshevism in Transcaucasia and Georgia.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin he gave the Baku organization its Leninist *Iskra*-ist physiognomy and did a great deal of work in founding the illegal newspaper *Brdzola*.

The work of Comrade L. Ketskhoveli could not pass unnoticed.

Captain Runich in a secret report on the work of Comrade Ketskhoveli, dated August 10, 1903, and addressed to the Tiflis Gendarmerie Department, wrote:

“It has been ascertained that the accused Vladimir Ketskhoveli . . . was the chief organizer of the secret printing shop which printed almost all the leaflets and other revolutionary publications circulated at various times in the districts of the Tiflis, Kutais and Baku Gubernias up to the time of Ketskhoveli’s arrest, i. e., up to September 1902. Moreover, the same

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 30-31.

investigation disclosed that at his secret printing shop Ketskhoveri . . . together with other accused, printed manifestoes addressed to the troops *with the intention of inciting the troops to open insubordination and mutiny, which manifestoes, it has been established, were very widely circulated among the troops.*

"... Owing to his extensive revolutionary connections and numerous acquaintances, Ketskhoveri, living under assumed names and with false passports . . . was able to organize such a complicated and hazardous undertaking as a secret printing press, which functioned for almost two years, and a section of which has not been discovered up to the present time."*

Comrade Ketskhoveri was arrested in Baku on September 2, 1902, after which the underground printing shop was temporarily closed.

This printing shop was re-established, on the instructions of Lenin, by Comrade L. Krassin and others, and up to November 1903, it worked for Lenin's *Iskra*.

After the Second Party Congress, when the Mensheviks gained control of *Iskra* and the Central Committee, the printing shop, on the instructions of L. Krassin, worked for the new, Menshevik *Iskra* and the Menshevik C. C.

From the day it was started, Comrades Vano

* Archives, Folio 36, File No. 467, p. 59, Material on Ketskhoveri at the Shaumyan Institute, pp. 111-12.

Sturua, Sylvester Todria, Karaman Jashi, and others worked in this printing shop.

In this period, besides the central Party printing shop, there was in Baku the Baku Committee's printing shop, which served the Baku organization.

Of this Baku Committee printing shop Comrade Georgi Sturua informs us:

"By decision of the Baku Committee I was instructed to take up the work of organizing an illegal printing shop. In view of the fact that the illegal Baku printing shop had been raided and that the Baku Committee had decided to set it up again . . . a small illegal printing shop was established, where various leaflets of the Baku Committee were printed. . . .

"Later on, when this printing shop was enlarged, two workers were transferred from the central illegal printing shop, which was then in Baku, to the Baku Committee."*

Comrade Ketskhoveli was confined for about a year, first in the Baku prison and after that in a Tiflis prison (Metekhy).

In prison Comrade Ketskhoveli stood his ground like a real proletarian revolutionary, denounced the police thugs and carried on agitation among the prisoners against the tsarist autocracy.

The police resorted to the vilest methods of reprisal against this sterling revolutionary fighter. On August 10, 1903, exactly seven days before the murder of Comrade Ketskhoveli, that prison police

* From the Reminiscences of Georgi Sturua.

hound Captain Runich, wrote to the Tiflis Gendarmerie Department:

"It would be useful . . . in view of Ketskhoveri's consequence and importance to the revolutionary movement, as proved by the investigation, that while he is on his way to exile *some sort of special measures* should be taken against Ketskhoveri, because once at large Ketskhoveri will escape abroad at the first opportunity and in the future *will certainly cause a lot of mischief by virtue of his extremely radical convictions.*"*

These "special measures" materialized on August 17, when Ketskhoveri was shot dead in his prison cell.

The Tiflis Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. issued the following manifesto on the foul murder of Ketskhoveri:

"Comrades! On Sunday, at half past nine in the morning, Lado Ketskhoveri, untiring fighter for freedom and Socialism, was shot dead in the Metekhy prison. From his early years till his last breath he untiringly defended the sacred rights of man and protested against all acts of violence and despotism. . . .

"In 1893, while still a young student, he took an active part in disturbances at the seminary, for which he was expelled. After that he studied in a seminary at Kiev where, however, he was imprisoned twice. From 1897 on he took an active part in the working-class movement in

* Archives, Folio 36, File 467, p. 59.

the Caucasus. In Tiflis he organized the first strike of the employees of the horse tramway. . . . It was he who first organized the publication of *Brdzola*.

"We dip our banners to you, fearless champion of the people's freedom!

"Comrades! This foul, ghastly murder must not go unprotected. Let us, like Lado, raise the mighty cry:

"Down with the autocracy!

"Long live the democratic republic!

"Down with capitalism!

"Long live Socialism!

"The Tiflis Committee."

In 1903 the Caucasian Federal Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Party⁴ issued a pamphlet, *On the Life and Revolutionary Activities of Lado Ketskhoveli*, which stated:

"Lado was the *first* to create a Georgian revolutionary literature. He was *first* to organize a revolutionary printing press here, the *first* to issue a Georgian revolutionary periodical, the *first* to sow the seeds of revolution among the Baku workers. . . . It is clear that Lado was a most deadly enemy of the autocratic brutes and of all tyrants. They understood this very well and that is just why they killed him so basely, so vilely, so treacherously."

Such was the Caucasian Federal Committee's opinion of Comrade Ketskhoveli and of his role in the revolutionary movement in Transcaucasia.

Thus:

1) *The first seeds of Marxism were brought to Transcaucasia in the early 'nineties, on the one hand, by Russian revolutionary Social-Democrats exiled from the central regions of Russia, and, on the other, by the Georgian "legal Marxists" who had lived abroad.*

2) *The "Messameh Dassy" was the first Georgian Marxist, Social-Democratic organization; it played a definite, positive role (in the period of 1893-98) in the dissemination of the ideas of Marxism, and also in the struggle against the openly chauvinist tendencies of the Georgian aristocratic and bourgeois intelligentsia.*

3) *The "Messameh Dassy," however, was not a homogeneous organization. The majority of the "Messameh Dassy," headed by N. Jordania, represented an opportunist trend—"legal Marxism"—which vulgarized and distorted the principles of revolutionary Marxism, denying as it did the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement, the political revolutionary struggle of the working class against the autocracy, and the idea of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The majority of the "Messameh Dassy" vulgarized the teachings of Marxism and adapted them to the interests of bourgeois-capitalist development and bourgeois nationalism.*

4) *The minority of the "Messameh Dassy," headed by Comrades Stalin, Ketskhoveli and A. Tsulukidze, represented the revolutionary-*

Marxist, internationalist wing of the "Messameh Dassy," which organized an uncompromising struggle against the majority of the "Messameh Dassy" for the principles of Lenin's "Iskra."

The minority of the "Messameh Dassy," headed by Comrade Stalin and the others, combating all distortions of revolutionary Marxism, propagated and upheld the principles of revolutionary Marxism. This minority served as the nucleus of the R.S.D.L.P. of the Leninist "Iskra"-ist trend in Transcaucasia.

5) *After the Second Congress of the R S D.L.P., particularly towards the end of 1904 after the news of Plekhanov's desertion to Menshevism had reached Transcaucasia, the differences of opinion and the strife between the majority and the minority of the "Messameh Dassy" intensified and became general differences of opinion on the question of Bolshevism and Menshevism. The majority of the "Messameh Dassy," headed by N. Jordania, went wholly over to the position of Menshevism, while the minority, headed by Comrade Stalin, went wholly over to Lenin's position, the position of Bolshevism. (Loud applause.)*

Towards the close of 1904 a Bolshevik organization of the R.S.D.L.P. took shape in Tiflis.

6) *The founder of the Leninist "Iskra"-ist Social-Democratic organization in Georgia and Transcaucasia was Comrade Stalin (applause) together with Comrades A. Tsulukidze, Lado Ketskhoveli and the Russian Social-Democrats who were in Tiflis (Kurnatovsky and others).*

It was under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, in a relentless struggle against the enemies of Marxism and Leninism, primarily in the struggle against the Georgian "legal Marxists" (the majority of the "Messameh Dassy," headed by N. Jordania, S. Jibladze and others), that the Bolshevik organizations in Georgia and Transcaucasia originated and developed. (Loud applause.)



II

ON THE HISTORY OF THE BOLSHEVIK ORGANIZATIONS OF TRANSCAUCASIA IN THE PERIOD OF THE FIRST RUSSIAN REVOLUTION (1905-1907)

In February 1904, after his escape from exile in Siberia, Comrade Stalin returned to Tiflis and took his place at the head of the Bolshevik organizations of Transcaucasia, organizing and directing the struggle against the Mensheviks, who during his absence had become especially active after the Second Party Congress.

Comrade Stalin and the other Transcaucasian Bolsheviks launched a campaign for the convocation of the Third Party Congress, firmly pursuing the line of a split, a rupture with the Mensheviks. Under his leadership the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. severed connections with the C.C. of the R.S.D.L.P., which had fallen into the hands of the Mensheviks after the Second Congress, and demanded that the Third Party Congress be called.

In November 1904 a conference of Caucasian Bolshevik Committees (attended by fifteen dele-

gates) was held in Tiflis. This conference adopted a decision to organize a widespread agitation campaign and a struggle for the convocation of the Third Party Congress.

The decision of the conference said:

"The Party crisis which broke out immediately after the Second Congress owing to the refusal of the so-called 'minority' to submit to Party discipline has prevented the Party throughout the entire post-congress period from serving the interests of the proletariat of Russia to any extent satisfactorily.

"For the reasons mentioned above, there are no grounds whatever for hoping that our central bodies will lead the Party out of such a difficult situation by their own efforts. . . . If anyone can do it, it is only the Party itself by means of a congress. Only the legitimate means of a Party congress can restore to the central bodies the lost confidence that is necessary to render them capable of action.

"The immediate convocation of a special congress, essential in the interests of peace within the Party, is extremely necessary also because of the conditions of the present historical moment, which requires *exceptional* unanimity and unity of action on the part of the individual sections of the Party for a decisive onslaught against the tsarist autocracy."*

* From the resolution adopted by the conference of Caucasian Committees, November 1904.

The November Conference of Caucasian Committees elected a bureau to organize the fight for the convocation of the Third Congress.

During the period of the revolution (1905-07) Comrade Stalin, together with Mikha Tskhakaya, directed the work of the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. In this period, besides Comrades Stalin and Mikha Tskhakaya, the following comrades among others were at various times members of the Committee: A. Tsulukidze, St. Shaumyan, A. Japaridze, B. Knuniyants, Ph. Makharadze, M. Bochoridze, M. Davitashvili and N. Alajalova.

The Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. launched a struggle against the Mensheviks, demanding that all local Social-Democratic organizations undeviatingly carry out the tactical and organizational principles of Bolshevism.

In June 1904 the Caucasian Federal Committee dissolved the Menshevik Baku Committee, which opposed the calling of the Third Party Congress, and organized a new, Bolshevik Baku Committee.

In June 1904, on the instructions of the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., Comrade Stalin arrived in Baku.

Comrade Stalin directed the struggle of the Baku Bolsheviks and spoke at a number of meetings of the active workers of the Baku Social-Democratic organization, at which he exposed the Mensheviks and the Shendrikovites.⁵

The Tiflis Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., headed by S. Jibladze and N. Ramishvili, evaded carrying out the Bolshevik instructions of the Caucasian

Federal Committee, and on January 17, 1905, adopted a decision to leave the Caucasian Federation of the R.S.D.L.P. The Caucasian Federal Committee then decided to dissolve the Menshevik Committee and organized a Bolshevik Tiflis Party Committee.

On February 4, 1905, the Caucasian Federal Committee, in connection with its decision to dissolve the Tiflis Committee, issued a special appeal to the members of the Tiflis organization of the R.S.D.L.P. stating:

"The central body of the Caucasian Federation, the Caucasian Federal Committee, has adopted the following decision regarding the withdrawal of the Tiflis Committee from the Federation: Such behaviour on the part of the Tiflis Committee (withdrawal from the Federation) violates the Party principles laid down by the Second Congress and the rules of the Federation, thus placing the present members of the Tiflis Committee outside the Party; therefore the Caucasian Federal Committee is setting up a new Tiflis Committee, which will be the genuine representative of the Party in Tiflis, and which together with the other Caucasian comrades will lead us in the struggle against the government and the bourgeoisie."*

In 1904-05, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks waged a

* From the appeal of the Federal Committee of February 4, 1905, entitled "To the United Workers of Tiflis."

struggle to expose Menshevism and win over the masses of the workers.

In January 1904 the Russo-Japanese War broke out. The Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia, headed by Comrade Stalin, consistently pursued Lenin's line for the "defeat" of the tsarist government, constantly urging the workers and peasants to take advantage of the military embarrassments of tsarism and to fight for the revolutionary overthrow of the autocracy.

The Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. and the Tiflis and Baku Committees of the R.S.D.L.P. issued a number of leaflets exposing the imperialist, predatory character of the Russo-Japanese War on the part of both warring powers and calling for the defeat of tsarism.

One of the leaflets of the Tiflis Committee of the Caucasian Federation of the R.S.D.L.P. said:

"However much they call us 'unpatriotic' and 'the enemies at home,' let the autocracy and its accomplices remember that the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party is the representative of 99 per cent of the population of Russia, whose sweat and blood created the treasury, created the entire wealth of the state, culture, civilization, science and literature! Their brothers are being driven into the jaws of death to shed the blood of the sons of the Japanese, a brother people! Russia (like the whole world) is our country, but you are our enemies, vampires, lackeys of the autocracy, its pillars and zealots! The Japanese workingman, or the worker of any

other tribe or nation is our brother who is groaning under the yoke of labour just as we are doing! But the time will come—and it is not so far off now—the dawn has long revealed its beaming face to us—when the awakened proletariat will sweep over the globe and, menacingly shouting the battle cry of its creed: ‘Workers of the World, Unite!’ will overthrow the present bourgeois order and establish on its ruins the socialist order where there will be no slaughter of the peoples, no war, militarism or ‘police patriotism’! So let us too awaken, comrades, awaken and act! Time does not wait! We will neither be hoodwinked nor intimidated by the hangman of the people, Nicholas II, or his ministers, or the monster who tyrannizes over us in the Caucasus—Golitsyn! We want this war to be more lamentable for the Russian autocracy than was the Crimean War. . . . Then it was serfdom that fell, now, as a result of this war, we will bury the child of serfdom—the autocracy with its foul secret police and gendarmes! This is what we want, and we will act, comrades!

“Long live the labouring people of the whole world—the proletariat!”

*“Down with war, down with militarism!”**

Day in and day out the Bolsheviks urged the soldiers to support the revolutionary struggle of the people against tsarism.

* Manifesto entitled “Comrades!” issued by the Tiflis Committee of the Caucasian Federation of the R.S.D.L.P.

The appeals and manifestoes of the Bolshevik committees called on the soldiers to come over to the side of the workers and peasants and to turn their weapons against the tsar and the landlords.

Another manifesto issued by the Tiflis Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. said:

“But to hasten the happy hour of the downfall of the people’s enemy, all honest people, all those who are shackled by the Russian autocracy are in duty bound to espouse the proletariat’s great struggle for emancipation. And you, soldiers and brothers, more than anyone else, are in duty bound to unite with the workers in the struggle against the tsarist autocracy. If you lack the courage to come over to the side of the workers openly right now and to turn your weapons against our common enemy—the bloodthirsty autocracy—the least you can do is to refuse to fire on your brothers, the workers. After all you are workers too, only in military uniform for a time! You can be sure, brothers, if we free ourselves, you too will be free. You are the only hope, the only support of the long tottering tsarist autocracy, which is stained with the people’s blood. And so, if you cease supporting it, it will crumble into dust.”*

The defeat of tsarism in the Russo-Japanese War caused an extreme intensification of class antago-

* Manifesto entitled “Brother Soldiers” issued by the Tiflis Committee of the Caucasian Federation of the R.S.D.L.P.

nisms and stimulated the growth of the revolutionary and opposition movement throughout Russia.

Under the influence of the liberal movement of the Russian *Zemstvo* members, the liberal-bourgeois and aristocratic groups in Transcaucasia organized a banquet campaign.*

At the end of 1904 banquets were held in Tiflis, Baku, Kutais, Sukhum and other towns. At these banquets the liberal bourgeoisie tried to proclaim their demands for constitutional "rights," without dreaming of trespassing beyond the law.

The liberals advanced the slogan: "All classes, unite! There must be no parties here!"

The Transcaucasian Mensheviks advised the workers to take part in the liberals' banquets and to speak there in support of the constitutional demands of the liberals.

In 1905, the Transcaucasian Mensheviks favoured participation in the "Assembly of Estate Representatives" which the Viceroy of the Caucasus, Vorontsov-Dashkov, intended to call.

Comrade Stalin and the other Bolsheviks in Transcaucasia exposed the Menshevik plan for a *Zemstvo* campaign and called on the working class to engage in an open revolutionary struggle against the autocracy.

A manifesto of the Tiflis Committee of the Caucasian Federation of the R.S.D.L.P. on the banquet campaign of the Tiflis liberals, stated the following:

* Bourgeois political meetings held in the guise of banquets.—*Tr*,

"The liberal bourgeoisie is dissatisfied with the autocracy, but it needs the autocracy for the purpose of suppressing the working class. . . .

"We have been fighting and shedding our blood for political freedom, while the cowardly liberals have been skulking in corners. . . .

"Our motto: 'Down with the autocracy!' must become our present demand. By meetings and demonstrations we must show that to this day we are in our" (i. e., the foremost—*L. B.*) "place. Not the cowardly word of the liberals, but our straightforward and bold word must echo throughout Russia.

"It is not the liberals but we who must set the tone for the whole revolutionary movement. We must demand a democratic republic with universal suffrage, we must fight both against the autocracy and against the bourgeoisie. So—

"Down with the autocracy!"

"Long live the democratic republic!"

"Long live universal and equal suffrage!"

"Down with capitalism!"

*"Long live Socialism!"**

In all the industrial districts of Transcaucasia—Baku, Tiflis, Kutais, Chiaturi, Samtredi, Poti, etc.—the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks launched a great ideological and organizational struggle against Menshevism; while exposing opportunism and the

* Manifesto of the Tiflis Committee of the Caucasian Federation of the R.S.D.L.P. entitled: "The Public Has Begun to Speak!"

treacherous role of the Mensheviks in the revolution, the Bolsheviks built up and strengthened their own Party organizations.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. conducted a series of debates with the Mensheviks in a number of cities and districts.

Big discussion meetings were held in Tiflis among the Social-Democratic workers of the railway shops and depots, the Adelkhanov factory, the tobacco factories, etc. Comrade Stalin spoke at these debates, exposing the Menshevik leaders—Noah Jordania, I. Tsereteli, N. Ramishvili and the others.

In Batum there was also a big debate, at which Comrade Stalin spoke against N. Ramishvili, R. Arsenidze and other Menshevik leaders.

A number of debates were held at various times in Chiaturi at almost all the manganese mines (Perevissi, Shukurty and others). Comrade Stalin spoke at these debates on behalf of the Bolsheviks, and with him at various times, A. Tsulukidze, S. Intskirveli and other comrades. The Menshevik leaders G. Lordkipanidze, N. Khomeriki, K. Ninidze, Z. Guruli and others spoke on behalf of the Mensheviks.

In the Chiaturi debates the Mensheviks were utterly defeated. The overwhelming majority of the Social-Democratic workers sided with the Bolsheviks.

In Chiaturi Comrade Stalin organized a Bolshevik County Committee of the Party, selected a group of propagandists from the foremost worker activ-

ists and trained a special group of activists for work among the peasants of the Chiaturi District.

Debates were held in Kutais, where the Mensheviks G. Lordkipanidze, N. Khomeriki, K. Sulakvelidze and others had managed to win over the majority of the Social-Democratic organizations.

On the initiative of Comrade Stalin, the Imeretino-Mingrel Bolshevik Committee was formed in Kutais, which directed the Party organizations of the former Kutais Gubernia. Comrade Stalin organized a group of propagandists under the Kutais Committee and trained them for Party agitational work.

Comrade Stalin, together with Mikha Tskhakaya, Ph. Makharadze and others, held a number of debates with the Mensheviks in the Khoni District (Khoni, Kukhi). After these debates a Bolshevik Committee was formed at Khoni.

Comrade Stalin organized a debate in Poti too and formed a Bolshevik organization there.

The Mensheviks, headed by N. Jordania and N. Ramishvili among others, resorted to malicious insinuations and demagogy against the Bolsheviks, slanderously accusing them, particularly Lenin and Stalin, of "Blanquism," of "Jacobinism," of "acting like dictators," etc.

In November 1904 Comrade Stalin left for Baku to intensify the campaign for the convocation of the Third Party Congress and further develop the struggle against the Mensheviks, particularly against the representative of the Menshevik Central Committee, Glebov (Noskov), who was then in Baku.

Comrade Stalin and the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks ruthlessly attacked the nationalist parties: the Dashnaks,⁶ Federalists,⁷ and others. A number of big debates were held with the Anarchists, Federalists and others.

There was a big debate in Tiflis with K. Gogelia and M. Tsereteli, Kropotkin Anarchists, ending in complete victory for the Bolsheviks. Another big debate was held in Chiaturi. Here the Bolsheviks opposed S. Meskhishvili (Socialist-Revolutionary), S. Mdivani (Federalist), Gogelia, a leader of the Anarchists, and others. In all these debates Comrade Stalin played an outstanding part.

Comrade Kekelidze recalls the Chiaturi debate in the following words:

"In May 1905 a meeting was called, which turned into a debate before an audience of about two thousand workers. Comrade Koba-Stalin spoke. Among the other speakers were G. Lordkipanidze, on behalf of the Mensheviks; S. Meskhishvili, on behalf of the Socialist-Revolutionaries; S. Mdivani, on behalf of the Federalists; K. Gogelia, on behalf of the Anarchists. The meeting opens. Koba speaks first. A long debate ensues. . . . Whereas each of his opponents stormed and raved, Comrade Koba calmly and firmly shattered and demolished all their arguments. So, here too, the Bolsheviks were victorious: the workers supported Comrade Koba unanimously."*

* From the Reminiscences of Batlomé Kekelidze.

During the first revolution (1905-07) Comrade Stalin firmly carried out Lenin's line; he was the guide and leader of the Bolsheviks and the revolutionary workers and peasants of Transcaucasia. (Loud applause.)

In Transcaucasia the revolution of 1905, like the entire revolutionary movement, arose under the immediate influence of the revolutionary movement of the Russian proletariat.

In 1905 the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants of Transcaucasia against the autocracy assumed wide dimensions.

In December 1904, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, a huge strike of the Baku workers took place; it lasted from December 13 to December 31 and ended with the conclusion of a collective agreement with the oil magnates, the first collective agreement in the history of the working-class movement in Russia.

The Baku strike marked the beginning of the revolutionary upsurge in Transcaucasia.

The Baku strike served as the "signal for the glorious actions in January and February all over Russia." (*Stalin.*)

The events of January 9 in St. Petersburg stimulated a further development of the revolutionary movement.

Political strikes spread all over Transcaucasia.

On January 18 (31), a general strike of the Tiflis proletariat took place, ushering in a period of general and individual strikes in Batum, Chiaturi, Kutais, Samtredi and other towns.

According to official statistics, the *average number of strikes per worker in 1905 was 4.56 in Baku and 4.49 in Tiflis*. Under the leadership of the Bolshevik organizations, the strikes usually developed into armed demonstrations and armed clashes with the police and the troops.

The revolutionary upsurge in the Transcaucasian countryside was particularly marked.

In a number of districts in Georgia (Ozurgeti, Zugdidi, Senaki, Gori, Dushet, Tiflis and Telav counties), and particularly in Guria (Ozurgeti county), big uprisings of armed peasants took place. Peasant Revolutionary Committees—the organs of armed insurrection of the revolutionary peasantry—seized the landowners' estates, abolished all taxes and boycotted the landowners, the clergy and the government institutions.

The magnitude with which the first Russian revolution developed in Transcaucasia, when from the very outset it grew into a popular armed insurrection against tsarism, was due to the desperate economic and political situation of the workers and peasants and the barbarous national-colonial oppression of the peoples of Transcaucasia.

White terror was already raging in Transcaucasia on the eve of the 1905 Revolution. The usual methods of the tsarist local authorities were arrests, exiles, floggings, bayonet attacks and the knout.

There were more survivals of serfdom in the Transcaucasian countryside than in the central regions of Russia. The peasants' acute land hunger, the vicious exploitation on the part of the landowners

and nobles, the piratical tax policy and the tyranny of tsarism, and the penetration of usurer capital into the villages placed the peasantry of Transcaucasia in a position of dire distress and helped to revolutionize them.

The leading, guiding force of the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants in Transcaucasia was the Bolshevik organization, headed by Lenin's truest and most consistent comrade-in-arms—Comrade Stalin.

From the very outset of the revolution the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks succeeded in isolating the Menshevik, Dashnak and Federalist parties from the masses and led the proletariat and the revolutionary peasantry in the struggle against tsarism and the bourgeoisie for the complete victory of the revolution.

The revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants of Transcaucasia, led by Comrade Stalin, met with warm support, guidance and assistance from Lenin, the Russian working class and the Bolshevik Party.

At the Third Congress of our Party there was a special discussion on the revolution in the Caucasus.

On the proposal of Lenin, the Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. greeted the beginning of the armed struggle of the masses against tsarism and called on the workers of Russia to give their wholehearted support to the revolution in the Caucasus.

The resolution of the Third Congress said:

“On behalf of the class-conscious proletariat of Russia the Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.

sends warm greetings to the heroic proletariat and peasantry of the Caucasus and instructs the central and local committees of the Party to adopt the most energetic measures to spread information on the state of affairs in the Caucasus to the utmost by means of pamphlets, meetings, workers' gatherings, circle talks, etc. and also to give timely support to the Caucasus with every available means."*

In his article on the armed struggle in the Caucasus, "The Present Situation in Russia and the Tactics of the Workers' Party," Lenin wrote:

"In this respect we have been left behind by the Caucasus, Poland and the Baltic Region, i. e., precisely those centres where the movement had advanced farthest beyond the old terrorist methods, where the uprising was best prepared, where the mass character of the proletarian struggle was most forcibly and clearly in evidence."**

In the period of 1904-07 Comrade Stalin, at the head of the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks, did a tremendous amount of theoretical and organizational work. He led and directed the struggle of the whole Bolshevik press.

During that time the following Bolshevik newspapers were issued in Transcaucasia: in Tiflis—*Borba Proletariata (The Struggle of the Proletariat)* and

* *The C.P.S.U.(B.) in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the C.C.*, Part. 1, 6th ed., 1940, p. 49.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. X, 4th ed., pp. 99-100.

Listok Borby Proletariata (*Newssheet of the Struggle of the Proletariat*), in Georgian, Russian and Armenian; *Kavkazsky Rabochy Listok* (*Caucasian Workers' Newssheet*), *Akhali Droyeba* (*The New Times*), *Dro* (*The Times*), *Akhali Tskhovreba* (*The New Life*), *Mnatobi* (*The Torch*), *Chveni Tskhovreba* (*Our Life*), *Kaits* (*The Spark*), in Armenian; *Nor-Khosk* (*The New Word*), in Armenian; in Baku—*Bakinsky Rabochy* (*The Baku Worker*), *Bakinsky Proletary* (*The Baku Proletarian*), *Gudok* (*The Siren*), *Banvori Dzain* (*The Worker's Voice*) in Armenian; *Ryadovoi* (*The Rank and File*), *Koch-Devet* (*The Call*), in Azerbaijanian and Armenian, and others.*

* *Borba Proletariata* (*The Struggle of the Proletariat*)—an organ of the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., published from April 1903 to October 1905 under the direction of Comrades Stalin, A. Tsulukidze and S. Shaumyan, in Georgian, Russian and Armenian. Georgian title: *Proletariatis Brdzola*; Armenian: *Proletariati Kriv*. There were twelve issues in all.

The newspaper published a number of unsigned leading articles by Comrade Stalin.

It was printed in the illegal Avlabar printing shop of the Caucasian Federal Committee.⁸

Listok Borby Proletariata (*Newssheet of the Struggle of the Proletariat*)—an organ of the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. The newspaper came out under the direction of Comrade Stalin from 1903 to 1905, in Georgian, Russian and Armenian. Georgian title: *Proletariatis Brdzolis Purseli*; Armenian: *Proletariati Krvi Tertik*. There were fourteen issues in all.

The newspaper published a number of unsigned leading articles by Comrade Stalin.

Kavkazsky Rabochy Listok (*Caucasian Workers' Newssheet*)—a legal organ of the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. The newspaper was published in Tiflis under the direction of Comrade Stalin, in Russian, from November 20 to December 14, 1905. There were seventeen issues.

In his books and articles Comrade Stalin made war on the Mensheviks, defended, substantiated and propagated Lenin's teaching on the proletarian party and the organizational principles of Bolshevism.

In the pamphlet *Briefly About the Disagreements in the Party*, written in April 1905 and published illegally in May of the same year, and in the article "A Reply to *Sotsial-Demokrat*," which appeared in the newspaper *Proletariats Brdzola*, Comrade Stalin subjected the Menshevik opportunist theory of spontaneity to devastating criticism and substantiated the Marxist-Leninist teaching concerning the importance of revolutionary theory and of a political party for the working class. In these publications Comrade Stalin came out in support of Lenin's "What Is to Be Done?" He wrote:

Suppressed by the Governor of Tiflis for calling for a general strike, the newspaper came out on December 16 and 17 under the title of *Yelisavetpolsky Vestnik* (*Elizabethpol Herald*). After the second issue the paper was again suppressed.

The newspaper published a number of unsigned leading articles by Comrade Stalin.

Akhali Droyeba (*The New Times*)—the weekly organ of the Tiflis Central Council of Trade Unions, published legally in Tiflis in the Georgian language under the direction of Comrades Stalin and Mikha Tskhakaya. It ran from November 14, 1906 to January 8, 1907 and in all nine issues appeared. The paper was suppressed by order of the Governor of Tiflis.

It published a number of leading articles by Comrade Stalin (signed "Ko. . .").

Dro (*The Times*)—a Bolshevik daily, published legally in Georgian in Tiflis from March 11 to April 15, 1907, under the direction of Comrade Stalin. Thirty-one issues appeared.

The paper published a number of leading articles by Comrade Stalin (signed "Ko. . ." and unsigned).

“...the *spontaneous* working-class movement, the working-class movement *without Socialism*, inevitably becomes petty and assumes a trade unionist character—it submits to bourgeois ideology. Can we from this draw the conclusion that Socialism is everything and the working-class movement nothing? Of course not! Only idealists say that. Some day, in the very distant future, economic development will inevitably lead the working class to the social revolution and, consequently, compel it to break off all connection with bourgeois ideology. The only point is that this path will be a very long and painful one.

“On the other hand, Socialism *without the working-class movement*, no matter what scientific

Akhali Tskhovreba (*The New Life*)—a Bolshevik daily published legally in Georgian under the direction of Comrade Stalin in Tiflis from June 20 to July 14, 1906. Twenty issues came out. It was suppressed by order of the Governor of Tiflis.

The paper published a number of leading articles by Comrade Stalin (signed “Koba”).

Mnatobi (*The Torch*)—a legal daily Bolshevik newspaper published in the Georgian language in Tiflis under Comrade Stalin’s direction from January 1 to 6, 1906. Five issues appeared. Suppressed by order of the Governor of Tiflis because of its “extremely pernicious trend.”

The newspaper contained a number of unsigned leading articles written by Comrade Stalin.

Chveni Tskhovreba (*Our Life*)—a legal Bolshevik daily published in the Georgian language in Tiflis under Comrade Stalin’s direction from February 18 to March 6, 1907. Suppressed by order of the Governor of Tiflis because of its “extremely pernicious trend.”

basis it may have arisen on, nevertheless will remain an empty phrase and lose its significance. Can we from this draw the conclusion that the movement is everything and Socialism—nothing? Of course not! Only sorry-Marxists who attach no importance to consciousness because it is engendered by social life itself argue in that way. Socialism can be combined with the working-class movement and thereby be transformed from an empty phrase into a sharp weapon.

“Conclusion?”

The paper published a number of leading articles by Comrade Stalin signed “Ko. . .” and also unsigned.

Kaits (The Spark)—a legal Bolshevik newspaper published in the Armenian language in Tiflis from April 1 to July 6, 1906. Appeared every other day. In all forty-seven issues were published.

Nor-Khosk (The New Word)—a Bolshevik newspaper published in the Armenian language in Tiflis beginning with August 18, 1906. In all fourteen issues were published.

Bakinsky Rabochy (The Baku Worker)—a Bolshevik newspaper, organ of the Baku Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. The first issue came out in April 1906.

In 1908 publication was resumed under the direction of Comrade Stalin. Appeared legally from September 6 to October 31. In all eighteen issues appeared. Suppressed because of its “pernicious trend.”

The *Bakinsky Rabochy* resumed publication on April 22, 1917 and continued publication until August 10, 1918. Resumed publication in 1920. At the present time it is the organ of the Central Committee and the Baku Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan.

Bakinsky Proletary (The Baku Proletarian)—a Bolshevik paper published illegally in Baku under Comrade Stalin's direction. The first issue was published on June 20, 1907, the last, No. 7, on August 27, 1909.

"The conclusion is that the working-class movement must be combined with Socialism; practical activities and theoretical thought must merge into one and thereby lend the spontaneous working-class movement a Social-Democratic character. . . ."*

In the same pamphlet Comrade Stalin substantiated the leading role of revolutionary Social-Democracy:

"Our duty, the duty of Social-Democracy, is to divert the spontaneous movement of the workers from the trade union path to the Social-

The newspaper published a number of leading articles by Comrade Stalin (signed "Koba," "Koba Ivanovich," "K. Ko. . . ." "K." and "S.").

Gudok (The Siren)—a mass workers' daily newspaper, organ of the Baku Oil Workers' Union. Published legally under Comrade Stalin's direction from August 12, 1907 to June 1, 1908. In all thirty-four issues appeared. Its contributors included A. Japaridze, S. Shaumyan, Sergo Orjonikidze, S. Spandaryan (Timofei) and A. Stopani.

The paper published a number of leading articles by Comrade Stalin (signed "K. Kato" and "Ko. . . .", and also unsigned).

Banvori Dzain (The Worker's Voice)—a Bolshevik newspaper published illegally in the Armenian language in Baku, beginning with March 19, 1906.

Ryadovoi (The Rank and File)—an illegal organ of the Baku Bolshevik military organization for carrying on propaganda in the army and navy.

It was published in Russian in 1906 and 1907.

Koch-Devet (The Call)—a Bolshevik newspaper, published in Baku, in the Armenian and Azerbaijan languages, beginning with May 26, 1906. Altogether nineteen issues appeared. It was suppressed by order of the Governor of Baku because of its "pernicious trend."

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, p. 105.

Democratic path. Our duty is to introduce socialist consciousness* into this movement and unite the progressive forces of the working class in one centralized party. Our task is always to be at the head of the movement and tirelessly combat all those—foes or ‘friends’—who hinder the accomplishment of these tasks.”**

In an article “They Began with a Toast and Ended with a Requiem,” Comrade Stalin exposed the disruptive and undermining activities of the Mensheviks and the unprincipled and politically unscrupulous nature of their attacks upon the Second Congress of the Party.

In this article written in 1905, Comrade Stalin pointed out that in essence the Mensheviks were already moving along the road to liquidationism.

Comrade Stalin wrote:

“In a word, if the Second Congress was not a Party congress and not legitimate, then the program drawn up by it must unquestionably be not a Party and not a legitimate program. You Mensheviks, however, deny the legitimacy of the Congress, but you regard the program as legitimate? Truly ridiculous! . . . This ridiculous contradiction, it seems, is felt by the ‘Mensheviks’ themselves, who are trying to extricate themselves somehow. But how? They can do this in one of two ways: either they must acknowledge that the Congress is legitimate, or they

* Which Marx and Engels elaborated (J. V. Stalin’s footnote).

** J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, p. 106.

must acknowledge that the program is also not legitimate and reject it. It appears that they have chosen the second way—rejection of the program. But in order to reject the program to which they have clung so tenaciously till now, they must first prove that it is of little importance. And so the ‘Mensheviks’ have already set themselves to this formidable task. . . . To begin with, they minimized the importance of a program: we can manage, they said, without a definite program, too; then, after a while, they began to talk about it being of little importance; a little time will pass and they will undoubtedly declare that a program is altogether unnecessary.”*

The following editorial comment on this article appeared in the central organ of the Party, *Proletary*, which was under the editorship of Lenin:

“The article ‘They Began with a Toast and Ended with a Requiem’ exposes all the vacillation and lack of principle of the Party politics of the minority from the Second Congress to the present time.”**

The newspaper *Proletariatis Brdzola*, which was directed by Comrade Stalin and appeared in the Georgian, Russian and Armenian languages, was the militant organ of the Bolshevik Party.

Lenin attributed enormous importance to the publication of this paper.

* *Proletariatis Brdzola*, No. 11, August 15 (28), 1905.

** *Proletary*, No. 22, 1905.

The Editorial Board of the central organ of the Party, *Proletary*, wrote as follows concerning the appearance of the first numbers of *Proletariatis Brdzola*:

"We heartily greet the extension of the publishing activity of the Caucasian Federation and wish it further successes in the establishment of the Party spirit in the Caucasus."*

In his article "A Reply to *Sotsial-Demokrat*," (in *Proletariatis Brdzola*, No. 11, August 15 (28), 1905), *Comrade Stalin* developed Lenin's thesis concerning the introduction of socialist consciousness into the spontaneous working-class movement, the thesis that revolutionary theory must be combined with the mass working-class movement.

"Modern social life is built up on capitalist lines. Here there are two large classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and between them a life-and-death struggle is going on. The conditions of life of the bourgeoisie compel it to strengthen the capitalist system. The conditions of life of the proletariat, however, compel it to undermine the capitalist system, to destroy it. Corresponding to these two classes, two kinds of consciousness arise: the bourgeois and the socialist. . . .

"But what importance can socialist consciousness have in itself if it is not widespread among the proletariat? It can only remain an empty phrase. Things will take an altogether different

* *Proletary*, No. 12, 1905.

turn when that consciousness becomes widespread among the proletariat: the proletariat will become conscious of its position and strive towards the socialist way of life at a *more rapid* pace. It is here that Social-Democracy (and not only Social-Democratic intellectuals) comes in and introduces socialist consciousness into the working-class movement.”*

Lenin expressed a very high opinion of Comrade Stalin’s article, “A Reply to *Sotsial-Demokrat*.”

In the central organ of the Party, *Proletary*, No. 22, 1905, Lenin wrote:

“In the article ‘A Reply to *Sotsial-Demokrat*’ we find an excellent formulation of the question of the famous ‘introduction of consciousness from without.’ The author divides this question into four independent parts: 1) The philosophic question of the relation of consciousness to being: being determines consciousness. In conformity with the existence of two classes, two kinds of consciousness arise: a bourgeois consciousness and a socialist consciousness. The socialist consciousness corresponds to the position of the proletariat. 2) ‘Who can and who does develop this socialist consciousness (scientific Socialism)?’ ‘Modern socialist consciousness can arise only on the basis of profound scientific knowledge’ (Kautsky), i.e., the elaboration of it ‘is the work of a few Social-Democratic intellectuals who have the necessary means and leisure for

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 161-63.

this.' 3) How does this consciousness penetrate the proletariat? 'This is where Social-Democracy comes in (and not only the Social-Democratic intellectuals) and introduces socialist consciousness into the working-class movement. 4) What does Social-Democracy encounter in the proletariat itself, when it approaches the latter with the propagation of Socialism? An instinctive leaning towards Socialism. 'Of natural necessity a socialist tendency is born together with the proletariat, both among the proletarians themselves and among those who make the proletariat's point of view their own; this explains the birth of socialist leanings' (Kautsky). From this the Menshevik draws the following ridiculous conclusion: 'Hence it is clear that Socialism is not brought to the proletariat from without, but, on the contrary, comes from the proletariat and enters the minds of those who make the proletariat's point of view their own.'"*

It is well known that the pivot of the acute disagreements and conflicts between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks at the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. was the question of the organizational principles on which the party of the working class was to be based. At the Congress, the Mensheviks succeeded in carrying the opportunist formulation of paragraph 1 of the Party Rules (on membership) proposed by Martov. Comrade Stalin, in a series

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th ed., Vol. IX, p. 357.

of articles, substantiated and supported the line Lenin pursued at the Second Congress of the Party.

In an article entitled "The Proletarian Class and the Proletarian Party (Concerning Paragraph 1 of Our Party Rules)" published in *Proletariatis Brd-zola*, No. 8, January 1, 1905, Comrade Stalin wrote:

"Our Party is a Social-Democratic Party. This means that it has its own program (the immediate and the ultimate aims of the movement), its own tactics (methods of struggle), and its own principles of organization (form of association). *Unity* of views on program, tactics and organization is the basis on which our Party is built. Only the *unity* of these views can unite the Party members in *one* centralized Party. If unity of views collapses—the Party will collapse. Consequently, only one who fully accepts the Party's program, tactics and organizational principles can be called a member of the Party. Only one who has adequately studied and fully accepts our Party's views on program, tactics and organization can find a place in the ranks of our Party and, thereby, in the ranks of the leaders of the proletarian army.

"But is it enough for a Party member merely to *accept* the Party's program, tactics and organizational views? Can a person like that be regarded as a true leader of the proletarian army? Of course not! In the first place, everybody knows that there are plenty of windbags in the world who will readily 'accept' the Party's program, tactics and organizational views, but are incapable of being

anything else than windbags. It would be a desecration of the Party's Holy of Holies to call a windbag like that a member of the Party (i. e., a leader of the proletarian army)! Moreover, our Party is not a school of philosophy or a religious sect. Is not our Party a *fighting* Party? If it is, then is it not self-evident that our Party will not be satisfied with a platonic *acceptance* of its program, tactics and organizational views? That it will undoubtedly demand that its members *give effect* to the views they have accepted? Hence, whoever wants to be a member of our Party cannot rest content with merely accepting our Party's views on program, tactics and organization, but must undertake to give effect to these views, to put them into practice.

"But what do we mean by a Party member giving effect to the Party's views. When can he give effect to these views? Only when he is fighting, when he is marching with the whole Party at the head of the proletarian army. Can the struggle be waged by solitary, scattered individuals? Certainly not! On the contrary—people first unite, first they organize, and only after that do they go into battle. Without this, all struggle is fruitless. Clearly, then, the Party members too will be able to fight and, consequently, give effect to the Party's views, only if they unite in a solid *organization*. It is also clear that the more solid the organization in which the Party members unite, the better will they be able to fight, and, consequently, the more fully will

they give effect to the program, tactics and the organizational views of the Party. It is not for nothing that our Party is described as an *organization* of leaders and not as a conglomeration of individuals. And, since our Party is an *organization* of leaders, it is obvious that only those can be regarded as members of this Party, of this organization, who are active in this organization and, therefore, regard it as their duty to merge their wishes with the wishes of the Party and to act in unison with the Party.”*

In this same article Comrade Stalin subjected to withering criticism Martov’s formulation of paragraph 1 of the Party Rules and urged the necessity of substituting Lenin’s formulation for it. Comrade Stalin wrote:

“We are of the opinion that the decision of the Second Party Congress which (the Congress) adopted Martov’s formulation was due to an error of judgment, and we hope that the Third Party Congress will not fail to rectify the mistake of the Second Congress and adopt Comrade Lenin’s formulation.”**

The Third Congress of the Party did indeed rectify the error of the Second Congress: Lenin’s formulation of paragraph 1 of the Party’s Rules was substituted for the Menshevik formulation.

Comrade Stalin further elaborated the question of the role and significance of the Party in an article

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 64-66.

** *Ibid.*, p. 72.

signed "J. Bessoshvili," and entitled "The Party of the 'Independents' and the Tasks of Social-Democracy" (in the newspaper *Gantiadi*,* No. 5, March 10, 1906) and in an article signed "Koba," and entitled "The Reorganization in Tiflis" (*Akhali Tskhovreba*, No. 5, June 25, 1906). He proved why the economic interests, the joint economic struggle of the workers, necessitate the organization of trade unions, while the interests of the struggle for the class aims of the proletariat as a whole call for the creation of a political party.

"For trade matters, trade union . . . organizations, for Party matters, Party organizations—this is the basis on which the reorganization should be carried out. All those who advocate a struggle against their employers should join the first, irrespective of their political views; all members of the Party, irrespective of their trades, should join the second."**

In view of the revolutionary upsurge, which gave the Party certain possibilities for working legally, Comrade Stalin raised the question of practising inner Party democracy. He substantiated the Bolsheviks' conception of inner Party democracy as follows:

* *Gantiadi* (*Dawn*)—a legal daily Social-Democratic newspaper published in the Georgian language in Tiflis from March 5 to March 11, 1906. Altogether six issues were published.

The leading articles on behalf of the Bolshevik faction were written by Comrade Stalin under the pseudonym of "Bessoshvili."

** *Akhali Tskhovreba*, No. 5, June 25, 1906, "The Reorganization in Tiflis."

"Real democracy means that the Party membership functions in the Party organization, that the Party membership decides Party questions and general practical questions as well, that the Party membership passes *its own resolutions*, and obliges its organizations to put these resolutions into effect.

"Democracy does not consist only in democratic elections. Democracy in *elections* cannot yet be called real democracy. Napoleon III was elected by universal suffrage; but who does not know that this elected emperor was one of the greatest oppressors of the people?

"What we are referring to is democracy in *action*, whereby the Party membership decides questions itself and acts itself. And so we say that this is the kind of democracy that must serve as the foundation of our Social-Democratic organization."*

Comrade Stalin launched a campaign for workers' mass organizations and severely criticized the standpoint of the Dashnaks, who demanded the organization of party trade unions, which, in fact, meant trade unions organized on national lines.

In the article "Trade Unions in Tiflis" Comrade Stalin asks:

"What is meant by party trade unions? First of all, it means that members of the different parties should each unite in different unions . . . the Federalists in a separate trade union, the

* *Ibid.*

Dashnaktsakani in a separate union, the Georgians in a separate union, the Armenians in a separate union, etc. While all the factory owners combine *in one union*, irrespective of their political convictions, the Dashnaktsakani advise us to break up *into separate groups* and in this way to undermine our unity.”*

Further, Comrade Stalin showed what harm the “party trade unions” slogan could lead to. He wrote:

“The point is that party trade unions create a gulf between class conscious and non-class conscious workers. Everyone knows that there are workers who do not belong to any party. . . . Is it not necessary to draw them in? But instead of drawing them in, the Dashnaktsakani shut the doors of the trade unions to them, frighten them away, destroy the bridge between the class conscious and non-class conscious workers and so considerably weaken the unity of the workers.”**

In the articles “The Party of the ‘Independents’ and the Tasks of Social-Democracy,” (in *Gantiadi*, No. 5, March 10, 1906 signed “J. Bessoshvili”), “The Struggle of the Classes” (*Akhali Droyeba*, No. 1, November 14, 1906), and others, Comrade Stalin substantiated the necessity of strong Party leadership in the trade unions.

Under the conditions prevailing in Georgia and Transcaucasia the national question acquired exceptional importance. This is quite understandable;

* *Akhali Tskhovreba* No. 12, July 5, 1906.

** *Ibid.*

the policy of national oppression and of fomenting national strife was pursued by the tsarist autocracy with exceptional intensity in these regions. In the pursuit of this brutal policy the tsarist autocracy found abettors in the various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalist parties and groups, such as the Georgian Federalist Social-Democrats, the Armenian Social-Democratic Labour Organization, and others. The bourgeois nationalism of these parties was exposed and the Marxist view of the national question was explained in an article by Comrade Stalin entitled "The Social-Democratic View of the National Question" published in *Proletariats Brdzola* of September 1, 1904.

After completely shattering the opportunist principle of dividing the proletariat on national lines, Comrade Stalin proved the necessity of a single, centralized working-class party. He wrote:

"... if the proletariat is to achieve victory, *all the workers, irrespective of nationality*, must be united. Clearly, the demolition of national barriers and close unity between the Russian, Georgian, Armenian, Polish, Jewish and other proletarians is a necessary condition for the victory of the proletariat of all Russia."*

This article, which is a model of the creative application of the Marxian dialectical method to the complicated national problem, contains the germ of the main ideas which Comrade Stalin

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, p. 36.

later developed in his well-known programmatic work *Marxism and the National Question*.

Comrade Stalin undeviatingly exposed and vigorously attacked the nationalist party of the Georgian Federalists. His article "Political Chameleons" contains the following devastating description of this party:

"... The chameleon's distinguishing feature is that it is forever changing its colour. It is a well-known fact that every animal has its own particular colouring; but the chameleon's nature is not satisfied with this; it assumes a lion's colour when it is with the lion, a wolf's when it is with the wolf, a frog's when it is with the frog, depending on which colour is more to its advantage at the time, like a man who is hypocritical and unprincipled,—he is mine when with me, yours when with you, a reactionary with a reactionary, a revolutionary with a revolutionary, provided he can somehow creep into a loophole and get what he wants. . . .

"Time was when the Party of the proletariat roared and shook the country. How did these Anarchist-Federalist babblers act then? They looked at this Party with envy, coveted its lot for themselves, and, hiding round corners, applauded it discreetly. Why did they act this way? Because it was more to their advantage at the time; everyone knows that it is not so easy to muster courage to abuse a victor. Now that the wind of reaction is blowing, turning the wheel back, these gentry have changed their colour

and are reviling the Party of the same proletariat for all they are worth. Why? Because today it is apparently more advantageous for them—they know that they will ‘get away’ with this filthy demagogy. And what else can they do but bark? . . . Of course the tail-wagging bourgeoisie have nothing left to do but play the chameleon, the consequence being that they will always try to change the people into a chameleon too so as to get the political reins into their own hands. That is why our bourgeois gentlemen have completely assimilated the chameleon’s art in politics—blood is thicker than water.

“But all this means that the proletariat must watch the field of battle soberly, it must not be deceived by outward glitter, but must fight relentlessly both against the pillars of reaction and against the chameleon tricks of the bourgeoisie.

“The interests of the proletariat demand this.”*

In the years of the first revolution every advance scored by the revolutionary movement of the Transcaucasian workers and peasants was won by the Bolsheviks in a relentless struggle against the Mensheviks.

* *Elva*, No. 3, March 15 (28), 1906. *Elva* (*The Lightning*) was a Social-Democratic daily published legally in the Georgian language in Tiflis from March 12 to April 15, 1906. In all twenty-eight issues appeared.

The leading articles on behalf of the Bolshevik faction were written by Comrade Stalin, signed “Bessoshvili.”

The Transcaucasian Mensheviks rejected the Bolshevik estimation of the nature, the driving forces and the tasks of the revolution, and fought against the slogan of revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, against the bourgeois-democratic revolution passing into a socialist revolution.

The Mensheviks categorically denied that a revolutionary government and a general armed insurrection were necessary, and demanded the establishment of revolutionary self-government, an alliance with the bourgeoisie and constitutional, democratic methods of struggle against the autocracy, declaring that the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry was a Blanquist scheme.

Jordania formulated the strategy and tactics of the Transcaucasian Mensheviks in the following way:

“Smashing the reaction, winning and applying the constitution will depend on the conscious unity and singleness of aim of the forces of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Therefore, the political maturity and the organization of these classes is an essential condition for victory. True, the peasantry will be drawn into the movement, giving it a spontaneous character; nevertheless these two classes will play the decisive role, and the peasant movement will bring grist to their mill.”*

From the beginning of the revolution the Mensheviks advanced and backed the demand for the con-

* N. Jordania, “Burning Problems,” *Selected Works*, p. 533.

vocation and support of a representative assembly (Duma).

In an article entitled "The *Zemsky Sobor** and Our Tactics," N. Jordania demanded liberal, constitutional tactics in the revolution, flatly rejecting the tactics of preparing an armed uprising. He proposed that the political struggle of the proletariat should centre around the *Zemsky Sobor* planned by the tsarist government.

N. Jordania wrote:

"The Russian proletariat as a whole is not yet class conscious and organized enough to carry through the revolution alone. And even if it could do so, it would carry through not a bourgeois but a proletarian (socialist) revolution. Hence, it is in our interests for the government to be left without allies, to be unable to divide the opposition, win over the bourgeoisie and leave the proletariat isolated. . . .

". . . otherwise, the defeat of the proletariat and victory of the government are inevitable. . . .

"Let us assume that we paid no attention whatever to the *Zemsky Sobor*, but started to prepare an uprising by ourselves, and one fine day came out on the streets armed and ready for battle. We would then have to face not one, but two enemies: the government and the *Zemsky Sobor*. While we were preparing, they would manage to come to terms, to enter into an agreement with one another, to work out a constitution advantageous

* *Zemsky Sobor*—National Assembly.—Tr.

to themselves, and to divide power between them. These tactics are clearly advantageous to the government, and we must repudiate them most energetically.

"... the other tactics, on the contrary, consist in placing the *Zemsky Sobor* under our surveillance, in preventing it from acting as it pleases and from entering into an agreement with the government. . . .

"As a result of such tactics the government will constantly remain alone; the opposition will remain strong and the establishment of a democratic system will thus be facilitated."*

In his book *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, Lenin exposed and branded the open opportunism, the bourgeois liberalism of N. Jordania, and dealt a crushing blow to the Transcaucasian Mensheviks.

Lenin wrote:

"So, it is in the interests of the proletariat that the tsarist government shall not be able to disunite the bourgeoisie and the proletariat! Is it not by mistake that this Georgian organ is called *Social-Democrat* instead of being called the *Osvobozhdeniye*?** And note the peerless philosophy with regard to a democratic revolution! Is it not obvious that this poor Tiflisian is hope-

* *Sotsial-Demokrati* (*Social-Democrat*), No. 1, April 7 (20), 1905. The *Sotsial-Demokrati* was an illegal monthly organ of the Tiflis organization of the Mensheviks. It was published in the Georgian language in 1905.

** The organ of the bourgeois liberals.—Tr.

lessly confused by the pedantic, *khvostist** interpretation of the concept "bourgeois revolution"? He discusses the question of the possible isolation of the proletariat in a democratic revolution and *forgets* . . . forgets about a trifle . . . about the peasantry! Of the possible allies of the proletariat he knows and favours the landowning *Zemstvo*-ists and is not aware of the peasants. And this in the Caucasus! Well, were we not right when we said that by its method of reasoning the new *Iskra* was sinking to the level of the monarchist bourgeoisie instead of raising the revolutionary peasantry to the position of an ally?"**

The first Transcaucasian Menshevik Conference, held on April 14, 1905, rejected the slogan of a revolutionary government and declared for the convocation of a State Duma.

The resolution of this Conference stated:

"Considering it to be our task to utilize the revolutionary situation for the purpose of rendering the Social-Democratic consciousness of the proletariat more profound, the Conference (the Caucasian Conference of new *Iskra*-ists), in order to ensure the Party the utmost freedom to criticize the nascent bourgeois state system, expresses its opposition to the formation of a Social-Democratic provisional government, and to

* From the word *khvost*, meaning "tail," i.e., dragging behind the course of events.—*Tr.*

** V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Two-Vol. Eng. ed., Moscow 1947, Vol. I, p. 378.

entering it, and considers it most expedient to put outside pressure on the bourgeois provisional government in order to secure the greatest possible democratization of the state system. The Conference believes that the formation of a Social-Democratic provisional government, or entry into it, would lead, on the one hand, to the masses of the proletariat becoming disappointed in the Social-Democratic Party and abandoning it because the Social-Democrats, in spite of the fact that they had seized power, would not be able to satisfy the pressing needs of the working class, including the establishment of Socialism, and, on the other hand, *would induce the bourgeois classes to desert the cause of the revolution and in that way diminish its scope.*"*

On August 6, 1905, as soon as the tsarist government declared its intention of convening the so-called Bulygin Duma, the Mensheviks came out in favour of participation in the Duma.

The Second Transcaucasian Conference of Mensheviks (1905, at the end of August) firmly expressed its support of the Bulygin Duma.

After the August Conference the Mensheviks organized a campaign for maintaining and supporting the Duma, strenuously opposed the preparation of an armed uprising of the workers and peasants, and hindered mass revolutionary action in every way.

* Quoted from V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th ed., Vol. IX, 220.

The Transcaucasian Bolshevik organization was the only proletarian revolutionary Party, the only organization which led the revolution in Transcaucasia.

From the very beginning of the revolution the Bolsheviks upheld and carried through Lenin's strategy and tactics of revolution, fought for the organization of an armed uprising of the workers and peasants, for the victory of the revolution, for the establishment of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

In January 1905 a call to action was issued under the title: "Workers of the Caucasus, It Is Time to Take Revenge!" In this leaflet, written by Comrade Stalin, the Caucasian Federal Committee declared the need of an armed insurrection.

"It is time to *destroy* the tsarist government!

"And we will *destroy* it.

"In vain are Messieurs the liberals trying to save the tottering throne of the tsar! In vain are they stretching out a helping hand to the tsar! They are begging for charity from him and trying to win his favour for their 'draft constitution' so as, by means of petty *reforms*, to lay a road for themselves to political domination, to transform the tsar into their instrument, to substitute the autocracy of the bourgeoisie for the autocracy of the tsar and then systematically to strangle the proletariat and the peasantry! . . .

"On the other hand, the outraged masses of the people are preparing for *revolution* and not for conciliation with the tsar. They stubbornly

adhere to the proverb: 'Only the grave can straighten the hunchback.' Yes, gentlemen, vain are your efforts! The Russian revolution is inevitable. It is as inevitable as the rising of the sun! Can you prevent the sun from rising? *The main force in this revolution is the urban and rural proletariat, its banner-bearer is the Social-Democratic Labour Party*, and not you, Messieurs liberals! Why do you forget this obvious 'trifle'?

"The storm, the harbinger of the dawn, is already breaking. Only yesterday, or the day before, the proletariat of the Caucasus, from Baku to Batum, unanimously expressed their contempt for the tsarist autocracy. There can be no doubt that this glorious attempt of the Caucasian proletarians will teach something to the proletarians in other parts of Russia. Read also the innumerable resolutions passed by workers expressing profound contempt for the tsarist government, listen to the low but powerful murmuring in the rural districts—and you will convince yourselves that Russia is a loaded gun with the hammer cocked ready to go off at the slightest shock. Yes, comrades, the time is not far distant when the Russian revolution will hoist sail and 'sweep from the face of the earth' the despicable throne of the contemptible tsar!

"Our vital duty is to be ready for that moment. Let us prepare then, comrades! Let us sow the good seed among the broad masses of the proletariat. Let us stretch out our hands to one

another and rally around the Party Committees! We must not forget for a moment that *only the Party Committees can worthily lead us, only they* will light up the road to the 'promised land' called the socialist world! The Party which opened our eyes and pointed out our enemies to us, which organized us in a formidable army and led us to fight our foes, which stood by us amidst joy and sorrow and always marched ahead of us—is the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party! It, and *it alone*, will lead us in future!

"A Constituent Assembly elected on the basis of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage—this is what we must fight for now!"

"Only such an Assembly will give us the *democratic republic* which we need so urgently in our struggle for Socialism.

"Forward then, comrades! Since the tsarist autocracy is tottering, our duty is to prepare for the decisive assault! It is time to take revenge!"*

The Caucasian Federal Committee constantly carried on propaganda and called on the workers and peasants for an armed insurrection.

On March 26, 1905, the Caucasian Federal Committee issued the leaflet "What Are the Facts?" addressed to all Caucasian workers and written by Comrade Stalin. The leaflet ran as follows:

"Comrades! Only a few months have passed since 'new breezes' sprang up in Russia. That was the time of 'revelation from on high,' when

*J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 77-80.

the notorious Svyatopolk-Mirsky made his declaration of 'confidence' in 'the public.' This is just what the liberals were waiting for. Their tongues loosened at once and a round of banquets, social evenings, petitions, etc., began. 'We are the salt of the earth, so, for the love of Christ, give us a little freedom,' they implored the tsar; social-revolutionaries clicked their pistols here and there and people began to talk about the approach of 'spring.' The tsar looked at it all and laughed. . . . But all things come to an end. The tsar got tired of the 'endless pothor' of the liberals and sternly cried: 'Now, now! An end to your jokes, enough of your noise!' And they, poor things, piped down and hid in corners. With this the 'revolution' of the liberals ended. And the proletariat said nothing, as though deep in thought. Only 'restless' Baku did not 'calm down.' But what is Baku compared with all Russia? Its voice made the silence of the proletariat still more mysterious. A 'silence that could be felt' reigned in the atmosphere. Everybody was waiting for something. . . . It was then that the Petersburg insurrection thundered forth. The proletariat had risen. Three hundred thousand proletarians demanded 'human rights.' 'Freedom or death' was the slogan of the insurgent Petersburgers. They were followed by Moscow, Riga, Vilna, Warsaw, Odessa, the Caucasus—and Russia became an arena of insurrection. The tsar and the proletariat clashed. Here the tsarist

government retreated. The Russian proletariat answered its bellow of rage, its bullets, with a fearful battle cry—and the tsarist government trembled. It changed its tune forthwith and began to chatter about some sort of commissions; elect people, it said, and send them to me to confer about your needs, I shall be glad to give you satisfaction, etc. It even issued ‘proclamations’ imploring the proletariat to take pity on it and not ‘make trouble.’ What does all this mean? It means that the proletariat is a power, that in the proletariat the tsarist government sees its most formidable, its most merciless enemy, its gravedigger, that the very people it fired upon will rule the destinies of the Russian revolution. The proletariat is the nucleus that will rally around itself all those who are dissatisfied with the present order of things and lead them to storm capitalism. Take the facts of the last months, see with what reverence the turbulent peasantry of South Russia, the Volga region, Guria, Mingrelia, Imeretia, Kartalinia, Kakhetia, Kizikia regard the proletariat, note with what enthusiasm they repeat the slogans of the proletariat—Down with the tsarist government, Long live the people’s government!—and you will understand that the banner-bearer of the revolution, its main nucleus is precisely the proletariat.

“Yes, comrades, *the leader of the revolution is the proletariat*—that, above all, is the fact that appears from the events of the last three months.

“Well, and what? Do we see in the proletariat a striving towards revolution, an intense desire to overthrow the tsarist government? Is it thinking of exerting its full strength? Let us consult the facts. It needed only the signal from St. Petersburg, it needed only the raising of the revolutionary banner there, for the proletariat of the whole Russian empire: Russians, Poles, Jews, Georgians, Armenians, Tatars, Greeks, etc., all, as though by common consent, to respond with a unanimous fraternal greeting to the call of the St. Petersburg workers and boldly challenge the autocracy. ‘You can’t mollify us with a wage increase, we demand a democratic republic!’ they said. What does all this mean? It means that the political swaddling clothes of the present day do not fit the proletariat, that the proletariat is gasping for breath, is straining towards revolution heart and soul, that the cry ‘freedom or death’ comes from the depths of its heart.

“Yes, comrades, *the proletariat is straining towards revolution*—that is another fact that appears from the last three months’ struggle against tsarism.

“But wishes alone are not enough—the thing is to realize them. To what extent were we prepared to meet the revolution, did we manage to strike a straight road to the realization of our revolutionary strivings?—that is the question. Let us again refer to the facts. When the St. Petersburg comrades were shedding their blood and

perishing on the barricades, we quietly continued our routine work, and when, after a considerable lapse of time, we broke our silence and wanted to support the St. Petersburg comrades with our sympathy, they were already lying in their cold graves. We did not make a concerted advance on the enemy, the revolution found us broken up into small detachments—that is why the government was able to keep its presence of mind, and spill a sea of the people's blood with impunity. Had we been organized in a solid alliance, had there been a strong united party at our head and had we made a simultaneous and general attack on the enemy, matters would have been quite different. We had nothing of the sort, and that is why we failed. And from all this it follows that in order to realize our revolutionary aspirations we vitally need a united and indivisible party capable of rallying us around itself, of lighting our way and leading us to storm capitalism.

“Yes, comrades, *the proletariat needs a strong party, a party that is a genuine leader*—that is another fact that appears from the last three months' struggle.

“We went into action at different times and that is why the government was able to scatter us. We went into action without arms, barehanded, and that is why we failed. ‘Arms, oh, give us arms!’ cried the insurgent proletariat in desperation. At the sight of the enemy they ground their teeth, flung themselves into battle

like heroes, but because they had no arms they were vanquished in the struggle. Hence it follows beyond doubt that first of all we must arm, and being armed make a concerted attack on the enemy. Organize the insurrection—that is our task, that is what the Party of the Russian proletariat must do. Imagine something like this. Let us suppose that the insurrection has been organized in several large centres, that is to say, the committees have special groups for work among the soldiers; there are ‘fighting organizations’; arms are available, bombs, etc.; contacts have been established with batteries and with arsenals; there are also contacts with civil servants in state banks, post offices and telegraph offices, the committees are connected with the mass of the workers; the crisis is increasing and is making the workers revolutionary. . . . Let us suppose that the banner of insurrection has been raised somewhere in St. Petersburg, as was the case on January 9. Thereupon, the Party gives the signal—and the insurrection begins. The armed proletariat, encouraged by a general strike, makes attacks on arsenals, state banks, the post and telegraph offices, the railways; as far as possible all this takes place simultaneously in the principal places mentioned, so that the government has no time to take ‘measures.’ These foremost cities are followed by the other towns, the latter by the villages. . . . That is what organizing an insurrection means. We have not endeavoured to organize an insurrec-

tion up till now; but today, when the proletariat is eager for revolution, when the class interests of the proletariat oblige it to take the leading role—it is the duty of the proletarian Party to organize insurrection and thereby strengthen the ground for proletarian leadership.

“Yes, comrades, *to organize an insurrection is the direct duty of our Party*—that is another fact that appears from the three months’ bloody strife.”*

In the same leaflet the Caucasian Federal Committee backed Lenin’s idea of the bourgeois-democratic revolution passing into the socialist revolution:

“Only when our Party organizes the uprising and when, as a consequence, the proletariat actually assumes the role of leader of the revolution, only then will we be able to derive the necessary benefit from the destruction of the old order, only then will we have firm ground under our feet in future free Russia, and be able properly to pave the way to the ‘promised land’ called socialist society.

“So let us strengthen the Party, rally around the Party organizations and prepare ourselves for an all-Russian insurrection. While the tsarist government is becoming demoralized our duty is to fall in and make ready for an organized attack on the tsar’s throne!”**

* Manifesto of the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. entitled “What Are the Facts?” March 26, 1905.

** *Ibid.*

Comrade Stalin constantly advocated and explained what the Party must do to prepare and carry out a victorious armed insurrection.

In his article "Armed Insurrection and Our Tactics" Comrade Stalin wrote:

"What new questions is this approaching storm raising before our Party? How must we adjust our organization and tactics to the new requirements of life in order to take a more active and organized part in the insurrection, which is the only necessary beginning of the revolution? . . .

"These questions have been confronting the Party and demanding immediate solution for several months already. For those who worship 'spontaneity,' who degrade the Party's objects to the level of simply following in the wake of life, of dragging at the tail and not marching at the head as the leading class-conscious unit should do, such questions do not exist. Insurrection is spontaneous, they say, it is impossible to organize and prepare for it, every pre-arranged plan of action is a utopia (they are opposed to any sort of 'plan'—why, that is 'consciousness' and not a 'spontaneous phenomenon'!), a waste of effort—social life follows its own, unknown paths and will shatter all our projects. Hence, they say, we must confine ourselves only to conducting propaganda and agitation in favour of the idea of insurrection, the idea of the 'self-arming' of the masses; we must only exercise 'political guidance'; as regards 'technical' guidance of the

insurgent people, let anybody who likes undertake that.

“But we have always exercised such guidance up to now!—the opponents of the ‘*khvosist* policy’ reply. Wide agitation and propaganda, political guidance of the proletariat, are absolutely essential, that goes without saying. But to confine ourselves to such general tasks means either evading an answer to the question which life bluntly puts to us, or revealing utter inability to adjust our tactics to the requirements of the rapidly growing revolutionary struggle. We must, of course, now intensify political agitation tenfold, we must try to establish our influence not only over the proletariat, but also over those numerous strata of the ‘people’ who are gradually joining the revolution; we must try to popularize among all classes of the population the idea that an insurrection is necessary. But we cannot confine ourselves solely to this! To enable the proletariat to utilize the impending revolution for the purposes of its own class struggle, to enable it to establish a democratic system that will provide the greatest guarantees for the subsequent struggle for Socialism—it, the proletariat, around which the opposition is rallying, must not only serve as the centre of the struggle, but become the leader and guide of the insurrection. It is *the technical guidance and organizational preparation of the all-Russian insurrection* that constitute the new tasks with which life has confronted the proletariat. And if our Party wishes

to be the real political leader of the working class it cannot and must not repudiate these new tasks. . . .

"Only such thorough preparation for insurrection can ensure for Social-Democracy the leading role in the forthcoming battles between the people and the autocracy.

"Complete fighting preparedness alone will enable the proletariat to transform the isolated clashes with the police and the troops into a nation-wide insurrection with the object of setting up a provisional revolutionary government in place of the tsarist government.

"The supporters of the '*khvostist* policy' notwithstanding, the organized proletariat will exert all its efforts to concentrate both the technical and political leadership of the insurrection in its own hands. This leadership is the essential condition which will enable us to utilize the impending revolution in the interests of our class struggle."*

In an editorial the Bolshevik newspaper *Kavkazsky Rabochy Listok* (*The Caucasian Workers' Newssheet*), No. 1, 1905, formulated the revolutionary tasks of the proletariat in the following way:

"1) To engage in the decisive, resolute conflict, of which we have already spoken;

"2) To organize a revolutionary army in the process of this 'conflict';

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 132-33, 137.

"3) To establish a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry in the form of a provisional revolutionary government, brought about as a result of the victorious 'conflict,' and

"4) To convene a Constituent Assembly. . . ."

From August 1905 onward, the Mensheviks together with the liberals carried on a zealous campaign for the convocation of the State Duma and for the introduction of *Zemstvos* in Transcaucasia.

Consistently pursuing their treacherous tactics of disrupting the revolution, the Transcaucasian Mensheviks basely betrayed the workers and peasants who were eager for a revolutionary uprising, urging them to enter into agreements with the bourgeoisie and leading them into negotiations with the government.

On August 29, 1905, as we know, this policy of the Mensheviks resulted in a bloody clash between the unarmed Tiflis workers and the police in the City Hall and on the square in Tiflis formerly known as Erivan Square.

Comrade Stalin upheld and propagated the necessity for a general armed insurrection of the working class, and he exposed and stigmatized the Menshevik leaders.

On October 15 (28), 1905, in his article "Reaction Is Growing," Comrade Stalin wrote:

"Dark clouds are gathering over us. The decrepit autocracy is raising its head and arming itself with 'fire and sword.' The reaction is marching! Let them not talk to us about the tsar's 'reforms,' the object of which is to strength-

en the despicable autocracy: the 'reforms' are a mask for the bullets and nagaikas to which the brutal tsarist government is so generously treating us.

"There was a time when the government refrained from shedding blood within the country. At that time it was waging war against the 'external enemy,' and it needed 'internal tranquility.' That is why it showed a certain amount of 'leniency' towards the 'internal enemy' and looked 'between its fingers' at the movement that was flaring up.

"Now times are different. Frightened by the spectre of revolution, the tsarist government hastened to conclude peace with the 'external enemy,' with Japan, in order to muster its forces and 'thoroughly' settle accounts with the 'internal enemy.' And so reaction set in. It had already revealed its 'plans' before that, in *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*. The government... 'was obliged to wage two parallel wars'... wrote that reactionary newspaper—'an external war and an internal war. If it waged neither of them with sufficient energy... it may be explained partly by the fact that one war hindered the other.... If the war in the Far East now terminates....' the government '... will, at last, have its hands free victoriously to terminate the internal war too... without any negotiations to crush'... 'the internal enemies....' 'With the termination of the war, Russia [read: the government] will concentrate

all her attention on her internal life and, mainly, on quelling sedition' (see *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, August 18).

"Such were the 'plans' of the tsarist government in concluding peace with Japan.

"Then, when peace was concluded, it announced these 'plans' once again through the mouth of its minister: 'We shall drown the extreme parties in Russia in blood,' said the minister. Through its viceroys and governor-generals it is already putting the above-mentioned 'plans' into execution: it is not for nothing that it has transformed Russia into a military camp, it is not for nothing that it has inundated the centres of the movement with Cossacks and troops and has turned machine guns against the proletariat—one would think that the government is setting out to conquer boundless Russia a second time!

"As you see, the government is proclaiming war on the revolution and is directing its first blows against its leading unit—the proletariat. That is how its threats against the 'extreme parties' are to be interpreted. It will not, of course, 'neglect' the peasantry and will generously treat it to nagaikas and bullets if it proves to be 'unwise enough' to demand a human existence; but meanwhile the government is trying to deceive it: it is promising land and inviting it into the Duma, painting pictures of 'all sorts of liberties' in the future.

"As regards the 'gentry,' the government will, of course, treat it 'more delicately,' and

will try to enter into an alliance with it: that is exactly what the State Duma exists for. Needless to say, Messieurs the liberal bourgeoisie will not reject an 'agreement.' As far back as August 5 they stated through the mouth of their leader that they were enthusiastic over the tsar's reforms: '. . . All efforts must be exerted to prevent Russia . . . from following the revolutionary path pursued by France' (see *Ruskiye Vedomosti* of August 5, article by Vinogradov). Needless to say, the sly liberals would rather betray the revolution than Nicholas II. This was sufficiently proved by their last congress. . . .

"In short, the tsarist government is exerting all efforts to crush the people's revolution.

"Bullets for the proletariat, false promises for the peasantry and 'rights' for the big bourgeoisie—such are the weapons with which the reaction is arming.

"Either the defeat of the revolution or death—such is the autocracy's slogan today.

"On the other hand, the forces of the revolution are on the alert too, and are continuing to do their great work. The crisis which has been intensified by the war, and the political strikes which are breaking out with growing frequency, have stirred up the proletariat of the whole of Russia and have brought it face to face with the tsarist autocracy. Martial law, far from intimidating the proletariat, has, on the contrary, merely poured oil on the flames, and has still further worsened the situation. Whoever has

heard the innumerable exclamations of proletarians: 'Down with the tsarist government, down with the tsarist Duma!', whoever has carefully felt the pulse of the working class, can have no doubt that the revolutionary spirit of the proletariat, the leader of the revolution, will rise higher and higher. As regards the peasantry, the war mobilization, the mobilization which wrecked their homes by depriving their families of their best breadwinners, roused them against the present system. If we also bear in mind that to this has been added the famine which has afflicted twenty-six gubernias, it will not be difficult to guess what path the long-suffering peasantry must take. And lastly, even the troops are beginning to murmur, and the tone of this murmur is daily becoming more menacing for the autocracy. The Cossacks—the prop of the autocracy—are beginning to evoke the hatred of the troops: recently the troops in Novaya Aleksandriya wiped out three hundred Cossacks.* The number of facts like these is steadily growing. . . .

"In short, life is preparing another revolutionary wave, which is gradually rising and sweeping against the reaction. The recent events in Moscow and St. Petersburg are harbingers of this wave.

"What should be our attitude towards all these events? What should we, Social-Democrats do?

* *Proletary*, No. 17.

"To listen to the Menshevik Martov, we ought this very day elect a Constituent Assembly in order to uproot the foundations of the tsarist autocracy forever. In his opinion, illegal elections ought to be held simultaneously with the legal elections to the Duma. Electoral committees should be set up to call upon 'the people to elect their representatives by means of universal suffrage. At a certain moment these representatives should gather in a certain town and proclaim themselves a Constituent Assembly. . . .' This is how 'the liquidation of the autocracy should take place.'* In other words, we can conduct a general election all over Russia in spite of the fact that the autocracy still lives! 'Illegal' representatives of the people can proclaim themselves a Constituent Assembly and establish a democratic republic in spite of the fact that the autocracy is still raging! It appears that neither arms, nor insurrection, nor a provisional government is needed—the democratic republic will come of its own accord; all that is needed is that the 'illegal' representatives should call themselves a Constituent Assembly! Good Martov has only forgotten that one fine day his fairyland 'Constituent Assembly' will find itself in the Fortress of Peter and Paul! Martov in Geneva fails to understand that the practical workers in Russia have no time to play at bourgeois spillikins.

* *Proletary*, No. 15, where Martov's "plan" is published.

"No, we want to do something else.

"Black reaction is mustering the dark forces and is doing its utmost to unite them—our task is to unite the Social-Democratic forces and to weld them more closely.

"Black reaction is convening the Duma; it wants to gain new allies and to enlarge the army of the counter-revolution—our task is to proclaim an active boycott of the Duma, to expose its counter-revolutionary face to the whole world and to multiply the ranks of the supporters of the revolution.

"Black reaction has launched a deadly attack against the revolution; it wants to cause confusion in our ranks and to dig the grave of the people's revolution—our task is to close our ranks, to launch a country-wide *simultaneous* attack against the tsarist autocracy and wipe out the memory of it forever.

"Not Martov's house of cards, but a general insurrection—that is what we need.

"The salvation of the people lies in the victorious uprising of the people themselves.

Either the victory of the revolution or death—such should be our revolutionary slogan today."*

The Mensheviks acclaimed the tsar's Manifesto of October 1905 with joy and enthusiasm, for, in their opinion, it ushered in the era of the bourgeois constitutional system in Russia.

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 173-78.

On the day the tsar's Manifesto was proclaimed the leaders of the Caucasian Mensheviks, N. Jordania, N. Ramishvili and others, addressed meetings that were held in Tiflis and triumphantly announced: "Henceforth there is no autocracy, the autocracy is dead. Russia is entering the ranks of the constitutional monarchies."

The Mensheviks issued the slogan of disarming the working class. "We do not want arms, down with arms!" they said.

Comrade Stalin untiringly exposed the treacherous tactics of the Mensheviks and called for a general armed uprising.

In Nadzaladevi (Tiflis), on the day the Manifesto was proclaimed, Comrade Stalin said in a speech he delivered at a workers' meeting:

"What revolution can be victorious without arms, and what revolutionary would say 'Down with arms?' The speaker who says this is probably a Tolstoyan, not a revolutionary, and whoever he may be, he is an enemy of the revolution, of the people's freedom. . . .

"What do we need in order to really win? We need three things: first—arms, second—arms, third—arms and arms again!"*

Soon after, a Bolshevik leaflet was issued—an appeal of the Tiflis Committee with a subscription list. The leaflet stated:

"Citizens!

"The great Russian revolution has begun!

* Georgian Branch of the M.E.L.I., Folio 34, File No. 85.

We have already gone through the first act of horrible bloodshed. The future will demand of us still greater struggle and sacrifice. The first goal which is before us is *the arming of the people*. What is needed for the defeat of the autocracy and the victory of the revolution is arms, arms and arms!

"Citizens! All measures must be taken to procure arms. It is necessary to smash the hooligans, to curb the tsar's bashi-bazouks, it is necessary to wage a decisive war against the autocracy—civil war and political war. And all this is impossible *without arms*.

"Citizens! Do not shirk your duty—give your mite towards the arming of the people.

"Long live the victorious revolution!

"Hail the universal armed uprising!

"Long live the democratic republic!"*

After the proclamation of the October Manifesto the Mensheviks intensified their campaign for the convocation of the State Duma and openly called upon the workers and peasants to restore order, to disarm and to organize a struggle for reforms along constitutional lines.

After the proclamation of the October Manifesto the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia became even more active in exposing the treacherous tactics of Menshevism and organizing an armed insurrection of the workers and peasants against tsarism.

* Archives of the Georgian Branch of the M.E.L.I., Folio 31, File No. 141, Leaf 236.

The Caucasian Federal Committee kept on explaining the tasks of the revolution to the workers and peasants and urged them to continue their self-sacrificing struggle. On the day following the publication of the tsar's Manifesto the Committee issued the following appeal:

“Let us overthrow the tsarist Duma and set up a popular Constituent Assembly—this is what the proletarians of Russia are saying today. The proletariat will not demand petty concessions from the government, it will not call upon it to rescind ‘martial law’ and ‘flogging’ in several towns and villages—the proletariat will not sink to such trifles. Whoever demands concessions from the government does not believe that the government will die—but the proletariat confidently believes that it will die. Whoever expects ‘favours’ from the government has no confidence in the might of the revolution—but the proletariat is filled with this confidence. No! The proletariat will not dissipate its energy in making senseless demands. It presents only one demand to the tsarist autocracy: Down with it! Death to it! And so, over the vast expanse of Russia the revolutionary cry of the workers rings out more and more boldly: Down with the State Duma! Long live a popular Constituent Assembly! This is the goal towards which the proletariat of Russia is striving today. . . . Only on the bones of the oppressors can the people's freedom be erected, only with the blood of the oppressors can the soil be fertilized for

the autocracy of the people! Only when the armed people come out headed by the proletariat and raise the banner of general insurrection can the tsarist government, which rests on bayonets, be overthrown. . . .

“Only a provisional government can convoke a popular Constituent Assembly which must establish a democratic republic. A revolutionary army and a revolutionary provisional government—this is where the proletarians of Russia are steering today.

“The tsarist autocracy is barring the road of the people’s revolution, it wants with the aid of the Manifesto it issued yesterday to check this great movement—clearly the waves of the revolution will engulf the tsarist autocracy and sweep it away. . . .”*

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Fourth Bolshevik Conference of the Caucasian Federation of the R.S.D.L.P. held in November 1905, at which the Baku, Imeretino-Mingrelia, Tiflis and Batum Committees and the Guria group were represented, adopted a decision to intensify the struggle for preparing and carrying out an armed uprising, for a boycott of the tsarist Duma, for extending and strengthening the revolutionary organizations of the workers and peasants—the strike committees, the soviets of workers’ deputies and the revolutionary peasant committees.

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 189-90, 191.

The Conference once more stressed the necessity of an armed uprising as the only method of liberating the people, and branded the State Duma as an implement for strengthening reaction.

The Conference set up a Caucasian Bureau to direct the boycott of the Duma and to prepare the general armed uprising.

On November 30, 1905, the Caucasian Federal Committee reported the following in the *Kavkazsky Rabochy Listok*, No. 8, on the results of the work of the Conference:

“ . . . Emphasizing the imminence of the moment of ‘decisive conflict,’ and the great role the peasants and soldiers are to play in this conflict, the Conference, as regards the peasants, in order to raise their revolutionary spirit and to rally them around the proletariat, recommended the immediate establishment of democratically constituted revolutionary peasant committees which would have as their aim the actual emancipation of the countryside. As regards the soldiers, the Conference pointed to the necessity of linking up the soldiers’ movement with the movement of the proletariat and of estimating it only from the point of view of the latter movement, and proposed that consciousness and organization be introduced into the soldiers’ movement, subordinating it to the movement of the Russian proletariat, the vanguard of the revolution. Further, the Conference took up the question of arms and the ‘decisive conflict.’ It stressed the necessity of ‘street fighting’ as

the only method of liberating the people, branded all kinds of reforms and State Dumas as means of strengthening the old regime, and proposed the establishment of a 'Caucasian Bureau' to prepare a practical solution of the above-mentioned questions."

In November 1905, in a leaflet of the Tiflis Committee of the Caucasian Federation of the R.S.D.L.P., Comrade Stalin wrote:

"Citizens!

"The mighty giant—the proletariat of all Russia—is stirring again. . . . Russia is in the throes of a broad country-wide strike movement. All over the boundless expanse of Russia life has come to a standstill as if by the wave of a magic wand. In St. Petersburg alone, and on its railways, over a million workers have gone on strike. Moscow—the old, tranquil, sluggish capital, faithful to the Romanovs—is completely enveloped in a revolutionary conflagration. Kharkov, Kiev, Ekaterinoslav and other cultural and industrial centres, the whole of central and south Russia, the whole of Poland and, lastly, the whole of the Caucasus, have come to a standstill and are threateningly looking the autocracy straight in the face.

"What is going to happen? The whole of Russia is waiting for an answer to this question with bated breath. The proletariat is hurling a challenge at the accursed two-headed monster. Will this challenge be followed by a real clash, will the strike develop into open, armed insur-

rection, or will it, like previous strikes, end 'peacefully' and 'subside'?

"Citizens! Whatever the answer to this question may be, in whichever way the present strike ends, one thing must be clear and doubtless to all: we are on the eve of the all-Russian, nation-wide uprising—and the hour of this uprising is near. The general political strike now raging—of dimensions unprecedented and unexampled not only in the history of Russia but in the history of the whole world—may, perhaps, end today without developing into a nation-wide uprising, but tomorrow it will shake the country again with even greater force and develop into that mighty armed uprising which must settle the age-long contest between the Russian people and the tsarist autocracy and smash the head of this despicable monster.

"A nation-wide armed uprising—this is the fateful climax, to which all the events that have recently taken place in the political and social life of our country are leading with historical inevitability! A nation-wide armed uprising—such is the great task that today confronts the Russian proletariat and is imperatively demanding its execution!

"Citizens! It is in the interest of all of you, except the handful of financial and landed aristocrats, to join in the rallying cry of the proletariat and to strive jointly with it to bring about this all-saving, nation-wide uprising.

“The criminal tsarist autocracy has brought our country to the brink of doom. The ruination of a hundred million Russian peasants, the down-trodden and distressed condition of the working class, the excessive national debt and burdensome taxes, the lack of rights of the entire population, the endless tyranny and violence that reign in all spheres of life, and lastly, the utter insecurity of the lives and property of the citizens—such is the frightful picture that Russia presents today. This cannot go on much longer! The autocracy, which has caused all these gloomy horrors, must be destroyed! And it will be destroyed! The autocracy realizes this, and the more it realizes it the more gloomy these horrors become, the more frightful becomes the hellish dance which it is whipping up around itself. In addition to the hundreds and thousands of peaceful citizens—workers whom it killed in the streets of towns, in addition to the tens of thousands of workers and intellectuals, the best sons of the people, who are languishing in prison and in exile, in addition to the incessant murder and violence that is being perpetrated by the tsar’s bashi-bazouks in the rural districts, among the peasantry, all over Russia—the autocracy, towards the end, has invented new horrors. It has begun to sow enmity and hatred among the people themselves and to incite different strata of the population and whole nationalities against each other. It has armed Russian hooligans and has unleashed them against the Russian workers and intellectuals, the ignorant and starving

masses of Russians and Moldavians in Bessarabia against the Jews, and lastly, the ignorant and fanatical Tatar masses against the Armenians. With the assistance of Tatars it has demolished one of the revolutionary centres of Russia and the most revolutionary centre of the Caucasus—Baku—and has frightened the whole of the Armenian province away from the revolution. It has converted the entire Caucasus with its numerous tribes into a military camp where the population anticipates attack at any moment not only by the autocracy, but also by neighbouring tribes, the unfortunate victims of the autocracy. This cannot go on much longer! And only revolution can put a stop to it!

“It would be strange and ridiculous to expect that the autocracy itself, which created all these hellish horrors, will, or can, put a stop to them. No reforms, no patching of the autocracy—such as a State Duma, *Zemstvos*, and so forth—to which the liberal party wants to limit itself—can put a stop to these horrors. On the contrary, every attempt in this direction, and resistance to the revolutionary impulses of the proletariat, will only serve to intensify these horrors.

“Citizens! The proletariat, the most revolutionary class in our society, the class which has up to now borne the brunt of the struggle against the autocracy and which will remain to the end its most determined and unrelenting enemy, is preparing for open, armed action. And it calls upon you, all classes of society, for assistance

and support. Arm yourselves and help it to arm, and prepare for the decisive battle.

"Citizens! The hour of insurrection is nigh! We must meet it fully armed! Only if we do that, only by means of a general, country-wide and simultaneous armed uprising will we be able to vanquish our despicable foe—the accursed tsarist autocracy—and on its ruins erect the free democratic republic that we need.

"Down with the autocracy!

"Long live the general armed uprising!

"Long live the democratic republic!

*"Long live the fighting Russian proletariat!"**

After the proclamation of the tsar's Manifesto the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants grew more intense.

In Tiflis and Baku the Manifesto was answered by mass revolutionary protest demonstrations organized by the Bolsheviks. November and December witnessed an unbroken series of demonstrations, mass meetings and armed risings all over Transcaucasia.

In 1905, to sidetrack the workers and peasants from revolutionary struggle, the tsarist government provoked bloody massacres between the Armenians and Tatars in Baku, Tiflis and Yelisavetpol (Kirovabad).

To put an end to the "disorders" in Tiflis tsarism made use of the Georgian Mensheviks, issuing 500 rifles to them through the agency of Isidor Ramishvili.

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 185-88.

In this connection Count Vorontsov-Dashkov, Viceroy of the Caucasus, wrote to Tsar Nicholas II:

"... I decided to issue 500 rifles to the labour party consisting of pure Social-Democrat Mensheviks, which undertook, as a departure from its principle, not to use the arms for party aims."*

The Mensheviks, traitors to the revolution, zealously carried out the Viceroy's injunction and strove to sidetrack the masses of the workers from armed struggle against the autocracy.

The armed insurrection in Moscow prompted the revolutionary masses of the Caucasus to make a direct attack on the autocracy.

The Bolsheviks organized an insurrection of the Tiflis proletariat. A decision of the council of the Tiflis Bolshevik Committee on December 9, 1905, stated:

"The council is of the opinion that the Tiflis proletariat must join the all-Russian political strike. While taking strike action, the proletariat and all citizens must avoid collisions with the government. But everybody must be ready for this collision.... The population must arm, must band together in fighting squads."**

The strike committee seized the main office of the Transcaucasian railway and the telegraph office and began to regulate the economic life of the city. Nakhalovka (Nadzaladevi, a working-class quarter of Tiflis) was in the hands of the armed proletarian insurgents.

* *The Revolution of 1905 and the Autocracy*, p. 179.

** *Kavkazsky Rabochy Listok*, No. 15, December 11 (24), 1905.

The tsarist government retaliated by crushing Nakhalovka by armed force and declared martial law in the Tiflis Gubernia.

On December 22-23 the workers of Tiflis, in the district of the Soldatsky Bazaar and Didube, came into armed conflict with the tsar's troops.

Under the leadership of the Bolshevik Imeretino-Mingrelia Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. fierce armed struggles took place in Kutais, Chiaturi, Kvirili, Zugdidi, Samtredi and elsewhere. The whole of West Georgia was in insurrection.

In a report to the Director of the Department of Police in St. Petersburg, dated December 10, 1905, Shirinkin, Chief of Police in the Caucasus, said:

"The Kutais Gubernia is in a special situation. . . . The insurgents have disarmed the gendarmes, made themselves masters of the western line of the railway and are themselves selling tickets and keeping order. . . . I am receiving no reports from Kutais; the gendarmes have been taken off the line and concentrated in Tiflis. The couriers sent out with reports are searched by the revolutionaries and the documents are confiscated; the situation there is impossible. . . . The Viceroy has had a nervous breakdown; his condition is not yet hopeless. The Count is attending to reports of major importance but is very weak. I will send details by post, or, if that is not possible, by messenger."*

* Archives Board of the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Georgian S.S.R., Folio 63, File No. 3839, Leaf 66, 1905.

In the beginning of 1906, as a result of the defeat of the December armed insurrection in Moscow, the suppression of the insurrection in Tiflis and other cities of Transcaucasia, and the treacherous tactics of the Mensheviks and the nationalist parties (Social-Federalists, Dashnaks and others) the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants of Transcaucasia began to wane.

However, armed detachments of workers and peasants continued to offer determined resistance to the counter-revolution. The Red Hundreds of West Georgia effected a fighting retreat into the forests and mountains where they continued to make guerilla sorties and attacks on the troops.

Comrade Stalin wrote on the causes of the defeat of the December armed insurrection as follows:

“The December action proved that, in addition to all our other sins, we Social-Democrats are guilty of another great sin against the proletariat. This sin is that we failed to take the trouble, or took too little trouble, to arm the workers and to organize Red detachments. Recall December. Who does not remember the excited people who rose to the struggle in Tiflis, in the West Caucasus, in the south of Russia, in Siberia, in Moscow, in St. Petersburg and in Baku? Why did the autocracy succeed in dispersing these infuriated people so easily? Was it because the people were not yet convinced of the worthlessness of the tsarist government? Of course not! Why was it, then?

"First of all, the people had no arms, or too few of them—however conscious you may be, you cannot stand up against bullets with bare hands! Yes, they were quite right when they reviled us and said: You take our money, but there is no sign of arms.

"Secondly, because we had no trained Red detachments capable of leading the rest, of procuring arms by force of arms and of arming the people: the people are heroes in street fighting, but if they are not led by their armed brothers and are not set an example, they can turn into a mob.

"Thirdly, because the insurrection was sporadic and unorganized. While Moscow was fighting at the barricades, St. Petersburg was silent. Tiflis and Kutais were preparing for the assault when Moscow was already 'subdued.' Siberia took to arms when the South and the Letts were already 'vanquished.' This shows that the fighting proletariat entered the insurrection split up into groups, as a consequence of which the government was able to inflict 'defeat' upon it with comparative ease.

"Fourthly, because our insurrection adhered to the policy of the defensive and not of the offensive. The government itself provoked the December insurrection, the government attacked us; it had a plan, whereas we met the government's attack unprepared; we had no thought-out plan, we were obliged to adhere to the policy of self-defence and thus dragged at the tail of events.

Had the Moscowites, from the very outset, chosen the policy of attack, they would have immediately captured the Nikolayevsky Railway Station, the government would have been unable to transport troops from St. Petersburg to Moscow, and thus, the Moscow insurrection would have lasted longer; this would have exerted corresponding influence upon other towns. The same must be said about the Letts: had they taken the path of attack at the very outset, they would first of all have captured artillery and would thus have sapped the forces of the government.

"It was not for nothing that Marx said:

"... The insurrectionary career once entered upon, act with the greatest determination, and *on the offensive*. *The defensive is the death of every armed rising*. . . . Surprise your antagonists while their forces are as yet scattered, prepare new successes, however small, but daily; keep up the moral ascendant which the first successful rising has given you; rally those vacillating elements to your side which always follow the strongest impulse, and which always look out for the safer side; force your enemies to a retreat before they can collect their strength against you; in the words of Danton, the greatest master of revolutionary tactics yet known: *de l'audace, de l'audace, encore de l'audace!* (See Karl Marx "Historical Sketches," p 95).⁹

"It was precisely this 'audacity' and the policy of an offensive that the December insurrection lacked.

"We shall be told: these are not the only reasons of the December 'defeat'; you have forgotten that in December the peasantry failed to unite with the proletariat, and this too was one of the main reasons of the December retreat. This is the downright truth, and we don't intend to forget it. But why did the peasantry fail to unite with the proletariat? What was the reason? We shall be told: lack of consciousness. All right, but how should we make the peasants conscious? By distributing pamphlets? This is not enough, of course! Then how? By fighting, by drawing them into the struggle, and by leading them during the struggle. To-day it is the mission of the town to lead the country, the mission of the workers to lead the peasants; and if the insurrection is not organized in the towns, the peasantry will never march with the advanced proletariat in this matter."*

Comrade Stalin and the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia supported Lenin's view that the retreat of the revolution was temporary.

In a pamphlet entitled *Two Clashes (Concerning the 9th of January)* published in January 1906 by the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., Comrade Stalin criticized the Mensheviks' treacherous defeatist standpoint and said that the proletariat had not been vanquished and that armed insurrection was the only way to victory.

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 269-71.

In this pamphlet Comrade Stalin wrote:

"... Our task is to help the Party to organize the armed insurrection, actively to intervene in this sacred cause and to work tirelessly for it. Our task is to augment the Red detachments, to train and weld them together; our task is to procure arms by force of arms, to reconnoitre the disposition of government institutions, calculate the enemy's forces, study his strong and weak sides, and draw up a plan for the insurrection accordingly. Our task is to conduct systematic agitation in the army and in the rural districts, especially in villages that are situated close to towns, in favour of insurrection, to arm the reliable elements in these villages, etc., etc. . . .

"Thirdly, our task is to cast away all hesitation, to condemn all indefiniteness, and resolutely to pursue a policy of an offensive. . . .

"In short, *a closely-knit Party, an insurrection organized by the Party, and a policy of an offensive*—this is what we need today to achieve the victory of the insurrection.

"And this task becomes more acute and imperative the more famine in the rural districts and the industrial crisis in the towns become intensified and grow.

"Some people, it appears, are beset with doubts about the correctness of this elementary truth, and they say in a spirit of despair: what can the Party, even if it is united, do if it fails to rally the proletariat around itself? The prole-

tariat, they say, is routed, has lost hope and is not in the mood to take the initiative; we must now expect salvation to come from the rural districts; the initiative must come from there, etc. One cannot help saying that the comrades who argue in this way are profoundly mistaken. The proletariat is by no means routed, for the rout of the proletariat means its death; on the contrary, it is as alive as it was before and is gaining strength every day. It merely retreated in order, after mustering its forces, to enter the final clash with the tsarist government.

“When, on December 15, the Soviet of Workers’ Deputies of Moscow—the very Moscow which in fact led the December insurrection—publicly announced: we are temporarily suspending the struggle in order to make serious preparations to raise the banner of insurrection again—it expressed the cherished thoughts of the entire Russian proletariat.

“And if some comrades nevertheless deny facts, if they no longer place their hopes on the proletariat and now clutch at the rural bourgeoisie—the question is: with whom are we dealing, with Socialist-Revolutionaries or Social-Democrats? For no Social-Democrat will doubt the truth that the actual (and not only ideological) leader of the rural population is the urban proletariat.

“At one time we were assured that the autocracy was crushed after October 17, but we did not believe it, because the rout of the autocracy

means its death; but far from being dead, it mustered fresh forces for another attack. We said that the autocracy had only retreated. It turned out that we were right. . . .

"No comrades! The Russian proletariat is not routed, it has only retreated and is now preparing for fresh glorious battles. The Russian proletariat will not lower its bloodstained banner; it will yield the leadership of the insurrection to no one; it will be the only worthy leader of the Russian revolution."*

Comrade Stalin proved the necessity for an armed struggle in the revolution on the part of the proletariat and pointed out that its main ally in this struggle is the peasantry. Comrade Stalin called upon the peasants to wage a determined struggle against tsarism under the leadership of the proletariat.

In a leaflet entitled "Not Tsarist Reform, but a People's Revolution!" Comrade Stalin wrote:

"It is just forty-five years today since the tsar proclaimed to the people the 'abolition' of the feudal order.

"This was the time when the tsarist government, defeated in the Crimean War, had left more than 50,000 sons of the people on the battlefield and, upon returning home, had encountered an indignant peasantry demanding land and freedom from it. The tsar had no love for the peasantry, he had no regard for their demands,

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 203-05.

but he feared their anger, and, not wishing to lose power, decided to pacify the angry peasantry with petty concessions. The tsar knew what he was doing when he told the Moscow nobles: 'It is better to abolish serfdom from above than to wait until the peasants themselves abolish it from below.' And so that the people would not see through the government's cunning, the liberal lackeys of the tsar began to trumpet right and left about 'the emancipation of the people from above,' 'the boon from the gracious tsar,' the 'tsar-little-father, the liberator of the peasants,' and so on and so forth.

"The peasants awaited the proclamation of the tsar's Manifesto with all the more impatience.

"Then came February 19. The Manifesto was proclaimed, preceded by an exhortation to the people to pray for the tsar.

"And what then? It turned out that all these promises of 'freedom,' all the hubbub about the 'tsar liberator' were mere deception, mere empty words and nothing more!

"The peasants demanded the land which had been theirs from time immemorial and which had been drenched with their own blood. But the tsar took this very land away from the peasants and handed it over to the nobility, allowing them to buy back only part of their own land, and for top prices at that! Thus the peasants had less land than ever.

"The peasants demanded liberty, freedom from the fetters of the nobility. But the tsar, making

the burden of these fetters just the slightest bit lighter, cast still heavier fetters upon them, the fetters of the tsar autocrat! Thus the peasants had to work under the double yoke of the nobility and the tsar.

"The peasants demanded the abolition of the dues which they had been paying to the nobility. But the tsar, merely reducing these dues, imposed bigger ones on them, state taxes, thus completely undermining the foundations of peasant farming! . . .

"And so that the peasantry should not revolt in its extremity and shatter the throne of the tsarist government, the tsar invented military service, took their best workers away from the peasants, dressed them in soldiers' uniforms and made them swear to shoot the peasants and workers without mercy if they so much as dared to speak of their human rights! . . .

"True, the peasantry obtained a modicum of personal freedom from the government and thereby made the government reckon with the might of the people's indignation—that is why we celebrate February 19—but what does this personal freedom alone mean for the peasants if they have no land and no real liberty? . . .

"That is what they call 'emancipation of the people,' that is how they drank the blood of the people under the guise of 'emancipation of the people'!

"Is this what the long-suffering peasantry wanted? And is it not sheer mockery of the peas-

ants for the pharisaical manifesto of the tsarist government to be called the 'emancipation of the peasantry' and the tsar oppressor a 'liberator'?

"No! It is not emancipation of this kind that the long-suffering peasantry needs!

"The land was taken away from the peasantry and handed to the nobles; all this land must be taken back from the nobility without any compensation or remuneration!

"The peasants have been put in double fetters, the nobles' and the tsar-autocrat's; both the one and the other must be destroyed, and all the land must be made available to the peasantry.

"The peasants have been burdened with indirect state taxes which have ruined their farms; these taxes must be abolished and direct taxes must be imposed on none but people with means!

"The peasants are subject to military service and their best workers are taken from them every year; the soldiery must be disbanded forever and the arming of the whole people proclaimed!

"This is the kind of emancipation the peasantry needs!

"And all this must be done not by the tsar with his pitiful reforms, but by the people itself through a popular revolution, because the experience of the past, and the nineteenth of February in particular, show clearly that we can expect nothing but chains from the council chambers

of the tsarist government, that the emancipation of the peasants can be achieved only by the peasants themselves, and that the very same thing the workers of Europe say about the proletariat can be said of the peasantry:

No saviour from on high deliver,
No trust have we in prince or peer;
Our own right hand the chains must shiver,
Chains of hatred, greed and fear!

"Let the peasants remember these precious words of the workers, and let them realize that they can achieve genuine emancipation only by rallying round the urban workers and marching against the old order! . . .

"The peasants must do this and they will do it!

"As for the autocrat brigands who are still trying to hoodwink the peasants with promises of 'bits of land to buy back,' they would do well to remember that their crackbrained plans will fall to pieces when the revolutionary peasants, led by the revolutionary proletariat, cry:

"Down with the survivals of serfdom!

"Down with the tsar's reforms!

"Long live the people's revolution!

"Long live the democratic republic!

"Long live the revolutionary proletariat!

"The Tiflis Joint Committee
of the R.S.D.L.P.

"February 1906."

Comrade Stalin and G. Telia, an advanced workingman, were sent as delegates from the Transcau-

casian Bolshevik organizations to the First All-Russian Bolshevik Conference in Tammerfors (December 1905).

At this Conference Comrade Stalin was elected to the political commission for editing the resolutions of the Conference.

Here Comrade Stalin met Lenin, whom he had known previously only through correspondence.

In his reminiscences, D. Suliashvili, one of the members of the Leipzig group of Bolsheviks, writes as follows about Comrade Stalin's correspondence:

"We used to receive inspired letters about Lenin from Comrade Stalin. The letters were received by Comrade M. Davitashvili.* In these letters Comrade Stalin expressed his admiration of Lenin, his unswerving, purely Marxian tactics, his solution of the problems connected with building the Party, and so forth. In one of these letters Comrade Stalin called Lenin a 'mountain eagle' and expressed great enthusiasm about his relentless struggle against the Mensheviks. We forwarded these letters to Lenin and soon received a reply from him in which he called Stalin the 'fiery Colchian.'"

* M. Davitashvili was a member of the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. In 1904 he lived in Leipzig and was a member of Lenin's group of Bolsheviks. A Russian translation has been found of two of Comrade Stalin's letters to Davitashvili, including the one referred to in these reminiscences.

These letters are published in the *Collected Works* of Comrade Stalin, Vol. I, pp. 56-61.

The revolutionary situation at the end of 1905, the imminence of a nation-wide armed insurrection, the fact that the bourgeoisie had gone over to the camp of counter-revolution, the bitter Party struggle between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks throughout Russia as well as in Transcaucasia, gave rise to a desire among the rank-and-file working-class members of the Party for unity between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

With a view to forming a united front with the workers who were following the Mensheviks, in order to draw them away from the Mensheviks and win them over to their side, Lenin, the Bolsheviks, decided to agree to a formal union with the Mensheviks.

In December 1905 the Tammerfors Conference of Bolsheviks adopted a resolution on the need for unity with the Mensheviks.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia settled the question of unity in a Leninist spirit.

At the end of 1905 the Fourth Conference of Bolsheviks agreed to unity in principle, on the basis of the obligatory recognition and operation of Lenin's organizational principles.

A decision of the Fourth Conference of the Caucasian Federation of the R.S.D.L.P. said:

"Noting as a welcome fact the ever increasing trend in our Party in favour of a complete amalgamation between the two halves of the Party, and bearing in mind that this trend could lead to the desired results only after the general

conditions for amalgamation have been made clear, the Fourth Conference of the Caucasian Federation of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party is of the opinion that:

“a) the recognition of paragraph 1 of the Rules adopted at the Third Party Congress, including the organizational centralism that follows from this paragraph, must be the principal condition for *amalgamation* in both the local and ‘higher’ bodies of the Party;

“b) the existing differences on tactics, which can be settled by congresses of a united Party, cannot and should not hinder amalgamation into a single Party;

“c) for the purpose of really achieving an amalgamation of the two halves of the Party, it is essential to proceed immediately, wherever possible, to the work of amalgamating locally on the basis of the principal condition mentioned above, and wherever this is not possible to enter into an *agreement* with the Mensheviks on the basis of joint practical slogans during open actions by the proletariat.

“In regard to the question as to whether complete amalgamation within our Party is to be prepared by means of conferences or by means of congresses, the present Conference favours the Central Committee’s plan of parallel congresses.”*

* *Kavkazsky Rabochy Listok*, No. 8, December 3 (16), 1905.

In 1906 the Tiflis and Baku "Unity" Conferences and the Transcaucasian Congress of Bolshevik and Menshevik organizations were held, at which formal amalgamation was effected, and the United Tiflis and Baku Committees as well as the United Transcaucasian Regional Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. were elected.

As a matter of fact, however, the Mensheviks continued to backslide into rank opportunism so that unity with them was not fated to be realized.

In 1906, parallel with the "United" Transcaucasian Regional Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., a Bolshevik centre existed and functioned. This was the Regional Bureau of Bolsheviks, consisting of J. Stalin, M. Tskhakaya, Ph. Makharadze, M. Davitashvili, S. Shaumyan, A. Japaridze, V. Naneishvili, and others.

The Bolsheviks were forced to pursue the line of a split, of a break with the Mensheviks, and to fight for the isolation of the Menshevik leaders with the view to winning over the Social-Democratic workers.

During the entire course of the revolution of 1905-07 and in the period of reaction, the Bolsheviks both in Russia and in Transcaucasia were and remained an independent organization.

In the fight against the Mensheviks of Transcaucasia Comrade Stalin upheld, substantiated and propagated Lenin's theory of revolution, the Bolshevik strategic slogan of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, the idea of the bourgeois-democratic revolution passing into the social-

ist revolution, and also the tactical tasks of the proletariat.

Comrade Stalin carried on an unceasing, day-to-day ideological, theoretical, organizational and political struggle against the Mensheviks of all Russia and of Transcaucasia.

Speaking at the Fourth ("Unity") Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (in Stockholm, 1906), Comrade Stalin (Ivanovich) proved the necessity for the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution:

"... We are on the eve of another upheaval; the revolution is on the upgrade and we must carry it to the end. On this all are agreed. But under what circumstances can we, and should we, do this? Under the hegemony of the proletariat, or under the hegemony of bourgeois democracy? This is where our main disagreement begins.

"Comrade Martynov said already in his *Two Dictatorships* that the hegemony of the proletariat in the present bourgeois revolution is a harmful utopia. The same idea ran through the speech he delivered yesterday. The comrades who applauded him evidently agreed with him. If that is the case, if in the opinion of the Menshevik comrades we need not the hegemony of the proletariat, but the hegemony of the democratic bourgeoisie, then it is self-evident that we should take no direct active part either in the organization of armed insurrection, or in the seizure of power. Such is the 'scheme' of the Mensheviks.

"On the other hand, if the class interests of the proletariat lead to its hegemony, if the pro-

letariat must be at the head of the present revolution and not drag at its tail, it goes without saying that the proletariat cannot refrain either from taking an active part in the organization of armed insurrection or from seizing power. Such is the 'scheme' of the Bolsheviks.

"Either the hegemony of the proletariat, or the hegemony of the democratic bourgeoisie—that is how the question stands in the Party, that is where we differ."*

In his pamphlet *The Present Situation and the Unity Congress of the Workers' Party* (1906) Comrade Stalin substantiated and developed the views of the Bolsheviks on the nature and driving forces of the revolution, on the attitude to be taken towards the State Duma, and on armed insurrection, and at the same time subjected the liberal bourgeois views of the Mensheviks to comprehensive, withering criticism.

"It is now clear that the people's revolution has not perished, that in spite of the 'December defeat' it is growing and swiftly rising to its peak. We say that this is as it should be: the driving forces of the revolution still live and operate, the industrial crisis which has broken out is becoming increasingly acute, and famine, which is utterly ruining the rural districts, is growing worse every day—and this means that the hour is near when the revolutionary anger of the people will burst out in a menacing flood.

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 239-40.

The facts tell us that a new action is maturing in the social life of Russia—more determined and mighty than the December action. We are on the eve of insurrection.

“On the other hand, the counter-revolution, which the people detest, is mustering its forces and is gradually gaining strength. It has already succeeded in organizing a camarilla, it is rallying all the dark forces under its banner, it is taking the lead of the Black-Hundred ‘movement,’ it is preparing to launch another attack upon the people’s revolution, it is rallying around itself the bloodthirsty landlords and factory owners—consequently, it is preparing to crush the people’s revolution.

“And the more events develop, the more sharply is the country becoming divided into two hostile camps, the camp of the revolution and the camp of counter-revolution, the more threateningly the two leaders of the two camps—the proletariat and the tsarist government—confront each other, and the clearer it becomes that all the bridges between them have been burnt. One of two things: *either* the victory of the revolution and the autocracy of the people, *or* the victory of the counter-revolution and tsarist autocracy. Whoever tries to sit between two stools betrays the revolution. Those who are not for us are against us! The miserable Duma and its miserable Constitutional Democrats (Cadets) have precisely got stuck between these two stools. It wants to reconcile the revolution with

the counter-revolution, it wants the wolves and the sheep to herd together—and in that way to suppress the revolution ‘at one stroke.’ That is why the Duma is engaged to this day only in pounding water in a mortar, that is why it has failed to rally any people around itself and, having no ground to stand on, is swinging in the air.

“The chief arena of the struggle is still the street. That is what the facts say. The facts say that it is in the present-day struggle, in street fighting, and not in that talking-shop the Duma, that the forces of the counter-revolution are daily becoming more feeble and disunited, whereas the forces of the revolution are growing and mobilizing; that the revolutionary forces are being welded and organized under the leadership of the advanced workers and not of the bourgeoisie. And this means that the victory of the present revolution, and its consummation, is quite *possible*. But it is possible only *if* it continues to be led by the advanced workers, *if* the class-conscious proletariat *worthily* fulfils the function of leading the revolution.”*

In July 1906, in connection with the dissolution of the First State Duma, Comrade Stalin urged the masses to carry on a revolutionary struggle outside the Duma:

“The reaction has dissolved the Duma—consequently it is our duty not to be satisfied in

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 250-52,

the future with a sham parliament like the Duma, but to fight with yet greater self-sacrifice for a real parliament, for a democratic republic.”*

“... After the dispersed Duma must come organized street action; upon the ruins of the Duma the power of the street must be built.”**

In his introduction to the Georgian edition of Kautsky's pamphlet *The Driving Forces and Prospects of the Russian Revolution* (February 1907), Comrade Stalin again substantiated and amplified the Bolshevik views concerning the nature and driving forces of the Russian revolution, the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, the hegemony of the proletariat and the counter-revolutionary role of the bourgeoisie, and participation in a provisional revolutionary government.

“The first question that is splitting Russian Social-Democracy into two parts is the question of the general character of our revolution. That our revolution is a bourgeois-democratic and not a socialistic revolution, that it must end with the destruction of feudalism and not capitalism—is clear to everybody. The question is, however, who will lead this revolution, and who will unite around itself the discontented elements of the people—the bourgeoisie or the proletariat? Will the proletariat drag at the tail of the bour-

* *Akhali Tskhovreba*, No. 17, “The Reaction is Becoming More Violent, Close Your Ranks,” July 11, 1906.

** *Akhali Tskhovreba*, No. 18, “The Dissolved Duma and the United Street,” July 12, 1906.

geoisie as was the case in France, or will the bourgeoisie follow the proletariat? This is how the question stands.

"The Mensheviks say through the mouth of *Martynov* that our revolution is a bourgeois revolution, that it is a repetition of the French revolution, and as the French revolution, being a bourgeois revolution, was led by the bourgeoisie, so our revolution must be led by the bourgeoisie too. 'The hegemony of the proletariat is a harmful utopia. . . .' 'The proletariat must follow the extreme bourgeois opposition' (see *Martynov's Two Dictatorships*).

"The Bolsheviks, however, say: True, our revolution is a bourgeois revolution, but this does not mean in the least that it is a repetition of the French revolution, that it must without fail be led by the bourgeoisie, as was the case in France. In France, the proletariat was an unorganized force with a low degree of class consciousness and, as a consequence, the bourgeoisie acquired the hegemony in the revolution. In our country, however, the proletariat is a relatively more class-conscious and organized force; as a consequence, it is no longer content with the role of appendage to the bourgeoisie and, as the most revolutionary class, is coming out at the head of the present-day movement. The hegemony of the proletariat is not a utopia, it is a living fact; the proletariat is actually uniting the discontented elements around itself. And whoever advises it 'to follow the bourgeois opposition' is

depriving it of independence, is converting the Russian proletariat into a tool of the bourgeoisie (see Lenin's, *Two Tactics*). . . .

"The second question on which we disagree is: can the liberal bourgeoisie at least be an ally of the proletariat in the present revolution?

"The Bolsheviks say that it cannot. True, during the French revolution, the liberal bourgeoisie played a revolutionary role, but this was because the class struggle in that country was not so acute, the proletariat was at a low level of class consciousness and was content with the role of appendage to the liberals, whereas in our country, the class struggle is extremely acute, the proletariat is far more class conscious and cannot resign itself to the role of appendage to the liberals. Where the proletariat fights consciously the liberal bourgeoisie ceases to be revolutionary. That is why the Cadet-liberals, frightened by the proletariat's struggle, are seeking protection under the wing of reaction. That is why they are fighting the revolution more vigorously than they are fighting the reaction. That is why the Cadets will sooner conclude an alliance with the reaction against the revolution than with the revolution. Yes, our liberal bourgeoisie, and its champions the Cadets, are the allies of the reaction, they are the 'enlightened' enemies of the revolution. It is altogether different with the poor peasants. The Bolsheviks say that only the poorest peasants will extend a hand to the revolutionary proletariat, and only they

can conclude a firm alliance with the proletariat for the whole duration of the present revolution. And it is these peasants that the proletariat must support against the reaction and the Cadets. And if these two main forces conclude an alliance with each other, if the workers and peasants support each other, the victory of the revolution will be assured. Without this, the victory of the revolution is impossible. That is why the Bolsheviki are not supporting the Cadets either in the Duma or outside the Duma, in the first stage of the elections. That is why the Bolsheviki, both during the elections and in the Duma, support only the revolutionary representatives of the peasants against the reaction and the Cadets. That is why the Bolsheviki unite the broad masses of the people only around the revolutionary *part* of the Duma and not around the *entire* Duma. That is why the Bolsheviki do not support the demand for the appointment of a Cadet ministry (see Lenin's *Two Tactics* and *The Victory of the Cadets*).

"The Mensheviki argue quite differently. True, the liberal bourgeoisie oscillates between reaction and revolution, but in the end, in the opinion of the Mensheviki, it will join the revolution and, after all, play a revolutionary role. Why? Because the liberal bourgeoisie in France played a revolutionary role, because it is opposed to the old order and, consequently, will be obliged to join the revolution. In the opinion of the Mensheviki, the liberal bourgeoisie, and its champions the

Cadets, cannot be called traitors to the present revolution, they are the allies of the revolution. That is why the Mensheviks support them both during the elections and in the Duma. The Mensheviks assert that the class struggle should never eclipse the general struggle. That is why they call upon the masses of the people to unite around the *entire* Duma and not only around its revolutionary *part*; that is why they, with all their might, support the demand for the appointment of a Cadet ministry; that is why the Mensheviks are ready to forget the maximum program, to cut down the minimum program, and to repudiate the democratic republic, only not to frighten the Cadets away from themselves. Some readers may think that all this is a libel against the Mensheviks and will demand facts. Here are the facts.

"The following is what the well-known Menshevik writer *Malishevsky* wrote recently:

"'Our bourgeoisie does not want a republic, consequently, we cannot have a republic . . .' so that ' . . . as a result of our revolution there must arise a constitutional system, but certainly not a democratic republic.' That is why Malishevsky advises 'the comrades' to abandon 'republican illusions' (see *First Symposium*, pp. 288, 289).

"This is the first point.

"On the eve of the elections the Menshevik leader *Cherevanin* wrote:

"'It would be absurd and insane for the proletariat to try, as some people propose, jointly

with the peasantry to enter into a struggle against both the government and the bourgeoisie for a sovereign and popular Constituent Assembly.' We, he says, are now trying to reach agreement with the Cadets and to get a Cadet ministry (see *Nashe Dyelo*, No. 1).

"That is the second point.

"But all this was only written. Another Menshevik leader, *Plekhanov*, did not confine himself to this and wanted to put what was written into practice. At the time when a fierce debate was raging in the Party on the question of the election tactics to be adopted, when everybody was asking whether it was permissible to enter into an agreement with the Cadets at the first stage of the elections, Plekhanov deemed even an *agreement* with the Cadets inadequate, and began to advocate a direct bloc, temporary *fusion*, with the Cadets. Recall the newspaper *Tovarishch* of November 24 (1906) in which Plekhanov published his little article. One of the readers of *Tovarishch* asked Plekhanov: Is it possible to have a common Social-Democratic and Cadet platform; if it is, 'what could be the nature . . . of a common election platform?' Plekhanov answered that a common platform was *essential*, and that such a platform must be 'a sovereign Duma. . . .' 'There is no other answer, nor can there be' (see *Tovarishch*, November 24, 1906). What do Plekhanov's words mean? They have only one meaning, namely, that during the elections the Party of the proletarians, i. e.,

Social-Democracy, should actually *join with* the party of the employers, i. e., the Cadets, should jointly with them publish agitation leaflets addressed to the workers, should practically renounce the slogan of a popular Constituent Assembly and the Social-Democratic minimum program and instead issue the Cadet slogan of a sovereign Duma. Actually, this means renouncing our minimum program to please the Cadets and to enhance our reputation in their eyes.

"As you see, the Mensheviks are so enchanted with the 'revolutionariness' of the liberal bourgeoisie, they place so much hope on its 'revolutionariness' that to please it they are even ready to forget the Social-Democratic program.

"The third question on which we disagree is: what is the class content of the victory of our revolution, or, in other words, which classes must achieve victory in our revolution, which classes must win power?

"The Bolsheviks assert that as the proletariat and the peasantry are the main forces in the present revolution, and as their victory is impossible unless they mutually support each other—it is they who will win power, and, therefore, the victory of the revolution will mean the *dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry* (see Lenin's *Two Tactics* and *The Victory of the Cadets*).

"The Mensheviks, on the other hand, reject the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, they do not believe that power will be won by the proletariat and the peasantry. In

their opinion power must drop into the hands of a Cadet Duma. Consequently, they, with extraordinary zeal, support the Cadet slogan of a responsible ministry. Thus, instead of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, the Mensheviks offer us the dictatorship of the Cadets (see Martynov's *Two Dictatorships*, and also the newspapers *Golos Truda*, *Nashe Dyelo*, and others).

"The fourth question on which we disagree is as follows: during the revolutionary storm a so-called Provisional Revolutionary Government will, of course, automatically arise—is it permissible for Social-Democracy to enter the revolutionary government?

"The Bolsheviks say that it is not only permissible to enter such a provisional government from the point of view of principle but that it will be necessary to do so for practical reasons, in order that Social-Democracy may worthily protect the interests of the proletariat and of the revolution in the Provisional Revolutionary Government. If in the street fighting the proletariat, jointly with the peasants, overthrows the old order, and if it sheds its blood together with them, it is only natural that it should also enter the Provisional Revolutionary Government with them, in order to lead the revolution to the desired results (see Lenin's *Two Tactics*).

"The Mensheviks, however, reject the idea of entering the Provisional Revolutionary Government—they say that this is impermissible

for Social-Democracy, that this is unseemly for a Social-Democrat, that it will be fatal for the proletariat (see Martynov's *Two Dictatorships*). . . .

"And so, who agrees with the Mensheviks, and with whom, finally, do the Mensheviks agree?

"Here is what history tells us about this. On December 27 (1906), a debate was held in Solyani Gorodok (in St. Petersburg). In the course of the debate the Cadet leader P. Struve said: 'You will all be Cadets. . . . The Mensheviks are already being called semi-Cadets. Many people regard Plekhanov as a Cadet and, indeed, the Cadets can welcome much of what Plekhanov says now; it is a pity, however, that he did not say this when the Cadets stood alone' (see *Tovarishch* of December 28, 1906).

"So you see who agrees with the Mensheviks.

"Will it be surprising if the Mensheviks agree with them and take the path of liberalism? . . ."*

In 1906-07, in connection with the influx of Kropotkinist Anarchists into Transcaucasia, Comrade Stalin wrote a number of theoretical articles on the subject "Anarchism or Socialism." (See the newspaper *Akhali Tskhovreba*, Nos. 2, 4 and 7 of June 21, 24 and 28, and No. 16 of July 9, 1906; the newspaper *Akhali Droyeba*, Nos. 5, 6 and 7, of December 11, 18 and 25, 1906, and No. 8 of January

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 2-3, 4-8, 9, 10-12, 13.

1, 1907; the newspaper *Chveni Tskhovreba*, Nos. 3, 5, 8 and 9, of February 21, 23, 27 and 28, 1907; and the newspaper *Dro*, Nos. 21, 22, 23 and 26, of April 4, 5, 6 and 10, 1907.)

In these articles Comrade Stalin developed the Marxist teaching on the fundamental principles of dialectical materialism. With exceptional profundity he worked out the problem of the inevitability and unavoidability of the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the problem of the necessity for a militant proletarian party and also of its strategical and tactical tasks. These works are a model of how profound problems of the theory of Marxism-Leninism are linked with the immediate tasks of the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat.

Let us quote some excerpts from these works of Comrade Stalin:

On reformism:

“Reformism (Bernstein and others), which regards Socialism merely as a remote goal and nothing more, reformism, which actually repudiates the socialist revolution and aims at establishing Socialism by peaceful means, reformism, which advocates not class struggle but class collaboration—this reformism is decaying day after day and, day after day, is losing all semblance to Socialism. . . .”*

On anarchism:

“... Marxism and anarchism are built up on entirely different principles, in spite of the

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 294-95.

fact that both come into the arena of the struggle under the flag of Socialism. The cornerstone of anarchism is the *individual*, whose emancipation, according to its tenets, is the principal condition for the emancipation of the masses, the collective body. According to the tenets of anarchism the emancipation of the masses is impossible until the individual is emancipated. Accordingly, its slogan is: 'Everything for the individual.' The cornerstone of Marxism, however, is the *masses*, whose emancipation, according to the Marxist view is the principal condition for the emancipation of the individual. That is to say, according to the tenets of Marxism, the emancipation of the individual is impossible until the masses are emancipated. Accordingly, its slogan is: 'Everything for the masses.'**

On the connection between Marxist philosophy and scientific Communism:

"Marxism is not only a theory of Socialism, it is an integral world outlook, a philosophical system, from which Marx's proletarian Socialism automatically follows. This philosophical system is called dialectical materialism."**

On the dialectical method:

"What is the dialectical method?

"It is said that social life is in continuous

* *Ibid.*, p. 296.

** *Ibid.*, p. 297.

movement and development. This is true: life must not be regarded as something immutable and static; it never remains at one level, it is in eternal movement, in an eternal process of destruction and creation. Therefore, life always contains the *new* and the *old*, the *growing* and the *dying*, the revolutionary and the counter-revolutionary.

"The dialectical method tells us that we must regard life as it actually is. We have seen that life is in continuous movement, consequently, we must regard life in its motion and ask ourselves: where is life going? We have seen that life presents a picture of continuous destruction and creation; consequently, we must examine life in its process of destruction and creation and ask ourselves: what is being destroyed and what is being created in life?

That which is born in life and grows day after day is invincible, its progress cannot be checked. That is to say, if, for example, the proletariat as a class is born and grows day after day, no matter how weak and small in numbers it may be *today*, in the long run, it must be victorious. Why? Because it is growing, gaining strength and marching forward. On the other hand, all that in life which grows old and marches to its grave must inevitably sustain defeat, even if *today* it represents a titanic force. That is to say, if, for example, the ground is gradually slipping from under the feet of the bourgeoisie, and the latter is slipping further and further

back every day, no matter how strong and numerous it may be today, it will sustain defeat in the long run. Why? Because as a class it is decaying, growing feeble, growing old, and becoming a superfluous burden to life.

"From this arose the well-known dialectical proposition: all that which really exists, i.e., all that which grows day after day, is rational, and all that which is decaying day after day is irrational and, consequently, cannot avoid defeat.

"For example. In the eighties of the last century a great controversy flared up among the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia. The Narodniks asserted that the main force that could undertake the task of 'liberating Russia' was the petty bourgeoisie, rural and urban. Why?—the Marxists asked them. Because, answered the Narodniks, the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie now constitute the majority, and, moreover, they are poor, they live in poverty.

"To this the Marxists replied: It is true that the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie now constitute the majority and are really poor, but is that the point? The petty bourgeoisie has long constituted the majority, but up to now it displayed no initiative in the struggle for 'freedom' without the assistance of the proletariat. Why? Because the petty bourgeoisie, as a class, is not growing; on the contrary, it is disintegrating day after day and breaking up into bourgeois and proletarians. On the other hand, of course, poverty too is of no decisive importance here:

'tramps' are poorer than the petty bourgeoisie, but nobody will say that they can undertake the task of 'liberating Russia.'

"As you see, the point is not which class to-day constitutes the majority, or which class is poorer, but which class is gaining strength and which is decaying.

"As the proletariat is the only class which is steadily growing and gaining strength, which is pushing social life forward and rallying all the revolutionary elements around itself, it is our duty to regard it as the main force in the present-day movement, join its ranks, and make its progressive strivings our strivings.

"That is how the Marxists answered.

"Obviously the Marxists looked at life dialectically, whereas the Narodniks argued metaphysically—they depicted social life as something that remains static.

"This is how the dialectical method looks upon the development of life.

"But there is movement and movement. There was movement in social life during the 'December days,' when the proletariat, straightening its back, stormed arms depots and launched an attack upon reaction. But the movement of preceding years, when the proletariat, under the conditions of 'peaceful' development, limited itself to individual strikes and the formation of small trade unions, must also be called social movement.

"Clearly, movement assumes different forms.

"And so the dialectical method says that movement has two forms: the evolutionary and the revolutionary form.

"Movement is evolutionary when the progressive elements spontaneously continue their daily activities and introduce minor, *quantitative* changes into the old order.

Movement is revolutionary when the same elements combine, become imbued with a single idea, and sweep down upon the enemy camp with the object of uprooting the old order and of introducing *qualitative* changes in life, of establishing a new order.

"Evolution prepares revolution and creates the ground for it; revolution consummates the process of evolution and facilitates its further activity."*

On the contradiction between form and content in the process of dialectical development:

"... consciousness and being, idea and matter, are two different forms of one and the same phenomenon, which, broadly speaking, is called nature, or society. Consequently, they do not negate each other;** at the same time they are not one and the same phenomenon.***

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 298-301.

** This does not at all contradict the idea that there is a conflict between form and content. The point is that the conflict is not between content and form in general, but between the *old* form and *new* content, which is seeking a new form and striving towards it. (J. V. Stalin's footnote.)

*** J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, p. 318.

On the materialist theory:

"What is the materialist theory?

"Everything in the world changes, everything in life develops, but *how* does this change take place, in *what form* does this development proceed? . . .

"Some people say that 'nature' and 'social life' were preceded by the universal idea, which later served as the basis of their development, so that the development of the phenomena of 'nature' and of 'social life' is, so to speak, the external form, merely the expression of the development of the universal idea.

"Such, for example, was the doctrine of the *idealists*, who in the course of time split up into several trends.

"Others say that from the very beginning there have existed in the world two mutually negative forces—idea and matter, consciousness and being, and that correspondingly, phenomena also divide up into two categories—the ideal and the material, which negate each other, and contend against each other, so that the development of nature and society is a constant struggle between ideal and material phenomena.

"Such, for example, was the doctrine of the *dualists*, who, in the course of time, like the idealists, split up into several trends.

"The materialist theory utterly repudiates both dualism and idealism.

"Of course, both ideal and material phenomena exist in the world, but this does not at all mean

that they negate each other. On the contrary, the ideal and material sides are two different forms of one and the same nature or society, one cannot be conceived of without the other, they exist together, develop together, and, consequently, we have no grounds for thinking that they negate each other.

"Thus, the so-called dualism proves to be groundless.

"A single and indivisible nature expressed in two different forms—material and ideal; a single and indivisible social life expressed in two different forms—material and ideal—this is how we should regard the development of nature and of social life.

"Such is the monism of the materialist theory.

"At the same time, the materialist theory also repudiates idealism.

"It is wrong to think that in its development the ideal side, and consciousness in general, precedes the development of the material side. . . .

"It follows that the development of consciousness needs a given structure of the organism and development of its nervous system.

"It follows that the development of the ideal side, the development of consciousness, is *preceded* by the development of the material side, the development of the external conditions: first the external conditions change, first the material side changes, and *then* consciousness, the ideal side, changes accordingly.

"Thus, the history of the development of nature radically undermines so-called idealism.

"The same thing must be said about the history of the development of human society. . . .

"Clearly, here too, in social life, first the external conditions change, first the conditions of men change and then their consciousness changes accordingly. . . .

"The same must be said about classes, and about society as a whole.

"In social life, too, first the external conditions change, first the material conditions change, and then the thoughts of men, their habits, customs and their world outlook change accordingly.

"That is why Marx says:

"It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.'

"If we can call the material side, the external conditions, being, and other similar phenomena, the *content*, then we can call the ideal side, consciousness and other similar phenomena, the *form*. Hence arose the well-known materialist proposition: in the process of development content precedes form, form lags behind content.

"And as, in Marx's opinion, economic development is the 'material foundation' of social life, its *content*, while legal, political, religious and philosophical development is the 'ideological form'

of this content, its 'superstructure,' Marx draws the conclusion that: 'With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is *more or less rapidly* transformed.'

"This, of course, does not at all mean that in Marx's opinion content is possible without form, as Sh. G. imagines (see *Nobati** No. 1. 'A Critique of Monism'). Content is impossible without form, but a given form, since it lags behind its content, never *fully* corresponds to this content; and so the new content is 'obliged' to clothe itself for a time in the old form, and this causes a conflict between them. At the present time, for example, the form of appropriation of the product, which is *private* in character, does not conform to the *social* content of production, and this is the basis of the present-day social 'conflict.'

"On the other hand, the idea that consciousness is a form of being does not mean at all that by its nature consciousness is matter. That was the opinion held only by the vulgar materialists (for example, Büchner and Moleschott), whose theories fundamentally contradict Marx's materialism, and whom Engels rightly ridiculed in his *Ludwig Feuerbach*."***

* *Nobati (The Call)*—a weekly legal newspaper of the Anarchist party, published in the Georgian language in Tiflis, from March 25 to June 2, 1906. Altogether fourteen numbers appeared.

** J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 310, 311-14, 315, 316-17.

On the class struggle and the inevitability of the proletarian revolution:

“How should the proletariat act, what path must it take in order consciously to carry out its program, to overthrow capitalism and to build Socialism?

“The answer is clear: the proletariat cannot achieve Socialism by making peace with the bourgeoisie—it must unfailingly take the path of struggle, and this struggle must be a class struggle, a struggle of the entire proletariat against the entire bourgeoisie. Either the bourgeoisie and its capitalism, or the proletariat and its Socialism! This must be the basis of the proletariat’s actions, of its class struggle.

“But the proletarian class struggle assumes numerous forms. A strike, for example, partial or general, is class struggle. Boycott and sabotage are undoubtedly class struggle. Processions, demonstrations, entering public representative bodies, etc., whether national parliaments or local government bodies makes no difference—are also class struggle. All are different forms of the same class struggle. We shall not here examine which form of the struggle is more important for the proletariat in its class struggle, we shall merely observe that each one of them, in its proper time and place, is undoubtedly needed by the proletariat as essential means for developing its class consciousness and organization; and the proletariat needs class consciousness and organization as much as it needs air. It must also

be observed, however, that for the proletariat all these forms of struggle are merely *preparatory* means, that not one of them, taken separately, constitutes the *decisive* means by which the proletariat can smash capitalism. Capitalism cannot be smashed by the general strike alone; the general strike can only prepare some of the conditions for the smashing of capitalism. It is inconceivable that the proletariat should be able to overthrow capitalism merely by being represented in parliament: parliamentarism can only help to prepare some of the conditions for overthrowing capitalism.

“What, then, is the *decisive* means by which the proletariat will overthrow the capitalist system?

“The *socialist revolution* is this means.

“Strikes, the boycott, parliamentarism, processions, and demonstrations—all these forms of struggle are good means for preparing and organizing the proletariat. But not one of these means is capable of abolishing existing inequality. All these means must be concentrated in one principal and decisive means; the proletariat must rise and launch a determined attack upon the bourgeoisie in order to destroy capitalism to its foundations. This principal and decisive means is precisely the socialist revolution.*

On the dictatorship of the proletariat, its class struggle and the principles underlying the tactics

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 343-45.

of the proletarian party in the socialist revolution:

"The socialist revolution must not be conceived as a sudden and short blow, it is a prolonged struggle waged by the proletarian masses, who inflict defeat upon the bourgeoisie and capture its positions. And as the victory of the proletariat will at the same time mean domination over the vanquished bourgeoisie, as, *in the conflict between the classes* the defeat of one class signifies the domination of the other, the first stage of the socialist revolution will be the political domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie.

"The socialist *dictatorship of the proletariat*, capture of power by the proletariat—this is what the socialist revolution must start with.

"This means that *until the bourgeoisie is completely vanquished*, until its wealth has been confiscated, the proletariat must without fail possess a military force, it must without fail have its 'proletarian guard,' with the aid of which it will repel the counter-revolutionary attacks of the dying bourgeoisie. . . ."

"From this general principle follow all the other views on tactics. Strikes, boycott, demonstrations, and parliamentarism are important only in so far as they help to organize the proletariat and to strengthen and enlarge its organizations for the purpose of bringing about the socialist revolution."**

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 345-46.

** *Ibid.*, p. 347.

On the class organizations of the proletariat and the necessity of a proletarian party:

"The object of the trade unions is to fight (mainly) against industrial capital to improve the conditions of the workers under the present capitalist system. The object of the cooperative societies is to fight (mainly) against merchant capital to secure an increase of consumption by the workers by reducing the prices of articles of prime necessity, also under the capitalist system, of course. The proletariat undoubtedly needs both trade unions and cooperative societies as means of organizing the proletarian masses. Hence, from the point of view of the proletarian Socialism of Marx and Engels, the proletariat must take hold of both these forms of organization and reinforce and strengthen them, as far as this is possible under present political conditions, of course.

"But trade unions and cooperative societies alone cannot satisfy the organizational needs of the fighting proletariat. This is because the organizations mentioned cannot go beyond the limits of capitalism, for their object is to improve the conditions of the workers under the capitalist system. The workers, however, want to free themselves entirely from capitalist slavery, they want to smash these limits, and not only revolve within the limits of capitalism. Hence, in addition, an organization is needed that will rally around itself the class-conscious elements of the workers of *all* trades, that will

transform the proletariat into a conscious class and make it its chief aim to smash the capitalist system, to prepare the socialist revolution.”*

On the building of a proletarian party of a new type:

“This party must be a class party, quite independent of all other parties—and this is because it is the party of the proletarian class, the emancipation of which can be brought about only by this class itself.

“This party must be a revolutionary party—and this is because the workers can be emancipated only by revolutionary means, by means of the socialist revolution.

“This party must be an international party, the doors of the party must be open to every class-conscious proletarian—and this is because the emancipation of the workers is not a national but a social question, equally important for the Georgian proletarians, for the Russian proletarians, and for the proletarians of other nations.

“Hence, it is clear, that the more closely the proletarians of the different nations are united, the more thoroughly the national barriers which have been raised between them are demolished, the stronger will be the party of the proletariat, and the more will the organization of the proletariat in one indivisible class be facilitated.”**

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. I, pp. 347-48.

** *Ibid.*, pp. 348-49.

Comrade Stalin carried on the whole of his theoretical work with exceptional consistency and adherence to principle, waging a relentless struggle against opportunism in the Russian and international movement, against Bernsteinism and Russian Menshevism, against the Georgian Mensheviks—those “Bernsteins in miniature” (*Stalin*)—who tried to adapt Marxism to the needs of the bourgeoisie.

Thus, the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin and equipped with the Leninist strategy and tactics of revolution, constituted the only revolutionary party in the Caucasus, which led the struggle of the workers and peasants for the victorious conclusion of the revolution, for the overthrow of the autocracy and the establishment of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

A gulf lies between the strategy and tactics of the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks and the strategy and tactics of the Mensheviks. One excludes the other. Hence the irreconcilable struggle of the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia against the Mensheviks.

Ph. Makharadze in his book *Sketches of the Revolutionary Movement in Transcaucasia* (published in 1927) commits a gross error.

He writes:

“Here I must briefly point to one circumstance which, unfortunately, to a considerable degree played a retarding role in the development of the revolution of 1904. I am referring to the split among the Russian Social-Democrats which took place at the Second Party Congress. A great part

of the energy of Party people was wasted on squabbles, polemics, and inner Party strife. It was evident to all that this was an enormous drain and handicap on the Party leadership in its efforts to strengthen the revolutionary movement among the masses. Indeed, the disagreements and the split, at a time when its leadership of the growing revolutionary movement was needed, resulted in great harm to the cause."

According to Ph. Makharadze, the struggle of world-historic importance waged between Bolshevism and Menshevism was just an unnecessary "squabble." He underestimates the struggle that Lenin (the Bolsheviks) waged against international opportunism and Russian Menshevism. This struggle determined the fate of Marxism and of the entire labour movement. For it must be understood that it was only in an irreconcilable struggle against opportunism (against "legal Marxism," "Economism" and Menshevism) that the Bolsheviks built up their Party and brought it to completion.

"Before we can unite, and in order that we may unite, we must first of all draw firm and definite lines of demarcation."*

"Bolshevism ran the old *Iskra* for three years, 1900-03, and launched a struggle against Menshevism as an integral trend."**

Beginning with 1900, the Bolsheviks, under the leadership of Lenin, built their Party in an irrecon-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th ed., Vol. IV, p. 329.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIV, p. 163.

cilable struggle against the Mensheviks. And here, in Transcaucasia too, the Bolshevik organizations grew and became steeled in a determined fight against Menshevism.

That enemy of the people Orakhelashvili deliberately falsified the history of the Bolshevik Party.

In his booklet *The Transcaucasian Bolshevik Organizations in 1917* he slanderously ascribed to the Bolsheviks belief in the possibility of transforming the Mensheviks into devoted servants of the proletariat, and proclaimed that all of *Lenin's* and *Stalin's* immense work of establishing and consolidating the Bolshevik Party was simply insurance against the possible waverings of the Mensheviks.

A. Yenukidze, since exposed as an enemy of the people, a past master in the art of self-praise and self-advertisement, deliberately distorting the history of the Party also denied that the Bolsheviks effected the split with the Mensheviks long before 1905, i. e., at the Second Party Congress, that the new *Iskra* was the central organ of the Menshevik faction, that *Lenin* and *Stalin* carried on a relentless struggle against Glebov and Krassin, the men who had surrendered the C.C. to the Mensheviks and tried to prevent the convocation of the Third Party Congress.

What else can such statements be called but falsification of the history of Bolshevism?

It is well known that *Lenin*, *Stalin*, the Bolsheviks, not only did not believe in the possibility of reforming the Mensheviks, of transforming them to any degree into devoted servants of the proletariat, but all through the history of the Party waged a

most uncompromising struggle to expose and defeat the Mensheviks. The Bolsheviks organized and built up their Party not in order to insure themselves against the opportunism of the Mensheviks, but in order to lead the struggle of the proletariat against tsarism and capitalism, for the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the defeat of opportunism—Menshevism—in the working-class movement.

We know that Bolshevik and Menshevik factions arose inside the Party at the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. and that from 1905 onwards (from the time the Third Congress of the Party was held) the Bolsheviks actually constituted an independent Party. We also know that the split at the Second Congress was prepared for by the whole of the preceding struggle Lenin had waged against opportunism both in the Russian movement and in the entire Second International.

“As a trend of political thought and as a political party, Bolshevism exists since 1903.”*

At the Second Congress Lenin and the Bolsheviks fought to overcome the opportunist groups by ousting and isolating them.

Like the whole history of the struggle of Bolshevism against anti-Bolshevik trends and factions, the struggle of the Bolsheviks against the Menshevik opportunist group at the Second Congress was *a struggle of principles for Leninism*, a struggle for the formation of a proletarian party of a new type,

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Vol. II, Moscow 1947, p. 574.

"a new party, a militant party, a revolutionary party, one bold enough to lead the proletarians in the struggle for power." (*Stalin.*)

At the Second Congress the Bolsheviks carried the struggle against the Mensheviks to a split, thereby showing the international proletariat that the only way to build a genuine revolutionary workers' party was to break away from the opportunists.

On this question Comrade Stalin wrote:

"Every Bolshevik, if he is really a Bolshevik, knows that already long before the war, beginning approximately from 1903-04, when the Bolshevik group took shape in Russia and when the Lefts in German Social-Democracy first made themselves felt, Lenin pursued a line towards a rupture, towards a split with the opportunists both here, in the Russian Social-Democratic Party, and over there, in the Second International, particularly in the German Social-Democratic Party. Every Bolshevik knows that it was for that very reason already at that time (1903-05) the Bolsheviks won for themselves in the ranks of the opportunists of the Second International honourable fame as 'splitters' and 'disrupters.'"*

At the beginning of 1904 the conciliators Krassin and Glebov (Noskov) gained the upper hand in the Central Committee that was elected at the Second Congress; they refused to admit that the Mensheviks were opportunists, agents of the bourgeoisie

* J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 11th ed., p. 351.

among the working class; they opposed Lenin's demand for the convocation of the Third Congress and condemnation of the factional activities of the Mensheviks. The lack of principle and the conciliationism of these Central Committee members rendered the Mensheviks enormous service in their anti-Party activities.

On the initiative of Krassin and Noskov a number of Mensheviks were co-opted on the Central Committee and in this way the Mensheviks gained control of the C.C. In the autumn of 1904 this C.C. issued a special circular to the Party announcing reconciliation with the Mensheviks and prohibiting all agitation for the Third Congress.

As an agent of this Menshevik Central Committee Glebov made a special tour of the Caucasian Party organizations. In a letter to Lenin and Krupskaya, Comrade V. Sturua wrote the following about this tour:

"As was to be expected, the tour of the Caucasus by the C.C. (Glebov) turned into widespread agitation against a congress. This agitation took the form of a fight against the Caucasian Federal Committee too."

In 1904 Lenin proved that Glebov and Krassin were guilty of systematically deceiving the Party and that they "...violated every principle of Party organization and discipline."*

In opposition to the Menshevik C.C. Lenin appealed to the Party rank and file to fight for the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th ed., Vol. VII, p. 497.

Third Congress and in August 1904 called a Bolshevik Conference in Geneva.

This Conference condemned the factional and disruptive activities of the Mensheviks and mobilized the Party to fight vigorously for the convocation of the Third Congress.

The Bureau of the committees of the majority and the newspaper *Vperyod* (*Forward*), led by Lenin, launched a struggle for the congress and won over the majority of the Party Committees.

Under pressure of the committees the Central Committee of Mensheviks and conciliators was forced to admit the necessity for convening a Party congress.

The Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. was in essence the first purely Bolshevik congress.

Lenin left the editorial board of the old *Iskra* on November 1 (October 19), 1903. After this the Mensheviks took possession of *Iskra* and transformed it into the central organ of the Menshevik faction.

We also know that in 1904 Lenin started the Bolshevik central organ, *Vperyod* (*Forward*).

The Menshevik *Iskra* waged a fierce struggle against Lenin (against the Bolsheviks) all through 1904 and 1905. The Mensheviks themselves emphasized that a gulf lay between the old and the new *Iskra*. While the old *Iskra*, which pursued Lenin's line, carried on a relentless struggle against Russian and international opportunism and prepared for the struggle to form a proletarian party of a new type, the new *Iskra* fought to wreck the Party not

only on organizational but also on ideological and tactical issues and slipped into Economism.

Lenin's pamphlet *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* contains an annihilating criticism of the new, Menshevik *Iskra*. Comparing it with the old *Iskra* he wrote:

"The old *Iskra* taught the truths of revolutionary struggle. The new *Iskra* teaches the worldly wisdom of yielding and living in harmony with everyone. The old *Iskra* was the organ of militant orthodoxy. The new *Iskra* treats us to a recrudescence of opportunism—chiefly on questions of organization. The old *Iskra* earned the honour of being detested by the opportunists, both Russian and West European. The new *Iskra* has 'grown wise' and will soon cease to be ashamed of the praises lavished on it by the extreme opportunists. The old *Iskra* marched unswervingly towards its goal, and there was no discrepancy between its word and its deed. The inherent falsity of the position of the new *Iskra* inevitably leads—independently even of anyone's will or intention—to political hypocrisy. It cries out against the circle spirit in order to conceal the victory of the circle spirit over the Party spirit. It pharisaically condemns splits, as if one can imagine any way of avoiding splits in any at all organized party except by the subordination of the minority to the majority. It says that heed must be paid to revolutionary public opinion, yet, while keeping dark the praises of the Aki-movs, it indulges in petty scandalmongering about

the committees of the revolutionary wing of the Party! How shameful! How they have disgraced our old *Iskra!*"*

As we have pointed out, in the fight for the Third Party Congress, in the fight against the Mensheviks and the Menshevik C.C., Comrade Stalin played a tremendous part.

In *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, which was published in 1904, Lenin denounced the opportunism and the factional struggle of the Mensheviks in scathing terms and showed that the split at the Congress was no accident.

In his pamphlet "Briefly About the Disagreements in the Party" Comrade Stalin made a brilliant defence of Lenin's views and in true Leninist spirit exposed the Mensheviks throughout Russia and in Transcaucasia and the factional work they were engaged in.

Thus:

1) *In the first Russian revolution (1905-07) the Transcaucasian Bolshevik organization, which was led by the Caucasian Federal Committee, was the only revolutionary proletarian organization that headed, organized and directed the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants of Transcaucasia for the overthrow of the autocracy, the struggle to win the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, and the passing of the bourgeois democratic revolution into the socialist revolution.*

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Two-Vol. Eng. ed., Vol. I, Moscow 1947, pp. 339-40.

2) Every advance of the revolutionary mass movement in the first revolution (1905-07) was won by the Bolsheviks in an uncompromising struggle against Menshevism and all the petty-bourgeois nationalist parties.

As an independent political Party organization, the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks, armed with Lenin's program and strategy of revolution, ruthlessly fought the Georgian Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries, Dashnaks, Anarchists and Federalists; and this struggle was a decisive factor in the great achievements of the Bolsheviks in the revolution, a decisive factor in the upsurge and development of the first Russian revolution in Transcaucasia.

3) During the years of the first revolution the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia were headed by Lenin's best companion-in-arms, the man who laid the foundations of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism in Transcaucasia and of the first Social-Democratic organizations of the Leninist "Iskra"-ist trend—Comrade Stalin. (Loud applause.)

III

ON THE HISTORY OF THE BOLSHEVIK
ORGANIZATIONS OF TRANSCAUCASIA
IN THE PERIOD OF REACTION AND
OF THE NEW RISE OF THE WORKING-CLASS
MOVEMENT
(1907-1913)

In alliance with the bourgeoisie tsarism was able to crush the first Russian revolution.

The *coup d'état* of June 3, 1907, soldered the alliance of the tsar and the Black-Hundred landowners with the big bourgeoisie of commerce and industry.

A dark period set in, the period of the Stolypin regime.

Comrade Stalin has written the following about this period of reaction:

"The younger members of the Party, of course, did not experience the charms of this regime and do not remember them. As for the old men, they must remember the punitive expeditions of accursed memory, the savage raids on working-class organizations, the mass flogging of peasants, and, as a screen to all of this, the Black-Hundred-

Cadet Duma. Public opinion in shackles, general lassitude and apathy, want and despair among the workers, the peasantry downtrodden and terrified, with a rabble of police, landowners and capitalists rampant everywhere—such were the typical features of Stolypin's 'pacification.' . . ."

"The triumph of the knout and the powers of darkness was complete. At that time the political life of Russia was defined as an 'abomination of desolation.' " *

Russian tsarism took cruel revenge on Transcaucasia as one of the strongest centres of the revolution.

In the Caucasus Vorontsov-Dashkov, Viceroy and satrap of the tsar, viciously carried out the Stolypin policy of bestial terror and destruction of the revolutionary organizations of the workers and peasants. The revolutionary proletariat and its vanguard, the Bolshevik organization of Transcaucasia, bore the brunt of the sentences to exile, penal servitude and death.

The tsarist government strewed the long trail from the Caucasus to Siberia with the bones of the best revolutionary representatives of the peoples of Transcaucasia. According to incomplete statistics, in 1907, 3,074 persons were banished from the Tiflis and Kutais gubernias.

It was in this environment of terror and bloody repressions that the Third Duma elections were

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. V, pp. 129-30.

held in Transcaucasia. The faithful servants of tsarism, Timoshkin, a member of the Black Hundreds; Prince Shervashidze; the bourgeois nationalist Khasmamedov, and the hired agents of the bourgeoisie, the Menshevik-Liquidators, K. Chkheidze and E. Gegechkori, were elected to the Third Duma from Transcaucasia.

In the years of reaction Russian tsarism intensified its colonization policy in the Caucasus, inciting enmity between the nationalities and persecution of the national cultures of the peoples of Transcaucasia. In its reactionary policy tsarism fully relied on the Georgian princes and nobles, Azerbaijan *beks* and Armenian bourgeoisie.

In a report to tsar Nicholas II, Vorontsov-Dashkov, Viceroy of the Caucasus, explained his policy of colonizing the Caucasus with Russian kulaks and dissenters as follows:

“... It is possible to single out a considerable number of the most substantial and enterprising families upon whom, as experience has shown, we may boldly impose the great task of installing Russian civicism in the territory and instilling the principles of civilization into it.”*

Tsarism was able to inflame national enmity between the peoples of Transcaucasia. Vorontsov-Dashkov boasted to Nicholas II:

“... I must point out that if there are no separatist tendencies on the part of the various nationalities, neither are there any separatist

* Vorontsov-Dashkov, *Report to His Majesty*, p. 35, St. Petersburg 1910.

tendencies on an all-Caucasian scale, because all the nationalities of the Caucasus are at loggerheads with one another and submit to cohabitation only under the influence of the Russian authorities, without which they would plunge into bloody rivalry at once.”*

Russian tsarism bestowed special patronage on the Armenian bourgeoisie and the Armenian nationalist party of Dashnaks, using them to arouse national enmity between the Armenians and Azerbaijanians.

The Great-Power policy of the tsarist government, a policy of terror and pogroms, was supplemented by an economic offensive on the part of the bourgeoisie against the working class. The working class was hard hit by the severe economic crisis of 1907-12. The economic gains it had won in the period of the revolution were taken away.

The condition of the Baku proletariat in the period of 1908-09 was described by Comrade Stalin as follows:

“... economic reprisals, far from subsiding are steadily increasing. Housing allowances and ‘bonuses’ are being withdrawn. The three-shift system (eight hours work) is being replaced by the two-shift system (twelve hours work), while overtime gang work is becoming systematic. Medical assistance and expenditure on schools are being reduced to a minimum (although the oil owners spend over 600,000 rubles per

* Vorontsov-Dashkov, *Report to His Majesty*, p. 14, St. Petersburg 1913.

annum on the police!). Canteens and people's halls have already been closed. The oil field and works committees and the trade unions are absolutely ignored, class-conscious comrades are being discharged in the old way. Fines and beatings are being reintroduced.”*

In the years of reaction a fierce struggle developed between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks which widened the split—the breach between them—and enabled the workers to see more clearly that the Mensheviks were agents of the bourgeoisie.

In the period of reaction (1907-12) the Transcaucasian Mensheviks, like the counter-revolutionary bourgeois liberals (Cadets), openly repudiated revolution. The Menshevik leaders—N. Jordania, I. Tsereteli, K. Chkheidze and others—contended that the bourgeois revolution had been completed and that further changes in the political system would take place through Duma reforms. The Mensheviks declared that the proletariat must abandon the attempt at a new revolution as hopeless and direct its efforts towards obtaining the franchise, the right of assembly, the right to organize unions, the right to strike, etc.

N. Jordania asserted that the proletariat must renounce its independent line in the revolution and the slogan of a democratic republic, and must fight together with the bourgeoisie, and under the hegemony of the bourgeoisie, for a moderate constitution.

He wrote as follows:

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 175.

"The struggle of the proletariat alone, or of the bourgeoisie alone, will by no means overthrow the reaction. . . . The passion for independence means isolating the bourgeoisie, weakening the movement, strengthening reaction, and through this, transforming the bourgeoisie into an involuntary tool of counter-revolution."*

"The revolution will be victorious only if the bourgeoisie, and not the proletariat, comes out as its leader. If the proletariat again stands at the head of the revolution, the revolution will suffer defeat. We must now work out purely European tactics. . . . Our tactics must in no way be adapted to revolutionary actions. Let the bourgeoisie itself make its own revolution, and let us pursue the cause of the proletariat."**

"The thesis that the proletariat plays the leading part in a bourgeois revolution is not justified either by the theory of Marx or by historical facts."***

* N. Jordania, in *Dasatskisi*, No. 4, 1908. *Dasatskisi* (*The Beginning*) was a legal Menshevik newspaper published in Georgian at Tiflis beginning with March 4, 1908. Twenty-three issues appeared.

** From a speech by N. Jordania at the Fifth Transcaucasian Congress of Social-Democratic Organizations, reported in *Borba* (*Struggle*), Nos. 2-4, 1908. *Borba* was an illegal journal of the Tiflis Bolsheviks published from June to November 1908. Altogether four issues appeared.

*** N. Jordania in *Azri*, No. 17, 1908. *Azri* (*Thought*) was a legal Menshevik daily published in Georgian in Tiflis from January 29 to March 2, 1908. Altogether twenty-seven issues appeared.

The Transcaucasian Mensheviks transferred the centre of their activity to the Duma, declaring it to be the "organ of the popular movement." In the Second Duma they constituted a large part of the Social-Democratic group.

The Menshevik deputies of Transcaucasia were elected to the Duma mainly by the votes of the petty and middle bourgeoisie and the Georgian nobility. In the Duma they pursued an open policy of opportunism and compromise, a policy which betrayed the interests of the proletariat.

In the Second Duma, I. Tsereteli preached that "it is impossible to fight for freedom without some sort of an alliance with bourgeois democracy" that "the line of fundamental political cleavage in our revolution is to the Right of the Cadets and not to the Left," etc.

When the Second Duma was dissolved, the Mensheviks confined themselves to empty declarations and wordy threats against the autocracy, and urged the workers and peasants to be submissive.

The Menshevik attitude towards the dissolution of the Duma was estimated by the tsarist secret police as follows:

"The Baku workers, who are almost without exception under the influence of the agitation of the local revolutionary organization, have taken the dissolution of the Duma quietly—on the one hand under pressure of their present difficult material conditions which do not allow them to react openly against the dissolution

of the Duma without risking the loss of their jobs, and on the other hand *because of the tactics of the Menshevik Social-Democrats.*"*

During the years of reaction the Transcaucasian Mensheviks carried on a campaign to dissolve the illegal revolutionary party, heartily endorsing the Russian Liquidators' plan of organizing a broad, open, legal labour party. They held that what the proletariat needed was not a militant, revolutionary party, but a peaceful, parliamentary labour party, modelled on the type of West European Social-Democracy, and adapted to peaceful collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

The Transcaucasian Mensheviks consistently carried out their policy of an alliance, of collaboration with the bourgeoisie, which netted them several seats in the State Duma.

N. Jordania and the other leaders of the Georgian Mensheviks strained every nerve to defend the interests of the Georgian bourgeoisie. It is a well-known fact that, in the first place, N. Jordania, N. Ramishvili and others tried to disrupt the strikes that broke out at the enterprises of Georgian capitalists.

The leaders of the Georgian Mensheviks, K. Chkheidze and A. Chkhenkeli (members of the State Duma), speaking in their official capacity on behalf of democracy on June 26, 1911, at the funeral of D. Sarajishvili, a big Georgian capitalist, exhorted their listeners to go and learn from the

* Archives Board of the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Georgian S.S.R., Folio 63, File No. 133, Leaf 39-45, 1906.

"cultured capitalists." N. Jordania, the patriarch of Georgian Menshevism, gave vent to his feelings in a pathetic article dedicated to the "glorious memory" of this "European-educated" factory owner. He wrote:

"The other day inexorable death deprived us of a rare Georgian—D. Z. Sarajishvili. . . . The deceased was known as an industrialist, but few people know that he was the first industrialist of the European type. He once told me: 'In our country it is hard to get on your feet materially, to win economic success; as soon as anyone makes a little pile of sorts he is dogged by a hundred hungry fellows who give him no peace until they clean him out.' Under such conditions one must indeed have rare talent and great practical ability to hold off the onslaught of the hungry horde and to use one's substance rationally. If the late David had been a real Georgian industrialist, he would have finished up long ago in the Georgian way—nothing would have remained of his fortune. Only a European could arrange matters so as to satisfy everyone and at the same time not squander his fortune. . . . Once we ran across each other on the boulevard and he called out to me from a way off: 'Take a look at the things your Bernstein is writing! Drop in, take it and read it.' The book had only just appeared in Germany and it was unobtainable in Tiflis. The next day I visited David and borrowed the book. 'What do you think of it?' I asked

him. 'What do I think of it? It is a terrible bombshell for Germany. In the whole book I like one place where it says: "The movement is everything, the final goal is nothing. . . ."'

"Once I found the deceased in his office very much perturbed. And he was no pessimist. 'What's the matter with you?' I asked. 'We have no future,' he began. 'You say and claim that the petty bourgeoisie will engender a big bourgeoisie, but I can't see it. For this to happen we need civic spirit, culture, but we are ordinary yokels. . . .'

"The deceased was not carried away by revolution like a giddy lad, but neither was he a slave to reaction. . . .

"And this unique man we are today laying in his grave. He died as he had lived—with wide open mind and heart.

"Farewell, dear David! Your glorious memory will always be with us."*

And just who was this "cultured capitalist" to whom N. Jordania paid such profound respect?

D. Z. Sarajishvili was the owner of liqueur and cognac distilleries in Tiflis, also of cognac distilleries in Kizlyar, Erivan, Kalarash (Bessarabia) and Geokchay. On January 1, 1902, he was awarded the title of Counsellor of Commerce by the tsarist government "for useful activity in the sphere of home industry and trade."

Thus, during the years of reaction Transcaucasian Menshevism openly and finally grew into liquida-

* N. Jordania in *Kooperatsia* (Cooperation), July 10, 1911.

tionism, repudiating the revolution, Marxism, the principles of the Social-Democratic Party.

The Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia waged ruthless war on the liquidationism of the Mensheviks, unmasking them at every step as the direct agents and lieutenants of the counter-revolutionary monarchist bourgeoisie.

After the Fifth (London) Party Congress, in 1907, Comrade Stalin came to Baku.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks fought steadily in the years of reaction, as always, for Lenin's strategy of revolution, for the overthrow of tsarism, for the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and its passing into a socialist revolution.

The Bolsheviks unceasingly explained to the workers and peasants that the defeat of the revolution was temporary, and that a new revolution was inevitable. They exposed the tsarist policy, the Stolypin agrarian reform, the policy of imperialist and nationalist oppression pursued by the autocracy, and launched a struggle under the Bolshevik slogans: "A democratic republic," "An eight-hour day," "Confiscation of all landed estates," etc.

The Transcaucasian Bolsheviks built and strengthened their organization in strict secrecy, at the same time successfully applying Lenin's tactics of utilizing legal organizations of every kind (the Duma, trade unions, etc.) for revolutionary propaganda and agitation.

Stalin and the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia upheld Lenin's view of the prospects of the Russian revolu-

tion, maintaining that a new revolution was inevitable, ruthlessly exposing the Cadets, the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and others, and prepared the proletariat for new revolutionary battles.

Comrade Stalin vigorously combated the Menshevik election tactics of compromise with the Cadets, who wanted to share power with the tsar and the landowners and who dreaded revolution more than reaction.

Time and again Comrade Stalin stressed the enormous danger of the influence of the counter-revolutionary liberal bourgeoisie and of the Menshevik tactics of subordinating the working class to the political interests of the bourgeoisie.

In connection with the dispersion of the Second Duma, the *Bakinsky Proletary* (*The Baku Proletarian*), which was directed by Comrade Stalin, wrote in an editorial:

"There has been a First Duma, and there has been a Second, but neither the one nor the other 'solved' or could 'solve' a single problem of the revolution. Things remain as they were: the peasants are without land, the workers without the eight-hour day, all citizens without political freedom. Why? Because the power of the tsar is not yet defunct; it still continues to exist, dispersing the Second Duma after the First, organizing counter-revolution and attempting to disorganize the forces of revolution, to sever the many millions of the peasantry from the proletariat. . . . It is clear that without

overthrowing tsarist rule and without convening a National Constituent Assembly, it will be impossible to satisfy the broad masses of workers and peasants. It is no less clear that it will be possible to solve the cardinal questions of the revolution only in alliance with the peasantry against tsarist rule and the liberal bourgeoisie.”*

In the period of 1907 to 1912, the Baku Bolshevik Party organization, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, grew, gained strength and became steeled in the struggle against the Mensheviks, winning over the vast majority of the Social-Democratic workers to its side. The Bolsheviks had control of all the workers' districts (Balakhany, Surakhany, Romany, Bibi-Eibat, Chorny Gorod, Byely Gorod, the railway and other districts).

Baku became the stronghold of the Transcaucasian Bolshevik organizations, an invincible fortress of Lenin's Party.

Comrade Stalin conducted his work in Baku but he used to visit Tiflis for the purpose of guiding the work of the Bolshevik organization in Georgia and holding Party conferences.

During this period the leading body of the Baku Bolshevik organization, the Baku Committee, included the following members at various times: J. Stalin, A. Japaridze, S. Shaumyan, P. Sakvarelidze, I. Fioletov, S. Orjonikidze, S. Spandaryan, Kasparov, Nogin (Makar), Gvantsaladze (Apostol),

* *Bakinsky Proletary (The Baku Proletarian)*, No. 1, June 20, 1907.

Smirnov (Saratovets), Stopani, Vatssek, Alliluyev and Veprintsev (Peterburzhets).

The Baku Committee formed around itself a strong body of active Bolsheviks from among the leading workers, some of whom worked at the Baku Committee while others worked in various districts in the oil fields and other enterprises. Among them were Y. Kochetkov, I. Isayev, M. Mamedyarov, Khanlar, I. Bokov, V. Sturua, Kazi Mamedov, Seid Yakubov, G. Rtveladze, I. Garishvili, E. Sevryugin, G. Georgobiani, Kirochkin, Arshak (from the Khatisov factory), Rudenko, S. Maskhulia, S. Garishvili, Tronov, I. Melikov, Voloshin, Ordzelashvili, Bassin, Avakyan, Levinson (Stepanov), Mukhtadir (Malenki Mamed), N. Gubanov, Velichko, A. Georkov, M. Kuchuyev, Shitikov (Samartsev), M. Mordovtsev, M. Bakradze, Bakradze (Zhelezni), Turetsky (Lavrentyev), G. Mazurov, Isai Shenderov, and P. Siuda.

During this period a number of Bolsheviks—K. Voroshilov, Nogin (Makar), Radus-Zenkovich (Yegor) and other Russian Social-Democrats—came from Russia to Baku to establish connections and get information. Several of them remained in Baku for some time, rendering considerable assistance to the Baku Committee and becoming members of it.

During the same period, there existed, parallel with the Bolshevik Baku Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., a Menshevik Baku organization—the executive body of the Mensheviks—which was headed at various times by S. Devdariani, I. Ra-

mishvili, Larin, Tsederbaum (Martov's brother), Petrov, Gerus and others.

The Menshevik leaders, N. Jordania, Y. Martov, N. Ramishvili, Ginsburg, A. Chkhenkeli and others, often visited Baku for the purpose of assisting the Menshevik organization in its fight against the Bolsheviks.

The Baku Bolsheviks discredited and routed the Mensheviks and won over from them the vast majority of the workers.

In his reminiscences, P. Sakvarelidze, one of the members of the Baku Committee at that time, writes the following about the work of the Bolshevik Baku organization and its leader, Comrade Stalin:

"The Baku Committee and its Executive Bureau headed by Comrade Stalin (there were three comrades on the Bureau) directed all the work. District committees worked in the districts. . . . The main burden of the ideological and organizational struggle to strengthen and consolidate the Bolshevik organization was borne by Comrade Stalin. He put his heart and soul into all the work he did. At the same time he was in charge of the illegal newspaper, *Bakinsky Rabochy* (*The Baku Worker*), the publication of which was fraught with great difficulties at that time . . . he organized the work among the Mussulman workers (with the assistance of the 'Gummet' organization), led the strikes of the oil workers, etc. He fought hard to drive the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries out of the workers' districts. First of all, Comrade

Stalin went to the districts where the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries were intensifying their work. Finally, he settled in Bibi-Eibat, the stronghold of the Mensheviks in Baku. At that time the remnants of the Shendrikov movement—a peculiar form of police socialism—were predominant in Bibi-Eibat. Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin the Bolsheviks broke the influence of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries and turned Bibi-Eibat into a Bolshevik district.”

The Baku Bolshevik organization led all the class battles of the Baku proletariat against tsarism and capitalism. Under the leadership of the Bolsheviks the Baku proletariat traversed a glorious path of heroic struggle and was in the front ranks of the revolutionary working-class movement of all Russia.

“The first general strike in Baku in the spring of 1903 marked the beginning of the celebrated July strikes and demonstrations in the South-Russian towns. The second general strike in November and December 1904 served as the signal for the glorious January and February actions all over Russia. In 1905, rapidly recovering from the Armenian-Tatar massacres, the Baku proletariat again rushed into battle, infecting with its enthusiasm ‘the whole Caucasus.’ Lastly, beginning with 1906, already after the retreat of the revolution in Russia, Baku remains ‘irrepressible,’ to this day actually enjoys certain liberties, and every year celebrates proletarian

May Day better than any other place in Russia, rousing feelings of noble envy in other towns. . . .”*

The Bolshevik Baku Committee, headed by Comrade Stalin, captured every position from the Mensheviks by storm. Besides doing a great deal of practical organizational work, Comrade Stalin was very active in the sphere of theory and propaganda.

In his article “The London Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party” (*Notes of a Delegate*) published in *Bakinsky Proletary* in 1907, Comrade Stalin gave a profound, principled appraisal of the proceedings and results of the Congress and exposed the Menshevik liberal-bourgeois estimation of the driving forces and prospects of the revolution and the Mensheviks’ tactics.

In his article on the London Congress, Comrade Stalin divides the work of the Congress into two parts:

“First part: debates on formal questions, such as the agenda of the Congress, the reports of the Central Committee and report of the group in the Duma, i. e., questions of profound political significance but connected, or capable of being connected, with the ‘honour’ of this or that faction, with the idea of ‘not offending’ this or that faction, of ‘not causing a split’—and for that reason called formal questions. . . .

“Second part: the debates on questions of principle, such as the questions of the non-prole-

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 137.

tarian parties, the labour congress, etc. Here 'moral' considerations were absent, definite groups were formed in conformity with strictly defined trends of principle; the relation of forces between the factions was revealed at once. . . ."

Comrade Stalin, unmasking the Menshevik Central Committee, revealed its bankruptcy:

"Menshevism, which then predominated in the Central Committee, is incapable of guiding the Party, is utterly bankrupt as a political trend. From this point of view, the entire history of the Central Committee is the history of the failure of Menshevism. And when the Menshevik comrades reproach us and say that we 'hindered' the Central Committee, that we 'pestered' it, etc., etc., we cannot refrain from answering these moralizing comrades: yes, comrades, we 'hindered' the Central Committee in its violation of our program, we 'hindered' it in its adaptation of the tactics of the proletariat to the tastes of the liberal bourgeoisie, and we will continue to hinder it, for this is our sacred duty. . . ."

In the same article Comrade Stalin gave a classical description of Menshevism as a medley of all opportunist trends.

He wrote:

". . . Menshevism is not an integral trend; Menshevism is a medley of trends, which are

* J. V. Stalin. *Collected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 52, 53.

** *Ibid.*, p. 57.

imperceptible during the factional struggle against Bolshevism but which spring to the surface as soon as current questions and our tactics are discussed from the point of view of principle.*

Further on Comrade Stalin discloses a certain logic in the amalgamation of all the opportunist groups and groupings, from the Right Menshevik Liquidators to the Trotskyites, and describes Trotskyism as centrism.

"...the formal division of the Congress into five factions (Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, Poles, etc.) retained a certain amount of validity, inconsiderable, it is true, only up to the debates on questions of principle (the question of the non-proletarian parties, the labour congress, etc.). When these questions of principles came up for discussion the formal grouping was in fact cast aside, and when a vote was taken the Congress, as a rule, divided' into two parts: Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. There was no so-called Centre, or Marsh, at the Congress. Trotsky turned out to be a 'pretty bauble.'***

The same article contains a vivid and damning characterization of the Bund (which, by the way, played a conspicuous part in Baku together with the Mensheviks):

"The Bund, the overwhelming majority of whose delegates in fact always supported the

* *Ibid.*, p. 54.

** *Ibid.*, p. 51.

Mensheviks, formally pursued an extremely ambiguous policy. . . . Comrade Rosa Luxemburg characterized this policy of the Bund with artistic skill when she said that the Bund's policy was not the policy of a mature political organization that influenced the masses, but the policy of shopkeepers who are eternally looking forward to and hopefully expecting a drop in the price of sugar tomorrow."*

In his article "The London Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party" *Comrade Stalin exposes and shatters the Menshevik liberal-bourgeois "scheme" of revolution and further develops the Leninist theory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution:*

"That our revolution is a bourgeois revolution, that it must end in the rout of the feudal and not of the capitalist system, and that it can culminate only in a democratic republic—on this, everybody seems to be agreed in our Party. Further, that, on the whole, the tide of our revolution is rising and not subsiding, and that our task is not to 'liquidate' the revolution but to carry it to its end—on this too, formally at least, everybody is agreed, for the Mensheviks, as a faction, have so far not said anything to the contrary. But how is our revolution to be carried to its end? What is the role of the proletariat, of the peasantry and of the liberal bourgeoisie in this revolution? With what combination of fighting forces would it be possible to carry

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 51-52.

this revolution to the end? Whom shall we march with, whom shall we fight? etc., etc. This is where our disagreements begin.

"The opinion of the Mensheviks. Since our revolution is a bourgeois revolution, only the bourgeoisie can be the leader of the revolution. The bourgeoisie was the leader of the great revolution in France, it was the leader of revolutions in other European states—it must be the leader in our Russian revolution too. The proletariat is the principal fighter in the revolution, but it must march behind the bourgeoisie and push it forward. The peasantry is also a revolutionary force, but it contains too much that is reactionary and, for that reason, the proletariat will have much less occasion to act jointly with it than with the liberal-democratic bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie is a more reliable ally of the proletariat than the peasantry. It is around the liberal-democratic bourgeoisie, as the leader, that all the fighting forces must rally. Hence, our attitude toward the bourgeois parties must be determined not by the revolutionary proposition: together with the peasantry against the government and the liberal bourgeoisie, with the proletariat at the head—but by the opportunist proposition: *together with the entire opposition against the government, with the liberal bourgeoisie at the head. Hence the tactics of compromising with the liberals.*

"Such is the opinion of the Mensheviks. (My italics—L. B.)

"The opinion of the Bolsheviks. Our revolution is, indeed, a bourgeois revolution, but this does not mean that our liberal bourgeoisie will be its leader. In the eighteenth century the French bourgeoisie was the leader of the French revolution, but why? Because the French proletariat was weak, it did not come out independently, it did not put forward its own class demands, it lacked class consciousness and organization, it then dragged at the tail of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie used it as a tool for its bourgeois aims. As you see, the bourgeoisie were then not in need of an ally in the shape of the tsarist regime against the proletariat—the proletariat itself was its ally and servant—and this is why they could then be revolutionary, march even at the head of the revolution. Something entirely different is observed here in Russia. The Russian proletariat can by no means be called weak: for several years already it has been acting quite independently, putting forward its own class demands; it is sufficiently armed with class consciousness to understand its own interests; it is united around its own Party; its Party is the strongest Party in Russia, with its own program and principles of tactics and organization; led by this Party, it has already won a number of brilliant victories over the bourgeoisie. . . . Under these circumstances, can our proletariat be satisfied with the role of tail of the liberal bourgeoisie, the role of a miserable tool in the hands of this bourgeoisie? Can it, must it march

behind this bourgeoisie and make the latter its leader? Can it be anything else than the leader of the revolution? See what is going on in the camp of our liberal bourgeoisie: our bourgeoisie is terrified by the revolutionary spirit of the proletariat; instead of marching at the head of the revolution it rushes into the embrace of the counter-revolution and enters into an alliance with it against the proletariat. Its party, the Cadet party, openly, before the eyes of the whole world, enters into an agreement with Stolypin, votes for the budget and the army for the benefit of tsarism and against the people's revolution. Is it not clear that the Russian liberal bourgeoisie is an anti-revolutionary force against which the most relentless war must be waged? . . .

"Thus, the Russian liberal bourgeoisie is anti-revolutionary; it cannot be the driving force of the revolution, and still less can it be its leader; it is the mortal enemy of the revolution and a stubborn struggle must be waged against it.

"The only leader of our revolution interested in and capable of leading the revolutionary forces of Russia in the assault upon the tsarist autocracy is the proletariat. The proletariat alone will rally around itself the revolutionary elements of the country, it alone will carry our revolution to the end. The task of Social-Democracy is to do everything possible to prepare the proletariat for the role of leader of the revolution.

"This is the pivot of the Bolshevik point of view.

"To the question: who, then, can be the reliable ally of the proletariat in the task of carrying our revolution to the end, the Bolsheviks answer—the only to any extent reliable and powerful ally of the proletariat is the revolutionary peasantry. Not the treacherous liberal bourgeoisie, but the revolutionary peasantry will fight side by side with the proletariat against all the props of the feudal system.

"Accordingly, our attitude towards the bourgeois parties must be determined by the proposition: *together with the revolutionary peasantry against tsarism and the liberal bourgeoisie, with the proletariat at the head. Hence the necessity of combating the hegemony (leadership) of the Cadet bourgeoisie and, consequently, the impermissibility of compromising with the Cadets.*

"*Such is the opinion of the Bolsheviks.*" (My italics.—L. B.)*

Comrad Stalin disclosed the social basis of Menshevism, and exposed the tactics of the Mensheviks as the tactics of the semi-bourgeois elements of the proletariat:

"... the tactics of the Bolsheviks are the tactics of the proletarians employed in big industry, the tactics of those areas where class antagonisms are exceptionally clear, and where the class struggle is exceptionally acute. *Bolshevism is the tactics of the genuine proletarians.*

"On the other hand, it is no less obvious that

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 59-63.

the tactics of the Mensheviks are mainly the tactics of the handicraft workers and peasant semi-proletarians, the tactics of those areas where class antagonisms are not quite clear and the class struggle is obscured. *Menshevism is the tactics of the semi-bourgeois elements among the proletariat.*

“This is what the figures tell us.

“And this is not difficult to understand: it is impossible to talk seriously among the workers of Lodz, Moscow or Ivanovo-Voznesensk about blocs with the very same liberal bourgeoisie whose members are waging a fierce struggle against them and who, every now and again, ‘punish’ them with partial dismissals and mass lockouts—there Menshevism will find no sympathy, there Bolshevism, the tactics of uncompromising proletarian class struggle, is needed. On the other hand, it is extremely difficult to inculcate the idea of the class struggle among the peasants of Guria or, say, the handicraftsmen of Shklov, who do not feel the sharp and systematic blows of the class struggle and, therefore, readily agree to all sorts of compromises against the ‘common enemy.’ . . .” (My italics.—L. B.)*

Comrade Stalin exposed the liquidationism of the Mensheviks and the Menshevik idea of a non-party labour congress.

“... The idea of a labour congress, taken concretely, is fundamentally false, for it rests

* *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

not on facts, but on the false proposition that 'we have no party.' The point is that we have a proletarian party which loudly proclaims its existence, and the existence of which is felt only too well by the enemies of the proletariat—the Mensheviks are fully aware of this—and precisely because we already have such a party, the idea of a labour congress is fundamentally false.”*

Comrade Stalin proved that the idea of calling a labour congress was downright treachery to the working class on the part of the Mensheviks, who, “by order” of the liberal bourgeoisie, were striving to liquidate the revolutionary Party of the working class and thereby to behead the working-class movement.

Comrade Stalin wrote:

“It is not surprising that all the bourgeois writers from the syndicalists and Socialist-Revolutionaries to the Cadets and Octobrists—it is not surprising that all have so ardently expressed themselves in favour of a labour congress: after all, they are all enemies of our Party, and the practical work of convening a labour congress might considerably weaken and disrupt the Party. Why should they not welcome ‘the idea of a labour congress’?”**

In the same articles, Comrade Stalin sums up the results of the Fifth Congress and gives a general

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 74.

** *Ibid.*, p. 73.

estimation of the work of the Congress, defining its place in the history of our Party.

To quote Comrade Stalin:

"...the Congress ended in the victory of 'Bolshevism,' in the victory of revolutionary Social-Democracy over the opportunist wing of our Party, over 'Menshevism.'"*

The Congress summed up

"...the actual victories the Party achieved over the opportunist Central Committee, the victories which constitute the history of the internal development of our Party during the whole of the past year...."

"The actual uniting of the advanced workers of all Russia in a single all-Russian Party under the banner of *revolutionary* Social-Democracy—such is the significance of the London Congress, such is its general character."**

Such, in 1907, was Comrade Stalin's estimation of the significance of the Fifth (London) Party Congress.

Nevertheless, a number of comrades have committed gross distortions in their writings on the London Congress.

Comrade Ph. Makharadze, for instance, plainly underestimates the significance and meaning of the Fifth (London) Party Congress when he writes:

"And no unity congress could unite them other than by one of these factions relinquishing all

* *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.

** *Ibid.*, pp. 47, 48.

its fundamental views, which was entirely out of the question. Therefore the next, general (London) Party Congress in 1907 and our last Caucasian Congress in the beginning of 1908 were only a sheer waste of time. These two congresses were the last joint congresses. The Party was finally and irrevocably split, and all the subsequent repeated attempts to find common ground were foredoomed to failure.”*

According to Makharadze it would appear that the Bolsheviks went to the London Party Congress for the purpose of actually amalgamating with the Mensheviks. And since no such amalgamation took place, Ph. Makharadze declares the Fifth (London) Party Congress a sheer waste of time.

In the first place, it is known that Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not attend the Fifth (London) Party Congress or the Fourth (Stockholm) Unity Congress for the purpose of uniting with the Mensheviks, but in order to expose the Mensheviks, to show the working class that the Mensheviks were opportunists and traitors to the cause of the revolution, and to rally the majority of the working class around the Bolsheviks.

In the second place, the Bolsheviks never counted on finding common ground with the Mensheviks, but always fought relentlessly against Menshevism and against conciliation with it. The “unity” tactics

* Ph. Makharadze, “On the History of the Communist Party in Transcaucasia,” in the symposium *Twenty-Five Years of Struggle for Socialism*, p. 205.

served as an extremely valuable means of exposing and isolating the Menshevik leaders and of winning away from them the workers whom they had deceived. Therefore, the Fifth Party Congress was not a sheer waste of time but a tremendous victory of Bolshevism over Menshevism, a victory which furthered the work of uniting the advanced workers into a single revolutionary proletarian party under the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

During the years of reaction, the Baku Bolsheviks, headed by Comrade Stalin, led the class struggle of the Baku proletariat and successfully carried out a big campaign around the conference with the oil owners (at the end of 1907).

The oil owners tried to call the conference in order to completely alienate the workers at the derricks from those in the shops, to corrupt the latter entirely, to infect them with slavish trust in the oil owners and to replace the principle of irreconcilable struggle against capital by the "principle" of bargaining and servile begging.

In his article, "Boycott the Conference!" signed Ko. . . . Comrade Stalin characterized the two periods of the struggle of the Baku workers as follows:

"The first period is the period of struggle up to recent times, during which the principal roles were played by the mechanics, while the oil field workers simply and trustfully followed the mechanics as their leaders and were as yet unconscious of the enormously important part they played in industry. The tactics pursued by the oil owners during this period may be de-

scribed as the tactics of flirting with the mechanics, tactics of systematic concessions to the mechanics, and equally systematic ignoring of the oil field workers.

"The second period opens with the awakening of the oil field workers, their independent entry onto the scene and the pushing of the mechanics into the background. . . .

"The oil owners are trying to take advantage of the changed situation and are changing their tactics. They are no longer flirting with the mechanics, they are no longer trying to cajole the mechanics, for they know perfectly well that the oil workers will not always follow them now; on the contrary, the oil owners themselves are trying to provoke the mechanics to go on strike *without the oil field workers*, in order, thereby, to demonstrate the relative weakness of the mechanics and make them more tractable."*

The Baku Bolsheviks launched a campaign of political enlightenment among the working masses, and by means of the boycott of the conference switched the struggle of the workers onto the track of class-conscious political struggle against tsarism and the bourgeoisie.

Comrade Stalin advanced the following arguments in favour of boycotting the conference:

" ' . . . to go to the conference ' means not obliterating but still more strongly ingraining ' beshkesh ' prejudices in the minds of the masses.

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 83.

It means imbuing the minds of the masses not with distrust but trust towards the oil owners. It means not uniting the oil field workers around the mechanics, not drawing them nearer to the mechanics, but abandoning them for a time, throwing them back into the clutches of the capitalists.”*

Comrade Stalin gave a crushing answer to the Mensheviks’ efforts to champion participation in the conference “at any price” on the plea that it could be utilized for the purpose of “organizing the masses.”

“... The whole point is that to organize (in *our* and not in the Gapon sense of the term, of course) means *first of all* developing consciousness of the *irreconcilable* antagonism between the capitalists and the workers.”**

Hence the Bolshevik tactics of boycotting the conference were the only correct tactics, for

“The boycott tactics best of all develop consciousness of the irreconcilable antagonism between the workers and the oil owners.

“The boycott tactics, by shattering ‘beshkesh’ prejudices and divorcing the oil field workers from the oil owners, unite them around the mechanics.

“The boycott tactics, by imbuing distrust towards the oil owners, best of all emphasize in the eyes of the masses the necessity of fighting as

* *Ibid.*, p. 85.

** *Ibid.*

the only means of improving their conditions of life. . . .

" . . . we must launch a boycott campaign: organize works meetings, draw up demands, elect delegates for the better formulation of general demands, distribute the demands in printed form, explain them, bring them to the masses again for final endorsement, etc., etc., and we must do all this under the slogan of boycott with the view, after popularizing the general demands and utilizing the 'legal possibilities,' to boycotting the conference, making a laughingstock of it, and thereby emphasizing the necessity of a struggle for general demands."*

The Bolsheviks conducted the boycott of the conference under the slogan: "*A conference with guarantees, or no conference at all!*"

Boycotting the old, Shendrikov-type, behind-the-scene conferences held without the workers, the Bolsheviks declared that the workers should agree to the conference only on condition that the working masses and their unions participate freely in the entire proceedings of the conference. They proposed the following conditions on behalf of the workers:

" . . . 1) freely to discuss their demands, 2) freely to assemble a Delegate Council, 3) freely to utilize the services of their unions and 4) freely to choose the moment for opening the conference. . . . "**

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 86.

** *Ibid.*, p. 140.

These tactics were applied by the Bolsheviks in a struggle against the Menshevik line of a conference without guarantees, a "conference at any price," and in a struggle against the Socialist-Revolutionary and Dashnak standpoint of "a boycott at any price."

As a result of this struggle, the great majority of the Baku workers followed the Bolsheviks. Of 35,000 workers questioned only 8,000 voted for the tactics of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Dashnaks (unconditional boycott), 8,000 voted for the tactics of the Mensheviks (unconditional conference) while 19,000 voted for the tactics of the Bolsheviks (conference with guarantees).

After this great victory of the Bolsheviks at the end of 1907 meetings of the representatives of the oil fields and plants began, at which the demands to be presented to the oil owners were drawn up. The overwhelming majority of the elected representatives were on the side of the Bolsheviks. During the period of rampant reaction in Russia, a workers' parliament sat in Baku for about two weeks, with Comrade Tronov, a workingman Bolshevik, presiding. In this parliament the Bolsheviks worked out the demands of the workers and carried on widespread propaganda for their minimum program.

Dismayed by the workers' demands, the tsarist authorities and the oil owners prevented the conference from taking place, thus manifesting solidarity with the tactics of the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and Dashnaks. The tactics of the Bolsheviks, as always, proved to be the only correct tactics.

In January and February 1908, the Baku Committee, headed by Comrade Stalin, led a series of big strikes, the main feature of which was the fact that the workers passed from petty-bourgeois demands (bonuses, etc.) to proletarian demands. As a result of the painstaking and persistent work of the Bolsheviks, the passivity of the oil field workers became a thing of the past, the strikes at the Nobel, Adamov, Mirzoyev and other oil fields bore an organized and militant political character. Defensive strikes for partial demands became an important factor in cementing the unity of the proletariat.

During his work in Baku Comrade Stalin was arrested and sentenced to exile many times. The tsarist secret police dogged him tenaciously. One of Comrade Stalin's arrests took place in March 1908. Of the numerous police records of Comrade Stalin's activity, I will cite a few passages from the documents of the Gendarmerie Department.

First:

"In compliance with the request from the Department of Police of Sept. 30, ult., No. 136706, the Caucasian District Secret Police Department reports that according to the information of the chief of the Baku Secret Police Department, 'Soso,' who escaped from Siberia and is known in the organization as 'Koba,' has been identified as Oganess Vartanov Totomyants, a resident of the city of Tiflis in whose name he has a passport, No. 982, issued by the Tiflis superintendent of police on May 12 of this year and valid for one year. . . .

"Of the people named, 'Totomyants'—'Koba' (also reported to be known as 'Molochny') is at the head of the Baku organization of the R.S.D.L.P.; two others are members of Bibi-Eibat district of the same organization. They are under constant secret surveillance, and in some cases open surveillance and all will come under the measures being taken to break up the organization."*

Second:

"Jugashvili is a member of the Baku Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., known in the organization under the alias of 'Koba.' . . . In view of his stubborn participation, despite all administrative penalties, in the activity of the revolutionary parties in which *he has always occupied an extremely prominent position*, and in view of his escape on two occasions from the locality of his exile, as a result of which he has not undergone a single one of the administrative penalties imposed upon him, I would suggest recourse to a stricter measure of punishment—exile to the most remote districts of Siberia for *five years*."**

* From the report of the chief of the Tiflis Gubernia Gendarmerie Department, October 24, 1909, No. 13702. Material from the Central Party Archives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (B.) of Azerbaijan, File No. 430.

** From the report of Captain Galimbatovsky on the arrest of Joseph Vissarionovich Jugashvili, March 24, 1910. Material from the Central Party Archives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (B.) of Azerbaijan, File No. 430.

Third:

“On March 24, 1910, Captain Martynov reports that a member of the Baku Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. ‘known in the organization as “Koba” and a most active Party official, occupying a leading position,’ has been arrested.”*

Fourth:

On May 17, 1912, under reference No. 108/S, the Caucasian District Secret Police Department wrote to the Director of the Department of Police in St. Petersburg:

“‘Soso’ is the Party pseudonym of Joseph Vissarionovich Jugashvili, a peasant from the village of Didi-Lilo, in the County of Tiflis, who is also known by the Party name of ‘Koba.’ He has been known since 1902 as one of the most active Social-Democratic functionaries. In 1902 he was brought before the Tiflis Gubernia Gendarmerie Department for investigation as one of the accused in the case of the ‘secret circle of the R.S.D.L.P. in Tiflis,’ for which he was exiled to Eastern Siberia for three years under open police surveillance, whence, however, he escaped and was sought by the Department of Police through a ‘wanted’ circular. Later Jugashvili headed the Batum, Tiflis and Baku Social-Democratic organizations at various times; he was repeatedly searched and arrested but escaped from custody and went into hiding to evade exile. At the pres-

* Central Party Archives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (B.) of Azerbaijan, File No. 430.

ent time he is wanted by the police as per the Department of Police circular No. 89008/189, art. 23320, of April 5, 1912. According to information received on the 6th ult. from agents in the district, Jugashvili has been in the city of Tiflis recently. At the same time the chief of the Secret Police Department of Baku has been confidentially informed that 'Koba' was appointed to the Russian Central Committee of the Party . . . and left for St. Petersburg on March 30, concerning which Lt. Colonel Martynov reported to Your Excellency on April 6, reference No. 1379, and informed the chief of the St. Petersburg Secret Police Department the same day under File No. 1378."*

Comrade Stalin was confined in the Baku prison from March 25 to November 9, 1908. He succeeded in establishing connections from prison with the Baku Committee and guided its work; he also directed the newspaper *Bakinsky Rabochy* from prison.

In his reminiscences of this period P. Sakvarelidze says the following about this period of the work of Comrade Stalin:

" . . . Special note must be made of Comrade Stalin's term in the Baku (Bailov) prison. All the Bolsheviks united around him. . . .

" . . . Debates were constantly organized in the commune of political prisoners, at which questions of the revolution, democracy and Socialism were discussed. In most cases the debates were organized on the initiative of the Bolsheviks.

* Georgian Branch of the M.E.L.I., Folio 31, File 80.

Comrade Stalin often spoke at these meetings on behalf of the Bolshevik faction, sometimes as chief speaker, sometimes as opponent. . . . Comrade Stalin and his comrades had to direct the work of the organization from prison. The Bolshevik faction was able to establish connections with the Baku organization, from which it used to receive exact information on the current work and to which it gave advice and instructions. . . . It must also be pointed out here that Comrade Stalin directed the publication of the newspaper *Bakinsky Rabochy*, the organ of the Baku organization, from prison. On one occasion the entire copy for the newspaper was prepared in the Baku prison—this was for the second number of the *Bakinsky Rabochy*.”*

In the autumn of 1908 Comrade Stalin was exiled from Baku to Solvychegodsk, Vologda Gubernia, whence he escaped in the summer of 1909. He returned to Baku and resumed his energetic efforts to strengthen the Bolshevik organizations of Transcaucasia.

Comrade Stalin spoke regularly at district and inter-district Party meetings, and led the preparations for and conduct of strikes. He further developed the relentless struggle to expose and defeat the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries, Dashnaks and other petty-bourgeois parties.

In October 1909 Comrade Stalin arrived in Tiflis, organized and directed the struggle of the Tiflis Bol-

* From the Reminiscences of P. Sakvarelidze.

shevik organization against the Menshevik-Liquidators.

Comrade Stalin prepared the ground for the calling of the Tiflis Bolshevik Party Conference and the publication of the Bolshevik newspaper *Tiflissky Proletary* (*The Tiflis Proletarian*).

The Tiflis Bolshevik Conference took place in November 1909 and worked along the lines of Comrade Stalin's recommendations—to carry on the fight on two fronts.

The Conference emphatically condemned the Menshevik-Liquidators and the Otzovists, condemned the Menshevik-Liquidator Regional Committee and adopted a decision to call a Transcaucasian general Party congress.

The first number of the *Tiflissky Proletary** published a leading article by Comrade Stalin in which he forecast a revival of the working-class movement and urged the necessity of strengthening the illegal organizations.

Comrade Stalin wrote:

“The great Russian revolution is not dead—no, it is alive!—it has merely retreated and is gathering forces for mighty actions in the future.

“For the prime movers of the revolution, the proletarians and peasants, are alive and unscathed, and they will not, cannot, relinquish their vital demands. . . .

* A Bolshevik illegal newspaper, organ of the Tiflis Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. published in the Georgian and Russian languages in the beginning of 1910. (No. 1 appeared on January 5 and No. 2 on March 1.)

"We are living on the eve of new upheavals, we are confronted with the old problem of overthrowing the rule of the tsar. . . .

"It is our duty, the duty of the advanced workers, to be prepared worthily to face the glorious impending battles for the republic, for the rights of the proletariat.

"We, the advanced workers, and we alone, as in 1905, will have to lead the revolution and direct it onto the path to complete victory. . . .

"We, the advanced workers, and we alone, as in 1905, will have to rally the peasants around the revolutionary demands. . . .

"All this needs a united and strong party capable of undertaking the task of preparing all the living forces of the proletariat for the impending battles. . . .

"And so, to work, comrade reader, to concerted effort in training the forces of the Tiflis proletariat for the impending decisive actions!"*

In 1909-10 Comrade Stalin vigorously exposed the liberal-bourgeois, Zemstvo tactics of the Menshevik-Liquidators.

The *Sotsial-Demokrat*, No. 11, of February 13, 1910, published an article by Comrade Stalin entitled "Letter from the Caucasus," in which he pointed out that the projected local government bodies for the oil district would be "the arena of sharp conflicts between labour and capital" and that the Baku Committee had decided

* *Tiflissky Proletary*, No. 1, January 5, 1910.

“... to utilize the proposed scheme of local government *by participating in it* for the purpose of conducting agitation for the general economic needs of the workers and of strengthening the organization of the latter.”*

The Bolshevik organization agreed to participate in the local government bodies for the oil districts, demanding

“... equal representation for the workers in the local government body, emphasizing in this passage that the struggle within the local government body will be effective only to the extent that it is backed by the struggle outside the local government body and serves the interests of that struggle.”**

What is meant by subordinating participation in the local government bodies to the struggle outside becomes perfectly clear when Comrade Stalin says:

“... pointing to universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage as an essential condition for the free development of local government bodies and for the free manifestation of existing class antagonisms, the Baku Committee emphasizes the necessity of overthrowing the tsarist regime and of convening a popular Constituent Assembly as a preliminary condition for the creation of consistently democratic local government bodies...”***

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 179.

** *Ibid.*, p. 180.

*** *Ibid.*

In the same "Letter from the Caucasus," which is devoted to a characterization of the situation in the Party organization, Comrade Stalin raises the question of calling a Party conference and organizing the publication of an all-Russian Party newspaper in Russia.

Comrade Stalin wrote:

"... Isolation from the Party and complete lack of information about what the Party organizations are doing in Russia have a bad effect upon the Party membership. An all-Russian organ, regular general Party conferences, and systematic tours by members of the Central Committee could help matters. Of the decisions of a general organizational character adopted by the Baku Committee, the most important are the following two: on a general Party conference, and on an all-Russian organ. On the first question, the Baku Committee considers that it is necessary to convene a conference at the earliest possible date to settle urgent questions, mainly organizational questions. The Baku Committee also considers that, parallel with this conference it is necessary to convene a conference of Bolsheviks to liquidate the abnormal situation that has existed within the faction for the past few months."*

As is known this proposal of Comrade Stalin's met with a lively response, and nine months after the appearance of his article the first number of the

* J. V. Stalin. *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 182,

newspaper *Zvezda* (*The Star*) was issued (December 16, 1910). At first the paper was organized as the joint publication of the Bolsheviks and pro-Party Mensheviks, but from the autumn of 1911 on, it became a Bolshevik organ exclusively.

At the end of 1909 the Baku proletariat was among the first in Russia to rise against the vicious offensive of capital.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin preparation was made for a general strike, meetings of active Party and non-party workers were held, general demands were drawn up, leaflets calling for action were published and distributed, etc.

In a leaflet written by Comrade Stalin on the fifth anniversary of the December strike of 1904, the Baku Committee urged the Baku proletariat to take the offensive against the overbearing oil owners.

The leaflet stated:

“... shall we remain silent much longer, is there a limit to our patience, should we not break the chains of silence and hoist the flag of a general economic strike for our vital demands?”

“Social-Democracy led us to victory in December 1904; it will lead us to future victories through an organized general strike.

“*Long live the coming general strike!*”

“*Long live Social-Democracy!*”*

Fighting to strengthen the Bolshevik organizations in Transcaucasia, Comrade Stalin constantly

* *Ibid.*, pp. 171, 173.

exposed the treachery of the Georgian Mensheviks at every turn, using them as an example to expose the Liquidators of all Russia.

In his historic articles, "Letters from the Caucasus" (1910), Comrade Stalin delivered a crushing blow to the Tifli: Menshevik-Liquidators, exposing them as liquidators of the Party's program and tactics, and unmasking the Liquidator N. Jordania, the leader of the Georgian Mensheviks:

"... our author's program exercises, which the Tiflis Mensheviks have accepted as a 'new' factional manifesto, are tantamount to the liquidation of the Party's minimum program, liquidation that calls for the adjustment of our program to the program of the Cadets."*

Comrade Stalin continued:

"Now everything is clear. For the triumph of the revolution we need the moderate Cadet bourgeoisie with a moderate constitution. But it cannot achieve victory alone, it needs the assistance of the proletariat. The proletariat must assist it because it has nobody to rely on—not even on the peasantry—except the moderate bourgeoisie. But for this it must cast aside its own uncompromising attitude and, extending a hand to the moderate bourgeoisie, wage a common struggle for a moderate Cadet constitution. All the rest will come of its own accord. The Party which regards the struggle of the workers and peasants against the moderate bourgeoisie and the serf

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 192.

owners as the guarantee of the triumph of the revolution—is mistaken.

“In short, instead of the leading role of the proletariat which leads the peasants, we have the leading role of the Cadet bourgeoisie which leads the proletariat by the nose.

“Such are the ‘new’ tactics of the Tiflis Mensheviks.

“There is no need, in our opinion, to analyze all this vulgar liberal junk. We need only observe that the ‘new’ tactics of the Tiflis Mensheviks means the liquidation of the Party’s tactics, the correctness of which has been confirmed by the revolution, a liquidation which calls for the conversion of the proletariat into an appendage of the moderate Cadet bourgeoisie.”*

Some of our comrades commit the gross error of vulgarizing and over-simplifying the question of the struggle against the Mensheviks of Georgia and of naively minimizing the role and the relative importance of the Mensheviks in Georgia.

For instance, Ph. Makharadze has written:

“Menshevism in Georgia originated artificially, and had no strong foothold either at the time of the Soviets or even under the autocracy. The Menshevik party was formed in our country quite artificially.”**

In this statement Makharadze absolutely contradicts history and what Comrade Stalin wrote at

* *Ibid.*, pp. 195-96.

** *Rabochaya Pravda (Workers Truth)*, No. 130, 1923.

the time in his "Letters from the Caucasus" on the relative importance of the Mensheviks in Georgia (Tiflis).

To quote Comrade Stalin:

"As regards industrial development, Tiflis is the very opposite of Baku. While Baku is interesting as the centre of the oil industry, Tiflis may be interesting only as the administrative-commercial and 'cultural' centre of the Caucasus. The total number of industrial workers in Tiflis is about 20,000, i.e., less than the number of troops and police. The only large enterprise here is the railway workshops (employing about 3,500 workers). The other enterprises employ 200 or 100 workers, but most employ from 40 to 20. On the other hand, Tiflis is literally crammed with commercial establishments and with the 'commercial proletariat' connected with them. Its slight dependence upon the big markets of Russia, which are always animated and feverish, puts the impress of stagnation on Tiflis. The absence of the sharp class conflicts that are characteristic only of large industrial centres converts it into something in the nature of a marsh, waiting to be pushed from outside. It is this in particular that explains why Menshevism, real, 'Right' Menshevism, has held on so long in Tiflis. How different from Baku, where the sharp class stand of the Bolsheviks finds a lively response among the workers.

"What is 'clear in itself' in Baku becomes clear in Tiflis only after prolonged debates—

the uncompromising speeches of the Bolsheviks are assimilated with great difficulty. It is this that explains the 'exceptional propensity' of the Tiflis Bolsheviks for debates and, on the contrary, the desire of the Mensheviks to 'avoid' debates as far as possible. But the only conclusion to be drawn from the above is that the work of the revolutionary Social-Democrats in promoting the socialist education of the Tiflis proletariat will very often and inevitably assume the form of an ideological struggle against Menshevism."*

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia and Georgia, all through their history, carried on a fierce struggle against Menshevism as the principal enemy in the working-class movement. At all stages of the history of the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia Comrade Stalin attacked and routed the "legal Marxists," the Economists and the Menshevik-Liquidators, in true Leninist fashion. During the period of darkest reaction, as well as during the years of revolutionary revival, he built up and consolidated the Bolshevik Party organizations in a fierce struggle against the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries.

During his work in Baku, in the period of reaction, Comrade Stalin turned Baku into a fortress of Bolshevism.

The Party organization, led by Comrade Stalin, "lived right through the period of counter-revolution" and notwithstanding repressions, the reaction

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 188-89.

failed to smash it. Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Baku organization "took an extremely active part in everything that went on in the working-class movement; in Baku it was a mass Party in the full sense of the word."*

Comrade Stalin was arrested on March 23, 1910, and exiled to Solvychegodsk, a town in the Vologda Gubernia.

During the years of reaction Lenin and Stalin persisted in the fight to revive and strengthen the Bolshevik Party and smash the liquidator factions in the Russian Social-Democratic Party—the Mensheviks, Trotskyites and Otszovists.

Lenin and Stalin pursued a firm line of rallying all the revolutionary elements of Social-Democracy to revive the Party and defeat the Liquidators.

In the middle of 1909 Lenin presented a plan for a bloc with the pro-Party Mensheviks who, with Plekhanov at their head, were opposed to the Liquidators and in favour of maintaining an illegal Social-Democratic Party.

In a letter from exile in Solvychegodsk (December 1910), Comrade Stalin wrote on the importance of a bloc between the Bolsheviks and the pro-Party Mensheviks:

"In my opinion, the line of the bloc (Lenin-Plekhanov) is the only correct one: 1) this line

* S. Orjonikidze, "Report on the Meetings of the Russian Organizational Commission for the Convocation of a General Party Conference," in *Sotsial-Demokrat*, No. 25, December 8 (21), 1911.

alone answers the real interests of the work in Russia, which demands that all real Party elements should rally together; 2) this line and it alone, will expedite the process of freeing the legal organizations from the yoke of the Liquidators by digging a gulf between the workingmen Mensheviks and the Liquidators and scattering and wiping out the latter. A fight for influence in the legal organizations is the burning question of the day, a necessary stage on the road towards the regeneration of the Party; and a bloc is the only means by which these organizations can be cleansed of the garbage of liquidatorism.

"The plan for a bloc reveals the hand of Lenin—he is a shrewd fellow, and knows a thing or two. But this does not mean that any kind of bloc is good. A Trotsky bloc (he would have said 'synthesis') would be rank unprincipledness, a Manilov amalgam of heterogeneous principles, the helpless longing of an unprincipled person for a 'good' principle. The logic of things, by its nature, adheres strictly to principle and abhors an amalgam."*

The tactics of a united front with the Plekhanovites based on principles, made it easier to win over to the side of the Bolsheviks the workers who had been deceived by the Mensheviks.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia pursued the tactics of a united front with the pro-Party Plekhanovite-Men-

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 209-10.

sheviks, while, however, maintaining the independence of their organization, allowing no merging with the Mensheviks and without "mixing up the two parties."

The Bolsheviks did not forget for a moment that the Plekhanovites were still Mensheviks and that their opportunism had to be criticized and exposed.

Comrade Stalin warned the Bolsheviks against trusting the pro-Party Mensheviks.

In a letter from exile in Solvychegodsk he wrote:

"It is quite possible that in the course of their work the Bolsheviks will completely tame the Plekhanovites, but that is only a possibility. At all events, we must not go to sleep and wait for such a result, even if it is a very probable one. The more unitedly the Bolsheviks act, the more organized they are in their actions, the greater will be the chances of taming. We must, therefore, tirelessly hammer away on all anvils."*

The bloc which was formed in the Baku organization at the beginning of 1911 came nearest to success. On the initiative of the Bolsheviks the "Baku Executive Committee of the R.S.D.L.P." was formed (of the sixteen members, nine were Bolsheviks). At that time the Bolsheviks in the united committee were headed by Comrade Stepan Shaumyan. In August 1911 the Baku pro-Party Mensheviks took part in the formation of the Russian Organization Commission, which was to call the Prague Conference. The bloc did not last long.

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 210.

In 1912 the pro-Party Mensheviks swung over to the August Liquidator Bloc of the Mensheviks, Trotskyites and Otzovists and left the Baku Executive Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.

In the conditions of the new upsurge that was developing in the working-class movement in Russia, the question of strengthening the Bolshevik Party and defeating the liquidator opportunist groups was a question of decisive importance for the revolutionary movement. In the forefront Lenin put the question of calling a Party conference which, under the circumstances of the new revolutionary upsurge, should determine the tactics to be adopted, in order to prepare the second Russian revolution and to purge the Party of Liquidator-Mensheviks and Trotskyites.

Lenin and Stalin organized a campaign for the convocation of a general Party conference.

While he was yet in exile, Comrade Stalin, in a letter to the Central Committee of the Party stressing the need to re-establish a Party centre in Russia wrote as follows:

“... In my opinion, our immediate task, one that brooks no delay, is to organize a central group (in Russia), to coordinate the illegal, semi-legal and legal work at first in the main centres (St. Petersburg, Moscow, the Urals, the South). Call it what you like—the ‘Russian section of the Central Committee’ or auxiliary group of the Central Committee—it makes no difference, but such a group is as essential as air, as bread. At the present time lack of information, loneli-

ness and isolation reign among the Party workers in the localities and they are becoming discouraged. This group could give fresh stimulus to the work and introduce clarity. And this would clear the road for the actual utilization of legal possibilities. And this, in my opinion, will give an impetus to the revival of the Party principle.”*

In June 1911, under Lenin’s leadership, a conference of C. C. members was held, at which a decision was adopted to call a general Party conference and an Organization Commission for action abroad was appointed. Among the Bolsheviks nominated to the latter were Comrades J. Stalin, S. Spandaryan and P. Smidovich.

On the instructions of Lenin, Comrade Stalin did a tremendous amount of work in Russia for convening the general Party conference at Prague. At the beginning of autumn 1911 Comrade Stalin made his third escape from exile and arrived in St. Petersburg. In St. Petersburg Comrade Stalin organized and guided the struggle against the Liquidator-Mensheviks and Trotskyites and consolidated and strengthened the Bolshevik organizations in St. Petersburg.

Comrade Stalin’s fight against the Liquidators in St. Petersburg was vividly reflected in his article “From the Camp of the Stolypin ‘Labour’ Party (Dedicated to Our ‘Peace-Makers’ and ‘Conciliators’),” which earned exceptionally high praise from Lenin.**

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 211.

** *Sotsial-Demokrat*, September 14 (1), 1911.

Writing on behalf of the editorial board of the *Sotsial-Demokrat*, Lenin commented on Comrade Stalin's article as follows:

"Comrade K.'s article merits the utmost attention of all who hold our Party dear. A better exposure of *Golos* policy (and *Golos* diplomacy), a better refutation of the views and hopes of our 'peace-makers and conciliators' can hardly be imagined. . . .

"It is not always that these Liquidators come in contact with Party workingmen; it is very rare that the Party receives information on their shameful utterances as exact as that for which we must thank Comrade K.; but the preaching of the Independent-Legalist group is *always and everywhere* conducted in precisely that spirit."*

The Tiflis Bolsheviks published a manifesto written by Comrade Stalin giving a clear picture of the upsurge of the revolutionary movement and of the task of restoring the illegal workers' party and defeating the opportunist liquidator groups.

To quote the manifesto:

"Comrades and Fellow Workers!

"The political reaction that set in after the defeat of the Great People's Revolution of 1905 has saddled the country with a terrible burden. The liberal bourgeoisie, taking fright at the independence displayed by the working class in the struggle for power, betrayed the cause of the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XV, p. 217.

people's freedom and treacherously stretched out its hands to the tsarist autocracy in order to share political power with it behind the backs of the people.

"The tsar of the landowners with his lackey ministers, relying on the old, tried methods of enslavement and limitless exploitation of the masses: spies, jails, penal servitude and the gallows, began to fight for its existence with unparalleled cynicism and arrogance. The factory owners and manufacturers, utilizing the triumph of reaction, began to withdraw from the workers the concessions wrested from them in the days of the upsurge, and, with one accord, subjected the workers to lockouts, black lists, wage and piece rate reductions, and longer hours.

"The tsar, the landowners and the Russian merchants, all thoroughly aware that their main enemy is the working class, realized that the historic role of the proletariat of Russia is to overthrow the tsarist autocracy and set up a democratic republic, this threshold to the complete triumph of the workers' cause, the threshold to the radiant realm of free and joyous labour—Socialism. And that, first and foremost, is why all the vengeance, all the persecution, all the horrors of triumphant reaction descended upon the working class and its class Party, 'Russian Social-Democracy.'

"And this reaction, this triumph of counter-revolution, turned many away from the revolutionary cause; in these years many, very many,

began to repudiate the former slogans, former beliefs and convictions. This process of 'moulting' was particularly marked among the intellectual groups.

"But the working class remained true to its revolutionary duty, although it more than all others had to make sacrifices in the days of the struggle, more than others had and still has to suffer privation in this hour of the triumph of black reaction. And no reaction, no persecution can daunt or 'pacify' its ranks, since by reason of its position in modern society this class cannot but be revolutionary and must inevitably struggle, because in this struggle it has 'nothing to lose but its chains' and 'a world to win.'

"The temporary apathy, lassitude and quiescence were a result of the previous heroic efforts of the proletariat of Russia and the economic crisis which our country has passed through. At the present time, however, the difficult period for industry is passing, there are signs of a revival in economic life, the workers have begun to pull themselves together, they have felt an urge for political life, for revolutionary action. 'We must fight' is becoming the slogan of the day; the necessity for struggle and its inevitability are acknowledged by all the class-conscious and advanced elements of the working class. And now the class-conscious proletariat is confronted with the problem of the forms, immediate tasks and objects of the proletarian struggle, because the workers never take action, never take practical

steps without first discussing the situation, without determining their line of conduct, their tactics.

“The working classes of the advanced countries have their own working-class political organization—the Social-Democratic Party, which pursues a class policy. And to us, workers of Russia, after the revolution we have been through, the necessity of a class political organization has become even more obvious. We, the workers of Russia, are faced with the great historic role of grave-diggers of tsarism. Recent revolutionary experience teaches us that we must make absolutely no deals with the bourgeoisie, that we must not shed our proletarian blood for some sort of ‘constitutional guarantees,’ but must raise the standard of a democratic republic from the very outset. We must fight until we have completely destroyed tsarist rule, in order to have a clear road to our ultimate goal—Socialism. And if in the impending struggle we are to be strong and have influence over the masses, if we are to lead them, we must have our own compact, strong and stable proletarian organization. However, it is clear that under the present political conditions we workers are unable to organize in an open, legal party, and must therefore conduct illegal, unlawful, *underground* work. And that is why no obstacles must stop us in the sacred cause of reviving our illegal workers’ party. At the same time, to extend and strengthen our influence we must utilize all legal opportunities too—open

forms of working-class organization—for our revolutionary ends. Everywhere, throughout Russia, class-conscious workers are tirelessly performing the hard and difficult work of restoring and strengthening the R.S.D.L.P. And we urge the local working-class comrades to take part in this concerted and joint work together with the class-conscious workers of all Russia. Unfortunately, besides political stumbling blocks, provocateurs and similar scoundrels, the advanced workers participating in our vital work of strengthening our own Social-Democratic Party have to contend with a new obstacle in our own ranks, that is to say, people with a bourgeois psychology, people who, in our proletarian ranks, are channels of bourgeois influence on the working class. They fight against our illegal Party, they want to abolish it completely (liquidate it); they do not want an independent workers' party, they turn down our program, they strive to make the working class of Russia a hanger-on of the bourgeoisie, to turn it into cannon fodder for the Russian bourgeoisie.

"These gentlemen, headed by Potressov, that traitor to the workers' cause, do not admit that the leader of the Russian revolution is the Russian proletariat; they want to surrender the cause of the people's freedom to its historical betrayer—the bourgeoisie. Instead of an illegal workers' Social-Democratic Party these gentlemen propose to form an open 'Stolypin' labour party, at the price of abandoning our ultimate purpose, at the

price of abandoning our program together with our economic and political demands. These traitors propose to substitute our revolutionary struggle by supplications, petitions, 'tearful entreaties' to the 'June Third' Duma, the Black-Hundred-Octobrist Duma, the gentlemen's Duma, while ignoring our S.-D. deputies. But the class-conscious workers have turned away contemptuously from these bourgeois intellectuals who are trying to disrupt the workers' party from within, and, following the dictates of proletarian conscience and of revolutionary spirit, have once more turned to the building of the illegal party. And so, comrades and fellow workers, the time has come to set to work with redoubled energy to prepare for new battles under the scarlet banner of our glorious old Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

"The sombre, bloody clouds of black reaction hovering over our country are beginning to disperse, are beginning to give way to the thunder clouds of the people's anger and indignation. The dark background of our life is being rent by lightning and in the distance we already see the first flashes; the storm is approaching which will sweep from the face of the earth the age-old bulwark of violence and oppression—the throne of the tsar-executioner, the murderer of the people, the Russian despot, Nicholas the Last. The tsarist government which has summoned all the dark forces to combat the people's revolution and its leader, the working class, has itself fallen into

the hands of these forces. Iliodor, the tsarina's half-demented monk, who is inciting the masses to take vengeance on the rich intellectuals, Bogrov, the provocateur and secret police agent, at whose feet lies the corpse of the omnipotent favourite, P. A. Stolypin—such is the pacification achieved by the counter-revolution whose hero was the fallen minister.

“Only a new revolution will lead Russia out of this situation onto the open road of further development. And the emancipation of the country from political and economic fetters can be achieved only by the revolutionary people led by the proletariat.

“Organize, comrades, in compact, illegal ranks into a single illegal workers' party.

“Down with liquidationism!

“Long live the R.S.D.L.P.!

“Long live the new people's revolution!

“Down with the autocracy!

“Long live the democratic republic!

“Long live Socialism!

“Leading Circle of the Tiflis
Group of the R.S.D.L.P.”

The *Sotsial-Demokrat* immediately drew attention to the publication of this leaflet, giving the gist of it and expressing the following opinion:

“The Leading Circle of the Tiflis Group of the R.S.D.L.P. has just issued a printed leaflet devoted to an evaluation of the present situation. . . . The leaflet . . . clearly and sharply attacks the Liquidators. . . .

"Further, the leaflet also repudiates Otzovism. . . ."*

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks organized the preparations for the Prague Conference in a decisive struggle against the Liquidators.

At the same time, acting on Lenin's instructions, Sergo Orjonikidze arrived in Transcaucasia to prepare for the Prague Conference of the Party.

With the help and guidance of Comrade Stalin, Orjonikidze succeeded in establishing an Organization Commission in Baku for the convocation of the all-Russian Party conference.

The Baku and Tiflis Bolshevik organizations played a major part in the preparations for convening the Prague Conference.

Lenin wrote that the Russian Organization Commission, which ensured the convocation of the Prague Conference, was "the work of the Kiev, Ekaterinoslav, Tiflis, Baku and Ekaterinburg organizations." (My italics.—L. B.)**

The Sixth (Prague) Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. endorsed Lenin's strategic line in the Russian revolution, emphasizing that now as before the immediate task of the working class was to fight for a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry; it decided the Party's political slogans for the elections to the Fourth Duma and called upon the Party and the working class to intensify

* *Sotsial-Demokrat*, No. 24, October 18 (31), 1911.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XV, p. 429.

the struggle against the liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie and their leader, the Cadet party.

The Conference expelled the Liquidator-Mensheviks from the Party and also put the Trotskyites and the followers of *Vperyod* outside its ranks.

The Prague Conference of the Bolsheviks marks a turning point in the history of Bolshevism, for it officially split with Menshevism, expelled the Liquidator-Mensheviks from the Party and inaugurated the Bolshevik Party.

The Prague Conference elected a Central Committee with Lenin at its head. Comrade Stalin was also elected to the Central Committee in his absence.

During the Prague Party Conference Comrade Stalin was in exile.

Comrade Stalin had been arrested in St. Petersburg on September 9, 1911, and exiled to the Vologda Gubernia, but he managed to escape in February 1912.

On Lenin's proposal, the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) that was elected at the Prague Conference set up a Bureau of the C. C., headed by Comrade Stalin, to lead Party work in Russia. Besides Comrade Stalin, Comrades Y. Sverdlov, S. Spandaryan, S. Orjonikidze and M. Kalinin were elected to the Russian Bureau.

After the Prague Conference, Comrade Stalin went to Transcaucasia (Baku and Tiflis) again and organized and directed the struggle of the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks for carrying out the decisions of the Prague Conference.

In March 1912, the Tiflis Bolshevik organization

heard a report on the work of the Prague Conference and approved its decisions.

The resolution of the Tiflis Bolshevik group stated:

“Recognizing:

“1) That the Party organizations in the country had been scattered and disorganized during the past few years, the recent Conference gathered together, as far as possible, all functioning Party nuclei, and thus laid the foundation for the amalgamation and consolidation of all Party organizations;

“2) That by establishing a Russian centre (of the C.C.), the Conference took the right road towards the unification of the Party, since the lack of such a practical leading centre reacted disastrously on Social-Democratic work;

“3) That all the decisions adopted by the Conference, both in regard to the political line of the Social-Democratic proletariat and in regard to the building of the Party organizationally, quite correctly indicate the line of conduct for the proletariat.

“The Tiflis group of the R.S.D.L.P. registers its complete adherence to them and will support the C.C. in its constructive work.”*

In April 1912 the Tiflis Bolshevik organization came out against the Transcaucasian Regional Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., which was led by the Menshevik-Liquidators. It characterized the Trans-

* *Sotsial-Demokrat*, No. 26, May 8 (April 25), 1912, p. 9.

caucasian Conference, which was being called on the initiative of the Regional Committee, as a liquidationist conference, and called upon the Social-Democratic organizations to boycott it. It is a known fact that the Transcaucasian Regional Committee of the Mensheviks set itself the aim of thwarting the decisions of the Bolshevik Prague Conference. The resolution of the Bolshevik group (April 1912) stated:

“We regard the conference being called by the January meeting* as a liquidationist and inaugural conference, since the initiatory groups, which work legally and which on their own authority declare themselves to be Social-Democratic, are being invited to it also. This openly contradicts the principles on the basis of which all previous general Party congresses and conferences have been called. The work of convening this conference is disorganizing the Party, which has just begun to rally round the Central Committee, and therefore we categorically refuse to participate in this conference and call upon all Social-Democratic organizations to boycott it.”**

In 1912 Comrade Stalin was in charge of the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) and did a tremendous amount of Party work in St. Petersburg.

* The meeting of “Nationals” in January 1912, in preparation for the August Conference of the Liquidators.

** Archives Board of the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Georgian S.S.R., Folio No. 7, File No. 2467, 1913, Leaf 48 (reverse)-49, “Case of Stassova and Others.”

Comrade Stalin directed the newspaper *Zvezda* (*The Star*), which published his articles "A New Page," "Life Wins," "How They Are Preparing for the Elections," "The Ice Is Broken," "Conclusions," and others.

In these articles Comrade Stalin analyzed the phase of revival of the working-class movement that had set in in Russia and substantiated the immediate tasks that confronted the Bolshevik Party.

On the basis of Lenin's instructions and under Comrade Stalin's personal leadership *Pravda* was founded—that splendid militant organ of the Bolshevik Party.

Pravda was a newspaper of tremendous political and organizational importance. In the period of the struggle against the Liquidators to maintain the illegal side of the movement and to win over the legal working-class organizations, *Pravda* was an organizational centre rallying the working class around the illegal Bolshevik Party.

The Bolshevik campaign in the elections to the Fourth Duma was conducted in accordance with Lenin's instructions from abroad and directed personally by Comrade Stalin. The Bolsheviks won a complete victory in the election of workers' deputies to the Fourth Duma. Stalin's "Mandate of the Workingmen of St. Petersburg to Their Labour Deputy" rallied the working class to Lenin's colours in the elections.

On the "Mandate" Comrade Stalin wrote:

"First of all the mandate speaks of the tasks of 1905 and says that these tasks were not ful-

filled, that the economic and political situation in the country makes the fulfilment of these tasks inevitable. According to the mandate, the emancipation of the country can be achieved by a struggle, a struggle on two fronts: against the feudal-bureaucratic survivals on the one hand, and against the treacherous liberal bourgeoisie on the other. In this the peasantry alone can be the reliable allies of the workers. But the struggle can be victorious only on the condition that hegemony (leadership) is exercised by the proletariat. The more class-conscious and organized the workers are the better will they play the part of leader of the people. In view of the fact that under present conditions the tribune of the Duma is one of the best means of organizing and enlightening the masses, the workers are sending their deputy to the Duma in order that he, and the entire Social-Democratic group in the Fourth Duma, shall advocate the fundamental tasks of the proletariat, the full and uncurtailed demands of the country. . . .

“Such is the content of the mandate.”*

Defeated and disgraced in the St. Petersburg elections of workers' deputies, the Liquidators raised a howl about the impermissibility of the split which, they alleged, was being effected by the Bolsheviks. Comrade Stalin exposed and denounced these hypocritical howls of the Liquidators about “unity.”

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 254.

"When bourgeois diplomats prepare for war they begin to shout very loudly about 'peace' and 'friendly relations.' . . .

"Fine words are a mask to cover shady deeds. A sincere diplomat is like dry water, or wooden iron.

"The same must be said about the Liquidators and their mendacious clamour for unity . . . the Liquidators are deceiving the workers by their diplomatic clamour for unity, for while they talk about unity they are working for a split. . . .

"The elections in St. Petersburg are direct proof of this."*

Comrade Stalin gave an excellent definition of the Marxist understanding of unity in the working-class movement.

"Unity means first of all the unity of action by the Social-Democratically organized workers within the working class, which is as yet unorganized, as yet unenlightened by the light of Socialism. The Social-Democratically organized workers raise questions at their meetings, discuss them, adopt decisions and then, as a single body, bring these decisions, which are absolutely binding upon the minority, before the non-party workers. *Without this there is not nor can there be unity in Social-Democracy!* . . .

"Further, unity means the unity of action of the proletariat in face of the entire bourgeois world. The representatives of the proletariat

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 276, 277.

adopt decisions and carry them out as a single body, on the condition that the minority submits to the majority. *Without this there is not nor can there be proletarian unity!*"*

In the same article Comrade Stalin exposed the liquidationist essence of the "unity" slogans of "Judas" Trotsky, who masked his liquidationism with "révolutionary" phrases about unity.

In his article "The Elections in St. Petersburg" Comrade Stalin wrote:

"It is said that by his 'unity' campaign Trotsky introduced a 'new current' into the Liquidators' old 'affairs.' But this is not true. In spite of Trotsky's 'heroic' efforts and 'terrible threats' he, in the end, proved to be merely a vociferous champion with fake muscles, for after five years of 'effort' he has succeeded in uniting nobody but the Liquidators. New noise—old actions!"**

In his article "The Results of the Elections in the Workers' Curia in St. Petersburg," Comrade Stalin wrote:

"Trotsky . . . jumbles everybody together—opponents of the Party principle as well as its supporters. And of course he gets no unity whatever. . . .

"The practical experience of the movement confirms the correctness of *Pravda's* plan of unity.

* *Ibid.*, pp. 277-78.

** *Ibid.*, p. 279.

"The practical experience of the movement smashes Trotsky's puerile plan to unite the un-uniteable.

"More than that. From an advocate of a fantastic unity Trotsky is turning into an agent of the Liquidators, doing what suits the Liquidators.

"Trotsky has done all in his power to ensure that we should have two rival newspapers, two rival platforms, two conferences which mutually repudiate each other—and now this champion with fake muscles is himself singing us a song about unity!

"This is not unity but a game worthy of a comedian."*

V. I. Lenin warmly supported the struggle which Comrade Stalin developed around the election campaign in the pages of *Pravda*.

Concerning Comrade Stalin's article entitled "Who Won?" in *Pravda*, No. 146, of October 31 (18), 1912, summing up the elections in St. Petersburg Lenin wrote to the editors:

"Today I read in *Pravda* : . . about the results of the elections in the workers' curia of St. Petersburg. I cannot refrain from congratulating you on the editorial in No. 146: in a moment of defeat dealt not by Social-Democrats (it is clear from an analysis of the figures that the Liquidators did not get in on Social-Democrat votes), the editors at once adopted the correct,

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 259-60.

firm, dignified tone of pointing to the significance of the principled standpoint of protest against 'humiliation.' . . .

"It is extremely important not to break off the work begun by *Pravda* of studying the elections, but to continue it. . . .

"Only *Pravda* can do this important job properly."*

During 1912 and 1913, conciliation towards the Menshevik-Liquidators and the opportunist practice of uniting and collaborating with the Mensheviks were current to a certain extent in the ranks of the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia and Georgia.

After the Prague Conference, which expelled the Liquidators from the Party and put an end forever to all survivals of formal unity with the Mensheviks, some Transcaucasian Bolsheviks violated this policy and adopted the line of collaboration with the Menshevik-Liquidators.

Thus, for instance, in 1912-13, in Kutais, people like Eliava, Zhgenti, M. Okujava** and G. Kuchaidze collaborated with the Mensheviks, were in one organization with them, worked on the Menshevik newspaper *Mertskhali*,*** etc.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIX, p. 76.

** In 1937 M. Okujava, Sh. Eliava and T. Zhgenti were exposed as enemies of the people.

*** *Mertskhali* (*The Swallow*)—a legal Menshevik newspaper published in Georgian in Kutais beginning with December 11, 1912. Altogether sixteen numbers appeared in 1912, and 101 numbers in 1913.

In their articles and reminiscences T. Zhgenti, B. Bibineishvili* and others maintained silence about the great historical significance of the struggle of the Transcaucasian Bolsheviks against the Menshevik-Liquidators, the struggle of the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia, and primarily of the Baku and Tiflis organizations, under the leadership of Comrades Stalin, Orjonikidze and Spandaryan, for the preparation of the Prague Conference and the carrying out of its decisions. Instead of fighting to smash the Menshevik-Liquidators completely, they proclaimed peace and formed a united front of a small group of Bolshevik-conciliators (to which they themselves belonged) with the Mensheviks.

Is it not clear that Zhgenti and Bibineishvili slandered the Bolsheviks of Georgia and unceremoniously falsified and distorted the history of our Party?

In 1913 serious mistakes were also made by Ph. Makharadze, who was then in charge of the magazine *Chveni Tskaro*** (appearing in the city of Baku).

Prior to Ph. Makharadze, Noah Jordania had been editor of this magazine.

In his articles, N. Jordania advanced and propagated the thesis that Bolshevism and Menshevism must merge on the basis of the principles of Menshevism, i. e., in essence advocated the slogan of the liquidation of Bolshevism.

* In 1937 B. Bibineishvili was exposed as an enemy of the people.

** *Chveni Tskaro* (*Our Fountain-Head*)—a monthly Social-Democratic magazine of a liquidationist tendency. It began to appear in 1913 after the suppression of *Tskaro* in Baku.

This is what he wrote at that time:

"One thing only is beyond doubt, namely, that these two trends are two wings of the same movement, two aspects of the same phenomenon. They complement each other, each representing a continuation of the other."*

Noah Jordania held up the Social-Democratic Parties of the West as worthy models of working-class parties, saying:

"We see great splits and different trends in the workers' parties of Western Europe. There are even some that completely repudiate the basic principles of Marxism. In spite of this, they are in one party, they march and fight together. But with us, when differences of opinion were still superficial, split and division became the aim from the very start."**

Jordania made a brazen and cynical attack on Marx. He wrote:

"When Marx wanted to arrange Party affairs in his own way from London, and wrote to his disciples, Liebknecht and Bebel, not to unite with the Lassalleans, the disciples hid this letter, carried through the unification and answered Marx: We on the spot are better able to see the need for union. And if a thinker of genius, divorced from local affairs, makes mis-

* *Tskaro (Fountain-Head)*, No. 9, 1913, p. 2. This was a weekly Social-Democratic magazine of avowedly liquidationist tendency. It was published in the Georgian language in Baku in 1913.

** *Ibid.*, p. 3.

takes, what shall we say about others, who send instructions from afar and wrap themselves in a cloak of infallibility, like the Pope of Rome?"*

Beginning with the twelfth issue of *Tskaro* Ph. Makharadze became its editor.

Instead of rooting out the Menshevik spirit of the magazine and waging a relentless struggle against Jordania, Ph. Makharadze gave him the opportunity of collaborating on the magazine and further propagating his Menshevik views.

In a number of articles published in the magazine *Chveni Tskaro* under the editorship of Makharadze, N. Jordania (cf. "An Inner-Party Misunderstanding" and other articles) defended and propagated the thesis that Russian Menshevism had the correct ideology and tactics, whereas Bolshevism had only a strong organization; that Bolshevism and Menshevism in Russia were complements of each other; that in contrast to Russian Menshevism, Transcaucasian Menshevism, which had not only ideological and tactical but also organizational merits, had liquidated Bolshevism.

Ph. Makharadze not only did not oppose the Menshevik-Liquidationist views of N. Jordania in his magazine (evidently in the interests of peace and collaboration with the Mensheviks), but committed a series of gross opportunist errors in his own articles.

In his article "An Inner-Party Disagreement" Makharadze wrote the following:

* *Tskaro*, No. 9, 1913, p. 3.

"Russian Social-Democracy has not been able to establish firm and inflexible discipline. And this is where we must look for the main reason of the split that exists in our Social-Democracy. . . .

"If discipline had been firmly established among us, would the appearance of 'Bolsheviks' and 'Mensheviks' within the Party and the corresponding division of the Party into two parts have been possible? . . . We are firmly convinced that if Russian Social-Democracy had had firm and strict discipline, so senseless a division as Bolshevism and Menshevism was at that time would have been wholly impossible; Social-Democracy would have been a single united party organizationally. This would in no way have hindered the existence of differences and even of disagreements within the Party, either on technical or organizational questions. Here we can point as an example to the German Social-Democratic Party, which organizationally is an integral unit, even though there are disagreements of various kinds within it. . . .

"The interests of the masses are everywhere the same; temporary disagreements can arise here only from a lack of class consciousness. True, in some instances this disagreement is introduced from above, in the interests of defending narrow factional views, but it is without foundation. The Social-Democratic Labour Party can exist only as a single party, otherwise it cannot exist at all. The existence of both a Bol-

shevik and a Menshevik Social-Democratic Labour Party is inconceivable. That would be sheer stupidity.”* (*Animation among the audience.*)

Need proof be given that such a conception of the Party is in glaring contradiction to Lenin's and Stalin's teaching on the proletarian party, that in championing the amalgamation of the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, Ph. Makharadze was continuing the work of Kautsky and Trotsky, who, on the plea of reconciling the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks strove to smash Bolshevism?

Ph. Makharadze declared that the struggle of world historic importance that Lenin was waging for the creation, development and strengthening of the Bolshevik Party was wholly unnecessary and only brought harm to the revolutionary working-class movement, and he considered the very existence of the Bolshevik Party “sheer stupidity.”

Failing to understand the extremely important task of making a complete rupture with Menshevism and of establishing a genuinely proletarian, Bolshevik Party, Ph. Makharadze took the Liquidators under his direct protection.

In the same article Makharadze wrote:

“Here we must observe that in the Caucasus liquidationism and liquidationist deviations have always been slight, and no such fierce struggle raged around this issue as in Russia. . . .

“ . . . The Liquidators were particularly strong

* *Chveni Tskaro*, No. 7-17, 1913, pp. 5-6, “An Inner-Party Disagreement,” Part II, signed “Dzveli Dasseli.”

in St. Petersburg, since it was there that their main forces were concentrated.

"... This campaign was carried on almost exclusively in St. Petersburg. Therefore in most cases the local workers did not even understand and still do not understand the fierce struggle against the Liquidators, which was carried on there by *Zvezda* and later by *Pravda*.

"... As we know, the backbone of the Liquidators was a group of literary men, of which Potressov, Martov, Dan, Levitsky, Mayevsky, and others were and still are members. Since all of them were formerly leaders of the Mensheviks, this fact gave rise to the misunderstanding that all Mensheviks must at the same time be Liquidators. Incidentally, this also explains why nearly all the Caucasian organizations were labelled liquidationist, which is absurd in itself. This is how liquidationism was understood among us and thus, in all probability, it is still understood. However, that was not the case."*

Thus, in 1913, Ph. Makharadze, being a conciliator, shielded the Transcaucasian Menshevik-Liquidators and N. Jordania against the Bolsheviks. Ph. Makharadze saw the struggle of the Liquidators against the Party in St. Petersburg, but did not see or understand the struggle of the Liquidators, the struggle of Noah Jordania, against Bolshevism

* *Chveni Tskaro*, No. 8-18, 1913, p. 7, "An Inner-Party Disagreement," Part III.

in the Transcaucasian organizations, underestimated this struggle, adopted a conciliatory attitude towards it and screened it.

Comrade Stalin had exposed the liquidationism of Jordania and the Transcaucasian Mensheviks already in 1909 in his "Letter from the Caucasus." Lenin had also given an estimate of Jordania's liquidationism.

In a letter to Olmsky in 1913 Lenin wrote:

"The clever diplomat, An* ... is playing a *very subtle* game. You don't know An! But I have studied his diplomacy for years, and know how he deceives the *whole Caucasus* with it!! . . . An wants to make it appear that he is against *Luch** AND THUS SAVE Luch!!* This is clear to those who know the history of the Party well, especially of *January* 1910 and *August* 1912!! *An chided Dan for trifles, while surrendering to Dan on the main issue**** (the slogan of the struggle for an open party) as he wished to show 'his own people' that *we too*, you see, are against the Liquidators. There is *no* more fatal mistake than to be caught by this bait of An's. You *do not know* the ins-and-outs of the attitude of Trotsky, An, the Bund, Braun, etc., towards *Luch* (and this is understandable)—but I do know. *There is no better way of assisting the Liquidators than by recognizing An as an anti-Liquidator.**** This is a fact. And An is their sole 'serious' *support*. This is also a fact. . . .

* The pseudonym of Noah Jordania.

** *Luch* (*The Ray*)—a newspaper of the Liquidators.

*** My italics,—L. B.

"P. S. They say that in St. Petersburg there is much talk about how An (together with Chkhenkeli) was 'taking away' *Luch* from Dan . . . but did not take it away. I believe he *pretended* to take it away, and wound up with *what seemed to be a compromise* but was in fact a surrender to Dan!! Dan is a poorly masked enemy battery. *An is also a battery of the same enemy, but cleverly masked.*"*

Ph. Makharadze's statements concerning the anti-liquidationism of the Caucasian Mensheviks could mean and did mean only one thing. Makharadze tried to justify his collaboration with Jordania, not understanding that "there is no better way of *assisting* the Liquidators than by recognizing An as an anti-Liquidator" (*Lenin*).

In 1913 this conciliatory attitude towards Menshevism on the part of the above-mentioned small group of Bolsheviki developed into complete organizational amalgamation and collaboration with the Menshevik-Liquidators.

The conciliators S. Eliava, T. Zhgenti, B. Bibineishvili and others, took part in the Transcaucasian Regional Conference of the Menshevik-Liquidators in the autumn of 1913.

The Regional Committee elected by the Conference included, in addition to the Liquidators, Comrade Ph. Makharadze and Shalva Eliava.

There is not a single word in the resolutions and communiqués of this Conference on the struggle

* My italics.—L. B.

Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVI, p. 438.

against the Liquidators, nor is there even any mention of the Prague All-Russian Conference of Bolsheviks and the new C. C. of the R.S.D.L.P. On the contrary, we find in the "Communiqué" of the Conference a call to rally around the Menshevik-Liquidationist Regional Committee.

"The Regional Committee invites all members of the Party to rally around it and the local leading bodies, and to work under their guidance for the consolidation of the Social-Democratic organizations and the strengthening of their influence among the broad masses of workers and peasants."*

In the resolution of the Conference on the Fourth State Duma, the Social-Democratic group, or more correctly, the Menshevik faction, is recognized as the worthy parliamentary representative of the Russian proletariat, while the split in the Social-Democratic group of the Duma, the struggle of the Bolsheviks within the Duma group against the Mensheviks, is adjudged a manifestation of the circle spirit:

"The Conference recognizes that the Social-Democratic group in the Fourth State Duma has on the whole shown itself to be a worthy parliamentary representative of the Russian proletariat, and that its activity was in harmony with the principles of international Social-Democracy.

* "Communiqué" and Resolutions. Extract from the protocol of the Tiflis Gendarmerie Department, Archives Board of the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Georgian S.S.R., Folio No. 7, File No. 2742, 1914, pp. 21-25.

"Noting certain shortcomings, as, for instance, the vote on the proposal to restore the seven-hour working day for postal and telegraph employees, and an insufficient intensity in its activity, the Conference considers the main reason for this to be the intensification of the inner factional fight and the decline of discipline within the Social-Democratic group."*

In the resolutions of the Conference on the peasant question, we find only a call to appeal to the State Duma:

"... The Conference resolves to instruct the Social-Democratic organizations to take all appropriate measures for the protection of the lawful interests of the peasantry, and to bring all unlawful actions of local authorities to the attention of the Social-Democratic group for the purpose of introducing a corresponding interpellation in the Duma.

"... To instruct the local organizations to intensify their organizational and propagandist activity, and for this purpose to distribute Social-Democratic literature among them (the small landowners) ... and to draw their representatives into cultural and educational activity in the countryside."**

A Menshevik resolution was also adopted on Sh. Eliava's report on the cooperative movement:

* "Communiqué" and Resolutions. Section "On the State Duma."

** *Ibid.*, Section "On Work Among the Peasants."

"The Conference considers the present time of the revival of the working-class movement particularly auspicious for the organization of consumers' cooperatives, which constitute an important factor in the struggle against the constantly rising prices of articles of consumption, and resolves to carry on widespread agitation for their organization."*

The resolution of the Conference on trade unions was typically Menshevik and liquidationist:

"The Conference considers it necessary to organize committees of enlightened workers in the localities in every industry, and in every trade, for the distribution of trade union literature, for drawing up draft rules and for calling preliminary meetings to discuss them.

"In the event of refusal to register a union established in accordance with the regulations of May 4, the Conference proposes that a complaint be lodged with the Senate against such unlawful refusal."**

Such were the resolutions of this Conference of Menshevik-Liquidators.

It is characteristic that the representatives of the Baku and Tiflis Bolshevik organizations, i. e., precisely those organizations which were waging a bitter struggle against the Liquidators, were not admitted to the Conference.

* "Communique" and Resolutions. Section "On Cooperatives."

** *Ibid.*, Section "On the Trade Unions."

On the national question, the Conference decided to open a discussion in the press on national cultural autonomy, between the supporters of the Party program and the supporters of the slogan of national cultural autonomy. And this despite the fact that the Cracow Conference of the C. C. of the R.S.D.L.P. (January 1913) had already condemned the slogan of national cultural autonomy.

In the central organ of the Party, the *Sotsial-Demokrat*, this Transcaucasian Regional Conference of the Mensheviks was characterized as follows:

“At the Regional Conference which has just taken place, delegates from seven localities were present. Baku was not represented. There was also no one present from the group of Tiflis Bolsheviks. . . .

“Liquidators of the first water attended the Conference, but they hid their true colours.

“The newly-elected Organization Committee includes one Bolshevik and another member who vacillates greatly between Caucasian Menshevism and our policy.”*

Thus, during the period of 1912-13, the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia carried on a fierce struggle not only against the Menshevik-Liquidators and the Menshevik-Trotskyites, but also against the conciliators among the Bolsheviks who had entered on a path of compromise and collaboration with the Mensheviks in accordance with the opportunist principle of the Trotskyite August Bloc (Comrade Ph. Makharadze

* *Sotsial-Demokrat*, No. 32, December 15 (28), 1913, pp. 8-9.

as well as M. Okujava, Sh. Eliava, T. Zhgenti, B. Bibineishvili, and others).

The Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia had to fight just as hard against the conciliators and the opportunist tendencies towards amalgamation during the period of 1917 also. In the period of the February bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1917, on the initiative of Comrade Ph. Makharadze, the Tiflis group of Bolsheviks came out in favour of union with the Mensheviks. Right up to the April Conference of our Party in 1917, Ph. Makharadze upheld and propagated unity with the Mensheviks, maintaining that the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks had a single program.

Makharadze's argument for unity was as follows:

"But as long as all of us, Bolsheviks as well as Mensheviks, have at bottom a single program and an identical understanding of the great tasks that history has imposed upon the working class, we must not split our forces, but must unite and create a single, powerful organization.

"It goes without saying that even given the existence of a single organization, *ideological* divergences and disagreements are not only possible but must exist in the interests of healthy development. On the contrary; these ideological disagreements must unceasingly invigorate the life of the Party, must impel it forward, not allowing it to stand still in one place."*

* Ph. Makharadze, in *Kavkazsky Rabochy* (*The Caucasian Worker*), No. 14, March 28, 1917. This newspaper was the organ of the Caucasian Territorial and the Tiflis Committees of the R.S.D.L.P.

Throughout the history of the Party, Lenin and Stalin, the Bolsheviks waged a relentless struggle not only against opportunism but also against every kind of conciliation with it.

* In one of his letters, Lenin defined the danger of conciliationism in the following way:

“Conciliationism and amalgamationism are a most harmful thing for the workers’ party in Russia: they are not only idiocy, but *fatal* to the Party. For *in reality* ‘amalgamation’ (or conciliation, etc.) with Chkheidze and Skobelev (matters hinge on them since they parade as ‘internationalists’) means ‘unity’ with the adherents of the Org[anization] Com[mittee] and through it with the Potressovs & Co., i. e., in reality, *servility* to the social-chauvinists. . . .

“We can rely only upon those who have understood the utter deceptiveness of the idea of unity, and the absolute necessity of a split with this fraternity (Chkh [eidze] & Co.) in Russia.”*

Therefore, the attempt of Ph. Makharadze, T. Zhgenti and others to proclaim conciliationism a “legitimate trend” of Bolshevism and *to substitute* for the history of the struggle the Bolsheviks waged against the Menshevik-Liquidators and the conciliators the history of the peace and collaboration of the opportunists and conciliators with the Menshevik-Liquidators is a gross falsification of the history of the Bolshevik organizations of Georgia.

(Bolsheviks). It was published in Tiflis in the Russian language from March 11, 1917 to February 8, 1918.

* V. I. Lenin, *Miscellany*, Vol. II, p. 278.

Thus:

1) During the years of reaction the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, like the whole Bolshevik Party led by Lenin, retreated in perfect order, with the least possible damage to the revolutionary movement, and carried on an enormous amount of revolutionary work in building and strengthening the illegal Party organization, waging a heroic struggle in preparation for a victorious assault upon the autocracy, for the victory of the revolution.

2) During the stern years of reaction the Baku Bolshevik organization, under the direct leadership of Comrade Stalin, was an impregnable fortress of Lenin's Party. The glorious Bolshevik traditions implanted by Comrade Stalin, the closest colleague of our great Lenin, placed the Baku proletariat in the front ranks of those fighting for the victory of the revolution, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the victory of Socialism.

3) With Comrade Stalin at the helm, the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia at all stages of the revolutionary movement carried on a relentless struggle against all enemies of the working class, primarily against the Mensheviks, the bourgeois nationalists, the "conciliators" and "compromisers." The historic "Letters from the Caucasus," in which Comrade Stalin tore the mask from the ideologists and builders of the Stolypin "Labour Party," played an extremely important part in the exposure and rout of the Mensheviks. (Loud applause.)

IV

ON THE HISTORY OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST NATIONALIST DEVIATIONISM

(1913-1924)

On the national question the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia and of Georgia, throughout their history, waged a relentless struggle against both the bourgeois nationalism of the Mensheviks and the bourgeois-nationalist parties—the Federalists and the Dashnaks—and against all nationalist deviations in their own ranks.

On the national question Comrade Stalin waged a struggle against the Georgian Mensheviks that is of immense historical importance. As is known, in opposition to the Bolshevik slogan of “the right of nations to self-determination and independent state existence” the Georgian Mensheviks put forward the reactionary nationalist demand for national cultural autonomy for the nationalities of the Caucasus. The program of national cultural autonomy, borrowed by the Mensheviks from the Austrian Social-Democrats (Mensheviks) and the Bund, aimed at a monarchist, liberal-constitutional solution of the national question in Russia.

National cultural autonomy did not touch the foundations of the bourgeois-landlord system, it left economic and political power completely in the hands of the landowners and the bourgeoisie of the ruling Great-Russian nation; if it had been put into effect it would have made Transcaucasia an arena of bloody conflicts between the nationalities.

In 1913 Stalin's *Marxism and the National Question*, which he wrote abroad, was published.

Lenin was the first to appreciate the enormous importance of Comrade Stalin's theoretical works on the national question.

In 1913 Lenin wrote to Gorky:

"Regarding nationalism I quite agree with you that it must be studied more seriously. We have a splendid Georgian who has got down to work and is writing a big article for *Prosveshcheniye* (*Enlightenment*), after collecting all the Austrian and other data."*

Somewhat later Lenin wrote:

"In theoretical Marxist literature this state of affairs and the principles of the national program of S.-D. have already been elucidated recently (here Stalin's article comes first)."

In his work *Marxism and the National Question* Comrade Stalin gives the following exhaustive analysis of the reasons for the national question being in the forefront at that time:

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVI, p. 328.

** *Ibid.*, Vol. XVII, p. 116.

"The period of counter-revolution in Russia brought not only 'thunder and lightning' in its train, but also disillusionment in the movement and lack of faith in common forces. As long as people believed in 'a bright future,' they fought side by side irrespective of nationality: common questions first and foremost! But when doubt crept into people's hearts, they began to depart, each to his own national tent: let every man count only upon himself! The 'national question' first and foremost!

"At the same time a profound upheaval was taking place in the economic life of the country. The year 1905 had not passed in vain: one more blow had been struck at the survivals of serfdom in the rural districts. The series of good harvests which succeeded the famine years, and the industrial boom that followed, furthered the progress of capitalism. The differentiation in the rural districts, the growth of the towns and the development of trade and means of communication all took a big stride forward. This applied particularly to the border regions. And this could not but hasten the process of economic consolidation of the nationalities of Russia. They were bound to be set in motion. . . .

"The 'constitutional regime' which was established at the time also acted in the same direction of arousing the nationalities. The spread of newspapers and of literature generally, a certain freedom of the press and cultural institutions, an increase in the number of national theatres,

and so forth, all unquestionably helped to strengthen 'national sentiments.' The Duma, with its election campaigns and political groups, gave fresh opportunities for greater activity on the part of the nations and provided a new and wide arena for their mobilization."**

In this same work Comrade Stalin substantiated the Bolshevik theory on the national question, subjected the Menshevik program of national cultural autonomy to annihilating criticism and shattered it.

"... Cultural national autonomy... shuts up the nations within their old shells, chains them to the lower rungs of cultural development and prevents them from rising to the higher rungs of culture... retards the development of the belated nations, transforms regional autonomy into an arena of conflict between the nations organized in the national unions.

"Thus cultural national autonomy, which is useless generally, would be a senseless reactionary undertaking in the Caucasus."**

In the ranks of the Bolsheviks of Georgia and of Transcaucasia in the pre-Soviet period, we had, on the one hand, a liberal-conciliatory attitude among certain Party members towards the Menshevik nationalist program on the national question, and, on the other hand, a "Leftist" petty-bourgeois repudiation of the slogan of Lenin and Stalin:

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 290-91.

** *Ibid.*, pp. 351-52.

the right of nations to self-determination (Comrade Ph. Makharadze). In the communist organizations of Transcaucasia the struggle against nationalist deviations was particularly bitter after the establishment of Soviet government.

The nationalist-deviationist opposition in the ranks of the Communist Party of Georgia arose and took shape in 1921. During the entire period of 1921-24 the Georgian nationalist deviationists carried on a fierce struggle against the Leninist-Stalinist national policy of our Party.

The nationalist deviationists were defeated, routed and condemned at the Second and Third Congresses of the Communist Party of Georgia, at the Second and Third Congresses of the Communist Organizations of Transcaucasia and at the Twelfth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.).

In 1924 a considerable number of the nationalist deviationists joined the then Trotskyite anti-Party opposition.

The leading group of the Georgian nationalist deviationists included Ph. Makharadze and B. Mdivani, S. Kavtaradze, M. Okujava, M. Toroshelidze and K. Tsintsadze.* One cannot help remembering that already in the period of preparation and accomplishment of the October Socialist Revolution (April 1917 to 1918) they held a Right opportunist standpoint, followed the treacherous line of the Right scabs in the Great October Revolution, by

* In 1936, B. Mdivani, M. Toroshelidze (and K. Tsintsadze at an earlier date) were exposed as enemies of the people,

opposing Lenin's plan of transforming the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution.

They preached the Menshevik slogan that revolutionary democracy must exercise control over the bourgeois Provisional Government, bring pressure to bear on the latter and on the governments of the belligerent powers for the purpose of concluding a speedy peace.

After the Kornilov mutiny they supported the Transcaucasian Mensheviks' slogan advocating the transfer of power to revolutionary democracy, which was serving as a screen for bourgeois counter-revolution.

At that time Comrade Stalin drew an extraordinarily vivid and convincing picture of the revolutionary situation which had arisen in Transcaucasia. In *Pravda* of March 27 (14), 1918, Comrade Stalin wrote:

"The Transcaucasian soldiers who returned from the front spread the agrarian revolution through the villages. Manors of the Moslem and Georgian landlords went up in flames. The foundations of the feudal survivals were vigorously attacked by the 'Bolshevized' soldier-peasants. Obviously, the Transcaucasian Commissariat's empty promises to give the land to the peasants could no longer satisfy peasants caught up by the agrarian wave. Action was demanded of it, but revolutionary, not counter-revolutionary action.

"And the workers, too, did not and could not lag behind events. First, the revolution which was sweeping from the north and bringing new gains for the workers naturally roused the

Transcaucasian workers to struggle anew. Even the workers of sleepy Tiflis, the bulwark of Menshevik counter-revolution, began to forsake the Transcaucasian Commissariat, and express themselves in favour of Soviet government. Secondly, after the triumph of the Soviets in the North Caucasus, which supplied grain to Tiflis during the Kaledin-Filimonov regime, the food shortage could not but get worse; this naturally provoked a number of food 'riots'—revolutionary North Caucasus flatly refused to feed counter-revolutionary Tiflis. Thirdly, the absence of currency (token money cannot serve as a substitute!) disrupted economic life and, most of all, railway transport, which undoubtedly aggravated the discontent of the urban masses. Finally, revolutionary, proletarian Baku, which had recognized Soviet rule from the very first days of the October Revolution and was waging a constant struggle against the Transcaucasian Commissariat, did not let the Transcaucasian proletariat sleep, but served as an infectious example and a living beacon illuminating the path to Socialism.

"All this taken together could not but lead to the revolutionization of the whole political situation in Transcaucasia. At last things came to such a pass that even the 'most reliable' national regiments began to get 'demoralized' and to go over to the side of the Bolsheviks."*

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. IV, pp. 59-61.

The Baku Bolsheviks took the utmost advantage of the revolutionary situation at the beginning of 1918.

With the help and guidance of Lenin and Stalin the Baku Bolsheviks, led by S. Shaumyan and A. Japaridze, achieved the victory of the proletarian revolution.

In April 1918 the Baku proletariat entered into armed conflict with the Mussavat-Bek-Khan counter-revolution and established Soviet rule (the Baku Commune).

But the Tiflis opportunist leadership—Comrade Makharadze, and B. Mdivani, M. Okujava, M. Toroshelidze and others—ignoring the instructions of Lenin and Stalin, categorically refused to prepare or carry out an armed struggle for power in Georgia and Transcaucasia, actually surrendered the Tiflis arsenal to the Mensheviks, refused to agitate for Soviet government among the soldiers or to use the revolutionary soldiers from the Caucasian front to fight for the overthrow of the bloc of the counter-revolutionary parties of Transcaucasia (Mensheviks, Dashnaks, Mussavatists¹⁰) which had seized power after the February Revolution. After the October Revolution they advanced the slogan for a peaceful transfer of power to the Soviets and for a struggle to induce the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries to recognize Soviet rule.

This group defined their standpoint in a proclamation of the Caucasian Territorial Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) as follows:

“For several days the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and the defencist parties of the

Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries have been busy spreading provocative rumours to the effect that the Bolsheviks are getting ready for action.

"Our Party has stated definitely and emphatically that the Bolsheviks in Tiflis are not preparing for any action whatever. . . .

"Not one shot! Not a single bullet must pierce the breast of a worker, the breast of a soldier.

"We have been certain all along that the question around which the conflict arose could have been settled peaceably.

"And we are certain now that the whole question can be settled without bloody collisions. . . .

"Once again we declare to the soldiers, workers and citizens that the Bolsheviks are contemplating no action whatever in Tiflis. There is absolutely no call for it, especially at the moment when the Workers' and Peasants' Government has grown strong, powerful and has been recognized by the overwhelming majority of Russia's democracy."*

Owing to the treacherous tactics of this leading group, the Bolsheviks of Georgia were unable to utilize the favourable revolutionary situation at the end of 1917 to seize power.

The nationalist deviationists launched their first attack against the national policy of our Party in 1921, in connection with the amalgamation of

* Proclamation of the "Caucasian Territorial Committee of the R.S.D.L.P." Quoted from *Kavkazsky Rabochy*, December 1, 1917.

the railways of Transcaucasia, the amalgamation of the Boards for Foreign Trade of the individual republics, and the liquidation of customs and inspection points on the borders between the Soviet Republics of Transcaucasia.

The victory of the Soviet Socialist Revolution, the establishment of Soviet rule and the imperative need for joint action in restoring the national economy and building Socialism at once raised the question of how to establish lasting national peace and close fraternal collaboration between the peoples of Transcaucasia. Therefore, in 1921 the basis was laid for the economic amalgamation of the Republics of Transcaucasia. On April 9, 1921, Lenin issued direct instructions to set up a regional economic body for the Republics of Transcaucasia. In answer to the report of Comrade S. Orjonikidze on the difficult economic situation of the Republics of Transcaucasia, Lenin replied:

"I received your code message about the desperate food situation in Transcaucasia. We have taken a number of measures, have given some gold to Armenia, and confirmed the various instructions given to the Commissariat for Food Supplies. But I must warn you that we are in great need here, and shall not be able to help. *I urgently demand that a regional economic organ for the entire Transcaucasus be established* . . .* that efforts be made to buy seeds, even abroad, and that the irrigation of Azerbaijan be pushed

* My italics.—L. B.

with the help of Baku resources, in order to develop agriculture and cattle-raising, and also that efforts be made to promote the exchange of goods with the North Caucasus. Have you and the Georgian comrades grasped the significance of our new policy in connection with the food tax? Read this to them and send me information more often. . . .”*

During 1921 only the Transcaucasian railways and the Boards for Foreign Trade could be amalgamated, because the group of Georgian nationalist deviationists in every way delayed and hindered the economic amalgamation of the Republics of Transcaucasia.

The main barrier to the fraternal union of the peoples of Transcaucasia was the survivals of national chauvinism inherited from the time when the counter-revolutionary nationalist governments of the Mensheviks, Dashnaks and Mussavatists existed. Therefore, for the purpose of uniting the efforts of the Republics of Transcaucasia for joint socialist construction it was necessary first of all to eradicate these elements of nationalism and national dissension, to create an atmosphere of mutual confidence, and to restore the old fraternal inter-national bonds between the peoples of Transcaucasia.

That is why Lenin, in his historic letter to the Communists of the Caucasus (April 14, 1921), attached exceptional significance to the establishment of peace among the nationalities.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 188-91.

“ . . . I permit myself to express the hope,” writes Lenin in this letter, “that their close alliance” (of the Soviet Republics of the Caucasus.—*L. B.*) “will serve as a model of national peace, unprecedented under the bourgeoisie and impossible under the bourgeois system.”*

Comrade Stalin, in the address “On the Immediate Tasks of Communism in Georgia and in Transcaucasia” he delivered at the meeting of the Tiflis Party organization on July 6, 1921, stated that the main political task that faced the Communists of Transcaucasia was to wage a relentless struggle against nationalism.

He said:

“I remember the years 1905-17, when complete fraternal solidarity was to be observed among the workers and the toiling population of the Transcaucasian nationalities in general, when bonds of brotherhood held together the Armenian, Georgian, Azerbaijanian and Russian workers in one socialist family. Now, upon my arrival in Tiflis, I have been astounded by the absence of the former solidarity between the workers of the nationalities of Transcaucasia. Nationalism has developed among the workers and peasants, and a feeling of mistrust towards the comrades of other nationalities has grown strong: anti-Armenian, anti-Tatar, anti-Georgian, anti-Russian

* “To the Communist Comrades of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia, Daghestan and the Gorsky Republic.” V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI, p. 191.

and every other sort of nationalism is now rife. The old bonds of fraternal confidence are severed, or at least greatly weakened. Evidently, the three years' existence of nationalist governments in Georgia (Mensheviks), in Azerbaijan (Mussavatists) and in Armenia (Dashnaks) did not pass without effect. By carrying out their national policies, by working among the toilers in a spirit of aggressive nationalism, these nationalist governments finally brought matters to the point where each of these small countries found itself surrounded by a hostile nationalist atmosphere which deprived Georgia and Armenia of Russian grain and Azerbaijan oil, and Azerbaijan and Russia of goods going through Batum—not to speak of armed clashes (Georgian-Armenian war) and massacres (Armenian-Tatar), the natural result of the nationalist policy. No wonder that in the poisonous nationalist atmosphere the old bonds between the nationalities have become sundered and the minds of the workers poisoned by nationalism. And since the survivals of this nationalism have not yet been eliminated among the workers, this circumstance (nationalism) is the greatest hindrance to the amalgamation of the economic (and military) efforts of the Transcaucasian Soviet Republics. . . . It is therefore the immediate task of the Communists of Georgia to put up a ruthless fight against nationalism, to restore the old fraternal bonds between the various nationalities, bonds that had existed before the nationalist Menshevik government

came on the scene, and thus create that healthy atmosphere of mutual confidence which is necessary for concerted economic effort on the part of the Transcaucasian Soviet Republics, and for the economic revival of Georgia.”*

These instructions by Lenin and Stalin predetermined the formation of the Transcaucasian Federation.

Despite the amalgamation of the railways and of the Boards for Foreign Trade, the Soviet Republics of Transcaucasia continued to lead self-contained lives. Each of them had its own currency and was walled in by customs barriers and frontier points of inspection. The nationalist deviationists made the frontier question an object of discussion at the special conference of official representatives of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan, which they tried to conduct according to all the rules of the art of diplomacy. At the First Congress of the Communist Party of Georgia, Budu Mdivani said the following on the question of frontiers.

“As to the delimitation of frontiers, we told the Armenian Communists that there were no disputes between us, but that there was lack of clarity, and that for tactical reasons it was better to take a referendum in the regions in dispute.”**

On July 2, 1921, the Caucasian Bureau of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol V, pp. 95-97.

** From the *Stenographic Report of the Second Congress of the Communist Organizations of Transcaucasia*, p. 60, Tiflis 1923. Published by the Transcaucasian Territorial Committee.

(Bolsheviks) for the first time censured the nationalist deviation of a group of Georgian comrades. The minutes of the Plenum of the Caucasian Bureau of the C.C. of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) for July 2 and 3, 1921, state:

“Noting the deviation towards nationalism manifested in the decision on the questions of the Board for Foreign Trade, of the territorial delimitation of the Republics, and of the abolition of customs and inspection points, the Caucasian Bureau instructs the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Transcaucasian Republics strictly to impress upon all Party representatives that it is necessary to approach the solution of such questions solely from the standpoint of the interests of the fraternal bond connecting the toiling masses of these Republics.”*

At the end of 1921, in view of the fact that close economic and political collaboration among the Transcaucasian Republics was impossible without their political union, the question of the need for a federation of the Transcaucasian Republics was raised. On November 3, 1921, the Plenum of the Caucasian Bureau of the C.C. of the R.C.P.(B.), in which Comrade Molotov, the Secretary of the C.C. of the R.C.P.(B.), took part, adopted the following decision on the establishment of a federation of the Transcaucasian Republics:

* Party History Archives, File No. 31, Leat 3, “Minutes of the Plenum of the Caucasian Bureau of the C. C. of the R.C.P.(B.),” July 2-3, 1921.

“The existence as isolated states of the Transcaucasian Republics enfeebles them in the face of the capitalist and bourgeois countries; a close political union will serve as a reliable guarantee against any attempts upon them on the part of counter-revolutionary forces and will strengthen Soviet rule on the borders of the Near East.

“Political union will enable the Republics really to establish a close economic alliance among themselves, attempts to conclude which have been made repeatedly. Moreover, the disunity between the Republics has aggravated the already difficult economic situation of Transcaucasia, the poverty and ruin of the masses of the people, and has brought on a series of misunderstandings among the Republics. Transcaucasia is a single economic unit and its economic development can proceed only on the condition of an all-Caucasian economic union.

“Finally, the numerous People’s Commissariats and other government offices in the Republics consume a great amount of forces and resources and create unnecessary duplication in the work of many bodies; therefore joint effort in the sphere of administration in the chief and most important departments of governmental activity will strengthen and improve Soviet work.

“In accordance with the foregoing, the Caucasian Bureau considers:

“1) That it is urgently necessary to conclude a federative union between the Republics, pri-

marily in the sphere of military, economic and financial work and foreign policy;

"2) That it is necessary to set up an administrative and economic centre for the Transcaucasian Republics (Union Soviet)."*

A group of deviationists (including Budu Mdivani, Koté Tsintsadze, Ph. Makharadze, S. Kavtaradze, M. Okujava, M. Toroshelidze and L. Dumbadze) came out openly against the establishment of the Transcaucasian Federation. The deviationists tried to make out that the federation of the Transcaucasian Republics was an imposition of the Caucasian Bureau and Comrade S. Orjonikidze personally, and that Lenin and Stalin did not support the idea of the Transcaucasian Federation.

It is a known fact that the inspirers and organizers of the Transcaucasian Federation were Lenin and Stalin.

In his report at the Twelfth Party Congress, Comrade Stalin, speaking on the question of the formation of the Transcaucasian Federation, said:

"On November 28, 1921, Comrade Lenin sent me a draft of his proposal for the formation of a federation of the Transcaucasian Republics. It proposes:

"(1) To recognize the federation of the Transcaucasian Republics as absolutely correct in principle and its realization as absolutely necessary,

* Party History Archives, File No. 31, "Minutes of the Evening Session of the Plenum of the Caucasian Bureau of the C.C. of the R.C.P.(B.)," November 3, 1921.

although it would be premature to apply it in practice immediately, i. e., it would require several weeks for discussion and propaganda, and for carrying it through from below;

“(2) To instruct the Central Committees of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan to carry out this decision.’

“I wrote to Comrade Lenin and suggested that there be no hurry about this, to wait a little, to give the local functionaries a certain period of time to carry through the federation. I wrote to him:

“‘Comrade Lenin, I am not opposed to your resolution, if you agree to accept the following amendment: instead of the words “would require several weeks for discussion,” in Point I, say: “would require a certain period of time for discussion,” and so on, as per your resolution. The point is that in Georgia it is impossible to “carry through,” a federation “from below” by “Soviet procedure” in “several weeks,” since in Georgia the Soviets are only just beginning to be organized. They are not yet built up. A month ago, they did not exist at all, and to call a congress of Soviets there in “several weeks” is inconceivable; and, well, a Transcaucasian federation without Georgia would be a federation on paper only. I think it necessary to allow two or three months for the idea of a federation to triumph among the broad masses of Georgia. *Stalin.*’

“Comrade Lenin answered: ‘I accept this amendment. . . .’

“ . . . This decision was adopted by the Political Bureau at the end of 1921 . . . unanimously. The struggle of the group of Georgian Communists, headed by Mdivani, against the instructions of the Central Committee concerning federation dates back to this time. You see, comrades, that the case was not as it has been represented by Mdivani. I cite this document against those unseemly insinuations which Mdivani made here.”*

The Georgian deviationists repeatedly protested to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (B.) against the formation of the Transcaucasian Federation.

In reply to the appeals and complaints of the Georgian deviationists, the Central Committee of the Party headed by Lenin and Stalin, on April 5, 1922, once more passed a resolution on the Transcaucasian Federation. This decision stated:

“The struggle to strengthen peace among nations and the fraternal solidarity of the toiling masses of Transcaucasia remains, as before, the major political task of the Communist Party. The Central Committee, in particular, reaffirms its decision on the federation of the Transcaucasian Republics, charging the Communist Party of Transcaucasia to carry out this decision unconditionally and without reservation.”**

Under the leadership of the Caucasian Bureau of the Central Committee of the R.C.P.(B.), the

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. V, pp 229-30.

** Quoted from the pamphlet, *Ten Years of the Transcaucasian Federation*, pp. 14-15. Zakkniga, Tiflis 1932.

Transcaucasian Party organizations popularized the idea of the Transcaucasian Federation among the masses of the working population, through the Party, Young Communist League, and trade union organizations, mobilizing them around the idea of a state union of the Transcaucasian Republics.

On March 12, 1922, a plenipotentiary conference of the Central Executive Committees of Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia established the Federative Union of Socialist Republics of Transcaucasia. At this conference a federal treaty was adopted, by which a Union Soviet and a Supreme Economic Council attached to it were established on the following basis:

“I. Supreme power in the Union of Republics shall be vested in a Plenipotentiary Conference of Representatives, to be elected in equal numbers by the governments of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia.

“II. The executive organ of the Plenipotentiary Conference are a ‘Union Soviet,’ the members of which are elected and subject to recall by the Conference.

“III. The ‘Union Soviet’ shall be in charge of military affairs, finance, foreign affairs, foreign trade, transport, means of communication, the struggle against counter-revolution, and the direction of economic policy on the territory of the contracting Republics. . . .”*

The Transcaucasian Federation, which was acclaimed with enthusiasm by the toiling masses, met

* Party History Archives, File No. 31, p. 12.

with furious opposition on the part of the bourgeois and aristocratic elements, the chauvinist bourgeois intelligentsia and the remnants of the defeated anti-Soviet parties—the Mensheviks, Dashnaks and Mussavatists. Reflecting these nationalist-chauvinist sentiments, the nationalist-deviationist opposition launched a fierce attack against the Transcaucasian Fèdération, and soon demanded that it be dissolved and that Georgia enter the Soviet Union directly.

Let us cite two documents:

On September 15, 1922, the Central Committee of Georgia, led by the deviationists, adopted a decision to “prèserve the attributes of independence.” It read as follows:

“That union in the form of making the independent republics autonomous, as proposed in accordance with Comrade Stalin’s theses, be deemed premature.

“That concerted economic effort and a common policy be deemed necessary, but that all the attributes of independence be preserved.”*

On October 21, 1922, the Central Committee of Georgia, after hearing Koté Tsintsadze’s report on the results of the visit of a special commission to Moscow, adopted a mendacious and contradictory decision to dissolve the Federation. The decision was:

“1. To accept the report as a whole.

“2. Fully to accept and undeviatingly carry

* Archives of the C.C. of the C.P.(B.) of Georgia, “Minutes of the Plenum of the C.C. of the C P.(B.) of Georgia,” No. 13, September 15, 1922.

out the decision of the Plenum of the C.C. of the R.C.P. on the federation of the Soviet Republics.

"3. To petition the C.C. of the R.C.P. that Georgia be admitted directly into the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

"4. In the event of the C.C. of the R.C.P. granting the petition of the C.C. of the Communist Party of Georgia for the direct admission of Georgia into the Union of Soviet Republics, to consider the existence of the Transcaucasian Union Soviet superfluous."*

A small group in the Azerbaijan Communist Party also opposed the formation of the federation, claiming that the time was not ripe (R. Akhundov** and others). There were opponents of the federation in the ranks of the Azerbaijan Communist Party (Bolsheviks)—Kadyrli and others—who came out more openly, demanding the dissolution of the Transcaucasian Federation and the direct entry of Azerbaijan into the U.S.S.R.

The Azerbaijan Communist Party, headed by Comrade Kirov, quickly routed the nationalist deviationists.

The Baku proletariat, true to the international banner of Lenin and Stalin, took its place in the front ranks of those fighting for the formation of a strong Transcaucasian Federation.

The Transcaucasian Party organization, under the

* Archives of the C.C. of the C.P.(B.) of Georgia, "Minutes of the Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.(B.) Georgia," No. 15, October 21, 1922.

** In 1936 R. Akhundov was exposed as an enemy of the people.

leadership of Comrade S. Orjonikidze, dealt a crushing blow to nationalist deviationism and brought about the establishment of a Federative Union of the Republics of Transcaucasia.

At the end of 1922 a further step towards the strengthening of the economic and political union between the Republics of Transcaucasia was taken by transforming the Federative Union of Transcaucasian Republics into a single Federative Republic (Transcaucasian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic), each affiliated republic retaining its independence.

The T.S.F.S.R. became a powerful instrument of peace between the nationalities, for the fraternal collaboration of the peoples of Transcaucasia, and an organ for uniting their efforts in the work of socialist construction.

Despite the decision of the Central Committee of the R.C.P.(B.) and Lenin's and Stalin's instructions, a group of Georgian deviationists (headed by Budu Mdivani, Ph. Makharadze, Koté Tsintsadze, M. Okujava, and others), far from putting a stop to the anti-Party struggle, fought harder than ever against the Transcaucasian Federation. The Central Committee of the R.C.P.(B.) was therefore obliged to return once more to the question of the federation. Let us cite two documents:

1. Comrade Stalin's telegram of October 16, 1922, to the Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party (Bolsheviks).

"The proposal of the Georgian C.C. concerning the prematureness of amalgamation and the pres-

ervation of independence was unanimously rejected by the Plenum of the C.C. In view of such unanimity at the Plenum, the representative of the C.C. of Georgia, Mdivani, was obliged to abandon the proposal of the Georgian C.C. The proposal of the members of the commission: Stalin, Orjonikidze, Myasnikov and Molotov, to preserve the Transcaucasian Federation, and incorporate it, together with the R.S.F.S.R., the Ukraine and Byelorussia, in the 'Union of Socialist Soviet Republics' was adopted by the Plenum without any amendment. The text of the resolution follows with Comrade Orjonikidze. The C.C. of the R.C.P. has no doubt that its instructions will be carried out with enthusiasm."*

2. Lenin's telegram of October 21, 1922.

"I am astonished at the unseemly tone of the wire signed by Tsintsadze and others, delivered to me by Comrade Bukharin and not by one of the secretaries of the C.C. I was convinced that the disagreements had been settled by the decision of the Plenum of the C.C. with my indirect participation, and with the direct participation of Mdivani. I therefore emphatically condemn your vituperation against Orjonikidze, and insist that you submit your conflict in a decent and loyal tone for settlement by the Secretariat of the C.C., to which I am communicating your message by direct wire. Lenin."**

* Archives of the C. C. of the C.P.(B.) of Georgia for 1922.

** Archives of the Georgian Branch of the M.E.L.I.

Georgian nationalist deviationism arose in the period of the New Economic Policy (NEP), and constituted an openly Right opportunist group which had lapsed into Menshevik positions both on the national question and on questions of general policy. Georgian nationalist deviationism arose not so much from the tendency to combat Great-Russian nationalism as from the tendency of aggressive Georgian nationalism, directed against the non-Georgian nationalities of Transcaucasia, and primarily against the Armenians.

Nationalist deviationism wanted to make use of Georgia's geographic and economic advantages, which were due to her possession of such important central points as Tiflis and Batum. On this basis the nationalist deviationists, in demanding withdrawal from the Federation, wanted to create and develop privileges for the Georgians at the expense of Soviet Azerbaijan and Armenia, and still more at the expense of the national minorities—the Abkhazians, Ajarians, Ossetians, Armenians, and others.

The Georgian deviationists fought against granting autonomy to the national minorities of Georgia. The then existing Central Committee and the Revolutionary Committee of Georgia (B. Mdivani, S. Kavtaradze, M. Okujava, K. Tsintsadze, and others) did everything in their power to delay the granting of autonomy to Southern Ossetia, Ajaristan and Abkhazia. Autonomy for these Republics was granted and put into effect against the will of the deviationist majority of the Central Committee and the Revolutionary Committee of Georgia. It is well

known that one of the leaders of Georgian deviationism, B. Mdivani, voted against the decision to include the town of Tskhinvali in the South Ossetian Autonomous Region, and that another leader of the deviationists, S. Kavtaradze, refused to send greetings to the Red Ajarian Mejlis in the name of the Central Committee and Revolutionary Committee of Georgia. The Georgian deviationists proposed as a centre for Ajaristan, not Batum, but Khulo or Kedy. (*Laughter.*)

Thus rejection of the Transcaucasian Federation and struggle against it, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, rejection of autonomy for the national minorities of Georgia and struggle against autonomy for Southern Ossetia, Ajaristan and Abkhazia constituted the nationalist theory and practice of Georgian deviationism.

Nationalist deviationism represented a fairly many-sided system of nationalist Menshevik views. It is known that the Georgian deviationists made an attempt to pass a decree "to relieve the congestion" of Tiflis, the effect of which would have been the expulsion of members of the non-Georgian nationalities, primarily of the Armenians. Another well-known fact is the cordon decree, termed "monstrous" by Comrade Stalin, under which Georgia was fenced off from the Soviet Republics; also the decree on citizenship, according to which a Georgian woman who married a man of another nationality (a non-Georgian) was deprived of the rights of Georgian citizenship. (*Laughter.*) Here are these documents:

1) On March 31, 1922, the following telegram was sent, bearing the signatures of Comrade Makh-aradze, Chairman of the Central Executive Committee of Georgia, and Okurjava, Vice-Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars:

"Rostov-on-Don, to the Executive Committee, copy to the Central Evacuation Board; Novorossiisk, to the Executive Committee, copy to the Chief of the Evacuation Board; Vladikavkaz, to the Chairman of the C.E.C. of the Gorsky Republic, copy to the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars; Batum, to the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of Ajaristan, copies to the Chairman of the Executive Committee, the Chairman of the Transcaucasian Cheka, the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs of Georgia, the Chairman of the Cheka of Georgia, the Chief of Railways of the Transcaucasian Republic, the Chairman of the C.E.C. of Abkhazia, the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs of Georgia:

"As from this date, the frontiers of the Georgian Republic are declared closed; hereafter admission of refugees to the territory of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Georgia is discontinued. We urgently request corresponding instructions to the respective organs. Please acknowledge receipt of this telegram. . . ."

2) "§1. Persons receiving permission for their relatives to enter Georgian territory shall pay 50,000 rubles for such permits. [In Georgian notes: one million rubles equal to ten gold rubles.]

"§2. Government institutions requesting the issuance of entry permits to persons who may be needed because of their special knowledge shall pay 500,000 rubles.

"§5. Persons who arrived in Georgia after August 13, 1917, and who wish to receive permission to reside in Georgia permanently, shall, if their request be granted, pay 1,000,000 rubles for the issuance of such permits.

"§6. Persons who on August 13, 1922, shall have resided in Georgia for five years . . . shall pay 1,000,000 rubles for the right of further residence in Georgia. . . .

"§8. The following persons who arrived in Georgia after August 13, 1917, shall have the right to remain in the country:

" . . . 3. All members of trade unions who have been members for six months on the day of the issuance of this order.

"4. Citizens who have business relations with Georgia. "

"Georgian citizenship shall be lost: by any Georgian female citizen who shall marry a foreigner."*

Thus, nationalist deviationism represented openly expressed, aggressive Georgian chauvinism, which might have transformed Transcaucasia into an arena of inter-national conflicts, which might have restored the situation that existed under Menshevik rule, when in

* *Stenographic Report of the Twelfth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.)*, 1923 edition, pp. 159-61.

fits of chauvinistic fury people resorted to fire and murder against each other.

In his report on the national question at the Twelfth Party Congress, Comrade Stalin described Georgian nationalist deviationism as follows:

“But there is still a third factor hindering the amalgamation of the Republics into a single union: it is the existence of nationalism in the individual republics. The New Economic Policy affects not only the Russian, but also the non-Russian population. The New Economic Policy is fostering private trade and industry not only in the centre of Russia, but also in the individual republics. And this New Economic Policy, and private capital, which is associated with it, nourish and foster Georgian, Azerbaijan, Uzbek and other nationalism. . . . If this nationalism were only defensive, it might not be worth making a fuss about. We could concentrate our entire action, our entire struggle, on Great-Russian chauvinism in the hope that if this powerful enemy were overcome, anti-Russian nationalism would be overcome with it; for, I repeat, this nationalism is in the long run a reaction to Great-Russian nationalism, a reply to it, a certain form of defence. Yes, that would be so if anti-Russian nationalism in the localities were nothing more than a reaction to Russian nationalism. But the trouble is that in some republics this defensive nationalism is turning into aggressive nationalism.

“Take Georgia. Over 30 per cent of its population are non-Georgians. They include Armenians,

Abkhazians, Ajarians, Ossetians and Tatars. The Georgians are at the head. Among some of the Georgian Communists the idea has sprung up and has been developing that there is no particular need to reckon with these small nationalities: they are less cultured, less developed, and there is therefore no need to reckon with them, they say. This is chauvinism—harmful and dangerous chauvinism; for it may turn, and has already turned, the small Republic of Georgia into an arena of discord.”*

On a number of questions of general Party policy, the Georgian deviationists assumed an openly opportunist position, lapsing into Menshevism. On the agrarian and peasant question, the deviationists entered upon a Menshevik, kulak land policy. They stubbornly resisted the carrying out of the Bolshevik agrarian reform, ostensibly on the ground that there was no landlordism in Georgia, but actually out of solicitude for the Georgian princes and nobles. The C.C. and the Revolutionary Committee of Georgia, in which the national deviationists predominated, hindered and delayed the carrying out of the land reform, and, although Soviet rule had existed for two years, the land remained in the hands of the landowners, princes and other noblemen.

On January 25, 1923, Comrade Orjonikidze, in summing up the results of the kulak land policy of the deviationists, wrote:

“In its two years’ existence the People’s Com-

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. V. pp. 248-50.

missariat of Agriculture has had no clear idea of what is going on in our countryside. Otherwise, how is it that the biggest landholdings in the counties are still untouched and that the former princes and noblemen are still sitting tight . . . the landlords are living on their old estates, the estates of their grandfathers, while the peasants are completely dependent economically on their good old landlords and princes, as before. . . . According to the report of Comrade Shabanov, Chairman of the Executive Committee of Borchalin County, matters are no better there. The old tsarist generals, the former princes Abkhazi and Tumanovs, and the Counts Kuchenbakh are still in possession of their estates and do not even allow the peasants to make roads through 'their' property. To our shame, nearly every one of these gentlemen has a special certificate, given him by some Soviet official in the People's Commissariat of Agriculture, guaranteeing him immunity and undisturbed possession. . . . An equally depressing picture is presented by Signakhi and Dushet counties, where the most illustrious princes Abkhazi, Mukhranskys, Andronikovs and Cholokayevs are living in clover in their fine mansions, jeering at the peasants and at Soviet rule."*

The Georgian deviationists openly advocated a Right opportunist position on questions of foreign

* S. Orjonikidze, "We Must Drastically Put an End to the Outrages in the Countryside," *Zarya Vostoka* (*Dawn of the East*), No. 182, January 25, 1923.

trade also. It is a known fact that the deviationists demanded that the Batum oil fields be denationalized and leased as a concession to the imperialist Standard Oil Company.

It is also known that the nationalist deviationists looked to the West in economic matters, with an eye to cheap goods from Constantinople.

The nationalist deviationists strongly urged that a private bank be opened in Tiflis or Batum, as was proposed by the capitalist adventurer Khoshtaria. This bank was to be a branch of the Ottoman Bank, in actual fact a subsidiary of Anglo-French capital.

If this orientation towards the capitalist West had been effected, it would have made Transcaucasia, and Georgia in particular, an appendage of foreign capital.

The Georgian deviationists adopted an openly liberal-conciliatory attitude towards the Georgian Mensheviks.

As is known, at the beginning of the Sovietization of Georgia an amnesty was declared for the Mensheviks, who promptly took advantage of it in order to organize an underground and semi-underground struggle against Soviet rule.

The Caucasian Bureau of the C.C. of the R.C.P.(B.), headed by Comrade Sergo Orjonikidze, set the aim of ruthlessly combating the Mensheviks, both by intensifying ideological and political work against Menshevik influence, and by taking repressive measures against the Menshevik counter-revolutionaries.

The deviationist group strongly opposed the tactics of uncompromising struggle against the Menshe-

viks, and substituted the policy of smashing the Mensheviks by a policy of "peacefully overcoming and re-educating" the Menshevik counter-revolutionaries.

In order to gauge rightly the depths to which the Georgian deviationists had fallen with their liberal-conciliatory attitude towards the Mensheviks, it is sufficient merely to recall what militant Georgian Menshevism was throughout its entire history.

From its very inception, Georgian Menshevism, headed by Jordania, falsified Marxism and adapted it to bourgeois nationalism and bourgeois democracy.

During the years of the first Russian revolution (1905-07) the Georgian Mensheviks, in alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie, fought against the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, against the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants.

During the years of reaction the Georgian Mensheviks constituted the extreme Right wing of the Liquidators. Jordania and the Georgian Mensheviks repudiated the demand for a democratic republic, "in order to preserve their alliance with the bourgeoisie. The Georgian Mensheviks were the most active "builders" of the Stolypin "Labour Party."

During the imperialist war the Georgian Mensheviks were the most blatant defencists and armour-bearers of tsarism and the Russian bourgeoisie; they helped the tsarist satraps to smash the Bolshevik illegal organizations.

After the February Revolution the Georgian Mensheviks came out on the war question in favour of

"a fight to a victorious finish," and opposed the granting of independence to Finland and the Ukraine, advocating a single, indivisible bourgeois Russia.

The Georgian Mensheviks were the vilest traitors and betrayers of the Georgian people. After the victory of the October Socialist Revolution they severed Georgia from revolutionary Russia, entered into an alliance first with German and then with Anglo-French imperialism, and together with the Dashnaks and Mussavatists turned Transcaucasia into a *place d'armes* for foreign intervention and bourgeois, Whiteguard counter-revolution against Soviet Russia (the alliance of the Mensheviks with Denikin, Alexeyev and other Whiteguard generals to fight the Soviets).

The Georgian Mensheviks were the basest betrayers of the interests of the Georgian peasantry. They saved the Georgian princes and noblemen from the revolutionary wrath of the peasants; they crushed the revolutionary uprisings of the peasants in Mingrelia, Guria, Lechkhum, Kakhetia, Southern Ossetia, Dushet and other counties; they were the executors of the Stolypin agrarian policy.

The Mensheviks inspired and organized all the forces of reaction—the nobles, the princes, the clergy and the bourgeoisie—against the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants of Georgia. Menshevik "democracy" was the last anchor of the bourgeois and aristocratic order.

The Mensheviks organized the policy of bestial national chauvinism and incited the nations of Transcaucasia against each other. It was they, the

Georgian Purishkeviches, who organized a bloody campaign against the national minorities of Georgia—the Ossetians, Abkhazians and Ajarians.

It was they, who, together with the Dashnaks, organized the bloody fratricidal Georgian-Armenian war. It was the Georgian Mensheviks, together with the Mussavatists and the Dashnaks, who organized the Shamkhor pogrom against the revolutionary soldiers.

After the victory of the Socialist Revolution in Transcaucasia and Georgia the remnants of defeated Georgian Menshevism did not cease their struggle against the proletarian dictatorship and Communism for a single day. The Georgian Mensheviks, headed by Jordania and Ramishvili, took the path of bloody adventurism in their struggle against Soviet rule.

Relying on the Georgian princes, nobles, shopkeepers, clergy and their like, and supported financially and otherwise by the Anglo-French imperialists and their general staffs, the Georgian Mensheviks, in August 1924, organized a sham insurrection against the Soviet government in Georgia.

This is what Comrade Stalin said about the Menshevik adventure of 1924:

“Our newspapers write about the sham events in Georgia. This is correct, for, on the whole, the insurrection in Georgia was a staged, and not a popular insurrection.”*

The dregs of the fascist counter-revolutionary Men-

* J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. VI, p. 308.

shevik party, headed by N. Jordania, sold themselves outright to the imperialists and interventionists, placing all their hopes on counter-revolutionary war and intervention by the imperialist powers against the Soviet Union. They became common spies and scouts of the general staffs and intelligence services of the imperialist states, direct agents of fascism and imperialism.

And it is with these monsters that the Georgian deviationists attempted to establish friendly relations!

Despite the resistance of the Georgian nationalist deviationists, the Communist Party of Georgia achieved the final defeat of counter-revolutionary Menshevism, and won from the Mensheviks those groups of misguided workers and peasants who had followed them in the past.

The victory of Socialism in our country, the victory of socialist industrialization and the collective-farm system, the tremendous rise in industry, agriculture and culture—national in form and socialist in content—have put an end to Menshevism in Georgia.

All this, of course, does not mean that in the present conditions of acute class struggle and liquidation of classes, some of the remnants of Menshevism cannot revive and become active in various fields of our work of construction.

The Georgian deviationist opposition met with the full sympathy and support of aggressive Georgian Menshevism and the national-chauvinist intellectual.

The Georgian Mensheviks repeatedly called on

the nationalist deviationists to fight against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the period of 1927-35 nationalist deviationism, merging with counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, became the hired agency of fascism, an unprincipled and depraved gang of spies, wreckers, diversionists, secret agents and murderers, a rabid gang of sworn enemies of the working class.

In 1936 a Trotskyite spying and wrecking terrorist centre was unearthed, which included B. Mdivani, M. Okujava, M. Toroshelidze, S. Chikhladze, N. Kiknadze, and others.

The Georgian Trotskyite centre worked under the leadership and on the instructions of the all-Union joint Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre of which it was a branch.

The members of the now exposed Georgian Trotskyite centre and its active followers were all nationalist deviationists. Some of them had been exiled for counter-revolutionary activities and on their return had wormed their way into the Party under false pretenses. The others consisted of secret Trotskyites who had previously escaped detection and exposure.

As we know, the former nationalist deviationists stubbornly denied their past connection with Trotsky. We now have documentary proof that the treacherous work of the nationalist deviationists against the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.(B.), against Comrade Stalin, against the national policy of Lenin and Stalin, was guided directly by that arch-bandit Judas Trotsky ever since 1923.

Cornered by the evidence brought out by the investigation, the members of the Georgian counter-revolutionary fascist-Trotskyite centre and other arrested active Trotskyites admitted to their crimes against the Party, the Soviet State and the Georgian people.

In their confessions they unfolded a monstrous picture of their vile, treacherous, destructive work of espionage and wrecking.

The chief aim of the Georgian Trotskyite centre, like that of the all-Union joint Trotskyite-Zinovievite terrorist centre, was to overthrow Soviet government and restore the capitalist system.

Counting on the defeat of the Soviet Union in the impending war with the capitalist powers, the Trotskyites did all in their power to weaken the might of our socialist country by espionage, sabotage and wrecking. Their intention was to sever Transcaucasia, and Georgia in particular, from the Soviet Union, and with the help of all anti-Soviet forces to form an "independent" Georgian state as a protectorate of one of the capitalist powers.

For this purpose the Georgian Trotskyites, in the person of Budu Mdivani, formed a bloc with representatives of the defeated remnants of the anti-Soviet parties of the Georgian Mensheviks and others; abroad, they formed a bloc with the contemptible traitor and mortal enemy of the Georgian people, and hireling of the imperialists, Noah Jordania.

The Georgian Trotskyites stooped to the basest and most criminal means of struggle against the Party, the Soviet State and the people. They car-

ried on systematic wrecking, sabotage and espionage in various fields of socialist construction in Georgia.

These vile traitors and murderers, the Georgian Trotskyite counter-revolutionaries, sold the Georgian people wholesale and retail, intent on surrendering Georgia to the European imperialist sharks to be torn and plundered, intent on making Georgia and Transcaucasia a colony of imperialism and casting the bloody yoke of fascism upon the free and happy Georgian people.

And this foul riffraff, this rabid gang of spies, bandits and wreckers, who had lost all traces of humanity, tried to pose as spokesmen of the Georgian people!

Our Party and our Soviet government with mighty Stalinist blows crushed and destroyed these despicable vipers, these hired agents of fascism.

The Transcaucasian Bolsheviks went through a thorough schooling in the struggle against nationalist deviationism and, after defeating the nationalists and nationalist deviationists, formed and strengthened the Transcaucasian Federation—a powerful instrument of peace between the nationalities, of joint socialist construction and of the economic and cultural renaissance of the nations of Transcaucasia.

In 1936, with the adoption of the Stalin Constitution of the U.S.S.R., the Transcaucasian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic was dissolved, and the Republics of Transcaucasia—Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia—entered the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics directly, as Union Republics with full rights.

The liquidation of the Transcaucasian S.F.S.R. was a direct result of the achievements and victories of the general line, and in particular of the national policy of our Party, achievements and victories won in the years of the revolution in the process of socialist construction in the Republics of Transcaucasia.

The Transcaucasian S.F.S.R. had performed a historical role, completely solving the tasks set before it. The Republics of Transcaucasia have become industrial-agrarian republics. The victory of the collective-farm system in the agriculture of Transcaucasia has been achieved. Enormous progress has been made in developing national culture. The Republics of Transcaucasia have produced Bolshevik national cadres that are wholly devoted to the Party of Lenin and Stalin.

Having broadened the economic and cultural ties of Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia with the other Republics, Territories and Regions of the Soviet Union, the victories of socialist construction prepared the conditions for the liquidation of the Transcaucasian Federation and the direct entrance of the Transcaucasian Republics into the Soviet Union.

The new Constitution of the U.S.S.R. ensures the further strengthening of the Stalin-created friendship between the nations of Transcaucasia and the whole Soviet Union, it ensures great new achievements for the national policy of Lenin and Stalin.

Thus:

1) *Nationalist deviationism in the ranks of the Bolshevik, Communist Party of Georgia represented*

a Right-opportunist trend, which reflected the pressure of bourgeois-nationalist Menshevik elements upon certain sections of our Party organization.

Having entered upon the path of struggle against the Party, the nationalist-deviationist opposition lapsed into the position of Georgian Menshevism.

2) Nationalist deviationism represented aggressive chauvinism, reflecting the Great-Power bourgeois nationalism of the Georgian Mensheviks and national-democrats.

Having entered upon the path of struggle against the national policy of Lenin and Stalin, the nationalist deviationists fought furiously against the Transcaucasian Federation and the autonomy of Abkhazia, Ajaristan and South Ossetia, for the perpetuation of the oppression of the national minorities in Georgia.

3) In the agrarian and peasant question the nationalist deviationists reflected the interests and demands of the Georgian nobles and kulaks.

In defending the kulak agrarian policy, nationalist deviationism acted as the herald and champion of the capitalist path of development for our countryside.

4) The nationalist deviationists adopted an openly liberal, conciliatory position on the questions of the struggle against counter-revolutionary Menshevism. For the ruthless struggle of the Party and the Soviet State against the Menshevik counter-revolutionaries—the direct agents and accomplices of international imperialism, they substituted a

policy of "peaceful re-education" and collaboration with the Mensheviks, the bitterest enemies of the workers and peasants of Georgia.

5) The danger of nationalist deviationism lay in the fact that had it been victorious it would have strengthened the survivals of serfdom in the countryside, would have reinforced the position of the kulaks, would have made Georgia and Transcaucasia an arena of friction and bloody conflicts among its nationalities, would have undermined the united inter-national front of the Soviet Republics against imperialism, would have unleashed the reactionary forces of the Mensheviks and bourgeois nationalists, and in this way would have paved the way to imperialist intervention and the restoration of capitalism.

6) The nationalist deviationists lapsed into a Trotskyite-Menshevik position at the very start, under the banner of Trotskyism fought furiously against the Party of Lenin and Stalin and then, in the ranks of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, became hired agents of fascism, a rabid gang of spies, wreckers, saboteurs, murderers, vile betrayers and enemies of the people.

7) Armed with the national program of Lenin and Stalin, the Bolsheviks of Transcaucasia, the Communist Party of Georgia (Bolsheviks), defeated and crushed the nationalist deviationists, raised the indestructible edifice of the fraternal collaboration of the peoples of Transcaucasia, formed and strengthened the Transcaucasian Federation, a "model of peace among the nationalities unprece-

dented under the bourgeoisie and impossible under the bourgeois system." (L e n i n.)

8) *After forming and strengthening the Transcaucasian Federation, the Bolsheviki of Transcaucasia, under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, succeeded in attaining enormous achievements in socialist construction and great victories for the socialist system in the Republics of Transcaucasia, thereby creating the necessary conditions for the liquidation of the Transcaucasian Federation and the incorporation of the Republics of Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in accordance with the great Stalin Constitution.*

Loud and prolonged applause.

All rise. The hall resounds with shouts of:

"Long live the Great Stalin!"

"Hurrah for Comrade Stalin!"

"Long live the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union [Bolsheviks]!"



APPENDIX

**ON THE QUESTION
OF THE PRAGUE CONFERENCE**

A Reply to Various Comrades by Lavrenti Beria

In my lecture "On the History of the Bolshevik Organizations in Transcaucasia," I said:

"The Prague Conference of the Bolsheviks marks a turning point in the history of Bolshevism, for it officially split with Menshevism, expelled the Liquidator-Mensheviks from the Party and inaugurated the Bolshevik Party."

Several comrades—G. Demchenko (Moscow), J. Yunover (Leningrad), Sakharov (Baku), Likhachov (Kirovabad), Mshvenieradze (Tiflis), Akopov (Ijevan), and others—have requested me to explain this passage in my lecture.

Some of these comrades (Comrades Yunover, Demchenko and others) write that this passage gives rise to unclarity and doubt in their minds. Thus, for instance, Comrade Yunover writes:

"Dear Comrade Beria,

"While at the 'Fourth of March' Sanatorium No. 4 at Sukhum, I read your striking and very profound lecture. I am writing because I was somewhat puzzled by one passage in the lecture. In the third chapter of the lecture 'On the His-

tory of the Bolshevik Organizations in Transcaucasia' the following passage occurs:

"The Prague Conference of the Bolsheviks marks a turning point in the history of Bolshevism, for it officially split with Menshevism, expelled the Liquidator-Mensheviks from the Party and inaugurated the Bolshevik Party.

"In my work as propagandist I have been giving a different explanation of the quintessence of the Prague Conference. Can it be asserted that 'it officially split with Menshevism'? But the part that puzzles me most is where it says that it 'inaugurated the Bolshevik Party.' Do you not consider it possible to word this passage more precisely, especially since the textbooks on Party history do not always give a clear analysis of the significance of the Prague Conference? Your explanations will be of great assistance to me in my future work."

Other comrades (Comrades Sakharov, Likhachov and Akopov) consider the statement I made incorrect, and find that the formulation in question contradicts Lenin's well-known dictum that "Bolshevism, as a trend of political thought and as a political party, exists since 1903." Thus, for instance, Comrade Sakharov writes:

"In speaking of the Prague Conference of the Bolsheviks, you conclude that it 'inaugurated the Bolshevik Party.' This, I think, is not accurate. It is quite correct that the Prague Conference was a turning point in the history of Bolshevism, that in 1912 an end was put to the

- . formal alliance between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, which had been in effect since the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. But it is likewise generally known that Bolshevism had its origin, as an ideological trend, as early as the 'nineties, in Lenin's struggle against the legal Marxism of P. Struve, against Narodism, Economism, that it established itself in the period of the old *Iskra*; Bolshevism has been in existence as a political party since the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. . . . Evidently, the phrase that the Prague Conference 'inaugurated the Bolshevik Party' was simply an inexact expression, or possibly a technical inaccuracy; at any rate this is indisputably proven by the lecture itself. This phrase ought therefore to be corrected."

Bolshevism as a trend of political thought and as a political party has been in existence since the Second Congress of the Party. In the struggle against the Mensheviks for Lenin's program, tactics and organizational principles, the Bolsheviks pursued the line of a rupture, a split with the Menshevik-opportunists since 1903, when the Bolshevik faction was formed. This policy was confirmed both in the struggle for the convocation of the Third Congress and at the Third Party Congress itself, at which resolutions were adopted "On the Secessionist Section of the Party," "On Preparing the Conditions for a Fusion with the Mensheviks" and "On the Dissolution of Committees Which Shall Refuse to Accept the Decisions of the Third Congress."

These resolutions stated:

1) *"On the Secessionist Section of the Party":*

"The Congress declares that since the time of its fight against Economism, certain trends have been retained in the R.S.D.L.P. which, in various degrees and in various respects, are shades akin to Economism, characterized by a common tendency to belittle the importance of the elements of consciousness in the proletarian struggle and to subordinate them to the elements of spontaneity. On questions of organization, the representatives of these shades put forward, in theory, the principle of organization as a process, which is at variance with the planned character of Party work, while in practice they systematically deviate from Party discipline in very many cases, and in other cases preach the broad application of the elective principle to the least enlightened section of the Party, without taking into consideration the objective conditions of Russian life, and so strive to undermine the only possible basis for Party ties at the present time. On tactical questions they manifest themselves by their endeavour to narrow the scope of Party work, in that they oppose the adoption of completely independent Party tactics towards the liberal bourgeois parties, deny the possibility and desirability of our Party assuming the role of organizer in the people's uprising, and oppose the participation of the Party in a provisional democratic-revolutionary government under any conditions whatsoever.

"The Congress instructs all Party members to wage an energetic ideological struggle everywhere against such partial deviations from the principles of revolutionary Social-Democracy; at the same time it is of the opinion that persons who share such views in some measure or other may participate in Party organizations provided they recognize Party congresses and the Party rules and wholly submit to Party discipline." (My italics.—L. B.)

2) *"On Preparing the Conditions for a Fusion With the Mensheviks":*

"The Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. instructs the C.C. to take all measures for preparing and drawing up the conditions for fusion with the secessionist section of the R.S.D.L.P., these conditions to be submitted to a new Party congress for final approval."

3) *"On the Dissolution of Committees Which Shall Refuse to Accept the Decisions of the Third Congress":*

"In view of the possibility that some Menshevik organizations may refuse to accept the decisions of the Third Congress, the Congress instructs the C.C. to dissolve such organizations, and to sanction as committees parallel organizations which shall submit to the Congress, but only after it shall have been fully established by careful investigation that the Menshevik organizations and committees are unwilling to submit to Party discipline." (My italics.—L. B.)*

* *The C.P.S.U.(B.) in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the C.C., Part I, 6th ed., 1940, pp. 47, 53.*

All this bears out the fact that while consolidating the Bolshevik faction still more strongly and confirming, at the Third Congress, the policy of splitting with the Mensheviks, the Bolsheviks at that time had not yet brought the split to the point of the complete and final dissolution of formal unity with the Mensheviks, which took place later, at the Prague Conference in 1912.

It is likewise a known fact that while fighting "in most determined fashion against mixing the two sections of the Party" (*Lenin*), the Bolsheviks adopted a resolution at the Tammerfors Party Conference (1905) to merge the Party centres. This resolution stated:

"1) For the purpose of practical amalgamation and as a provisional measure until the unity congress, the Conference proposes the immediate and simultaneous fusion of the practical (centres) and central press organs on an equal footing, members of the editorial board being allowed to be members of the practical centre.

"The editorial board is to be guided by the instructions of the common centre. Whenever one-third of the editors want the editorial board to print their individual opinion, the board must do so with a corresponding editorial reservation.

"2) The Conference is in favour of the immediate fusion of the local parallel organizations.

"3) *On the convocation of a unity congress.* The united Central and Organizational Committees, or the joint council of the C.C. and the

O.C., if there shall have been no fusion, shall immediately announce the summoning of a unity congress of the R.S.D.L.P. with a view to holding the congress as soon as possible. Representation at the unity congress is to be elective and proportional. All members of Party organizations may take part in the election of the delegates, which shall be by direct and secret vote.”*

The Fourth Party Congress (1906) has gone down in the history of our Party as the Unity Congress. The C.C. elected by this Congress consisted of seven Mensheviks and three Bolsheviks. The Fifth (London) Congress was also a united congress; the C.C. of the R.S.D.L.P. which was elected at this Congress consisted of five Bolsheviks, four Mensheviks, two members from the S.-D.P. of Poland and Lithuania and one member from the Lettish Social-Democrats.

In this connection one should also recall the decisions of the Conference of the Enlarged Editorial Board of *Proletary* in 1909, referring to the question of the methods and tactics of our Party in the struggle against the Mensheviks prior to the Prague Conference. (It is a known fact that the Enlarged Editorial Board of *Proletary* was actually the Bolshevik centre elected at a meeting of the faction held at the close of the London Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.)

The resolution of this Conference, “The Tasks of the Bolsheviks in the Party,” stated:

* The C.P.S.U.(B.) in resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the C.C., Part I, 6th ed., pp. 57-58.

"At the present time, in laying down the fundamental tasks of the Bolsheviks, the Enlarged Editorial Board of *Proletary* declares:

"1) That in the further struggle for the Party and the Party principle, the task of the Bolshevik faction, which must remain the foremost champion of the Party principle and of the revolutionary Social-Democratic line in the Party, is actively to support the Central Committee and the central organ of the Party in every way. In the present period of the regrouping of Party forces, only the central institutions of the entire Party can serve as the authoritative and strong representative of the Party line around which all the genuine Party and Social-Democratic elements can be rallied;

"2) That in the Menshevik camp of the Party, with the official organ of the faction, the *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* (*Voice of the Social-Democrat*), completely captive to the Menshevik Liquidators, the minority of the faction, having explored the path of liquidationism to the very end, is already raising its voice in protest against this path and is again seeking a Party basis for its activities (the letter of the 'Vyborg' Mensheviks in St. Petersburg, the split among the Mensheviks in Moscow, the split on the Editorial Board of *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata*, the corresponding division in the *Bund*, etc.);

"3) That under such circumstances, the task of the Bolsheviks, who will remain the solid vanguard of the Party, is not only to continue the struggle against liquidationism and all

the varieties of revisionism, but also to establish closer contact with the Marxian and Party elements of the other factions, in accordance with the dictates of the common aims in the struggle for the preservation and consolidation of the R.S.D.L.P.”*

The same idea also pervades the resolution of the Conference “On Agitation for a Bolshevik Congress or a Bolshevik Conference Apart From the Party,” which stated the following:

“In view of the fact:

“That ever since Party unity was restored the Bolshevik faction has always singled out and united the adherents of its political line on questions which have already become the subject of general Party discussion, and has always done so by means of an ideological struggle on the general-Party arena for its solutions of these questions—parallel platforms and discussions in the Party nuclei, and at general Party congresses;

“That this is the only way to guarantee both the solidarity of those who are really like-minded and the drawing in of all elements essentially akin to it into the faction;

“That for the realization of our principal aim, for the exertion of influence on the Party in the interests of the final victory in it of the revolutionary Social-Democratic line, the Bolsheviks should stand out separately only on the general

* The C.P.S.U.(B.) in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the C.P. .. Part. I, 6th ed., p. 148.

Party arena, this being the only correct and the only expedient way (my italics.—L. B.);

“That any other way—such was the calling of separate Bolshevik conferences and congresses—would inevitably lead to a split in the Party from top to bottom, and would cause irreparable damage to the faction that would assume the initiative in such a final split of the R.S.D.L.P.;

“In view of all this, the Enlarged Editorial Board of *Proletary* resolves:

“1) To warn all its adherents against agitation for a special Bolshevik congress, this being agitation which objectively leads to a split in the Party, and is capable of striking a severe blow at the position which revolutionary Social-Democracy has already gained in the Party.

“2) To hold the next conference of the Bolsheviks at the same time as the next regular Party conference, while the meeting of the faction’s adherents at the next Party congress is to be the supreme body of the faction as a whole.

“3) In view of the important questions on the agenda agitating the Party and the faction, the Bolsheviks in the C.C. are instructed to insist on the earliest possible convocation of a general Party conference (a time limit of two-three months) and after that on the speedy summoning of a Party congress.”*

* *The C.P.S.U.(B.) in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the C.C.*, Part I, 6th ed., p. 149-50.

Prior to the Prague Conference, Bolshevism, which had existed as a trend of political thought and as a political party since 1903, fought Menshevism within the framework of a formally joint party, a party united with the Mensheviks, making use of the general-Party arena to expose the Mensheviks, to wrest from them the workers they had deceived, to defeat Menshevism.

At all stages of this struggle the Bolsheviks maintained and preserved the actual independence of their Party organization; while not mixing with the Mensheviks, formally the Bolsheviks were in a united party until 1912.

At the Prague Conference, which marked the official split with the Mensheviks, the Bolsheviks left forever the organizational framework of the united party with a common Central Committee at its head. The Conference thereby marked the official separation of the Bolsheviks into a separate Social-Democratic Party headed by its own Central Committee.

The Mensheviks did everything in their power to split the working class of Russia, to weaken it and make it an obedient tool in the hands of the liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie. In opposition to this policy of splitting the working-class movement, the Bolsheviks took the line of splitting with the Mensheviks, of exposing the treachery of the Mensheviks and rallying the working class to the banner of revolutionary Social-Democracy—the banner of the Leninist Party.

At the Prague Conference the Bolsheviks finally expelled the Liquidator-Mensheviks from the Party

and forever put an end to all remnants of formal unity with the Mensheviks. Therefore, beginning with the Prague Conference, Bolshevism formally became an independent party. This is the gist of the matter.

This independence of the Bolshevik Party not only in substance but also in form achieved by breaking all organizational ties with the Mensheviks, is of paramount importance for an understanding of the methods and tactics of our Party which assured the defeat of Menshevism.

Here is what Lenin said about the forms and methods of combating the Mensheviks, before and after the final split:

“A split means the rupture of all organizational ties, which shifts the struggle of ideas from the ground of influencing the organization from within to that of influencing it from without, from the ground of correcting and persuading comrades to that of destroying their organization, to the ground of inciting the masses of the workers (and the masses of the people generally) against the seceded organization. . . . If anyone were to apply the measure of the struggle permissible within the Party to the struggle based on a split, a struggle directed against the Party from without or (in the case of a local split) against the given Party organization, such a person would have to be regarded either as being childishly naive, or as a hypocrite. From the organizational point of view, a split signifies a rupture of *all* organizational ties, i.e., the transition from a struggle to convince comrades

within the organization to a struggle *to destroy* the hostile organization, to destroy its influence over the masses of the proletariat. From the psychological standpoint it is perfectly obvious that the severance of all organizational ties between comrades *already* signifies an *extreme degree* of mutual bitterness and hostility, which has grown into hatred.”*

This is how Lenin put the question in connection with the split in the St. Petersburg organization of the R.S.D.L.P.

There is no need to prove that this manner of posing the question applies so much the more to the struggle our Party waged against Menshevism in the period of the Prague Conference, which consummated the split with the Mensheviks and consequently supplied the formal organizational basis for the separate, independent existence of the Bolshevik Party.

This is why the Prague Conference was a turning point in the history of Bolshevism.

This is why the Prague Conference inaugurated the independent existence of the Bolshevik Party.

Pravda, October 26, 1935

* V. I. Lenin *Collected Works*, 4th ed., Vol. XII, pp. 382, 383-84.

. CHRONOLOGY OF COMRADE STALIN'S ARRESTS,
EXILES AND ESCAPES

1902—April 5

Comrade Stalin is arrested in Batum.

1903—April 19

Comrade Stalin is transferred to the Kutais Gubernia prison.

1903—Autumn

Comrade Stalin is exiled for three years to the Gubernia of Irkutsk, East Siberia, via Batum and Novorossiisk.

1904—January 5

Comrade Stalin escapes from exile (from Balagansk, Irkutsk Gubernia) and goes first to Batum and later to Tiflis.

1908—March 25

Comrade Stalin is arrested in Baku under the name of Gaioza Nizharadze. Comrade Stalin is sent to the Bailov prison.

1908—November 9

Comrade Stalin is exiled for two years to the town of Solvychevodsk in the Vologda Gubernia.

1909—June 24

Comrade Stalin escapes from Solvychevodsk.

1910—March 23

Comrade Stalin is arrested in Baku

1910—August 27

By order of the Viceroy of the Caucasus, Comrade Stalin is forbidden to reside within the limits of the Caucasian Territory for a period of five years.

1910—September 23

Comrade Stalin is exiled to the town of Solvychegodsk in the Vologda Gubernia.

1911—September 6

Comrade Stalin illegally leaves Vologda for St. Petersburg.

1911—September 9

Comrade Stalin is arrested in St. Petersburg.

1911—December 14

Comrade Stalin is exiled to Vologda for three years.

1912—February 29

Comrade Stalin escapes from exile.

1912—April 22

Comrade Stalin is arrested in St Petersburg.

1912—July 2

Comrade Stalin is exiled to the Narym Territory for three years.

1912—September 1

Comrade Stalin escapes from exile (from Narym) and returns to St. Petersburg.

1913—February 23

Comrade Stalin is arrested in St. Petersburg.

1913—July 2

Comrade Stalin is exiled for four years under police surveillance to the Turukhan Territory.

1913—July 2

to

1917—March 8

Comrade Stalin is in exile in the Turukhan Territory.



EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. G. Tsereteli (1842-1900), together with N. Nikoladze and S. Meskhi, headed the "Meori Dassy" (Second Group)—a bourgeois-progressive trend.

The "Meori Dassy" published the newspaper *Droyeba* (1866-86) and the journals *Mnatobi* (1869-72) and *Krebuli* (1871-73) in the Georgian language, and *Obzor* (1878-81) in the Russian language.

In their publications the Tsereteli-Nikoladze group acquainted the Georgian public with the theories of the West European utopian Socialists (Fourier, Owen, Saint-Simon, Louis Blanc, Babeuf) and preached bourgeois nationalism and republicanism.

Of this group G. Tsereteli himself wrote:

"In the development of the social system this group [dassy] repudiated both the nobility and the separate existence of the common people. It advanced the idea of a genuine nation into which all estates entered on an equal footing, and recognized such a nation as corresponding to a democratic social order where there are no separate estates." (G. Tsereteli, *Kvali*, No. 46, 1897.)

This group of bourgeois intellectuals stood for the development of industrial banks, credit for town and country, trade, railways and industry. In their eyes the development of trade and industry was a means for the national renaissance of the country. It called for brisk promotion of education and science and pointed to capitalist progress as the road to be followed.

In the nineties of the 19th century this group took the path of serving the big bourgeoisie and supporting Russian tsarism. Page 14.

2. I. Ninoshvili (Ingorokva) (1859-1894), a well-known Georgian writer, an active member of "Messameh Dassy." Page 14.

3. *Ilya Chavchavadze* (1837-1907), one of the greatest classics of Georgian literature, was the ideological leader of "Pirveli Dassy" (First Group), the national-liberation movement of the intelligentsia of the latter half of the 19th century.

The journal *Sakartvelos-Moamleh* began publication in the Georgian language in 1863 under his leadership, and in 1877 the newspaper *Iberia*. Under his leadership this group carried on a struggle against the ideologists of the old nobility, who were still defending the patriarchal-feudal order.

In a number of splendid literary works, I. Chavchavadze painted a masterly picture of the slavish toil of the Georgian peasants and demanded the destruction of serfdom.

In *Iberia* the group made a resolute stand in defence of the Georgian language, Georgian letters and Georgian schools, combating the tsar's policy of Russifying Georgia.

The "Pirveli Dassy" sought to adapt the economy of the landed gentry to capitalism, and for this purpose secured the construction of the Kakhetia railway and the opening of a noble-men's bank.

The group propagated the idea of a national renaissance through conciliation and peaceful collaboration between the estates.

In his programmatic article "Life and Law" (1877), Chavchavadze advanced the slogan of conciliation between the estates and exhorted the liberal nobles to head the capitalist development of Georgia. Page 14.

4. The *Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.* was set up at the First Congress of Caucasian Social-Democratic organizations held in Tiflis in March 1903. Fifteen delegates were present at the Congress, representing the Tiflis, Baku and Batum Committees of the R.S.D.L.P. and the Social-Democratic organizations in Kutais, Guria, Chiaturi, Gori and Khashuri.

The Congress laid the basis for the inter-national structure of the Social Democratic organizations in the Caucasus.

The Congress approved the political line of Lenin's *Iskra*, accepted for guidance the draft program proposed by *Iskra* and *Zarya* and drew up and adopted the organizational rules of the Federation.

The Congress resolved to combine the newspapers *Brdzola* (published in Georgian) and *Proletariat* (published in Armenian)

in one organ under the title of *Proletariats Brdzola* (*The Proletarian Struggle*).

The Congress elected a leading Party body—the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. to which Comrade Stalin was elected in his absence; he was confined in the Batum prison at that time.

In May 1903, under the direction of the Caucasian Federal Committee, two committees were set up—the Kutai Committee and that of the Agricultural Labourers of Imeretia. At the same time the Agricultural Labourers' Committee of Guria was set up. In June the Kutais Committee and the Imeretia Agricultural Labourers' Committee amalgamated and formed one committee known as the Imeretia Committee. In July, the Imeretia-Mingrelia Committee was formed.

In 1904, on his return from exile, Comrade Stalin became the head of the Caucasian Federal Committee and jointly with Mikha Tskhakaya, directed its activities.

In February 1906, after the united committees of the Bolshevik and Menshevik factions were formed, the Caucasian Federal Committee went out of existence. Page 63.

5. *The Shendrikov Organization*, the so-called "Organization of Balakhan and Bibi-Eibat Workers," was formed in Baku by the Shendrikov brothers (Ilya, Leo and Gleb) in the summer of 1904. This was a non-party organization, but its leaders openly preached Menshevism from the outset.

The Menshevik leadership of the R.S.D.L.P. in the shape of the Party Council officially recognized the Shendrikov organization as a party organization. In 1904 the Party Council and the Menshevik *Iskra* tried to set off the Shendrikovites against the Baku Bolshevik organization.

Relying on the support of the labour aristocracy, the Shendrikov group conducted propaganda against waging the political struggle and preached outright Economism. They had all the markings of a Zubatov or Gapon organization. They disrupted political campaigns and disorganized strikes. During the December strike of 1904 the Shendrikov organization was busy extorting money from capitalists.

In the period of the revolution of 1905-07 the Shendrikov group, being agents of the tsarist authorities, formed a bloc with the capitalists.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Caucasian Federal Committee and the Baku Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) declared ruthless war on the Shendrikov group from the very outset. The Shendrikov brothers were expelled from the Party by the Baku Committee as early as the summer of 1904. In November 1904, when the editors of *Iskra* tried to represent the Shendrikov organization as a legitimate organization, the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) issued the following statement in reply:

"The editors of *Iskra* have been too hasty with praise for the 'group' calling itself the 'enlightened workers of Balakhan district' or the 'workers of Balakhan and Bibi-Eibat,' because closer acquaintance with its views, publications and all its activity in general would undoubtedly make the editors of *Iskra* see eye to eye with the Baku C [ommittee] and the Fed [eral] C [ommittee] which correctly consider the said 'group' not to be a Party group and its activity disruptive and harmful." (Cf. *Vperyod*, No. 3, 1905.)

The Shendrikov organization was completely shattered in 1907-08 after Comrade Stalin moved to Baku. Page 69.

6. *Dashnaks* ("*Dashnaktsutyun*")—an Armenian nationalist party which arose in the early 'nineties. Its program (socialization of the land, state federation, and terrorism) closely resembled that of the Russian Socialist-Revolutionaries.

In the beginning of the 1900's, under the influence of the movement for national emancipation, the Dashnaks went Left for a time and came out in opposition to tsarism.

In the period of the first Russian revolution, the Dashnaks came out openly in defence of the interests of the Armenian bourgeoisie and fought against the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants. At the behest of the tsarist authorities they organized Armenian-Tatar massacres in Baku, Tiflis, Yelissavetpol (Kirovabad) and other parts of Transcaucasia.

In a letter to Stolypin, Vorontsov-Dashkov, the Viceroy of the Caucasus, characterized the activity of the "*Dashnaktsutyun*" as follows:

"In this period the '*Dashnaktsutyun*' organization acquired a special, leading influence in Baku after the Armenian-Tatar disorders and the turbulent period of 1905-06.

This is due to the fact that at that time in the eyes of the most influential and wealthy part of the Armenian population this organization was an armed bodyguard against the Moslems and the anarchistic organizations engendered by the revolution, and they generously supported the Dashnaksakans financially, which explains why the latter were so well armed; besides using them as a bodyguard, the wealthier Armenians used the Dashnaksakans to guard their property and property interests, so that it would happen that in the oil fields the Dashnaksakans would break strikes by means of intimidation and, on the contrary, when they wanted to avenge themselves on some industrialist who had turned down their demands for money, they made the workers on his site go on strike." (*Krassny Arkhiv*, Vol. 34, p. 206.)

During the years of reaction and in the first imperialist war the Dashnaks served as the militant vanguard of the Armenian bourgeoisie, as open defenders and servants of tsarism.

After the victory of the Great Socialist Revolution in Russia the Dashnaks joined the Georgian Mensheviks and Mussavatists in a counter-revolutionary bloc and severed Transcaucasia from Soviet Russia.

In 1918-20 the Dashnaks headed the bourgeois Republic of Armenia which had been set up by the Turkish General Staff, and turned Armenia into a base for the Anglo-French interventionists and Russian Whiteguards in their war against the Soviets.

The Dashnaks together with the Mensheviks and Mussavatists transformed Transcaucasia into an arena of bloody strife between the nationalities; with the Georgian Mensheviks and Mussavatists they organized the Armenian-Georgian and Armenian-Tatar wars, and engineered massacres and pogroms against the Azerbaijanian population of Armenia.

After Soviet government was established in Armenia, the Dashnak Party was broken up and suppressed. On the instructions of the intelligence services of the imperialist states, the Dashnak scum continued to carry on a rabid struggle against the Soviets through espionage and wrecking. Page 78.

7. *Social-Federalists*—a Georgian nationalist party consisting of intellectuals from the bourgeoisie and nobility. It was formed at a conference in Geneva in 1904. Among the founders

of the party were A. Jorjadze, K. Abashidze, G. Laskhishvili and G. Zdanovich-Mayashvili.

The main demand in the Social-Federalist program was for the national autonomy of Georgia within a Russian bourgeois and landowner state.

In the years of the first Russian revolution the Federalists preached national autonomy, supported the liberal bourgeoisie and fought rabidly against the Bolsheviks.

In the years of reaction they completely gave up the struggle against tsarism, and during the imperialist war occupied a defence position.

After the victory of the Great Proletarian Revolution in Russia the Federalists joined the Georgian Mensheviks, Dashnaks and Mussavatists in a counter-revolutionary bloc, which, with the support of the Germano-Turkish, and, later on, of the Anglo-French interventionists, tore Transcaucasia and Georgia from Soviet Russia.

After Soviet government was established in Georgia, the Social-Federalist Party fell to pieces.

The miserable remnants of this party fought viciously against the Soviets and took an active part in the Menshevik putsch of 1924.

The leaders, who are in emigration, are in the intelligence services of foreign states together with Menshevik and White-guard counter-revolutionaries. Page 78.

8. *The illegal Avlabar printing plant*, the printing plant of the Caucasian Federal Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. set up in Avlabar, on the outskirts of Tiflis, at the end of 1903 and functioned until April 1906. It was fitted up in a secret cellar especially arranged for the purpose deep under ground, over which a one-storey house was built.

At this plant the publications of the Caucasian Federal Committee were printed in large issues in the Georgian, Russian and Armenian languages. Here too were printed Lenin's pamphlets *To the Rural Poor*, *The Revolutionary Democratic Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Peasantry*, *Statement Concerning the Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.* and other articles and leaflets, and the pamphlets by Stalin: *Briefly About the Disagreements in the Party* and *Two Clashes*.

On April 15, 1906, the plant was discovered and wrecked by the gendarmerie. Page 83.

9. The references to armed insurrection quoted in Comrade Stalin's pamphlet *The Present Situation and the Unity Congress of the Workers' Party* are those of Engels and not of Marx. Comrade Stalin referred to Marx because at the time he wrote this pamphlet (1906) the book *Revolution and Counter-revolution in Germany* from which Comrade Stalin quoted was believed to be the work of Marx. It was only later, when the correspondence of Marx and Engels was published, that it was learned that the book referred to was written by Engels. (cf. Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Two Vol. ed., Vol. II, 1938, p. 26; Lenin, *Collected Works*, 1937, pp. 518 and 281). Page 140.

10. *Mussavatists* ("Mussavat"), a nationalist Tyurkic bourgeois democratic party. It was established in 1912 and was called the "Mussulman Democratic Party"—"Mussavat" (which means *equality*). The founders of the party were representatives of the Azerbaijan bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intelligentsia: M. E. Rassul-Zadeh, G. R. Sharif-Zadeh, A. K. Kyazim-Zadeh and K. V. Mikailov. The program of the "Mussavat" was permeated with both Pan-Islamism—the ideology of Turkish, Tatar and other khans, landowners and Mussulman mullahs, who sought to unite all the peoples professing the Mohammedan religion, —and Pan-Tyurkism, which sought to unite all the Tyurkic Moslem nationalities under the rule of the Turks.

During the imperialist war the Mussavatists were ardent supporters of tsarism. One of the leaders of the Mussavatists, M. E. Rassul-Zadeh, wrote:

"Touching upon the fate of our common native land, Russia, we too, together with all other citizens, wish primarily for Russia's success and victory. . . .

"During this war all the nationalities inhabiting Russia have been cleared of all doubt, and by their sincere attitude have shown that they have honest aims and feelings of ardent patriotism." (Newspaper *Achyg-Soyuz* [*A Clear Word*]).

After the second Russian revolution, in 1917, the "Mussavat" merged with the Tyurkic Federalist Party of the Bek landowners and adopted the name of the Tyurkic Federalist Party, "Mussavat," demanding autonomy for Azerbaijan, and the formation of a Russian democratic republic on federative principles.

During 1918-20 the "Mussavat" constituted the main counter-revolutionary force in Azerbaijan, fighting against Soviet rule and the Bolshevik Party.

In May 1918, the Mussavatists organized a so-called "independent" bourgeois-landlord government with its centre in Gyandzheh, and waged a savage fight against the Baku Committee, enlisting the aid of the Turks and later of the British.

In 1920, on the instructions of British imperialism, the Mussavatists gave direct armed assistance to Denikin's retreating Whiteguard bands and fought against the Red Army.

In 1920 the Mussavatists and Dashnaks organized the criminal Azerbaijan-Armenian war.

When Soviet government was established in Azerbaijan, the "Mussavat" Party was smashed and lost all influence. The émigre leaders of the party are acting as spies for foreign states.

Page 282.



लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय
Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration Library

मसूरी

MUSSOORIE

यह पुस्तक निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।

This book is to be returned on the date last stamped.

[illegible]

320.9479
Ber

अवाप्ति संख्या
Acc No.

104619

वर्ग संख्या

पुस्तक संख्या

Class No. _____

Book No. _____

लेखक

Author Beria.

शीर्षक

History of the

320.9479

9114

Ber

LIBRARY

104619

LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI

National Academy of Administration
MUSSOORIE

Accession No.

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double price shall be paid by the borrower.

Help to keep this book fresh, clean & moving