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INTRODUCTION

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, devoted revolutionary and architect of the Soviet state, ranks as the foremost exponent of Marxist economic and political thought. As a theorist Lenin interpreted and amplified the teachings of Marx and contributed several concepts to Communist doctrine. Chief among these contributions was his theory of imperialism as the highest, final, decadent stage of capitalism.

Lenin's definitive essay on the subject, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," was written in 1916 and culminated several years of intensive thought and reading. The essence of the "new" imperialism that Lenin described was the competition among several modern world powers for colonial possessions. The idea of empire dates far back to the earliest attempts of a single nation to dominate the known world. The conquests of Rome were prime examples of "old" or simple imperialism. But the concept of more than one empire in competition for dominance distinguished the modern or "new" imperialism examined by Lenin and others.

The phenomenon of "new" imperialism encompassed many remarkable characteristics. Its dominance of political and economic thinking lasted from about the mid-nineteenth century to the end of World War I. During this period the industrial behemoths of Europe, led by Great Britain and soon followed by the United States and Japan, embarked on a far-ranging policy of conquest. They engaged in a race to gain colonies, spheres of influence, and economic concessions among the less developed regions of the world. Colonies became especially important as sources of raw material, captive markets for the manufactured goods of the home country and bastions of military strength against encroachment by competing powers.

Domestically, most of the imperialistic nations witnessed the growing
preponderance of industrial and financial monopolies in the economy. With few limitations on corporate growth and capital investment and a minimum of negative governmental interference, the control of a nation's economy often rested in the hands of a few magnates whose business dealings influenced world economy. The successful industrialist and the financier emerged as the most influential spokesmen of the epoch. Domestic economies witnessed the centralization and consolidation of industry under one or a few monopolists who attempted to throttle any competitors. The financier became increasingly more important since his control of investment and surplus capital affected the growth of industry. Glutting the home capital market resulted in the increase of capital exported abroad, a practice which became the mainstay of the imperialist system. Hence the demands of both industrialists and financiers for new markets for their commodities stimulated expansionary political policies.

Closely connected with the domestic and international aspects of imperialism was the growth of armaments. To protect distant territories and to discourage either revolt or external aggression imperial powers required vast military establishments. For the industrialist, the manufacture of munitions and equipment was a lucrative enterprise. Hence the arming of the world was a crucial concomitant of imperialism.

By the turn of the century a number of writers were attempting to analyze the phenomenon of imperialism. Men such as J. A. Hobson, Rudolf Hilferding, and V. I. Lenin, as well as others perhaps less well-known, pioneered the explanation of imperialism. Hobson introduced the definitive economic interpretation of the new imperialism and Hilferding wrote an early socialist interpretation. But it was Lenin who seized upon these earlier interpretations and, imposing the rigid discipline of the Marxian
dialectic, explained imperialism as the final stage of capitalist expansion which would herald the dawn of the new age, the end of history, the socialist millenium.

It is difficult to determine how much of Lenin's thought on this subject is original and how much is skillful adaptation, how much is tactical maneuvering and how much strategic planning. Lenin was above all a dedicated revolutionary and a political manipulator of consummate skill. Most of his writing was for the purpose of immediate argumentation, melding Marxist dogma with his own keen awareness of practical necessity to create a viable doctrine. Even his most brilliant theoretical expositions, such as the theory of imperialism, usually came in answer to immediate crises rather than as deliberately projected plans.

The development of Lenin's theory of imperialism did not follow a smooth logical path. Rather the completed theory expressed in "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" was a syncretism of several different strands of thought, his own and others'. Lenin's main ideological offering incorporated in his theory dealt with the nature of war and its relation to the impending proletarian revolution. Also a defense of Marxist revolutionary doctrine against revisionists such as Kautsky comprised a significant element of his theory. The end result of Lenin's theoretical syncretism bears the unmistakable stamp of originality, for it was Lenin who carried Marxist doctrine to its logical conclusion to explain the phenomenon of imperialism. It was he who conceived of imperialism as the final stage of capitalism and the initial stage of socialism. He alone through practical application connected the revolutionary role of the individual worker and his party to the downfall of authoritarian and bourgeois governments.
The following pages trace the evolution of Lenin's theory of imperialism through portions of his voluminous publications. Lenin's early writings are examined to elicit clues to his nascent thought on the subject and the influences of contemporary writers on him are noted. Finally, the complex nature of imperialism described in "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" is studied as are several subsequent modifications of this theory.
LENIN'S MARXIST HERITAGE AND HIS EARLY WRITINGS

As early as 1900 Lenin had no articulated concept of any relationship between imperialism and capitalist society or the coming socialist order. Already he had made himself a master of Marxist thought and had completed his major opus, The Development of Russian Capitalism (1896), but he was yet a fledgling theoretician.

Lenin's economic thinking was rooted deep in the ideas of Marx, who denounced the exploitation of the laboring masses by the industrialist. Marx himself had no concept of imperialism; he neither witnessed nor forecast its appearance. Yet within his writing were elements from which Lenin, with careful interpretation, could find support for his own theory of imperialism, as well as significant elements he found necessary to ignore.

Marx viewed the state as the summation of the desires of the class that controlled production in any given economic era. Within the bourgeois state Marx considered the compelling goal of capitalism to be the accumulation and the concentration of capital in order to achieve internal economies of scale and to overwhelm the competition. Centralization under one management would accompany concentration of capital and lead to expropriation of small industrialists by the large. Marx saw no end to the advantages of amalgamation of industry and foresaw the possibility of the entire economy falling under the control of a single or a few capitalists.

However, Marx was indefinite on the importance of foreign trade. In Das Kapital, volume II, he stated that a world market is the "basis and vital element of capitalist production," but that foreign trade,
while contributing to the disintegration of capitalism and to the socialist revolution, "only transfers the contradictions [of capitalism] to a wider sphere." Marx did not emphasize the necessity of colonial empires, though he did acknowledge the need for expanded markets as the formative for capitalism's destruction of feudalism. Although he admitted that foreign trade built up backward regions and gave privileges to the more advanced countries, he did not equate imperialism with foreign trade. According to Marx the search for new outlets stemmed from the overproduction of goods and the overaccumulation of capital. The capitalist system, he believed, must be an expansive one and the need to invest is a powerful stimulant to expansion. From these tenets Lenin derived his basic premises of economic doctrine that consistently recur throughout his writing with some modification.

But to Marx Lenin owed more than just the foundations of his economic thought. More importantly Lenin embraced the Marxian concept of the state, the theory of the inevitability of the overthrow of capitalism, and a firm belief in revolution as the handmaiden of socialism. These ideas formed the framework of Lenin's thought and served him as invariant reference points for his argumentation. Armed with the irrefutable dogma of Marxism, Lenin commenced a career as a revolutionary polemicist while still a young man in his twenties.

In 1900 while a member of the Iskra (The Spark) staff, Lenin published several articles dealing with the Russian war against China. The war was essentially an imperialist one, though Lenin did not refer to it as such. In "The War in China" he set forth perhaps the earliest inkling of his thought on imperialism. Describing the war waged by the great powers against China to insure certain economic concessions, such
as the right to traffic in opium, he wrote:

This policy of plunder has become known as colonial policy. Every country in which capitalist industry is rapidly developing has to seek colonies, i.e. countries in which industry is weakly developed, in which more or less patriarchal conditions still prevail, which can serve as a market for manufactured goods and sources of high profits.

He repeatedly referred to the "policy" of the tsarist government, a voluntary political policy of waging war solely for the profit of "a handful of capitalists," nobles and bureaucrats. In later writings including "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," he denied that imperialism could be a political "policy" voluntarily pursued by a government. He asserted that it was an inevitable economic stage through which the capitalist system must pass in its transformation to socialism.

Furthermore, he stated that the war might lead to a greater war if Russia quarrelled with other exploiting nations over the division of the loot. The vision of giant powers fighting for division of spoils later would become the keystone of his theory of imperialism. Lenin's pre-occupation with war, its causes and results established a practical line of thought which he followed with the avid interest of a revolutionary. However, this early foreshadowing of his fully developed view of imperialism was not pursued immediately in subsequent writings.

Returning to an examination of capitalist war in January 1905, Lenin published an article entitled "The Fall of Port Arthur" which suggested a relationship between capitalist wars and the revolutionary cause. In this article he described the Russian war against Japan as a conflict pitting a reactionary autocracy against a "progressive" bourgeoisie. Though the war was a capitalist conflict (he still did not use the term "imperialist"), a victory for Japan would represent a gain for the pro-
letariat because it would accelerate world-wide capitalist development and consequently, the socialist revolution.

The proletariat is hostile to every bourgeoisie and to all manifestations of the bourgeois system, but this hostility does not relieve it of the duty of distinguishing between the historically progressive and the reactionary representatives of the bourgeoisie. The revolutionary proletariat must carry on ceaseless agitation against war, always keeping in mind, however, that wars are inevitable as long as class rule exists.

In "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," "The Youth International," and other articles written in 1915-16, Lenin retreated slightly from the foregoing statement against war to make distinctions between various kinds of war and voiced support for certain of them. Always the calculating revolutionary who grasped the importance of war to the success of his cause, he was never an unqualified pacifist.

In April 1905 Lenin further expounded the theme that war was the ally of the proletariat. The "peace at any price" slogan of Juárez and other socialists played into the hands of the forces of reactionary capitalism and autocracy, Lenin maintained. Arguing that the defeat of Russia by Japan would spell the end of the domination of the autocracy over the proletariat, he insisted that a peace would save the Russian autocracy. Lenin clearly appreciated the catalytic possibilities inherent in military defeat and began to relate them to the conditions in Russia which might spark a revolution. The Bloody Sunday massacre of demonstrating workers led by Father Gapon in January 1905 precipitated a crisis which demonstrated the susceptibility of autocracy to destruction if only revolutionary leadership could be provided. Even as Lenin wrote, the tsar still faced strikes and riots among the populace following incredible fiascoes in the Russo-Japanese War and rebellion within the armed forces.
Toward the end of 1907 Lenin attended the Stuttgart Congress of the Second International which issued a condemnation of imperialist wars by the assembled socialist representatives of European nations. The last two paragraphs of the resolution, largely the work of Rosa Luxemburg and Lenin, qualified the anti-war statement of the congress with the idea that should an imperialist war break out despite the efforts of the workers of the world, it would be the duty of the proletariat to use war-time crises to spark the overthrow of capitalist rule. The significance of the last two paragraphs was not felt at that time when international socialism seemed most confident of thwarting any attempt to involve the proletariat in a war. However, the hard core revolutionaries, closely attuned to the practical necessities of the movement, realized full well that ultimately violent action would be necessary to overthrow the capitalism system.

In an article written late in 1907 explaining the Stuttgart Resolution, Lenin further crystalized his concept of the imperialist war and its role in the socialist scheme. He distinguished between a capitalist and a revolutionary war and stressed the need of standing by, prepared to "take advantage of the crisis created by war for the purpose of hastening the downfall of the bourgeoisie."13

Two articles written in August 1908 indicate additional peripheral thought on some aspects of imperialism but also show that Lenin had not yet begun his thorough syncretic work on the subject. Announcing the "law of the unequal development of capitalism" in "Inflammable Material in World Politics," Lenin began unraveling a thread of thought that he and successor Josef Stalin later used extensively to explain the survival of socialism in Russia alone.
Advanced capitalist countries show an intensification of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—the difference in historical conditions, political regime and forms of the labour movement creates the difference in the manifestations of one and the same tendency.... The international revolutionary movement of the proletariat does not proceed and cannot proceed evenly in the same form in different countries.14

Despite this intimation that individual socialist revolutions might occur within the capitalist system, Lenin proceeded to assert his belief that the revolution would be world-wide. Only later in his writings of the World War I era when the realities of socialist collapse and proletarian lethargy were unmistakably manifested did he return to this thread with the intention of raising it to the rank of genuine doctrine.

The second article in August 1908 dealt with "militant militarism" in world politics. The practices of stockpiling munitions, building up armaments, and using military force to coerce other nations was described by Hobson as the militaristic "policy," i.e. a politically expedient practice of imperialist nations seeking to extend their influence. To Lenin militarism represented no policy but instead an inseparable manifestation of higher capitalistic development.

Contemporary militarism is the result of capitalism: it is the "living manifestation" of capitalism in both its forms: as a military force used by the capitalist states in their external conflicts and as a weapon in the hands of the ruling classes for the suppression of all movements (economic and political) of the proletariat.15

Lenin reiterated previous stands on the nature of war and the inevitability of it as long as class differences remained. Rejecting the idea of a "war on war," as suggested by Herve26, he insisted that the proletariat must use a capitalist war to precipitate the revolution. Quoting extensively from the Stuttgart Resolution, he reminded his followers that "wars between capitalist states are, as a rule, the result of their
competition on the world market, because every state strives not only to safeguard its old markets, but to win new markets, and in this connection the subjugation of foreign nations and countries plays the primary part.\(^\text{17}\) Hence by this time Lenin had well in mind the nature of capitalist (imperialist) wars and their relationship with the revolution.

In this same article Lenin began a verbal joust with the Kautsky wing of socialists, the "opportunist\(^\text{5}\)" on the subject of "patriotic wars."

"...It is not the offensive or defensive character of the war, but the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat, or rather the interests of the international movement of the proletariat," Lenin insisted, that determine the participation of the workers.\(^\text{18}\) Kautsky, the German socialist who before the war was regarded as the outstanding spokesman for orthodox Marxism, hedged on the question of proletarian involvement in a capitalist war by arguing that workers might support a bourgeois government in "patriotic wars" defending the homeland. Slicing to the heart of Kautsky's argument, Lenin denied that workers should render any assistance to the military efforts of warring capitalists. Reiterating the Marxian dictum that proletarians have no country, he established benefit to the impending revolution as the only criterion in determining the worker participation. This clash of viewpoints foreshadowed the wreck of the international socialist movement on the shoals of war.

The development of Lenin's theory of imperialism primarily followed his thinking on the subject of war, but by December 1910 he was mulling another aspect which he would later include in the theory. Picking up an idea he had hinted before, he observed that different stages of labor relations may result in having supporters in the labor movement who have not broken completely with the bourgeois order. In "Differences in
European Labour movements" Lenin remarked that "the speed of development of capitalism differs in different countries and in different spheres of national economy" and that consequently there may be among proletarians those who are under the sway of the bourgeoisie.19 According to Lenin the "law of the unequal development of capitalism" dictated that countries differ in the misery, the preparedness and the dependability of their working classes. This assertion marked Lenin's growing suspicion of the reliability and sincerity of several socialist leaders whom he felt might be less attentive to working class needs than to bourgeois enticements.

In November 1912 the Second International issued the Basle Manifesto which called the proletariat of all countries to "wage war on wars" to unite against all imperialist militarism.20 Despite professed unanimity of international socialism against imperialism and its accompanying wars, there were traces of cracks in the solidarity of the facade. European socialists championed a host of anti-war attitudes ranging from adamant pacifism to mild defensism. Pompous pronouncements of unity hinged on apparent rather than real agreement over socialist goals and tactics. Lenin, Luxemburg and other radical revolutionaries vigorously opposed any stance which failed to include a demand for a well-organized overthrow of bourgeois and feudal governments during a capitalist war. Lenin especially insisted that socialist leaders must not accommodate themselves to the bourgeoisie by urging pacifism in all circumstances. Ominously for international socialism the various attitudes toward war often were aligned according to national considerations and bode no good for Marxist dreams of worker solidarity.

By the relatively late date of 1912--Hobson's study of imperialism
had been published in 1902, Hilferding's in 1910—Lenin had not yet begun to formulate his final concept of imperialism that would revolutionize Marxist theory. He still espoused the basic Marxist line that capitalism revolutionizes the means of production but at a certain point retards further growth of productive forces and creates a crisis situation which leads to its downfall. No clear idea of imperialism as a last, distinct stage of capitalism was yet evident in his writing, but the trend of his thought and tremors of disagreement within the Second International were leading him toward a precise ideological statement.

THE INFLUENCE OF OTHER WRITERS ON LENIN'S THEORY

Until the outbreak of World War I Lenin's energies were diverted to a number of critical areas, not the least of which was the organizing and equipping of a native Russian socialist party with cogent theoretical weapons. But with the onslaught of the war and the unbelievable collapse of the Second International, it became imperative for him to revamp existing Marxist theory that had failed miserably to predict the resiliency of the capitalist system in crisis. Hence 1914 marks the real influx of Lenin's thought concerning imperialism into the mainstream of his writings. His articles and pamphlets from 1914 to 1917 indicate how rapidly and effectively he did bring the massive guns of his intellect to bear on the subject once the need for action was undeniable.

Faced with the necessity of interpreting the chaos of a world at war in the light of Marxist dogma, Lenin quickly mastered the context of what others had written, evaluated it, and then proclaimed it to his followers as socialist truth. In the years directly preceding and during
the war Lenin's writing showed traces of the influence of several writers on imperialism, including Hobson, Hilferding, Bukharin, and Luxemburg. It is impossible to ascertain the precise times at which Lenin became cognizant of their ideas and began to draw upon them for his own. It is also difficult to determine precisely why a broad and coherent concept of imperialism began to appear in his writing at a given time and not earlier. However, it seems probable that Lenin, the dedicated revolutionary and organizer, was never able to collect and examine the data and formulate an encompassing theoretical structure as Marx had done for the theory of capitalism. Lenin developed his theory in the face of immediate and specific problems by drawing on a reservoir of inchoate ideas, socialist background, and broad knowledge. In the crucible of crisis elements of his own thought and the thought of others were melded to fashion a new concept in capitalist development.

Chief among those contributors to Lenin's thought was John A. Hobson, whose vigorous criticism of British imperialism supplied the foundation for Lenin's theory.21 As early as 1899 Lenin was acquainted with the writing of this famous British economist, and it seems likely that fairly soon after the publication of Hobson's Imperialism, A Study in 1902, he familiarized himself with the findings.

To Hobson imperialism indicated a "debasement of genuine nationalism, by attempts to overflow its natural banks and absorb the near or distant territory of reluctant and unassimilable peoples..."22 Nationalism, as the natural expression of a people's community of language, interests and heritage, should be a step on the way to internationalism, i.e. the peaceful cooperation of a number of nations, unless its nature becomes perverted. "Such perversion is Imperialism, in which nations trespassing
beyond the limits of facile assimilation, transform the wholesome stimulative rivalry of varied national types into the cutthroat struggle of competing empires. Hobson contributed the key concept that competition among empires was essentially modern, since early empires had usually comprehended the known world. Such competition led to antagonism among empires, expressed economically in a race for markets and politically in "unnatural systems of alliances." Hobson repeatedly referred to imperialism as a "policy" of government, a definite program to which a government subscribed rather than the ineluctable manifestation of overripe capitalism. In "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" Lenin vigorously refuted Hobson's "policy" concept (though he frequently used that terminology himself) and insisted on the inevitability of imperialism. In Hobson's view capitalist economic crises were perpetrated by "under consumption" of industrial goods at home, leaving surplus goods to be disposed of (a viewpoint which is also found in Marx's writing). This condition of under-consumption and a need for unloading surpluses on foreign markets bred imperialism, the pursuit of political, territorial, and economic advantages throughout the world. "Aggressive and predatory and favoring both the concentration of capitalist economic power and the alliance of this power with the ruling class in each imperialist country," imperialism endangered world peace by encouraging internecine conflicts and immensely destructive wars. Hobson observed, too, that the capitalist system was limited by the fact that eventually world production must exceed world demand. Furthermore, only a finite number of possibilities for investing fresh capital existed in the world and these would be exhausted. The same pressure upon available opportunities for foreign investment applied as upon the availability of foreign markets
for industrial goods. Lenin seized upon these limitations and contradictions of capitalism that amplified and often coincided with Marxist interpretations as the basis of his theory of imperialism.

But if Lenin founded his theory on the tenets of Hobson, he extended it with assistance from the ideas of Rudolf Hilferding, who wrote an early Marxist interpretation of capitalist development. Published in 1910, Hilferding's *Finanz Kapital* attempted to expand Marx's theory to describe the transition of bourgeois society from its early industrial to its later financial stage.28 This latter stage is characterized by the reign of great financiers who controlled many separate industrial and banking enterprises and whose main concern was not for the mere production of a particular commodity but for "the extraction of sheer surplus value by means of financial monopoly and pressure of high finance upon the states they controlled."29 By dominating the investment of capital, these financiers could dictate the economy of a nation and live by skimming the profits of investment. Although the concept of finance capital provided an important pillar for Lenin's discussion of the nature of imperialist society, Hilferding reached a conclusion utterly antithetical to one Lenin believed unavoidable. Hilferding maintained that capitalism in its era of imperialism could abolish its contradictions and with the cooperation of the proletariat, could grow into "political and industrial democracy."30 Lenin vehemently rejected the capacity of capitalism to reform itself, maintaining that while imperialism temporarily eased internal tensions, it inevitably would heighten the contradictions of capitalism and would lead to the proletarian revolution.31

Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin's occasional ally and frequent antagonist, also provided a sizeable contribution to the fund of ideas from which
he so liberally drew. Luxemburg examined certain contradictions in Marx's thinking in volume II of her *The Accumulation of Capital* (1913), especially his view that a rapid sequence of crises would lead to the overthrow of capitalist government by the proletariat. Marx implied that capitalism as an expanding system might continue to find new outlets for its products by displacing more primitive forms of production with more advanced ones and thus creating new markets. Luxemburg developed this line of thought to explain the imperialist period. According to her, the world was witnessing a momentary reprieve of the capitalist system as new expansion temporarily lessened the inherent weaknesses of the system. Marx was wrong, she argued, not in analyzing the conflicts within capitalism but merely in predicting when the end must come.

After a certain amount of capitalist expansion but long before the entire world had been subjugated, the collapse of capitalism and the revolution of the proletariat would come as a result of continuing, intensifying crises and rivalries within the world economy. Lenin agreed with her in part but differed significantly in his concept of imperialism as a distinct step beyond simple capitalism. As he stated in his definitive essay on the subject, the end of the system would come only after the whole world had been divided among imperialists and tensions had become unbearable.

To existing ideas concerning colonialism, Luxemburg added an interpretation. She viewed colonies as utterly vital, non-capitalist (i.e. primitive modes of production) dumping grounds for surplus commodities of capitalism. Lenin rejected outright her contention that capitalism could not develop without an external market (even in his *The Development of Russian Capitalism*) and her disregard for the export of capital as a
determinative factor, but he concurred with her in certain analyses of relationships among colonial and capitalist countries.

Another major theorist whose ideas influenced Lenin was a budding young Russian socialist named Bukharin. His significant writings on imperialism began to appear prior to the war and continued for several years as he expounded the role of the state in imperialism. He wrote of the necessity of totally destroying the existing state in the proletarian revolution in order to forestall the development of a Leviathan of "state capitalism." The state can either be the direct organization exploiting the worker or the indirect organization "serving as a mechanism to sustain and extend the most profitable condition for the process of exploitation." "The foreign policy of the state organization expresses its struggle to share the surplus value which is produced on a world-wide scale,...the struggle which is enacted between the various politically organized groups of the dominant classes." Bukharin's concept of state capitalism served Lenin well in pointing out the proximity of socialism to imperialism. In "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" Lenin observed that imperialism with the state controlled by monopolists was but one step away from socialism.

According to Bukharin there were three stages in the metamorphosis of the state. In the era of industrial capitalism, it is the primary organization representing the dominant class. With the rise of economic organizations such as powerful trusts, especially during the era of finance capitalism, the state becomes only one of many organizations of the dominant class. Finally, the state absorbs these other organizations in the era of imperialism and once again becomes the over-all organization of the dominant class. Lenin drew upon Bukharin's stages of
development to help trace the growth of imperialism in "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," but he increased the number of stages, redefined the progression, and emphasized the role of finance capital.  

From the knowledge of the four writers, Hobson, Hilferding, Luxemburg and Bukharin, Lenin borrowed freely without, as several critics have noted, properly acknowledging his debts. But as Meyer pointed out in Leninism, plagiarism "was more customary in the revolutionary movement [compared to the academic world], where there was a continuous active interchange of ideas, and where new ideas were proposed not for the sake of coming nearer to truth or of gaining academic prestige, but mainly for the purpose of convincing all comrades of the usefulness of certain strategies."  

THE RAPID DEVELOPMENT OF LENIN'S THOUGHT DURING THE WAR YEARS

With the publication of "The War and Russian Social-Democracy" in October 1914, Lenin began to hammer out a viable explanation of a world enmeshed in war; of workers and socialists of all nations rallying to their bourgeois governments; of a Marxist system woefully failing to describe the course of history. Obviously the pure Marxian forecast of increasing crises culminating in the victorious proletarian revolution was inadequate to cope with the facts. The war had come and with it the enormous crisis predicted by socialists, but instead of the heralded collapse of capitalism, it precipitated the ignominous demise of international socialism. Lenin now presented a bold new interpretation of capitalist development which, despite his dependence on others for many of the contributing ideas, must be considered essentially his own. He integrated
existing theory and his own thought into a plausible explanation of the era.

The very key to Lenin's analysis of the war was the phenomenon of imperialism, and conversely his explanation of the phenomenon was rooted in his theories on capitalist wars. "The growth of armaments, the extreme sharpening of the struggle for markets in the epoch of the latest, the imperialist stage in the development of capitalism..." he asserted, "have brought about the present war." The real significance of the war, Lenin concluded, was that it drew the attention of the proletariat away from existing conditions, exterminated their vanguard, and weakened the revolutionary movement by appealing to patriotism. The war was instigated by a predatory German bourgeoisie eager to throttle certain national revolutions (such as South Serbia's) and to despoil economic competitors such as Belgium, France and Britain. On the other hand, France and Britain were anxious to destroy Germany, a competitor with a faster growth-rate than their own, and to seize its colonies.

Lenin viciously attacked the national socialists, traitors to the cause of the international proletariat, who were encouraging workers to "chauvinism" and "sophism" by supporting their individual bourgeois governments. "The only correct proletarian slogan," he affirmed, was "to transform the present imperialist war into a civil war." Though the accomplishment of such an objective may have seemed singularly difficult, socialists were charged to prepare themselves to take advantage of revolutionary opportunities that might appear at any time.

In this Lenin's initial statement on the nature of imperialism, two points appear especially significant. First, here is the initial suggestion that imperialism is a distinct, inevitable stage of capitalism. The idea
that the end of capitalism would result from a revolution in the midst of internecine conflict among competing nations rather than from revolution due to the increasing misery of the proletariat during a fortuitous (but ultimately unavoidable) crisis was a departure from strict Marxist ideology. Secondly, Lenin opened his attack on those "chauvinists" and "opportunists" who were deserting the cause of international socialism. The defense of true socialism against these "traitors" was the basis for a major portion of his theory by exposing their error and justifying his own view of the phenomenon.

Following a conference of the Russian Socialist Democratic Labor Party (b) in March 1915, Lenin published a pamphlet on the resolutions which expanded his previous views on the question of the imperialist war.

The present war is of an imperialist character. The war is the outcome of the conditions of an epoch in which capitalism has reached the highest stage of its development; in which not only is the export of commodities of great significance, but so also is the export of capital; in which the trustification of industry and the internationalisation of economic life have assumed considerable dimensions; in which colonial policy has led to the partition of almost the whole of the globe; in which the productive forces of world capitalism have outgrown the limited boundaries of national and state divisions; in which the objective conditions for the achievement of socialism have fully matured.

In brief outline Lenin foreshadowed the theory of imperialism he would examine in detail in "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism."

Lenin proceeded to denounce the "defence of the Fatherland" slogan favored by many socialists, especially the Germans, as betrayal of the proletarian revolution. He championed the Marxist dogma that workers throughout the world owe allegiance solely to their class, not to their countries. Implicit in this assertion was Lenin's confidence that once the overthrow of the capitalist system began, revolution would spread
rapidly throughout the world. He adamantly maintained that the Marxist path to socialism, i.e. from feudalism to capitalism to socialism, must be followed. Consequently the civil war Lenin advocated would establish "democratic republics" in backward monarchist countries which were economically and politically unprepared for socialism and would lead to the expropriation of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat in advanced capitalist countries.\textsuperscript{46} To avoid confusion in understanding Lenin's ideas, it is important to note here that he distinguished between a "democratic" and a "socialist" revolution by insisting that socialism could only be achieved after a nation had passed through a democratic and capitalistic stage.

Lenin also urged the defeat of the tsarist monarchy as a necessary step in fostering the revolution and castigated "the bureaucracy in the labour movement and the labour aristocracy" who received a portion of capitalist profits for serving as "channels of bourgeois influence over the proletariat."\textsuperscript{47}

By August 1915 Lenin had advanced another step on the route to an encompassing theory of imperialism. Most socialists assumed that the revolution against imperialism would result in a world-wide seizure of power. But in "The United States of Europe Slogan," which rebutted a proposed slogan advocating a united Europe under capitalist control, Lenin observed that something less than a complete world-wide overthrow could be successful. Fineberg, the editor of Lenin's Selected Works, noted that for the first time in Marxian literature the suggestion was made that a proletarian revolution and the building of socialism could occur in a single country.\textsuperscript{48} Based on the law of the uneven development of capitalism which he had already espoused, Lenin remarked that "the victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even in one single capitalist country."\textsuperscript{49} But the
implication of this statement was that such a revolution, by example and by force, would automatically spark others.

Lenin reiterated the root concept of imperialism that "capital had become international and monopolistic" and a few powers had divided the world among them. Refuting the underlying idea of the slogan that a United States of Europe under capitalism would bring peace, Lenin argued that such a situation would be impossible because it was equivalent to an economic agreement to divide up colonies and to cease seeking profits. Capitalists, he insisted, would not be satisfied or assured of an accurate division according to strength without testing a division by war.

In October 1915 Lenin carried his concept of the proletariat's role in war to an obvious conclusion in an article entitled "The Defeat of One's Own Government in an Imperialist War." "A revolutionary class in a reactionary war cannot but desire the defeat of its government."50 The proletariat of all imperialist countries should desire the defeat of their own governments as well as all reactionary governments. Military defeats would facilitate the transformation of a reactionary war to a revolutionary one. Retreating somewhat from his earlier assertion that the socialist revolution could occur in one or a few countries, Lenin reaffirmed the existence of universal ties among the proletariat. A world revolution might be sparked, if objective conditions were right, by military defeats and political reverses of a reactionary government.

During the same month Lenin published "The Defeat of Russia and the Revolutionary Crisis," which unequivocally announced that internal reform of imperialism by constitutional democracy was utterly impossible. Revolution alone could establish the rule of the proletariat in Western Europe and could accomplish a take-over by the bourgeoisie in Russia. Reaffirming
the world-wide nature of the impending overthrow of capitalism, Lenin asserted that Russia must provide the spark for all of Europe.

The imperialist war has connected the revolutionary crisis in Russia, a crisis of a bourgeois-democratic revolution, with the growing crisis of the proletarian socialist revolution in the West. This connection is so direct that no separate solution of revolutionary problems is possible in any one country; the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia is now not only a prologue to, but an indivisible, integral part of the socialist revolution of the West. Here Lenin also emphasized the necessity of the middle stage of bourgeois-democracy between autocracy and socialism.

Also in October Lenin enunciated more specifically the characteristics of the impending revolution in Russia. The new government, he wrote in a "A Few Theses," must be the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasants. Introducing the novel idea of temporary cooperation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, Lenin tacitly acknowledged the practical needs of the revolutionary movement. Should the proletarian party gain power during the war, it would propose peace and liberation of all colonies but be prepared to stimulate and wage a revolutionary war against capitalist countries.

Late in 1915 in "Two Lines of the Revolution," Lenin crystallized his idea of the temporary union of the Russian proletariat and bourgeoisie to free the country of autocratic rule. Russia must be liberated from "military feudal 'imperialism' (tsarism)" before a socialist revolution can take place. The partnership of the petty bourgeoisie and the workers was a corollary to Lenin's theory of revolution necessitated by the pragmatic realization that the bourgeoisie alone was incapable of overthrowing the tsar.

In an extensive essay on "The Collapse of the Second International,"
Lenin returned to a favorite line: by delivering a sweeping denunciation of Kautsky and other "opportunists and chauvinists" of the now defunct Second International. Deriding Kautskyites for defending imperialism as a potentially successful means of achieving peace, he articulated some of his own thoughts on imperialism. The "epoch of imperialism" is irrefutably one in which great, privileged nations divide and oppress the world, he argued. "It is of the present war between the 'Great Powers of Europe' that the Basle Resolution declares that it 'cannot be justified by the slightest pretext of its being in the interests of the people.'"

The war represented the greedy grasping of "capitalist imperialism" and "dynastic interests," wholly bereft of any extenuating circumstances. The question of who "instigated" the war, which according to some chauvinists justified a certain cooperation with existing governments, was immaterial. The fact remained that the war was an imperialist one and must be converted to revolutionary purposes.

Against Kautsky's "defence of the fatherland" ideas Lenin employed his most venomous invective. Returning to the attack against the "labour aristocracy" (which he had begun as early as 1910 in "Differences in European Labour Movements"), he accused Kautsky and his followers of selling their proletarian principles. In exchange for some "crumbs of loot" of imperialism, these opportunists, the bureaucracy of the working class, would "gravitate toward Struveism" because it provided a vindication for the alliance with 'their' national bourgeoisie against the oppressed masses of all nations."

The Kautskyan theory of "ultra imperialism," i.e. the "joint exploitation of the world by internationally united finance capital in place of the mutual rivalries of national finance capital," suggested that an era of
moral regeneration and lasting peace would be the result of the imperialist age.\textsuperscript{57} According to Lenin, this theory "reduces itself to this and only this, that Kautsky utilizes the hope for a new peaceful era of capitalism to justify the opportunists and the official Social Democratic parties who joined the bourgeoisie and repudiated revolutionary, i.e. proletarian, tactics during the present turbulent era, notwithstanding the solemn declaration of the Basle resolution."\textsuperscript{58} Quick to demonstrate the fallacies of Kautsky's reasoning, Lenin insisted that the growth of monopoly (which is intensified by war demands) made free competition within capitalist states impossible. The division of the world by imperialist powers into colonial monopolies compelled capitalists to "pass from peaceful expansion to armed struggle for the redivision of colonies and spheres of influences.\textsuperscript{59} The proletariat must wage a struggle to overthrow those oppressive forces of imperialism and must not fight to prolong the system in hopes that a regeneration will occur. Kautsky was correct in thinking that imperialism was the necessary and inevitable product of capitalism, Lenin argued, but wholly wrong in believing that socialists could assist imperialists in establishing a chimerical world peace through capitalistic cooperation. The only possible role for the socialist must be that of the revolutionary.

Also in this article Lenin elaborated on the essentials of a revolutionary movement. "A Marxist cannot have any doubt that a revolution is impossible without a revolutionary situation; furthermore not every revolutionary situation leads to a revolution.\textsuperscript{60} Besides a suitable situation such as a war-time crisis, which creates fissures in society, a "subjective change is required, i.e. a revolutionary class must have the ability to carry out revolutionary mass actions.\textsuperscript{61} Lenin considered revolution to be unavoidably the only method of establishing the rule of
the proletariat and of destroying imperialism, yet successful revolution, he declared, was dependent upon circumstances within the country and within the party.

"IMPERIALISM, THE HIGHEST STAGE OF CAPITALISM"

Through the years of Lenin's leadership and emergence as a spokesman for socialism, his writing emphasized ideological postulates particularly relevant to practical problems. The needs of the Russian Socialist Democratic Labor Party with both intra-party strife and endless debate with other socialist parties obliged Lenin to concentrate on ideological essentials of party organization and policy. As have been noted previously, his theories on the nature of capitalist war, the role of the proletariat in precipitating a revolution, and the attitude of socialists toward the capitalist system were three of these indispensable areas of consideration.

But the ignominious collapse of the Second International in 1914 created a crisis in socialism requiring immediate and skilful resolution in ideological terms. Facing the challenge, Lenin derived his theory of imperialism from the writings of others and from his own favorite tactical concepts. With the publication of "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" in 1916, he arrived at a comprehensive statement describing the final dying gasp of capitalism. Long years of ideological jousting and response to problems had equipped him for his task of molding Marxist interpretation of imperialism. Lenin's "imperialism" was not an attempt to analyze objectively economic and political trends, but as Mayer observed, "to explain the stubborn fact that the revolution had not yet taken place in the most highly developed capitalist countries." 52
Throughout "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" Lenin defined and redefined imperialism in slightly different terms. Imperialism or "new capitalism" marked the highest, latest stage of capitalism where the separation of the ownership of capital from the means of production reached enormous proportions and where monopolies rather than free trade dominated world economy. Reflecting Hilferding's influence, Lenin decried the rise of finance capitalism as the result of economic concentration and centralization. The financier rather than the industrialist had become the exploiter of the economy. "Under the old type of capitalism, when free competition prevailed, the export of goods was the most typical feature. Under modern capitalism, when monopolies prevail, the export of capital has become the typical feature."63

Under this new capitalism the growth of monopoly within a nation was projected on a world-wide scale.

First, there are monopolistic capitalist combines in all advanced countries; secondly, a few rich countries, in which the accumulation of capital reaches gigantic proportions, occupy a monopolist position. An enormous "superfluity of capital" has accumulated in the advanced countries.64

"It is beyond doubt, therefore," wrote Lenin, "that the transition of capitalism to monopoly capitalism, to finance capitalism is connected with the intensification of the struggle for the partition of the world," as individuals and then nations attempted to control the world economy.65

From its free-trade beginnings capitalism "has grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the people of the world...."66

The world, he suggested, was divided into three categories of nations. The dominant group contained the imperialist countries subdivided into "young capitalist powers," such as America, Germany and Japan, with
a rapid rate of growth; "old capitalist powers," such as France and Great Britain, whose progress of late had been slower than that of the young powers; and "economically backward countries," such as Russia, where capitalist and pre-capitalist conditions existed simultaneously. The second category included the "semi-colonial" states that were dominated at least economically by the great powers but maintained political independence. The remaining category included fully colonial countries, wholly under the sway of invested foreign capital, both economically and politically.

Lenin studied several manifestations of imperialism concomitant to the phenomenon. The imperialist war, long a favorite topic in his writing, ineluctably resulted, he declared, from the partitioning of the world into political and economic spheres of influence. Lenin cited the statistics of Supan, a contemporary political geographer, as evidence that there were no more unoccupied territorial areas. "Only redivision is possible" and territories could only pass from owner to owner, rather than from unowned to owner. In a view similar to Hobson's idea of competing empires, Lenin noted that war among competing imperialist powers was the only means by which the world could be divided according to the respective strengths of the powers. Hence the imperialist epoch was destined to be rife with conflict.

The castigation of opportunists and false friends recurred in this essay to some length. Lenin claimed that a portion of the "super-profits" (profits exceeding a normal return for investment) of the capitalists was being used to bribe the top strata of labor leaders, whom he alternately called the "labour lieutenants of the capitalist class" and the "labour aristocracy." These leaders, he alleged, cooperated with the
bourgeoisie in keeping the working class tractable under capitalist exploitation. Lenin added a new corollary to this line of thought by pointing out that imperialism also fostered opportunistic divisions among the proletariat as native workers rose to overseer positions and immigrants served as laborers.

In conjunction with his denunciation of opportunism, Lenin applied the verbal lash to his old ideological antagonist Kautsky. He returned to Kautsky's contention that "ultra-imperialism" or the domination of the world by a few monopolies would bring lasting peace through a controlled economy. Peace was impossible under imperialism, Lenin submitted, because capitalists could continue to reap super-profits only as long as they continued to expand their markets; the only way expansion could be accomplished was through forcible appropriation of territories. Lenin rejected Kautsky's analysis of imperialism as the political "policy" of economic and political annexation by capitalists, arguing instead that it was an unavoidable result of capitalistic development.

Building on ideas originally propounded by Bukharin, Lenin advanced the remarkable theory that imperialism was the transitional stage between capitalism and socialism. Bukharin had previously warned of the possibility of "state Capitalism," in which the state would become the sole monopolist. Lenin picked up that thread and stated that with imperialism production becomes social (i.e. a few monopolies control all major industries, demand for labor, etc.) but the appropriation remains private. ...
The social means of production remain the private property of a few."58 Private monopolies and state monopolies were closely related and together were not far distant from socialism. Capitalism in its imperialist stage approached the most universal socialization of production; it dragged
capitalists against their will and conscience into a new social order, the transition from full freedom of competition to full socialization. Once control of the socialized means of production was concentrated in the hands of a very few monopolists, it would prove a simple matter for the proletariat to expropriate the expropriators and to take over the system.

Significant emphasis was also placed on the role and the nature of finance capitalism. Lenin proceeded to expound this subject with more care (and undoubtedly more help from Hobson and Hilferding) than in previous articles. Finance capitalism, a stage of "moribund" or "over-ripe" capitalism was described as parasitic in nature, seeking not to profit from the sale of commodities, but to reap the monopolistic super-profits of investment and exportation of capital. Lenin argued that the separation of the rentier, living on returns from invested capital, from the entrepreneur and management, directly concerned with management of capital had led to a step beyond simple capitalism. Characteristic of imperialism was the practice which permitted a growing class of rentiers to live by "clipping coupons" from invested capital and by exploiting several foreign colonies and countries. Lenin contended that this division had become universal with "the world divided into a handful of money lending states on the one side, and vast majority of debtor states on the other." A side-effect of this polarization was that some advanced countries were composed solely of the rentier class while the burden of physical toil was transferred to the colonies. This division, he insisted, heighten class conflicts to unbearable proportions and render inescapable the ultimate overthrow of imperialism.

Also in "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" several traditional Marxian principles were revitalized. Lenin briefly inserted
the law of the "increasing misery" of the masses when he stated that the
"uneven and wretched condition of the masses are fundamental and inevitable
conditions and premises of this mode of production." However, he did
not dwell on this tenet which for Marx explained precisely how and why
the revolution would come, i.e. through increasing proletarian misery and
increasing crises in capitalism. Lenin tacitly relegated this theory to
a position of secondary importance, since it was painfully obvious both
that the proletariat had not become more miserable in the imperialist era
and that the capitalist system was continuing to survive.

Employing the Marxist view of the contradictions of capitalism to
demonstrate that monopoly was at war with the environment of free compe-
tition that bred it, Lenin observed that in the era of imperialism free
trade, the foundation of the system, was transformed into its antithesis,
monopoly. Monopoly did not completely abolish free trade but existed
simultaneously, giving rise to antagonism and conflict.

"Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" marked the most ad-
vanced expression of Lenin's theory of imperialism. It included all the
elements of economic and political thought relevant to a Marxist inter-
pretation of the subject. After this essay "imperialism" enjoyed a well-
defined place in the Marxist scheme of history.

DEVELOPMENTS IN LENIN'S THEORY AFTER
"IMPERIALISM, THE HIGHEST STAGE OF CAPITALISM"

Although Lenin published his comprehensive view of imperialism by
mid-July 1916, he modified and refined it slightly during the next few
years. Returning to a favorite aspect of imperialism in "The War Program
of the Proletarian Revolution," "Bourgeois Pacifism and Socialistic Pacifism,"
and "The Youth International," all written in late in 1916, Lenin examined various kinds of war and endorsed certain of them. "Wars of national liberation" seeking to free colonies from their oppressors were to be supported by socialists. Civil wars pitting progressive democratic forces against reactionary forces were important in creating conditions suited to the socialist revolution. Finally, "defensive wars" by countries which had already achieved socialism were necessary to protect that country against the reaction of capitalist countries surrounding it.

Referring to the law of the unequal development of capitalism, Lenin emphatically stated that "it follows irrefutably that Socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously in all countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries... This must not only create friction but a direct striving...to crush the victorious proletariat of the Socialist country." In "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism" Lenin continued to wield his theories on war as weapons against his ideological enemies. If a war carries out the "policy" (he carelessly used the term which he derided others for using) of imperialism, such as safeguarding colonies or financial investments, then the substance of the war is imperialistic and socialists should denounce it. If a war carries out a policy of national liberation, then the substance of the war is national liberation and useful to socialism. Lenin distinguished between a socialist and a bourgeois war which defended the fatherland. "A war against imperialist, i.e. oppressing powers by oppressed (for example, colonial) nations is a genuine national war" and "the defence of the fatherland is possible." Also in refuting some of Fyatakov's arguments, Lenin expanded his theory of the socialist state emerging from the imperialist epoch. Socialism
would be achieved by the united action of the proletarians, not of all countries, but of the minority of countries that have reached the stage of development of advanced capitalism. Lenin maintained that the socialist revolution must come to those advanced countries whose "national tasks" have been fulfilled. Other undeveloped countries must still go through the process of fulfilling those national, democratic tasks.

Late in 1916 Lenin presented a concise summation of his definition of imperialism with slightly different emphasis in "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism."

Imperialism is a specific historical stage of capitalism. Its specific character is threefold: imperialism is (1) monopoly capitalism; (2) parasitic or decaying capitalism; (3) moribund capitalism. The substitution of monopoly for free competition is the fundamental economic feature, the quintessence of imperialism.

Lenin placed graphic emphasis on the decadence of imperialism rather than upon imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism but one step away from socialism. He cited the five principle manifestations of monopoly, tracing it from the formation of cartels and trusts through the economic and then territorial division of the world. Moribund capitalism he defined as monopoly capitalism that "is already...dying out, the beginning of its transition to Socialism. The tremendous socialization of labour by imperialism (what the apologists--bourgeois economists--call interlocking) means the same thing."

In this same article Lenin launched perhaps his most scathing attack on Kautsky. He produced statements from a letter by Engels to a friend which he employed to denounce Kautsky. Referring to the desertion of the proletariat by a certain "privileged minority of the workers," as Engels called them, Lenin noted that "capitalists can devote a part of [their]
super-profits to bribe their own workers to create something like an alliance between the workers of a given nation and their capitalists against the other countries." The success of Capital in "bribing" the socialist leaders of Western Europe, he charged, was the underlying reason for the breakup of international socialism.

Leaning heavily on Hobson, Lenin delineated a precise concept of "new" imperialism that he had previously mentioned in "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism." The last third of the nineteenth century marked the rise of several Great Powers which challenged England's position as sole monopolist of finance capital. This era succeeded the period described by Engels and Marx in which England alone exploited the world. Comparing the "new" imperialism to the old, he observed that "formerly the working class of one country could be bribed and corrupted for decades. Now this is improbable, if not impossible. But on the other hand, every imperialist "Great Power" can and does bribe the smaller strata of the 'labour aristocracy.'" The bribery of whole classes, which he intimated had allowed the financial oligarchy and the capitalist system to evade the inevitable revolution, must eventually fail because the mass of the proletariat is crushed in the process and will revolt.

In "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination" Lenin stated that "victorious socialism must achieve complete democracy and consequently, not only bring about the complete equality of nations, but also give effect to the right of oppressed nations to self-determination, i.e. the right to free political secession." Out of the revolution against imperialism would come complete democracy and freedom of determination for all nations. But the ultimate goal after the overthrow of imperialism would be to unite all nations under socialism,
to merge them into a single proletarian whole. He added that "democracy is also a form of state which must disappear...in the process of transition from completely victorious and consolidated socialism to complete communism." This is the basis for his famous "withering away of the state" idea.

LENIN'S THEORY OF IMPERIALISM IN RETROSPECT

By the end of 1917 Lenin's theory of imperialism had reached its full development. To the multitude of theories on the nature of imperialism he added a comprehensive Marxist one. The list of debts he owed to writers such as Hobson, Hilferding, Bukharin and Luxemburg would be a long one indeed since from their work he adapted the raw material for his theory. Most of Lenin's economic ideas and political observations were acquired second-hand and reinterpreted from a Marxist viewpoint. But there was more to Lenin's treatment of imperialism than mere restatement or facile adaptation of the ideas of others. To the corpus of theory on imperialism he contributed some very valuable corollaries. His study of the causes, nature and results of war in the imperialist era and his strong emphasis on the revolutionary possibilities inherent in the era added much to existing concepts. In addition he developed many peripheral ideas, such as "socialism in one country" and "withering away of the state" that provided the foundation for later ideological expansion of the Marxist framework. Most importantly for Marxists he melded his thought and that of others under the rigid discipline of the Marxian dialectic in history to fashion a viable explanation of his times.
NOTES


2. Ibid., p. 202-03.

3. Ibid., p. 204.

4. Ibid., p. 204.

5. Ibid., p. 227.

6. Ibid., p. 226.


8. Ibid., p. 228.


10. Ibid., p. 61.
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44. The Russian Socialist Democratic Labour Party (Bolshevik) was the radical, revolutionary wing of the major Marxist party. Led by Lenin the Bolshevik or "Majority" socialists (opposed to the Mensheviks or "Minority") split from the rest of the party over several questions of party discipline (the Bolsheviks favored a small, highly organized band of revolutionaries) and practices. The split occurred at a party congress in 1903 and the respective names for the two wings did not reflect the true strength of each but the victorious "majority" and "minority" on the question of staffing Iskra, the party organ.

55. Struvesn—P. B. Struve was a Marxist and a Social Democrat in the 1890's, but by 1905 he had switched to Constitutional Democratic Party, where became an outspoken leader of the right wing of the party. As a Marxist he was the foremost champion of "legal Marxism" which favored the growth of Russian capitalism. In Critical Remarks on the Economic Development of Russia, Struve criticized the Narodnik (populist) view that Russia could avoid the capitalist stage en route to socialism. He argued that capitalism was progressive and beneficial to Russia but he failed to mention the class conflicts inherent in capitalism according to Marx. Struve denied that the collapse of capitalism was inevitable and advocated that workers learn from capitalism rather than struggle against the bourgeoisie.
Pyatakov—Pyatakov was a Bolshevik who subscribed to Bukharin’s "ultra leftist" theory that capitalism was not an essential step on the way to socialism. He challenged Lenin’s assertion that the proletariat of oppressed and oppressing nations must act differently. He maintained that Marxist doctrine demanded a direct transition from imperialism to socialism without waiting, as Lenin suggested, for each nation to fulfill its national tasks. He opposed the idea of self-determination for countries freed from the imperialist yoke.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


