

THE MAIN BLOW IN THE PRESENT HISTORIC PERIOD



Two Articles from The Communist

including selections from Stalin:

CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF STRATEGY AND
TACTICS OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST

and

OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND TACTICS

The Workers Congress (M-L)

POB 1297 Chicago, Illinois 60690

The articles on the "main blow" reprinted in this pamphlet have a particular importance for our movement at this time. As Huang Hua, the Chairman of the Chinese delegation to the UN, pointed out in a speech to the General Assembly on September 29, we are in a new historic period -- the period of struggle against superpower hegemonism. For Marxist-Leninists, it is impossible to get a grasp of any historic period without understanding the focus of revolutionary strategy at that time -- that is, without understanding the direction of the main blow. This is generally true.

More particularly, errors on the main blow reflect an underlying failure to grasp the specific features of a historic period. As Stalin writes in a passage reprinted here at p. 22, "a strategic plan suitable for one period of history, which has its own features, cannot be suitable for another period of history, which has entirely different specific features." At this time, errors on the main blow reflect a fundamental failure to grasp firmly Chairman Mao Tsetung's great strategic concept of the three worlds.

The importance of this point cannot be overestimated. A sharp attack has come forward in the international communist movement against the three world thesis of Chairman Mao and this attack has been reflected in our own movement. Without a doubt it is fueled by opportunist interpretations of the three world thesis.

The social chauvinist line on the main blow taken up in this pamphlet is one example of that. The Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) (CPML) (formerly the Organizing Committee of the October League, the OL/OC) calls for us to direct our main blow internationally against the USSR only.* Objectively this is a social chauvinist line which plainly contradicts the strategy of a united front against the hegemonism of both superpowers. It is consistent only with a strategic plan which takes the USSR as the principal enemy, calls for a united front against Soviet social imperialism,

and in the end reduces the first world to the USSR alone.

THE ATTACK ON ONE ERROR COVERS ANOTHER

Attacking the social chauvinist character of this line has provided excellent cover for opportunist forces in our movement to conceal their own errors.

For example, a number of U.S. Marxist-Leninist organizations have taken up the line that both superpowers represent the same danger to the world's people to the same degree and the same extent in order to polemicize against the CP(ML)'s opportunist stand on the main blow. Instead of preserving what is correct and exposing what is incorrect, they use the cover of what is incorrect to attack what is correct.

Specifically, these forces fail to point out -- as we have done in this pamphlet -- why it is correct to call the Soviet Union the more dangerous of the two superpowers. As a result they are unable to expose in a theoretically convincing way the chauvinism of the CP(ML)'s position on the focus of revolutionary strategy in the present historic period. Their attempt to show that the two superpowers are equally dangerous falls short of its mark.

To call both superpowers the same danger to the same degree and to the same extent is wrong from the point of view of dialectical method and shows a failure to make a concrete analysis of changes which have taken place in world affairs. The history of two imperialist wars teaches us to pay close attention to the uneven development of the relationship of force between the imperialist great powers. These differences can only be resolved by force. To abandon the law of uneven development makes it impossible to trace concretely the development of these factors which must sooner or later give rise to imperialist war.

The debate, therefore, conducted within such narrow limits, has led only to confusion. One strategic plan leads to social chauvinism; the other belittles the danger of imperialist war. Neither is capable of mobilizing U.S. working and oppressed people in a complex international situation.

STALIN'S TEXTS ON THE MAIN BLOW

2 The texts from Stalin discussed here provide impor-

tant background to the concept of 'historic period' raised by Huang Hua in his UN speech. In the excerpts reprinted, Stalin clearly explains the relationship between a historic turn, a historic period, the main enemy and the main blow. These passages also make clear the distinction between the main blow of the party of the proletariat and the main blow of the working class and its allies. Failure to make this distinction has added mud to waters already clouded by theoretical confusion.

Notice that a historic period is not equivalent to the Marxist-Leninist concept of an epoch or an era. We are still in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution. But as Chairman Mao points out in *ON CONTRADICTION*, the process of the development of a thing goes through a number of stages, each of which is marked by its particular features. Decisive developments in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution reflect historic turns which demarcate historic periods. The present stage (historic period) in the development of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution is characterized by three factors which in their development constitute a fundamental historic turn. These factors are: (1) the restoration of capitalism in the USSR and the disintegration of the socialist camp; (2) the decline of US imperialism and the disintegration of the Western imperialist camp; (3) the rise of the Third World. It is these changes, summed up by Chairman Mao in his theory of the three worlds and which reflect the development of all the basic contradictions of the contemporary era, that are the basis for understanding the international situation today.

On this foundation, a revolutionary proletarian party in the U.S., genuinely built according to the revolutionary theory and style of Marxism-Leninism, must call for the broadest united front internationally against the hegemonism of the two superpowers based on the unity of the revolutionary movement in this country with the socialist countries and with the proletariat and oppressed people and nations throughout the world and with the third world countries and all countries subjected to aggression, interference or threats of superpower hegemonism, as a component part and the main content of the united front against imperialism in this period.

As we said in our article "Stalin:On the Main Blow", "The relatively greater danger to imperialist war posed by the USSR has not brought an end to this historic period and does not mark a new historic turn where the USSR is alone the principal enemy of world revolution."

DIRECT THE MAIN BLOW AGAINST BOTH SUPERPOWERS

The main blow is the main direction a proletarian movement must take in a given historic period. It is the main focus of a strategic plan suitable to the specific features of a particular historic period.

Huang Hua said:"We are now in a new period -- the period of struggle against superpower hegemonism."

There can be no doubt. In the present historic period we must direct our main blow against the hegemonism of both superpowers

*The articles in this pamphlet quote language from the Draft Program of the OL/OC as originally published in The Call. This language was adopted without change by the CP(ML) in its party program. See, Documents From the Founding Congress of the Communist Party(Marxist-Leninist), pp. 98-105

OC DRAFT PROGRAM

Proletarian Internationalism Or Social-Chauvinism

Reprinted from

THE COMMUNIST, Vol. III No. 9, May 7, 1977

May Day is an international working class holiday. It affirms the international solidarity of the working class and oppressed peoples. May Day is a good time, therefore, to take stock of the struggle against social chauvinism in our movement. Especially this is so in view of the rising danger of imperialist world war.

Social chauvinism is an opportunist trend in the international working class movement. Lenin defines social chauvinism as "socialists in words, but chauvinist in deeds, who are helping 'their own' bourgeoisie to rob other countries and enslave other nations." He continues, "That is the very substance of chauvinism - to defend one's own fatherland even when its acts are aimed at enslaving other people's fatherlands. *OPPORTUNISM AND THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL* (Lenin, *Collected Works*, v. 22, p. 109). In *SOCIALISM AND WAR* Lenin identifies the economic basis of social chauvinism -- "the interests of a tiny stratum of privileged workers and of the petty bourgeoisie who are defending their privileged position, their 'right' to crumbs of the profits 'their' national bourgeoisie obtains from robbing other nations, etc." Politically social chauvinism means "collaboration of classes instead of class struggle, renunciation of revolutionary methods of struggle helping one's 'own' government in its embarrassed situation instead of taking advantage of these embarrassments for revolution."

Imperialist war and imperialist war preparations feed social chauvinism. For that reason, now, with the increasing danger of a new world war between the U.S. and the USSR, we must place to the forefront of our tasks the struggle against social chauvinism. Only by defeating this opportunist trend do we lay the basis for an independent communist policy to lead the proletariat and oppressed masses in conditions of war.

Party building, therefore, is directly connected to the struggle against social chauvinism, and the rupture required with the positions of petty bourgeois

democracy is also a rupture with social chauvinism. Preparing the conditions for a new Marxist-Leninist party means purging our ranks of social chauvinism and of every tendency to confusion and vacillation on the question.

Significant debates on the international situation in our movement show that this task has not yet been accomplished. The Draft Program of the Communist Party (M-L) recently published by the Organizing Committee for the Marxist-Leninist Party (OC) is the most important example of confusion on fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism leading necessarily to social chauvinism.

THE OC'S DRAFT PROGRAM

The Draft Program reads:

"The Soviet Union is not only an imperialist superpower; it is also the center of modern revisionism, which is the main social prop of imperialism in the international working class movement. The Soviet Union, which carries out its aggression under the signboard of socialism, is the most dangerous of the two superpowers. Therefore, while we oppose both superpowers, as part of the worldwide movement against imperialism, we must direct our main blow internationally at Soviet social-imperialism." (*The Call*, April 4, 1977).

DIRECT THE MAIN BLOW AT THE COMPROMISING PARTIES

The October League (OL) has argued in its polemics over the last year that US revolutionaries should direct their main blow internationally at the USSR because the Soviet Union was "the main prop of imperialism". The OL relied here on Stalin's argument that we must direct our main blow against the parties of compromise with imperialism which are the social support or props of imperialism. (See *FOUNDATIONS OF LENINISM* and *THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND THE TACTICS OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISTS*.) Summing up the experience of the Bolshevik party in the October Revolution, Stalin writes:

"In this period the petty bourgeois democratic parties, the parties of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, were the most dangerous social support of imperialism. Why?

Because these parties were the compromising parties, the parties of compromise between imperialism and the laboring masses. Naturally, the Bolsheviks at that time directed their main blows at these parties, for unless these parties were isolated there could be no hope of a rupture between the laboring masses and imperialism, and unless this rupture was ensured there could be no hope of the victory of the Soviet revolution." (*ON THE OPPOSITION*, p. 166)

In other words, the main blow is directed at the compromising parties in order to facilitate and hasten the victory over the principal enemy. It is a means of organizing and preparing the conditions for revolution by breaking the influence of the disorganizing forces among the ranks of the people who attempt to subordinate the working masses to the leadership of the bourgeoisie at every turn. No party was as thoroughgoing as the Bolshevik party in preparing the conditions for that rupture and winning the broad masses of working people from the influence of the compromising parties--this was one of the decisive factors of the Bolshevik revolution. And no party was as ruthless with itself in overcoming those influences in its own ranks. That is why Bolshevization retains its significance as a party building slogan for us today.

However, the OL and the OC have never grasped the significance of the rupture required with the influence of the parties of compromise with imperialism and have proposed to form a new revolutionary party without demonstrating leadership in that struggle. As a result, they miss the point of Stalin's analysis. Instead, they took up dogmatically the positions of Stalin and used them to justify their view on a connected but somewhat different issue--that the main blow of communists internationally ought to be directed against the USSR. In the *CALL* of December 6, 1976, they wrote:

"The October League, along with the organizations inside the Organizing Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Party (OC), holds that, while the objective of the revolutionary struggle in the US is aimed at the overthrow of U.S. imperialism, internationally we must direct the main blow at the Soviet Union. Because it is the center of modern revisionism, the USSR is the main prop of imperialism internationally."

In other words, the USSR is a social support or party of compromise with imperialism.

For Marxist-Leninists this position is absurd. The USSR is not a party of compromise with or social support of imperialism--it is imperialism. It is not a prop of the enemy of the revolution--it is an enemy of the revolution.

Internationally, modern revisionism is the main party of compromise with imperialism--that much is true. In the international communist movement revisionism is the main danger and Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations direct their main blow against it. It is also true that the Soviet Union is the center of modern revisionism. But it is empty dogmatism to conclude from this that the USSR is a party of compromise and a social prop. The ideological, political and organizational center of every opportunist and compromising party will inevitably be found at the general headquarters of the bourgeoisie. This phenomena is not peculiar to modern revisionism. In fact, that is the significance of the collapse of the Second International. With the crisis of the First imperialist war, the social chauvinist and compromising parties of European Social Democracy found their center not with the organizational leadership of the international proletariat, but instead with their own bourgeois governments.

REVISIONISM IN POWER IS THE RISE TO POWER OF THE BOURGEOISIE

What is confused in the OL's presentation is that the USSR is not a "party" but a bourgeois state exercising class dictatorship. Stalin pointed out that after the February revolution in Russia the party of the liberal bourgeoisie, that is the party of compromise with the tsar in the bourgeois democratic revolution, "had been transformed from a compromising force into a governing force, into the ruling force of imperialism." The same kind of consideration applies here. While modern revisionism out of power is a compromising force, in power it is a governing force, in the Soviet Union, the ruling force of Soviet social imperialism. As Mao Tsetung said, "The rise to power of revisionism is the rise to power of the bourgeoisie." (quoted at the Tenth Party Congress)

Revisionism in power is no longer a compromising party that must be isolated, but a class in power that must

be overthrown. Under conditions of a fascist one party dictatorship in the USSR, compromising elements must be found among the middle and lower levels of the party and trade union bureaucracy, as well as the workers aristocracy, where an opportunist and reformist petty bourgeoisie has emerged whose role is to suppress class conflict and subordinate the goals of the working class to the needs of the new bourgeoisie and the state monopoly capitalist system it commands.

The paragraph of the Draft Program we have quoted is somewhat better than OL's arguments in the *CALL* and, on its face, neither defends nor depends on these polemics. The statement of the Draft Program is:

"The Soviet Union is not only an imperialist superpower; it is also the center of modern revisionism, which is the main social prop of imperialism in the international working class movement."

Accurately understood, this is correct. Modern revisionism is the main social prop and the USSR is the center of modern revisionism, as we have pointed out.

However, if the language of the Draft represented a conscious correction and repudiation of the confusion of OL's earlier positions, we would have expected the Commentary to the Draft to explain this and include a self-criticism. But with a stylish superficiality that has come to characterize the OC's work, the problem is ignored. Comrades would therefore be wrong to conclude that the language of the Draft represents an advance.

DIRECT THE MAIN BLOW AT THE PRINCIPAL ENEMY

In any case, the basic confusion of the Draft Program is not on the question of compromising parties. OL was led into error on that question because of its confusion on a more fundamental issue. Clearly from Klonsky's first use of the concept of the main blow in the *CALL* interview last year, OL has been concerned with the broader question raised in Stalin's essay on *STRATEGY AND TACTICS*. Stalin there is not considering the main blow of the party required to isolate compromising forces, but the main blow of the class and its allies required to overthrow the principal enemy. Stalin writes:

"The most important function of strategy is to determine the main direction which ought to be taken by the working class movement, and

along which the proletariat can most advantageously deliver the main blow at its enemy in order to achieve the aims formulated in the programme. A strategic plan is a plan of the organization of the decisive blow in the direction in which the blow is most likely to achieve the maximum results...The strategic plan defines the main blow to be delivered by the revolutionary forces and the corresponding disposition of the vast masses on the social front."

Here Stalin is speaking to the strategic alignment of all revolutionary forces to accomplish the tasks of a particular stage of the revolution. It is no longer a question of how the party of the proletariat should use its main weapons during a period of preparation in order to win the broad masses of working people away from the influence of the compromising forces, facilitating their organization. Stalin is now speaking of the strategic disposition of the proletariat itself and its allies along the main line which can be taken to deliver the main blow against the principal enemy of the revolution.

With this meaning, is the Draft Program correct?

No it is not. The strategic lesson Stalin brings forward is to deliver the main blow at the principal enemy. The Draft Program does not identify the USSR as the principal enemy, but calls for revolutionaries to direct their main blow against it anyway.

TOGETHER THE TWO SUPERPOWERS CONSTITUTE THE MAIN ENEMY

Identifying the main blow internationally is a question of the strategic alignment of forces and of our strategic plan. Today, this turns on an appraisal of the two superpowers. US imperialism, while still economically and financially more farflung than Soviet social imperialism, has nonetheless entered its decline. Decisively defeated in Indochina, weakened economically, politically and militarily, relatively well exposed before the peoples of the world--for these reasons, US imperialism is on the defensive. The USSR, on the other hand, is an imperialist power on the offensive. Like Germany before World War I, it is a younger, more aggressive imperialist power seeking to push its way into every corner of the globe. It is a latecomer to the im-

perialist banquet and has geared up for war to demand a larger share of the pie. It is a war economy with 60% of industrial enterprises bound up to military purposes and has more than double the US forces under arms. The Soviet revisionist clique in charge of the state machine directly controls the entire national economy and all economic lifelines and there is a higher concentration and organization of state monopoly capital than in the US. Most important, the USSR carries out its rivalry for hegemony with the US under the signboard of socialism, falsely pretending to inherit the Bolshevik tradition of proletarian internationalism. Many are still confused by its phony claim to be a "natural ally" of the Third World. For all these reasons, the USSR is the most dangerous source of war. For these reasons also, it is at this time the more dangerous of the two superpowers.

Does this mean that our strategic plan, the main direction along which the proletariat and its allies can most advantageously deliver the main blow is, internationally, against the Soviet Union?

The point is a crucial one. As a part of the world wide revolutionary united front, the US proletariat has no goals internationally different from other workers movements. Our most important contribution to world revolution is the overthrow of US imperialism, but world-wide we have no objectives different from those of the international working class. Furthermore, the tasks of revolution in the US are always subordinate to those of world revolution. To direct the main blow against the Soviet Union is to subordinate the overthrow of US imperialism to that task.

The OC's Draft Program is in error on this point. The strategic plan put forward by Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations world-wide does not call for the US or other revolutionary movements to direct their main blow at the Soviet Union, but calls for a united front against both superpowers. The Draft Program's views on the international situation are fundamentally inconsistent. The OL's position on the main blow has undermined positions of the Draft Program that are otherwise correct.

The Draft Program correctly states:

"The United States, along with the Soviet Union, stands today as one of the two imperialist superpowers who are the biggest international oppressors and exploiters. Together, they constitute

the main enemy of the peoples, nations, and countries of the world." (Our emphasis.)

From this, the Draft Program correctly concludes:

"The US working class must firmly unite with the international proletariat and the oppressed nations and peoples of the world, with all the countries subjected to aggression, subversion, interference and control or bullying by imperialism or social imperialism to form the broadest possible united front against imperialism and especially against the two superpowers."

These statements correctly identify the strategic plan and main direction along which the proletariat and its allies world wide can most advantageously deliver the main blow at its principal enemy. They identify the disposition of the vast revolutionary masses on the social front.

DIRECT THE MAIN BLOW AGAINST BOTH SUPERPOWERS

In other words, internationally, the strategic plan put forward by Marxist-Leninists is a united front against imperialism and especially against the hegemonism of the two superpowers. If we are to speak of the direction of the main blow of the international proletariat against its main enemy, the only position consistent with this strategic plan is to deliver the main blow against both superpowers which are together the main enemy of the peoples, nations and countries of the world.

But the OC vacillated on the point and offers a typical petty bourgeois attempt to compromise the positions of social chauvinism. It wants to have it both ways. If we direct the main blow against US imperialism, our strategic plan is to call for the people of the world to unite to defeat US imperialism and all its running dogs. If we direct the main blow against Soviet social imperialism, our strategic plan calls for a united front against Soviet social imperialism and its running dogs. At this time, however, the strategic plan of Marxist-Leninists calls for neither of these. At this time the call is for the broadest possible united front against the hegemonism of the two superpowers.

Under present circumstances, the call to deliver the main blow against one or the other superpower only, objectively aids its rival in the struggle for hegemony. It is social chauvinism: "the defense of the privileges,

advantages, robbery and violence of ones 'own' (or every) imperialist bourgeoisie." The OC has not succeeded in purging its ranks of social chauvinism. The position of the Draft Program, which must lead to error and confusion on the international front, is particularly serious in view of the grave danger of imperialist war.

We do not speculate as to what historic turns may lay ahead in the course of world revolution. A united front against social fascism, for example, is a possibility we cannot exclude. That, however, is not our strategic plan at this time and under present conditions.

The OC would like to reduce the question of the main blow to a matter of uneven development between imperialist superpowers. Uneven development, however, is a constant phenomena of imperialism. Because of uneven development the USSR at this time constitutes the main danger to war -- it is more aggressive, the least exposed and the more dangerous. For these reasons we must pay special attention to exposing its savage features and dragging its true character to the light of day. But the question of the main blow is a question of the strategic alignment of forces. It depends on our identification of the main enemy. At present the two superpowers together are the main enemy and everything depends on a principled stand toward this question. Until a turn in world history changes that situation, requiring a change in our strategic plan -- that is, the whole alignment of revolutionary forces -- we must direct our decisive blow at both superpowers.

The consolidation of the forces in the OC into a new Marxist-Leninist organization calling itself a party and based on the confusion of the Draft Program's positions on the international situation as well as its failure to thoroughly carry forward the struggle against social chauvinism would be a setback for our movement. Comrades in the OC and throughout the movement must give highest priority to the struggle against this deviation from the principles of orthodox Marxism-Leninism.

REVISIONISM ON STRATEGY AND TACTICS

It is important to comment on the Revolutionary Communist Party's (RCP) polemics against OL on the main blow.

The RCP correctly ridiculed OL's position that the Soviet Union is a social prop for or a party of compromise with imperialism. But they can find no other

way to do this than by a revisionist criticism of Stalin. After quoting Stalin's analysis in *THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND TACTICS*, the RCP says, "In fact, the RCP does not agree with the formulation in these articles by Stalin" (*REVOLUTION*, February 1977). Ignoring the plain meaning of words they call Stalin inconsistent and go on to counterpose the strategic lessons of the Bolshevik party to the practice of the Chinese revolution led by Mao Tsetung. They complain that Stalin's formulation "came down to a policy of isolating middle of the road social and political forces in any given revolutionary period. To this is counterposed the practice of the Chinese revolution -- directing the main blow at the chief enemy to isolate it, while for the middle forces, a policy is recommended of both uniting with them and struggling against them so they are at least neutralized and a basis provided for efforts to win them from neutrality to alliance with the revolutionary forces."

Under the guise of upholding the contributions of Mao Tsetung and the Chinese Communist Party to the science of revolution, this is a shamefaced attack on orthodox Marxism-Leninism. Not so long ago the Revolutionary Union, which formed the RCP, proposed that US Marxist-Leninists could ignore the fundamental scientific characteristics of a nation as summed up by Stalin - in order to make room for a stale revisionist theory of their own. We thought they had backed off that. But there has been no repudiation. The source of the error clearly has not been rooted out. In the RCP we still have to do with a clique of "creative" Marxists who think they can match their few years of 'building the mass movement' against a generation of stubborn Bolshevik revolutionary experience. What they offer now is revisionism on strategy and tactics.

MIDDLE FORCES AND COMPROMISING PARTIES

In the first place the RCP confuses middle forces with compromising parties. In fact there will be no middle forces won over at all unless the parties of compromise with imperialism are isolated. In *WORK OF THE XIV CONFERENCE OF R.C.P. (B)*, Stalin said:

"Hence the task of the communist elements in the colonial countries is to link up with the revolutionary elements of the bourgeoisie, and above all with the peasantry, against the bloc of imperialism

and the compromising elements of 'their own' bourgeoisie, in order, under the leadership of the proletariat to wage a genuinely revolutionary struggle for liberation from imperialism."

What is there to contradict the theory and practice of the Chinese revolution in this? Nothing of course! In a war of national liberation against imperialism, the chief enemy is the imperialist oppressor nation and the compromising parties are national parties of capitulation and betrayal. These are the forces that sell out and attempt to disorganize the national struggle. Mao Tsetung wrote constantly on the subject and, for example, pursued a policy of isolating the diehard wing of the Kuomintang which represented not middle forces of the Chinese nation, but primarily the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie. This was the wing which fostered a spirit of defeatism and national capitulation and sought accommodation with imperialism rather than liberation, asking communists to "fold up their tents", etc.

THE MAIN BLOW OF THE PARTY AND THE MAIN BLOW OF THE CLASS

In the second place, the RCP confuses the main weapon of the proletarian party with the main blow of the proletarian class. In *OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND TACTICS*, Stalin makes clear he is talking about the weapons of the Bolshevik party -- e.g. "Naturally, the Party at that time directed its main blows at the Cadets", or "Naturally, the Bolsheviks at that time directed their main blows at these parties..." A vanguard party of the proletariat uses its main weapons to organize the working masses in a period of revolutionary preparation. But it is the masses themselves, not the party which makes revolution. Under the leadership of a vanguard party a revolutionary class delivers its main blow at its chief enemy. The Bolshevik Party directed its main blow against the parties of petty bourgeois democracy, but the Russian proletariat, together with its allies, directed its main blow at the Russian bourgeoisie, not the petty bourgeoisie.

THE LEADERSHIP OF THE VANGUARD

Comrades who grasp this point will not be confused by the RCP's base attack on Stalin for a supposed in-

consistency concerning the main blow. As we pointed out above, in *STRATEGY AND TACTICS*, Stalin discusses the strategic alignment of the class and its allies against the principal enemy. In *THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND TACTICS*, he is speaking to the leadership of the vanguard of the proletariat must give in order to prepare this strategic alignment. Thus in *THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND TACTICS*, Stalin asks,

"The preparation for October thus proceeded under the leadership of one party, the Bolshevik Party. But how did the Party carry out this leadership, along what line did the latter proceed? This leadership proceeded along the line of isolating the compromising parties, as the most dangerous parties, as the most dangerous groupings in the period of the outbreak of the revolution, the line of isolating the Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks."

This Stalin calls the fundamental strategic rule of Leninism. In throwing it down, the RCP has once again attacked the leading role of a vanguard party. The RCP proclaims an onslaught against the chief enemy, but repudiated the tasks necessary to prepare the conditions for that onslaught.

The RCP repudiates Stalin on this question because it is a representative of the petty bourgeois democratic trend in our movement masquerading under the cloak of Marxism-Leninism. Therefore, the RCP does not want to make a rupture with the positions of the compromising petty bourgeoisie, ideologically, politically and organizationally. What the RCP wants to do -- as we know from its campaign in steel -- is to make a place in its mass work for the reformist trade union bureaucracy.

On strategy and tactics, as with the national question, the RCP tries to drive a wedge between Lenin and Stalin. But the ideas Stalin fought for are a summation of positions consistently developed by Lenin from the experience of 1905 on. For example, *TWO TACTICS OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN THE DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION* turns on an appraisal of the compromising parties of the bourgeois democratic revolution. Stalin's quote from Lenin's Address to the Constituent Assembly shows the continuity of Bolshevik thinking in spite of Trotskyite slanders:

"in order to win the majority of the population to its side the proletariat must...entirely destroy the influence of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois compromisers over the majority of the

non-proletarian toiling masses..." (*ON THE OPPOSITION*, p. 280)

THE LEADERSHIP OF THE VANGUARD AND THE HEGEMONY OF THE PROLETARIAT

By abandoning the struggle against the parties of compromise with imperialism, the RCP abandons the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution. This is the lesson of Lenin and Stalin on strategy and tactics and the significance of the RCP's revisionism on the question.

In the second issue of its theoretical journal, May 1, 1977, the RCP has again reaffirmed its position that prior to 1974, party building could not be the main task of communists (p.77), even though the proletariat had no vanguard party. The particular circumstances, they claim, of mass upsurge in the US prevented it. However, this view reduces the question of the need of the class for vanguard leadership to a question of particular conditions and circumstances. The correct view is that whenever the class lacks a vanguard, the main task of communists is to build one.

The RCP's attack on the leadership of the vanguard in the revolution is, therefore, only further developed and consolidated in its polemics on the main blow. Whereas the task of Bolshevization, which is essential to party building, requires a decisive break with the compromising parties and trends of our movement, the RCP comes forward to say that no such rupture is required, to say that this task contradicts the experience of the Chinese revolution. The necessary consequence is to abandon not only the leadership of the vanguard, but also the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution.

A "revolutionary" "communist" party that repudiates the leading role of the party at every stage of the revolution and the hegemony of the proletariat -- there is the measure of RCP's degeneration!

STALIN: ON THE MAIN BLOW

Reprinted from

THE COMMUNIST, Vol. III No. 12, June 20, 1977

In The Communist, V.III, no. 9, May 7, 1977, we attacked social chauvinist errors in the Draft Program of the October League's Organizing Committee for a new Marxist-Leninist Party. The main points of that article were:

1) There is a difference between the main blow delivered by the vanguard party of the proletariat and the main blow delivered by the working class and its allies.

a) The party delivers its main blow against the influence of the parties of compromise with enemies of the revolution. Only by isolating the compromising parties can the proletarian party establish its leadership and win the masses to its side.

In our case the trend of modern revisionism is the main social prop of imperialism and revisionist parties out of power like the "C" PUSA are compromising parties which Marxist-Leninists must isolate in order to establish the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist vanguard and win the masses to revolution.

b) The working class delivers its main blow against the principal enemy of the revolution. It is the function of strategy to determine the direction of the decisive blow corresponding to the disposition of the broad masses on the social front.

In our case the strategy for revolution is a united front against imperialism, and especially against the two superpowers which are together the main enemy of the world's people. Internationally, therefore, the working class directs its main blow against both superpowers.

2) In the present circumstances the Organizing Committee's call to deliver the main blow against the USSR is a social chauvinist position.

a) This cannot be justified by calling the USSR a compromising party. The USSR is a governing force of imperialism and an enemy of the revolution, not a party of compromise with the enemy of the revolution.

b) This cannot be justified by the relatively greater danger to imperialist war posed by the young, aggressive and rising Soviet superpower. Uneven devel-

opment is a constant phenomena of imperialism. Without a historic turn demanding a new strategic plan it is incorrect to direct the main blow against one superpower only.

c) The OC's position on the main blow is fundamentally inconsistent with our united front strategy. Since the two superpowers together are the principal enemy, the main blow must be directed against both superpowers. To direct the main blow against one superpower only objectively aids its rival in the struggle for hegemony and is social chauvinism. The inconsistency of the Draft Program is an effort to compromise the positions of proletarian internationalism with social chauvinism, and cannot serve as the programmatic basis for a new Marxist-Leninist party.



The excerpts from Stalin printed below are a basis for studying these points:

A) "STRATEGY": In this selection from his essay CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNISTS, V.5, p. 163, Stalin shows the connection between strategy and the main blow. The question here is how the working class (not the party of the working class) can most effectively deliver the main blow at its principal enemy in order to achieve maximum results. The answer is along the lines charted by a strategic plan.

Today the strategic plan of Marxist-Leninists internationally calls for a united front against imperialism and especially against both superpowers which are together the principal enemy of the world's people.

B) "STRATEGIC PLAN": This selection is from the same essay. The necessary connection between the main blow of the working class and the strategic disposition of revolutionary forces aligned against the principal enemy is here particularly clear.

The emergence of the USSR as a social-imperialist superpower fiercely contending for hegemony with US imperialism, coupled with the defeat of US imperialism in Indochina and its overall decline, represents a historic turn summed up in the line that the two superpowers together are the main enemy of the world's people. The corresponding strategic plan directs the main blow against both the superpowers. The relatively greater danger to imperialist war posed by the USSR has not brought an end to this historic period and

does not mark a new historic turn where the USSR is alone the principal enemy of world revolution. Therefore to direct the main blow against Soviet social-imperialism is incorrect.

C) "THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND TACTICS": This selection from V.6, p. 374 (see also ON THE OPPOSITION, p. 164) concerns the main blow of the party of the proletariat and not the strategic disposition of all revolutionary forces against the principal enemy. Looking to the period of revolutionary preparation, it identifies preconditions to the struggle of the class against its principal enemy.

For the party to direct its main blow at the parties of compromise with imperialism is the fundamental strategic rule of Leninism, because it is a task indispensable to the leadership of the vanguard party. Without the leading role of the vanguard, the revolutionary masses have nothing. Unless the compromising parties are isolated and the masses won from their influence, there can be no hope of a victorious alignment or mobilization of revolutionary forces against the principal enemy.

The selections below also makes clear the bankrupt opportunism of the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP) in claiming that Stalin contradicts himself in these passages. As we pointed out in Vol.III, no. 9, the RCP fails to distinguish the main blow of the party and the main blow of the class. Most importantly, in repudiating Bolshevik lessons on directing the main blow at the parties of compromise with imperialism, the RCP abandons an essential weapon to achieve leadership of the proletarian party in the revolution. Without shame, the RCP abandons the fundamental strategic rule of Leninism.

STRATEGY

The most important function of strategy is to determine the main direction which ought to be taken by the working-class movement, and along which the proletariat can most advantageously deliver the main blow at its enemy in order to achieve the aims formulated in the programme. A strategic plan is a plan of the organisation of the decisive blow in the direction in which the blow is most likely to achieve the maximum results.

The principal features of political strategy could easily be described by drawing an analogy with military

strategy: for instance, in the fight against Denikin during the Civil War. Everybody remembers the end of 1919, when Denikin's forces were standing near Tula. At that time an interesting dispute arose among our military men about the point from which the decisive blow at Denikin's armies should be delivered. Some military men proposed that the line Tsaritsyn-Novorossiisk be chosen for the main direction of the blow. Others, on the contrary, proposed that the decisive blow be delivered along the line Voronezh-Rostov, to proceed along this line and thus cut Denikin's armies in two and then crush each part separately. The first plan undoubtedly had its merits in that it provided for the capture of Novorossiisk, which would have cut off the retreat of Denikin's armies. But, on the one hand, it was faulty because it assumed our advance through districts (the Don Region) which were hostile to Soviet power, and thus would have involved heavy casualties; on the other hand, it was dangerous because it opened for Denikin's armies the road to Moscow via Tula and Serpukhov. The only correct plan for the main blow was the second one, because, on the one hand, it assumed the advance of our main group through districts (Voronezh Gubernia-Donets Basin) which were friendly towards Soviet power and, therefore, would not involve any considerable casualties; on the other hand, it would disrupt the operations of Denikin's main group of forces which were moving towards Moscow. The majority of the military men declared in favour of the second plan, and this determined the fate of the war against Denikin.

In other words, determining the direction of the main blow means deciding in advance the nature of operations during the whole period of the war, i.e., deciding in advance, to the extent of nine-tenths, the fate of the whole war. That is the function of strategy.

The same must be said about political strategy. The first serious collision between the political leaders of the Russian proletariat on the question of the main direction of the proletarian movement took place at the beginning of the twentieth century, during the Russo-Japanese war. At that time, as we know, one section of our Party (the Mensheviks) held the view that the main direction of the proletarian movement in its struggle against tsarism should be along the line of a bloc between the proletariat and the liberal bourgeoisie; the peasantry was omitted, or almost entirely omitted from the plan as a major revolutionary factor, while the leading role in the general revolutionary movement was assigned to the liberal bourgeoisie. The other section of the Party (the Bolsheviks) maintained, on the contrary, that the main blow should proceed along the line of a bloc between the proletariat and the peasantry, and that the leading role in the general revolutionary movement should be assigned to the proletariat, while the liberal bourgeoisie should be neutralised.

If, by analogy with the war against Denikin, we depict our whole revolutionary movement, from the beginning of this century to the February Revolution in 1917, as a war waged by the workers and peasants against tsarism and the landlords, it will be clear that the fate of tsarism and of the landlords largely depended upon which of the two strategic plans (the Menshevik or the Bolshevik) would be adopted, and upon which direction would be chosen as the main direction of the revolutionary movement.

Just as during the war against Denikin military strategy, by deciding the main direction of the blow, determined to the extent of nine-tenths the character of all subsequent operations, including the liquidation of Denikin's armies, so here, in the sphere of the revolutionary struggle against tsarism, our political strategy, by deciding that the main direction of the revolutionary movement should follow the Bolshevik plan, determined the character of our Party's work during the whole period of the open struggle against tsarism, from the time of the Russo-Japanese war down to the February Revolution in 1917.

The function of political strategy is, primarily, on the basis of the data provided by the theory and programme of Marxism, and taking into account the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the workers of all countries, correctly to determine the main direction of the proletarian movement of the given country in the given historical period.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1. HISTORIC TURNS. STRATEGIC PLANS

The Party's strategy is not something constant, fixed once and for all. It alters in accordance with the turns in history, with historic changes. These alterations in strategy find expression in the fact that with each separate turn in history a separate strategic plan is drawn up corresponding to that turn, and effective during the whole period from that turn to the next. The strategic plan defines the direction of the main blow to be delivered by the revolutionary forces and the corresponding disposition of the vast masses on the social front. Naturally, a strategic plan suitable for one period of history, which has its own specific features, cannot be suitable for another period of history, which has entirely different specific features. Corresponding to each turn in history is the strategic plan essential for it and adapted to its tasks.

The same may be said about the conduct of war. The strategic plan that was drawn up for the war against Kolchak could not have been suitable for the war against Denikin, which called for a new strategic plan, which, in its turn, would not have been suitable for, say, the war against the Poles in 1920, because the direction of

the main blows, as well as the disposition of the main fighting forces, could not but be different in each of these three cases.

The recent history of Russia knows of three main historic turns, which gave rise to three different strategic plans in the history of our Party. We consider it necessary to describe them briefly in order to show how the Party's strategic plans in general change in conformity with new historic changes.

2. THE FIRST HISTORIC TURN AND THE COURSE TOWARDS THE BOURGEOIS-DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA

This turn began at the beginning of the present century, in the period of the Russo-Japanese war, when the defeat of the tsar's armies and the tremendous political strikes of the Russian workers stirred up all classes of the population and pushed them into the arena of the political struggle. This turn came to an end in the days of the February Revolution in 1917.

During this period two strategic plans were at issue in our Party: the plan of the Mensheviks (Plekhanov-Martov, 1905), and the plan of the Bolsheviks (Comrade Lenin, 1905).

The Menshevik strategy planned the main blow at tsarism along the line of a coalition between the liberal bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Proceeding from the fact that at that time the revolution was regarded as a bourgeois revolution, this plan assigned the hegemony (leadership) of the movement to the liberal bourgeoisie and doomed the proletariat to the role of "extreme left opposition," to the role of "prompter" to the bourgeoisie, while the peasantry, one of the major revolutionary forces, was entirely, or almost entirely, left out of account. It is easy to understand that since this plan left out of account the millions of peasants in a country like Russia it was hopelessly utopian, and since it placed the fate of the revolution in the hands of the liberal bourgeoisie (the hegemony of the bourgeoisie) it was reactionary, for the liberal bourgeoisie was not interested in achieving the complete victory of the revolution, it was always ready to end the matter by a deal with tsarism.

The Bolshevik strategy (see Comrade Lenin's book *Two Tactics*) planned the revolution's main blow at tsarism along the line of a coalition between the proletariat and the peasantry, while the liberal bourgeoisie was to be neutralised. Proceeding from the fact that the liberal bourgeoisie was not interested in the complete victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, that it preferred a deal with tsarism at the expense of the workers and peasants to the victory of the revolution, this plan assigned the hegemony of the revolutionary movement to

the proletariat as the only completely revolutionary class in Russia. This plan was remarkable not only because it took into account correctly the driving forces of the revolution, but also because it contained in embryo the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat (the hegemony of the proletariat), because it brilliantly foresaw the next, higher phase of the revolution in Russia and facilitated the transition to it.

The subsequent development of the revolution right up to February 1917 fully confirmed the correctness of this strategic plan.

3. THE SECOND HISTORIC TURN AND THE COURSE TOWARDS THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT IN RUSSIA

The second turn began with the February Revolution in 1917, after tsarism was overthrown, when the imperialist war had exposed the fatal ulcers of capitalism all over the world; when the liberal bourgeoisie, incapable of taking in its hands the actual government of the country, was compelled to confine itself to holding formal power (the Provisional Government); when the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, after getting actual power into their hands, had neither the experience nor the will to make the necessary use of it; when the soldiers at the front and the workers and peasants in the rear were groaning under the burdens of the war and economic disruption; when the "dual power" and "contact committee" regime, torn by internal contradictions and capable neither of waging war nor of bringing about peace, not only failed to find "a way out of the impasse" but confused the situation still more. This period ended with the October Revolution in 1917.

Two strategic plans were at issue in the Soviets at that time: the Menshevik-Socialist-Revolutionary plan, and the Bolshevik plan.

The Menshevik-Socialist-Revolutionary strategy, vacillating at first between the Soviets and the Provisional Government, between revolution and counter-revolution, took final shape at the time of the opening of the Democratic Conference (September 1917). It took the line of the gradual but steady removal of the Soviets from power and the concentration of all power in the country in the hands of the "Pre-parliament," the prototype of a future bourgeois parliament. The questions of peace and war, the agrarian and labour questions, as well as the national question, were shelved, pending the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, which, in its turn, was postponed for an indefinite period. "All power to the Constituent Assembly"—this was how the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks formulated their strategic plan. It was a plan for the preparation of a bourgeois dictatorship, a combed and brushed-up, "perfectly democratic" dictatorship it is true, but a bourgeois

dictatorship for all that.

The Bolshevik strategy (see Comrade Lenin's "Theses," published in April 1917") planned the main blow along the line of liquidating the power of the bourgeoisie by the combined forces of the proletariat and the poor peasants, along the line of organising the dictatorship of the proletariat in the shape of a Soviet Republic. Rupture with imperialism and withdrawal from the war; liberation of the oppressed nationalities of the former Russian Empire; expropriation of the landlords and capitalists; preparation of the conditions for organising socialist economy—such were the elements of the Bolsheviks' strategic plan in that period. "All power to the Soviets"—this was how the Bolsheviks then formulated their strategic plan. This plan was important not only because it took into account correctly the actual driving forces of the new, proletarian revolution in Russia, but also because it facilitated and accelerated the unleashing of the revolutionary movement in the West.

Subsequent developments right up to the October Revolution fully confirmed the correctness of this strategic plan.

4. THE THIRD HISTORIC TURN AND THE COURSE TOWARDS THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION IN EUROPE

The third turn began with the October Revolution, when the mortal combat between the two imperialist groups in the West had reached its climax; when the revolutionary crisis in the West was obviously growing; when the bourgeois government in Russia, bankrupt and entangled in contradictions, fell under the blows of the proletarian revolution; when the victorious proletarian revolution broke with imperialism and withdrew from the war, and thereby made bitter enemies in the shape of imperialist coalitions in the West; when the new Soviet Government's decrees on peace, the confiscation of the landlords' land, the expropriation of the capitalists and the liberation of the oppressed nationalities earned for it the confidence of millions of toilers throughout the world. This was a turn on an international scale, because, for the first time, the international front of capital was breached, the question of overthrowing capitalism was for the first time put on a practical footing. This transformed the October Revolution from a national, Russian force into an international force, and the Russian workers from a backward detachment of the international proletariat into its vanguard, which by its devoted struggle rouses the workers of the West and the oppressed countries of the East. This turn has not yet come to the end of its development, for it has not yet developed on an international scale, but its content and general direction are already sufficiently clear.

Two strategic plans were at issue in political circles

in Russia at that time: the plan of the counter-revolutionaries, who had drawn into their organisations the active sections of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, and the plan of the Bolsheviks.

The counter-revolutionaries and active Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks planned along the line of uniting in one camp all the discontented elements: the old army officers in the rear and at the front, the bourgeois-nationalist governments in the border regions, the capitalists and landlords who had been expropriated by the revolution, the agents of the Entente who were preparing for intervention, and so forth. They steered a course towards the overthrow of the Soviet Government by means of revolts or foreign intervention, and the restoration of the capitalist order in Russia.

The Bolsheviks, on the contrary, planned along the line of internally strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia and extending the sphere of operation of the proletarian revolution to all countries of the world by combining the efforts of the proletarians of Russia with the efforts of the proletarians of Europe and with the efforts of the oppressed nations of the East against world imperialism. Highly noteworthy is the exact and concise formulation of this strategic plan given by Comrade Lenin in his pamphlet *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, namely: "To do the utmost possible in one country (one's own—J. St.) for the development, support and awakening of the revolution in all countries." The value of this strategic plan lies not only in that it took into account correctly the driving forces of the world revolution, but also in that it foresaw and facilitated the subsequent process of transformation of Soviet Russia into the focus of attention of the revolutionary movement throughout the world, into the banner of liberation of the workers in the West and of the colonies in the East.

The subsequent development of the revolution all over the world, and also the five years' existence of Soviet power in Russia, have fully confirmed the correctness of this strategic plan. The fact that the counter-revolutionaries, Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, who made several attempts to overthrow the Soviet Government, are now émigrés, while the Soviet Government and the international proletarian organisation are becoming the major instruments of the policy of the world proletariat, and other facts of this kind, are obvious testimony in favour of the Bolsheviks' strategic plan.

OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND TACTICS

The preparation for October thus proceeded under the leadership of one party, the Bolshevik Party. But how did the Party carry out this leadership, along what line did the latter proceed? This leadership proceeded along the line of isolating the *compromising* parties, as the most dangerous groupings in the period of the outbreak of the revolution, the line of isolating the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks.

What is the fundamental strategic rule of Leninism?

It is the recognition of the following:

- 1) the *compromising* parties are the most dangerous social support of the enemies of the revolution in the period of the approaching revolutionary outbreak;
- 2) it is impossible to overthrow the enemy (tsarism or the bourgeoisie) unless these parties are isolated;
- 3) the main weapons in the period of preparation for the revolution must therefore be directed towards isolating these parties, towards winning the broad masses of the working people away from them.

In the period of the struggle against tsarism, in the period of preparation for the bourgeois-democratic revolution (1905-16), the most dangerous social support of tsarism was the liberal-monarchist party, the Cadet Party. Why? Because it was the compromising party, the party of *compromise* between tsarism and the majority of the people, i.e., the peasantry as a whole. Naturally, the Party at that time directed its main blows at the Cadets, for unless the Cadets were isolated there could be no hope of a *rupture* between the peasantry and tsarism, and unless this rupture was ensured there could be no hope of the victory of the revolution. Many people at that time did not understand this specific feature of Bolshevik strategy and accused the Bolsheviks of excessive "Cadetophobia"; they asserted that with the Bolsheviks the struggle against the Cadets "overshadowed" the struggle against the principal enemy—tsarism. But these accusations, for which there was no justification, revealed an utter failure to understand the Bolshevik strategy, which called for the isolation of the compromising party *in order* to facilitate, to hasten the victory over the principal enemy.

It scarcely needs proof that without this strategy the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution would have been impossible.

In the period of preparation for October the centre of gravity of the conflicting forces shifted to another plane. The tsar was gone. The Cadet Party had been transformed from a compromising force into a governing force, into the ruling force of imperialism. Now the fight was no longer between tsarism and the people, but between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In this

period the petty-bourgeois democratic parties, the parties of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, were the most dangerous social support of imperialism. Why? Because these parties were then the compromising parties, the parties of *compromise* between imperialism and the labouring masses. Naturally, the Bolsheviks at that time directed their main blows at these parties, for unless these parties were isolated there could be no hope of a *rupture* between the labouring masses and imperialism, and unless this rupture was ensured there could be no hope of the victory of the Soviet revolution. Many people at that time did not understand this specific feature of the Bolshevik tactics and accused the Bolsheviks of displaying "excessive hatred" towards the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, and of "forgetting" the principal goal. But the entire period of preparation for October eloquently testifies to the fact that only by pursuing these tactics could the Bolsheviks ensure the victory of the October Revolution.

The characteristic feature of this period was the further revolutionisation of the labouring masses of the peasantry, their disillusionment with the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, their defection from these parties, their turn towards rallying directly around the proletariat as the only consistently revolutionary force, capable of leading the country to peace. The history of this period is the history of the struggle between the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, on the one hand, and the Bolsheviks, on the other, for the labouring masses of the peasantry, for winning over these masses. The outcome of this struggle was decided by the coalition period, the Kerensky period, the refusal of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks to confiscate the landlords' land, the fight of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks to continue the war, the June offensive at the front, the introduction of capital punishment for soldiers, the Kornilov revolt. And they decided the issue of this struggle entirely in favour of the Bolshevik strategy, for had not the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks been isolated it would have been impossible to overthrow the government of the imperialists, and had this government not been overthrown it would have been impossible to break away from the war. The policy of isolating the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks proved to be the only correct policy.

Thus, isolation of the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary parties as the main line in directing the preparations for October—such was the second specific feature of the tactics of the Bolsheviks.

It scarcely needs proof that without this feature of the tactics of the Bolsheviks, the alliance of the working class and the labouring masses of the peasantry would have been left hanging in the air.