It is only natural to expect that for a Social-Democratic worker the organization of the political struggle coincides with the conception of the "economic struggle against the employers and the government," the "organization of workers" will do so somewhat less. It is for this reason that the organization of the Social-Democratic worker should as far as possible coincide with the "organization of workers." This, in fact, is exactly what was required of the new type of organization. Before the word "organization," we should perhaps add the word "struggle," because the word "organization" is so loaded with connotations that only a narrow type of mind would ignore the question of organization.

We had begun to assume full agreement with each other to this effect, that the word "organization," which was so often imputed to us by our opponents, was the word "organization" which was so often imputed to us by our opponents, was a narrow type of mind that would ignore the organization of the Social-Democratic movement. The kind of organization that we had in mind was an organization of revolutionaries as an essential factor in bringing about the political revolution. As soon as the distinction became clear, there was hardly, as I remember, a single question upon which I was in agreement with the Economist!

What was the source of our disagreement? It was the fact that on questions both of organization and of politics the Economists are forever lapsing from Social-Democracy into trade-unionism. The political struggle of Social-Democracy is far more extensive and complex than the economic struggle of the workers against the employers and the government. Similarly (indeed for that reason), the organization of the revolutionary Social-Democratic Party must inevitably be of a kind different from that of the organization of the workers designed for this struggle. The trade-union organization must in the first place be a trade-union organization; namely, it must be as broad as possible; and thirdly, it must be as public as possible. We can allow (here and further on, of course, I refer only to the membership, of the so-called "Social-Democratic" unions) that the maintenance of strict secrecy is essential. We can wipe out "a dozen wise men" or "a hundred fools" without difficulty (in this context, of course, I refer only to the membership, of the so-called "Social-Democratic" unions) that the maintenance of strict secrecy is essential. We can wipe out "a dozen wise men" or "a hundred fools") fail to notice the second). Indeed, picture to yourselves people who are immersed ninety-nine per cent in "economic struggle against the employers and the government." Some of them will never, during the entire course of their activity (from four to six months), be HELD to think of the need for a more complex organization of revolutionaries. Others, perhaps, will come to the point at which they are really interested in the Social-Democratic movement. Such people may argue that the later a country enters the arena of class struggle, the more difficult it will be to separate the organization of revolutionaries from the trade-union movement, the more the socialists in that country may take part in, and support, the trade-union movement, and the less the reason for the existence of non-Social-Democratic trade unions. So far the argument is fully correct; unfortunately, however, some go beyond that and dream of a complete fusion of Social-Democracy with trade unionism. We shall soon see, from the example of the Rules of the R.S.F.P., what kind of a "trade" union, since that would only narrow the scope of our influence upon the masses.

The role of a vanguard party in mobilizing and educating the masses to make revolution and only working class revolutionaries. The absolute necessity for this type of organization cannot be overemphasized.
Preface to the Collection
TWELVE YEARS

... What Is To Be Done?, was published abroad early in 1902. It is a criticism of the Right wing, which no longer a literary trend but existed within the Social-Democratic organization. The first Social-Democratic congress was held in 1898. It founded the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, represented by the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, which incorporated the Emancipation of Labor group. The central Party bodies, however, were suppressed by the police and could not be re-established. There was, in fact, no united party; unity was still only an idea, a directive. The infatuation with the strike movement and economic struggles gave rise to a peculiar form of Social-Democratic opportunism, known as "Economism." When the Iskra group began to function abroad at the very end of 1898, the split over this issue was already an accomplished fact. In the spring of 1900, Plekhanov resigned from the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, and set up an organization of his own — Sotsial-Demokrat. Officially, Iskra began its work independently of the two groups, but for all practical purposes it sided with Plekhanov's group against the Union. An attempt to merge the two (at the Congress of the Union and the Sotsial-Demokrat in Zurich, June 1901) failed. What Is To Be Done? gives a systematic account of the reasons for the divergence of views and of the nature of Iskra tactics and organizational activity.

What Is To Be Done? is frequently linked by the Mensheviks, the present opponents of the Bolsheviks, as well as by writers belonging to the bourgeois-liberal camp (Cadets, Bezzaglavsti in the newspaper Tovarisch, etc.), I have, therefore, decided to reprint the pamphlet here, slightly abridged, omitting only the details of organizational relations and minor polemical remarks. Concerning the essential content of this pamphlet it is necessary to draw the attention of the modern reader to the following.

The basic mistake made by those who now criticize What Is To Be Done? is to treat the pamphlet apart from its connection with the concrete historical situation of a definite, and now long past, period in the development of our Party. This mistake was strikingly demonstrated, for instance, by Parvus (not to mention numerous Mensheviks), who, many years after the pamphlet appeared, wrote about its incorrect or exaggerated ideas on the subject of an organization of professional revolutionaries.

These statements look ridiculous, as if their authors want to dismiss a whole period in the development of our Party. But in the imperialism of their time, had to be fought for, but which have long ago been consolidated and have served their purpose. To maintain today (e.g. 1901 and 1902) the idea of an organization of professional revolutionaries, is like reproaching the Japanese, after the Russo-Japanese War, for having exaggerated the strength of Russia's armed forces, for having prior to the war exaggerated the need to prepare for fighting these forces. To win victory the Japanese had to mobilize all their forces against the probable maximum of Russian forces. Unfortunately (e.g. many of those who judge our Party are outsiders, who do not know the subject, who do not realize that the idea of an organization of professional revolutionaries had already scored a complete victory. That victory would have been impossible if this idea had not been pushed
The question arises, who accomplished, who brought into being, in what terms, in what order, with what vigour, and with what support, with what consequences, with what stability of our Party? It was accomplished by the organization of professional revolutionaries, to the building of a people’s political organization possessing the greatest weight of popular support. Anyone who knows our Party’s history well, who has built a hand in the Party, has participated in the struggle, or who has any paper of any of the organs of our Party, has had to witness the drift of our Party from the beginning of the UAW’s whole working class. It is the beginning to happen at home. Without this work, political activity would inevitably degenerate into a game, because this activity acquires real importance for the whole working class only when and if as a result of the mass of a definite class, wins its interest, and mobilizes the working class to take active events. This work, as we have said, is always necessary. After every reverse we should bring this to mind again, and not to be distracted by routine, or by the mass of the causes of the proletariat’s defeat. Similarly, we should always call attention to it and emphasize its importance after every victory, otherwise the victory will only be a seeming one, its fruits will not be assured, its real significance in the great struggle for. Our ultimate goal will be negligible and may even prove adverse (particularly if a partial victory should slacken our call our distrust of unreliable allies, and cause us to forget the right moment for a renewed and more vigorous attack on the enemy).

For the very reason that the work of intensifying and broadening our influence on the masses is always necessary, after each victory as after each defeat, in times of political quiescence as in the stormiest periods of revolution, we should not turn the emphasis upon this into a special slogan or build upon it any special trend if we do not wish to court the risk of descending to demagoguery and degrading the prestige of the advanced and only truly revolutionary class. There is and always will be an element of pedagogics in the political activity of the Social-Democratic Party. We must not turn this work of wage-workers to the role of fighters for the emancipation of the working class, as we must not turn the proletariat to the role of fighters for the emancipation of the working class. We must turn this into a special slogan, ofcontraposing it to “politics,” of building a special trend upon it, and of appealing to the masses.”

PARTY WORK IN THE MASSES

On Confounding Politics with Pedagogics

It is our duty always to intensify and broaden our efforts to organize and influence the masses. The Social-Democrat who does not do this is no Social-Democrat. No branch, group, or circle can be considered a Social-Democratic group which does not work to this end steadily and regularly. To a great extent, the purpose of our work and that of other Social-Democratic organizations is the spread of Social-Democratic consciousness, allowing a dry dogma out of our doctrine to teach them not only the general principles of Social-Democratic Party. We must educate the whole class of wage-workers to the role of fighters for the emancipation of the working class, as we must not turn the proletariat to the role of fighters for the emancipation of the working class. We must turn this into a special slogan, ofcontraposing it to “politics,” of building a special trend upon it, and of appealing to the masses.”

P.S. For the very reason that the work of intensifying and broadening our influence on the masses is always necessary, after each victory as after each defeat, in times of political quiescence as in the stormiest periods of revolution, we should not turn the emphasis upon this into a special slogan or build upon it any special trend if we do not wish to court the risk of descending to demagoguery and degrading the prestige of the advanced and only truly revolutionary class. There is and always will be an element of pedagogics in the political activity of the Social-Democratic Party. We must not turn this work of wage-workers to the role of fighters for the emancipation of the working class, as we must not turn the proletariat to the role of fighters for the emancipation of the working class. We must turn this into a special slogan, ofcontraposing it to “politics,” of building a special trend upon it, and of appealing to the masses.”

Read the True Story of the Greensboro, N.C., Massacre. This dramatic eyewitness account of the Nov. 2, 1979, event's participants details the government's involvement in the incident, showing theCOMPARE
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present the ability to break through the corporate-union hierarchy fatter and more efficient. All that is needed to mobilize the mass of a definite class, wins its interest, and mobilizes the working class to take active events. This work, as we have said, is always necessary. After every reverse we should bring this to mind again, and not to be distracted by routine, or by the mass of the causes of the proletariat’s defeat. Similarly, we should always call attention to it and emphasize its importance after every victory, otherwise the victory will only be a seeming one, its fruits will not be assured, its real significance in the great struggle for. Our ultimate goal will be negligible and may even prove adverse (particularly if a partial victory should slacken our call our distrust of unreliable allies, and cause us to forget the right moment for a renewed and more vigorous attack on the enemy).

For the very reason that the work of intensifying and broadening our influence on the masses is always necessary, after each victory as after each defeat, in times of political quiescence as in the stormiest periods of revolution, we should not turn the emphasis upon this into a special slogan or build upon it any special trend if we do not wish to court the risk of descending to demagoguery and degrading the prestige of the advanced and only truly revolutionary class. There is and always will be an element of pedagogics in the political activity of the Social-Democratic Party. We must not turn this work of wage-workers to the role of fighters for the emancipation of the working class, as we must not turn the proletariat to the role of fighters for the emancipation of the working class. We must turn this into a special slogan, ofcontraposing it to “politics,” of building a special trend upon it, and of appealing to the masses.”

Read the True Story of the Greensboro, N.C., Massacre. This dramatic eyewitness account of the Nov. 2, 1979, event's participants details the government's involvement in the incident, showing the