

Milroad M. Drachkovitch, Senior Staff Member of the Hoover Institution
Stefan T. Pecsny, Dir., Int. Pol. Studies, Hoover Institution
The Revolutionary Internationals, 1864-1943
Edited by Milroad M. Drachkovitch
Stanford U/Press, 1966

Preface by MMD \$6.95
Essays derived from papers delivered on "1st day of an int. scholarly gathering,
a conf. on "100 Yrs. of Rev. Int's., "orgd. by Hoover Institution on War, Rev. & Peace
held on Oct. 5, 6, 8, 7, 1964." "The 7 essays presented in this book are comparative
historical studies ... It is hoped ... the authors of the present vol. will
introduce both the layman & the professional historian to new facets of an
EXTREMELY COMPLEX HISTORICAL PHENOMENON."

Part I - 1st Int. - Rise & Fall of 1st Int. by Jacques Freymond & Mihlos Molnar
Secret Societies & the 1st Int. by Boris Nikolaevsky
Part II the 2nd Int. - The 2nd Int.: 1889-1914 Gerhart Klesmer
SD Carl Landauer
Part III - 3rd Int.
3rd Int. by Milroad M. Drachkovitch & Franko Lasitch
The Comintern as an Instrument of Sov. Strategy
by Stefan T. Pecsny

p/210: "By 1928 Moscow feared that the League of Nations would succeed in
overcoming their antagonisms bet. the cap. states." 3rd par. calling
SD "social imperialists" "united front from below"

A good ex. of "scholarship" & a better yet of slander "The coop. bet. C-ists &
Ger. nationalists had a long his. dating from Imperial Germany's aid to Lenin
during WWI." (Ref. is to his own book!) "It included C-ist readiness to enter
into an alliance with Ger. against the Entente powers in the summer of 1918... (That
is his interpretation of Brest-Litovsk)

p. 212 ~~ex.~~ paraphrases Nazi that the "C-ist movement provided a model for
the National Socialist struggle."

p. 213 6/31/31 CP supports Nazi-sponsored referendum for dissolution of the
Prussian Diet.

A good ex. of this man's McCarthyist slant is quote Thälmann's statement of
fascism as "mass movement" and "mass party" as if that meant agreement.

To top both the slanders & the total lack of any excuses, p. 218 Naturally the
C-ists did not help the Nazis ~~HEAVILY~~ (my emphasis) because they
wanted Hitler to win.

p. 220 This stupid ass tries to say that because, 3/31/39, the British govt.
"gave a guarantee to Poland & on 4/13/39 to Ru.ania & Hitler could not attack USSR
thru these countries that therefore (sick)" immediately returned
to his policy of 1932 & early in 1939 made the 1st fealers that were to result
in the Nazi-Soviet Pact of Aug. 23."

p. 230 "There was initially no concept, let alone a plan, that would have tied
together the hopes of the early '20s with the realization of the late
'40s.... Nevertheless central ideas inherited from Lenin dominated (sic)
Stalin's strategic thinking..."

This "scholar" is as ignorant of Hegel as of Lenin. p/221 "But even the highly
disciplined, "Bolshevized" Communist movement could not be switched & sigtagged
as easily from thesis to antithesis as the laws of dialectics demand... But ~~one~~
of the essential points of dialectics, as Lenin commented on Hegel, is to recognize
the necessity of the "jump"...." & again last sentence, p. 222: ~~But Communist~~

(Passage continued)

p.222: "The CI served the world rev. well. Never before had the world experienced strategy so astute & complex & never were operational concepts executed with greater skill & more cynicism..... It was all in line with the insight which Lenin drew from Hegel's phil. of his: "Dialectic equals the destroying of oneself."

3/24/51 *4/21/51* *11/9-22/51* *M.H. Drachler* *p.166 "foundings"*

Starting with the "fact" that neither the Party nor the Rev. would have been without Lenin, he lays basis for "continuity" of line of Lenin, not in 1919 when 3rd was founded, but from 1902 What Is To Be Done? And of course all would not have been without "The Fascination of Rev. Power" (1st subheading) so he proceeds from Leninist party's "Leninist rev." to show that no one followed him during war but "Power succeeded where Lenin's persuasiveness had failed." And in that therefore are not only Bolsheviks but socialists IWW anarchists, etc. but evidently it was all "A Historical Misunderstanding" (2nd subheading): "Attracted on essentially emotional rather than ideological grounds...." or "prestige (sic) of the only successful rev."//// or "Bolshevik's activism was attractive"... or, sin of sins, they were young: "It was no accident that the overwhelming maj. of C-ist leaders in the per. bet. 1919 & 1921 were under 30 yrs. of age, many of them under 25."

p.161: "With respect to the G.S. C-ists, whose leaders opposed the creation of the 3rd Int. as premature, Lenin enjoyed a great stroke of pol. good luck in the assassination by a 'class enemy' in 1919 of Rosa Luxemburg & Leo Jogiches."

After those 2 pieces of astuteness we get to "Pol. Background" (3rd subheading) not, however, the Russian Rev., or world situation, but of what? (p.163) "political immaturity" ("ignorant") as witness the Congress of Tours in 12/20 of the French SFIO--how only the "most backward" countries or "parts of the country" goes on in great detail for 2 pages of Yugoslavia

When we get down to 4th subheading "The Shaping of the CI", ~~it~~ (p.164: "from the disparate human material that came to Moscow...") we get back to 1902: "The events of Oct. 1917 in Russia confirmed Lenin in the correctness of his 1902 view, set forth in What Is To Be Done? that spontaneity was the main enemy of the working class movement, that the victory of the rev. could be secured only by "the centralization of the most secret functions in an org. of professional revolutionaries."

p.166 MMD calls 'Left-Wing' Communism, An Infantile Disorder "one of the greatest manuals of pol. warfare ever written", insisting that, despite its title & its warning against "leftwing sectarianism" it was really "right doctrinarianism" that was the enemy & therefore the 21 Conditions at the 2nd Congress soon to convene, at which supposedly "discipline was more important than truth." (p.167), making fascist triumph not the work of Mussolini, but the split in SP 1/21 which "paralyzed the workers' movement & thus contributed to the ultimate fascist triumph" (p.168) (NOT A WORD THAT THIS SECOND CONGRESS WAS THE NEW POINT OF THEORETICAL DEPARTURE FOR NATIONAL & COLONIAL QUES.) so that when he gets to 3rd CI Congress in 1921 MMD concludes that L "abandoned the positions & priorities he had urged upon the 2nd congress" (p.169) And by the 4th CI @ the new tactics of the United Front, endorsed by the 4th CI Congress in Nov-Dec. 1922, did more to confuse the rank & file of the CI than ***** to win over the non-Communist masses." & has "startled listeners" re his statement that the speech of the 3rd CI (or rather resolution) was "almost thoroughly Russian; that is to say everything is taken from Rus. conditions... we ourselves have blocked our own rd. to further success." (p.170)

12589

Drozhkovich cont'd/

The next subheading, "The Splitter" p.172 "the blind anti-Socialism of Lenin" (sic) let he must admit the lack of any Russianism & constant repetitions that once the rev. would spread Russia will cease to be the model country & once again a backward country. (CF. also L's Coll. Wks. Vol. XV, p. 546: "The complete victory of socialism rev. is unthinkable in one country. It requires the most active collaboration of at least several leading countries, AMONG WHICH WE CANNOT COUNT RUSSIA.")

As if merely to balance subheads, the next one is entitled "The Builder", which, however, deals "Leninist strategy & tactics were both a military science (sic) and a neo-Machiavellian pol. game." (p.175) "Lenin also enriched the arsenal of Communist weapons with the est. of auxiliary orgs. & pol. fronts." And again again (after "proving" that Dimitrov "Nat. Front" 1935 is Leninist inspired by virtue of fact that Dimitrov said so) "All these techniques of pol. warfare

did not bring the expected rev. dividends. THE ENTIRE EXISTENCE OF THE CI WAS MARKED BY RESOUNDING FAILURES."

after which he credits him for successes in gaining power in Balkans, in China, in Cuba--i.e. IN STALIN'S DAY.

Next subhead "Interregnum" p.177, which deals with Zinoviev's "Bolshevization" following defeat of 2nd Ger. R. v. Bulgarian. He does say Zinoviev replaced professional revolutionaries of Lenin's day with prof. bureaucrats. Zin. replaced by Bukharin in 1926, but Bukharin replaced by Stalin in 1928. In any case he jumps to 1928 & gives Stalin credit for working out new strategy for Ch. was worked out that FORESHADOWED (sic) Mao's protracted guerrilla warfare. (cf. THE COMINTERN; ITS HIGHLIGHTS. Essays, Recollection Documents, ed. by EMD again who calls attention to Richard C. Thornton's article.

Next subhead, "The CI under Stalin" begins with 6th CI 43rd par. "radicalisation of the masses" which EMD said recalled the early CI documents drafted by Lenin in "vague" Popular Fronts & retreat back to SD after 1935. Then off to Hitler Stalin Pact 8/23/39. (re Bertolt Brech "a former anarchist & libertarian poet" p.191)

And into final subhead "From Lenin to Stalin: A Balance Sheet" (p.193 last par.) speaks of "personal (sic) differences bet. L&S" but still it was L's "What Is To Be Done" with its "obsession with power" was in both. "T. THE ISOLATION OF RUS. IN ORDER TO PREVENT ITS CONTAMINATION BY INFIDELS--these were Lenin's legacy to the CI. Stalin simply exploited the full potential for the evil of practices that were well-est'd. in Lenin's lifetime."

No, he has more "The CI's Place in His. @ where he says in a way it is the rightful inheritor of 1st Int & "the real Marx, the passionate & impatient revolutionary... whose hatred of the bourgeoisie & contempt for pol. rivals matched Lenin's in intensity." Then he proceeds to show "differences" in "The Social nature of Lenin..."

p.201: "L's criticism of the 2nd Int., justifiable tho it may have been, was not so much a pol. critique as a theological excommunication."

p.4 (A/since this is really the beginning of book)

Part I-1st Int.

pp.3-35 "Rise & Fall of 1st Int." by Jacques Freyraud & Miklos Melnar

p.3 "In the general social & intell. his. if the last c., the 1st int. occupies only a modest place.... Still, the 1st Int. created quite a stir...."

"Complex Origins of the 1st Int." p.8 "There are as many precursors of the Int. as there are authors in the field."

"The Est. of the Int. in Europe", the largest sub-section deals with it nevertheless as if it only were European & only when he comes to "The Collapse of the 1st Int." do the authors mention US & then in passing thus: "In the making, founded in 1864, the Int. reached its zenith bet. 1869 & 1871. Sections proliferated throughout Europe & the US during the large strikes of 1868 & 1870 & the PC of 1871.

*****SEVERAL 100,000 WORKERS PROCLAIMED THEIR ALLEGIANCE TO THE IWA" (p.21, but even

*****Here CW is not mentioned; in fact it will not be mentioned except as ftn & then only by quoting EM) Formally not dissolved till 1875 in Phila.

p.23 does O Engels: "Commune which was beyond doubt the intellectual child of the Int." Also, FE: "For 10 yrs. the Int. channelled European

his. in one direction--the direction of the future...." but calls it "solever application of his. nat. & but admits FE analyzed it "moderately & dispassionately." p.23 "In a way the letter was the rough outline of a thesis; if its antithesis is spelled out, a synthesis emerged." And what a "synthesis" emerges from the authors' wishwash. heterogeneous sections, diversity & divergences, p.24

p.26 is where he quotes Mx that the existence of IWA "was what decided Palmerston 'to avoid war in the US.'" (the ftn. is on p.227, ftn.36, from article in "Int. Review of Social His. I (1956) which is based on Mx's letter to his uncle

Lion Philips thus: "If you consider, dear uncle, how at the time of Lincoln's election the only issue was not to make any further concessions

to the slave owners, whereas now the abolition of slavery is the avowed & partly already realized aim, it must be admitted

that such gigantic rev. was never carried out so fast. It will have the most beneficial influence on the whole world."

The "synthesis" is that prosperity came to Europe & revs. were not rev. any more. p.35: "The attainment of Italian & Ger. unity, in particular & the collapse of the old Int. coincide with the end of old Europe."

"Secret Societies & the 1st Int." by Boris Nicolaevsky

p.51 The Philadelphians & the Founding of 1st Int. v.g.: "The Int., as his. knows it, was born out of the struggle against the old methods of pol. conspiracy & secret organizations. Only against the background of this struggle can we understand the creation of the 1st Int. & its subsequent his."..... "I cannot refrain from indicating that not only was Mikhail Bakunin connected with the Philadelphians, but there were strong bonds bet. the Philadelphians, but there were strong bonds bet. the Philadelphians and the Blanquists. And it was, after all, the Blanquists who dealt the death blow to the 1st Int. when they forced Mx to move the General Council to the US."

The Anarchist Tradition by Max Nomad "propaganda by the deed"

p.61: "There was no place in the world of his (Proudhon's) ideas for either labor unions or strikes for higher wages."

p.62 Enter Bakunin From Proudhon through Bakunin to Kropotkin

12591

Cont. Nowad's The Anarchist Tradition (Prince Petur Kropotkin)

Nowad is v.g. in describing "The last convention of that "Anti-Authoritarian" or, more precisely, anti-Marxian Int. took place in 1871..."

p.70: "The disintegration of Bakuninism had begun even before Bakunin's death in 1876. It had started 2 yrs. earlier, in 1874, when the revered leader covered himself with shame & his movement with ridicule by wasting the entire war chest of the hoped-for rev. on the childish project of improving the villa in which he lived."

pp.78-79 re strength in Spain: "By relating their propaganda to the wage struggles of the wkr., the 1st Sp. leaders of the Int. est. in their country so firm a tradition of championing wkglass interests that no ext. of later Krist competition was able to weaken it."

1907 congress in Amsterdam, p.83: "Its main feature was the debate bet. Errico Malatesta, the most romantic rep. of post-Bakunin anarchism & Pierre Monatte, the outstanding spokesman of a new school of anarchism, usually designated as anarcho-syndicalism, which had emerged in the mid-1890's."

p.87: re WW I collapse of Fr. unions of Ger. of 2nd, etc. "That war proved a blow to the 'pure' anarchists as well. Peter Kropotkin, Jean Grave, Chas. Malato, Max Nettlay, & other bearers of famous names came out in defense of their respective countries... The fact that some of the old famous oldtimers, incl. Malatesta, Emma Goldman & Alexander Berkman, struck uncomprehendingly to their guns could not offset the disarray created by the fall from grace of the almost deified Kropotkin..."

pp.90-2 has conclusion which traces it from its 1st appeal to skilled wkr. (Proudhonism) which lost out with dev. of large-scale ind. "Proudhonist anarchism or mutualism was followed by Bakuninism, whose moving force was the declassé intelligentsia of the underdeveloped countries--precisely the social groups which the Proudhonists had opposed.... Unlike the Proudhonists, the Bakuninists were insurrections...." Then anarcho-syndicalism "And, finally it was the Bol. Rev. whose prol. mystique & anti-cap. reality deprived the anarchists of most of their rfd & of many of their leaders." But then (p.92) "It may also be said that basically Leninism is a hybrid of Bakuninist activism & Marxist terminology."

The 2nd Int., 1889-1914, Gergart Nicmeyer

Bulis up a shaw now he calls the second reality and what he says "the second reality" is just a fancy name for the same thing

p.95 "The name & the org. are concrete enough, but did they rep. anything of reality?"

8 periodical congresses plus 1 extraord. one. p.97 "It is most imp. to emphasize, though, that the 2nd Int. draw its identity 1st of all from a set of symbols rather than an org."

Exclusion of anarchists did not mean exclusion. p.99: "In the recurrent debates on the general strike, on the rd. to power, & above all, on war, the anarchists were silent but influential partners of the parties who though with the expulsion of the anarchists in 1896, they had laid the ghost of rev. radicalism forever." "end and means configuration" p.100

p.104: "Ger. S.-D.--the very term indicates its character as a little world unto itself--formed a "state within a state." "people in insurrection" (Babeufian phrase?)

Q FE on Tsarism (from Mayer's F.E.) says E's statement contained word, aggressor", p.111/ p.115 gd, re 2nd's insistence on nat. armies, nat. order, nat. parliaments, nat. parties p.120, ditto, above p.125 dismisses "noble enterprio", "idealism", "selfless concern" by: "Who will doubt that the Tsarina in her devotion to Rasputin was driven by motives of the highest purity?" "Is a person less to blame for clinging to his cherished Second Reality than for clinging to superstition?" (p.126) "their own fancies"--are they harmless?"

12592

Niemeyer cont.

p.26.concl: Without the Int., European labor might have become as integrated a part of the existing society as labor did in Am. in the 20th c. and... it would have done so earlier.. The revolutionary utopian ideology, however, stood in the way of this dev. It created fears & counterfears, & those helped to nourish the fascist & Nazi movements as much as they nourished the Communist movement...."

SD by Carl Landsauer

p.126.great hiatus in the his.of soc.in 19th c.severe repressions that followed 1st sub,"The Origins of SD & Elements of its Creed". §.129"Heir of dem/liberalism & of utopian soc."

p.130"SD humanitarianism,however, was in irreconcilable contradiction with SD belief in rev.,which had been inherited from radical dem." altho CL does admit "understood rev."in precisely this sense,"hav'fork sense of violence."

gives t.u. "credit" for inflicting sense of org.unity principle instead of v.v. CD does admit that except GB considered themselves Christp.131
!!!!"From the contention that labor was the cause of all value was derived the postulate that wkrs.should receive the full value of the product, REGARDLESS OF THE ROLE OF CAP.&LAND IN ITS PROD."p.133/

Lady! p.133"Rebrew-Christian tradition of the value of the human person,& Christ was one of the carriers of this tradition, all the professions of 'materialism' by Mx & his disciples notwithstanding."

p.136:"One element of Marxism was almost entirely eliminated...SD lost the survivals of ELITISM which are still found in Mxist thought"

MBENB without going into WW I CD jumps from "theory" ,counteracting forces adequate around mass strike as result of 1905 ALL THE WAY TO 1920s

"SD in the Interwar Per"p.131:"SD, as it emerged from the ordeal, was both weaker & stronger than it had been in the prewar per."

"how could the instrumentalit. of the state, if no longer restricted in its effectiveness by the many fetters on the popular will of the prewar per,be used to promote the dev.of society in the dir.of soc?"

p.142:SD believed in the value of the individual man/The kind of soc. the SD wanted was humanitarianism applied to the soc."

p.142:"ethical relativism of Mx"(sin!)

all on economics ? coop.of Am govts in WWII with those in Europe led by SD--what is that all about????????

AFTER WHICH HE JUMPS TO 1950's & 1960's p.146,"The SD 'Subculture':"Before turning to the effect upon the SD of the defeat of fascism in WWII,the prosperity of the 1950's & 1960's.."Like People's Theatre in Ger.& Austria

"The New Eco.Theory of Soc."

"Has SD a Future?"

p.151"Altho the SD parties emerged after WWII as proud bearers of a tradition that had survived fascist oppression,they soon found themselves in a new crisis....purged themselves of the relics of Marxism which now seemed just so much ideological rubble. This was a necessary sacrifice; whatever value Mxism as a unifying creed had had in the past,it had now disappeared...eco,planning, welfare state,etc,etc.

p.155:The SD movement as a protagonist of humanitarianism has not yet won the day in spite of the defeat of fascism