INTERNATIONALISM FROM BELOW

Reclaiming a hidden communist tradition to challenge the nation-state and capitalist empire

Allan Armstrong

VOLUME 3

REVOLUTIONARY SOCIAL DEMOCRACY, NATION-STATES AND NATIONALISM IN THE AGE OF HIGH IMPERIALISM AND THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL (1889-1916)

Contents

INTRODUCTION

1. THE IMPACT OF HIGH IMPERALISM

A. The triumph of the High Imperialism

i) Mercantile, Free Trade and Monopoly Capitalist Imperialism
ii) A world divided into 'nation'-states with their colonies
iii) From territorial division to redivision; from international diplomacy to the possibility of world war
iv) The political impact of Imperialist populism
v) The victims and the resistance

B. The Development of Orthodox Marxism and the 'National Question'

i) The Positivist-Materialist and Idealist philosophical split amongst pre-First World War One, Social Democrats and its application to the 'National Question'
ii) From Positivist-Materialist philosophy to mechanical economic determinist theory
iii) Kautsky and the Austro-Marxists set the terms of the debate on the issue of nationality, nations and nationalism

C. Kazimierz Kelles-Krauz takes on the Orthodox Marxists

i) Luxemburg and Kelles-Krauz and the division over Poland in the Second International
ii) Luxemburg and Kelles-Krauz take their differences over Poland to the 1896 Congress of the Second International in London
iii) Luxemburg and Kelles-Krauz continue their struggle at the 1900 Congress of the Second International in Paris
iv) Kelles-Krauz challenges Luxemburg's Radical Left and Auer's

and Winter's Right social chauvinist alliance in the SDPD

v) Kelles-Krauz takes on Kautsky of the SDPD and Renner of the SDPO

vi) Kelles-Krauz's contribution on the issue of national minorities - the case of the Jews

vii) Kelles-Krauz and organisation amongst oppressed minorities

viii) Kelles-Krauz's theory of nation and nationality formation

D. James Connolly's early contribution towards 'Internationalism from Below'

i) Connolly uses the language issue to point the way to a new 'internationalism from below'

ii) Kelles-Krauz and Connolly find common ground over the business of the 1900 Paris Congress

iii) Summary of the impact of 'High Imperialism' on Social Democratic politics

2. THE IMPACT OF THE 1904-7 INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY WAVE

A. The 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave

i) The impact of workers and peasant struggles

ii) The impact of national democratic struggles within the Tsarist Russian Empire

iii) The impact of national democratic struggles outside the Tsarist Russian Empire

B. Revolutionary social democrats consider the issue of Imperialism and different paths of development

i) Kautsky and Bauer and the different challenges from the three wings of the Internationalist Left

ii) Kautsky’s and Bauer’s differences over their solution to the ‘National Question’ mask their agreement over the maintenance of existing territorial states
iii) The ‘National Question’ - old issues sharpened after the new issues raised – the Jews and the Muslims
iv) The International Left - the Radical Lefts, Rosa Luxemburg and the Balkan Social Democrats
v) Imperialism - the new Centre takes the theoretical lead but is challenged by Rosa Luxemburg
vi) Luxemburg and Lenin on different paths of capitalist development
vii) Luxemburg and Lenis on two worlds of development and their differences on the role of the peasantry
viii) Luxemburg and Lenin clash over ‘the right of nations to self-determination’ and national autonomy
ix) Luxemburg and Lenin attack Bauer over the issue of ‘one state, one party’
x) Lenin on the “democratic and socialist element” in national culture and the case of Norway
xi) Summary of the impact of the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave on Social Democratic politics

3. PURSUING AN ‘INTERNATIONALISM FROM BELOW’ STRATEGY RESPONDED BETWEEN THE TWO INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY WAVES

A. The further development of ‘Internationalism from Below’– James Connolly

i) Connolly uses some parallel arguments to Lenin on the “socialist and democratic element” in his *History of Irish Labour*
ii) Connolly comes up against the limitations of ‘one state, one party’ politics of the International Left
iii) The outbreak of the First World War and the responses on

the International Left up to the 1916 Dublin Rising

B. The further development of ‘Internationalism from Below’– Lev Iurkevich

i) The Tsarist Empire - a ‘prisonhouse of nations’
ii) Lenin and the influence of developments in Finland, Poland, Georgia and Latvia
iii) Ukraine challenges the social chauvinism of the RSDLP before the First World War
iv) The background of Lev Iurkevich and his role in Ukrainian Social Democracy
v) Iurkevich and Lenin debate the nature of Imperialism and the forthcoming revolution
vi) The contradictions of federation
vii) Iurkevich investigates the historical roots of Russian social chauvinism and imperialism
viii) Iurkevich’s opposition to ‘the right of self-determination’
ix) Iurkevich identifies the common ground held by Lenin and the Radical Left
x) Iurkevich highlights the connection between the exercise of self-determination and the need for independent parties
xi) Towards the ‘Russian’ Revolution
xii) Summary of the thinking of James Connolly and Lev Iurkevich

INTRODUCTION

Volume Two examined the body of work left by Marx and Engels on the 'National Question' between the end of the 1847-9 International Revolutionary Wave and Engels' death in 1895. It was shown that Marx and Engels bequeathed a particular legacy on this issue, which, in its most developed form, amounted to an **Internationalism from Below** approach. In 1896, soon after Engels' death, the **Second International**, which had been formed in 1889, adopted its well-known support for 'the right of nations to self-determination'. This was a significant contribution by leading Social Democrats to addressing the 'National Question.' They wanted to forge an orthodox Marxism which they thought should underpin the working of the Second International.

Volume Three examines some of the debates from 1895, which took place amongst Social Democrats within the Second International and its constituent Social Democratic parties up to the first two years of the First World War from 1914-16. After this Introduction (Chapter 1), Chapter 2A outlines the global context of 'High Imperialism' which dominated the world from 1895-1916. 'High Imperialism' was the culmination of two decades of the 'New Imperialism', which had been building up since the 1870s (see Volume 2, Chapter 3A).

Chapter 2B shows outlines the debates over the 'National Question' of those wanting to claim the orthodox Marxist mantle. In this new situation of 'High Imperialism', theoreticians and spokespersons, from a number of Second International affiliated Social Democratic parties, examined the 'National Question' by looking through 'lenses' they claimed to have been left by Marx and Engels. However, they could be quite selective in their choice of 'lens'. This often led to blinkered viewpoints. As the pressures of the 'New Imperialism' (1) followed by 'High Imperialism' bore down upon Social Democrats, they tended to ignore Marx's and Engels' own later 'internationalism from below' approach to the 'National Question'.

As the influence of 'High Imperialism; grew, would-be orthodox Marxists of the Second International were able to identify a definite Revisionist current associated with Social Democracy's Right wing. However, most Rightists were less interested in participating in Social Democracy's Marxist debates. Instead, they increasingly used their official party and trade union positions to come to an accommodation with their host states, their rulers, employers and the imperialist policies they promoted. Thus, an initially unacknowledged **social chauvinism** and **social imperialism**, often found amongst Social Democrats in the dominant nations of the imperial states contributed, in turn, to a **social patriotic** response amongst many Social Democrats in the oppressed nations and nationalities.

Orthodox Marxists were often less vigorous in opposing the Right in practice, as opposed to theory. However, even the developing orthodox Marxist theories had failings, which made them less effective in countering the overall drift to the Right. Those would-be orthodox Marxists of the Second International became divided into two main camps over the 'National Question'. The first camp was led by Karl Kautsky of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SDPD) (2), the second by Otto Bauer of the Social Democratic Party of Austria (SDPO) (3). The debates between these two camps had most resonance in the Prussian/German, Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires.

Given the prestige in which the SDPD was held by most Social Democrats, it was Kautsky's theories that tended to have the greater international influence. Many on the Left saw the organisationally and electorally successful SDPD, and its 'German road to socialism', as the model to adopt. Just as the earlier, very French Jacobins believed that they provided a universal model for others to emulate, so too, if not so self-consciously, did the German Social Democrats. Most revolutionary Social Democrats, including Lenin and others in the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP) also accepted the SDPD's and, in particular, Kautsky's political lead up to the First World War.

Bauer led the other would-be orthodox Marxist, Social Democratic approach to the handling of the 'National Question'. Along with Max Adler and Karl Renner, he helped to develop an Austro-Marxist (4) approach to the 'National Question'. The SDPO advocated the reconstitution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire as a federation of territorial nations and nationalities (ethnic groups), where they formed concentrated populations, with cultural autonomy for national minorities. This was meant to address the problems arising from the multinational nature of the Hapsburg Austrian state. Bauer's ideas were also taken up in the Russian Empire, particularly by the influential Jewish Bund, but also by other Social Democrats, especially in Ukraine and the Caucasus.

Rosa Luxemburg (5) emerged as a key figure in trying to develop an alternative updated orthodox Marxist position on the 'National Question' She realised that the creation of a new orthodoxy meant going beyond a dogmatic repetition of earlier Marxist texts. Nevertheless, with regard to the 'National Question', Luxemburg still tried to stay within the theoretical framework already provided by Kautsky to combat the social patriots in the Polish Socialist Party (PPS) led by Josef Pilsudski (6).

However, there was another trend in the PPS. Chapter 2C introduces the thinking of Kelles-Kreuz (7) who returned to Marx's and Engels' 'Internationalism from Below' approach over the 'National Question'. Engels had outlined this, with regard to Poland, as recently as 1892. Kelles-Kreuz, a relatively unknown Polish revolutionary Social Democrat, became involved in the debates over the 'National Question' in the Second International and developed a body of theory addressing this. Before his tragic death in 1905, as revolution was breaking out in Poland, Kelles-Kreuz had already identified the weaknesses of both the Kautsky and Austro-Marxist wings of orthodox Marxism, anticipating their political trajectories in the First World War. Chapter 2D finishes this section by briefly examining James Connolly's thinking, developed in Ireland, over this period. He was another promoter of an 'Internationalism from Below' approach.

Chapter 3A examines the impact of the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave, which punctuated the period of 'High Imperialism'. This wave was centred upon Tsarist Russia, and produced its strongest effects, not to its West, where nevertheless, it had an impact, but to the East in Persia, the Ottoman Empire, China and colonial India, where its impact continued for some time later. This International Revolutionary Wave brought about a shift in the thinking of many Social Democrats over the 'National Question'. Chapter 3B examines Lenin's emergence as an advocate of a stretched version of the orthodox Marxism of Kautsky over the 'National Question'. In this he was very much influenced by the impact of national democratic movements in the Tsarist Empire during the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave. From this, he drew different conclusions to Luxemburg.

Chapter 3C shows that Luxemburg and Lenin believed they were helping to extend the vision of revolutionary Social Democrats, by buffing up their own versions of Kautsky's lenses. They both firmly rejected the alternative repolished glasses offered by Bauer. But in the period just before the war, differences emerged between Lenin and Luxemburg over their understanding of Imperialism and the response Social Democrats should make to the re-emergence of the 'National Question'. Luxemburg was beginning to move away from Kautsky's version of orthodox Marxism by 1910, whilst Lenin continued to uphold this until 1914.

It was during this period that the three main components of what later the **International Left** emerged. They consisted of the **Radical Left**, most influenced by Rosa Luxemburg; the **Bolsheviks**, most influenced by Lenin; and the third component, the advocates of **Internationalism from Below,** who included Lev Iurkevich in Ukraine and James Connolly in Ireland. They provided a glimpse of the possibilities once the orthodox Marxist spectacles were removed. Connolly's work is relatively well known, albeit often highly contested. Iurkevich's work is either hardly known, or known only from dismissive comments, written by Lenin.

When the Second International collapsed, in the face of the First World War, the International Left upheld the revolutionary Social Democratic legacy its leaders had abandoned. Chapter 4 examines how the three main currents in the International Left responded to the First World War. They all recognised this war had arisen as a consequence of the growing inter-imperialist rivalry, but they differed over significance of the 'National Question' and in particular the 'right to national self-determination'.

During this period, new theories of Imperialism and the 'National Question' were developed. Luxemburg had already produced her own theory of Imperialism shortly before the war broke out. The outbreak of the First World War led Lenin to follow Luxemburg and break from Kautsky. This contributed to him developing his own theory of

Imperialism. Yet, despite both now having broken with Kautsky, Luxemburg's and Lenin's divisions over the 'National Question' widened. Part 4A, Chapter iii shows that Lenin's thinking was particularly affected by the impact of the 1916 Rising in Ireland. But he now found himself having to challenge a Luxemburg-influenced Radical Left amongst the Bolsheviks, including Pyatakov and Bukharin.

It was during this period that James Connolly and Lev Iurkevich further developed the 'Internationalism from Below' approach. When the 1916-21 International Revolutionary Wave broke out, which ended the period of 'High Imperialism' dealt with in this book, the theories and strategies put forward by Lenin, Luxemburg and those advocates of 'Internationalism from Below' were to be tested in practice. This period will be examined in Volume 4.

References for Chapter 1

(1) Book 2, 3A.i.

(2) Massimo Salvadori, *Karl Kautsky and the Socialist Revolution, 1880-1938* (*KKatSR*) (Verso, 1979, London) **and** http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Kautsky **and** http://marxists.org/archive/kautsky/

(3) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Otto_Bauer

(4) Tom Bottomore & Patrick Goode, *Austro-Marxism* (translated texts) (*AM*) (Clarendon Press, 1978, Oxford) **and** http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Austro-Marxism

(5) Peter Nettl, *Rosa Luxemburg* (*RL*) abridged edition, (Oxford University Press, 1969, London)

(6) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Josef_Pilsudski

(7) Timothy Snyder, *Nationalism, Marxism and Modern Central Europe*

– *A Biography of Kazimierz Kelles-Kreuz (1872-1905)* (Ukrainian Research Institute (Harvard, Cambridge, 1997, Massachussets)

1. THE IMPACT OF HIGH IMPERALISM

A. THE TRIUMPH OF THE HIGH IMPERIALISM

i) Mercantile, Free Trade and Monopoly Capitalist Imperialism

From the sixteenth century, European mercantile capitalists had begun the process that helped to create the first truly global market. However, most of the commodities involved in this trade were still produced under pre-capitalist conditions. Mercantile empires were established by several European states. Their rulers granted charters to various companies, giving them the exclusive right to trade in particular territories. However, attempts made by the chartered companies, or their host states, to defend trading monopolies were continuously undermined by competitors resorting to smuggling, piracy and war.

From the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries in the UK, the rise of industrial capitalism, with its insatiable appetite for raw materials for its factories and foodstuffs for its workforces, had contributed to the new economic regime of expanding international 'free trade'. This was judiciously supplemented where necessary by diplomatic pressure and armed force. The Liberals in the UK strongly promoted this 'free trade', once British manufacturers had already achieved their domination of world commerce. Their 'Free Trade Imperialism' (1) was underpinned by the Bank of England's support for a gold standard, backing for sterling, then the world's leading international currency and, when necessary, by the Royal Navy and other British armed forces.

During the period of 'Free Trade Imperialism', those overseas territories, which had previously been administered by private chartered companies, mostly passed to the direct administration of the colonial authorities. This accentuated the division between the political and economic realms associated with mature capitalism. Companies still organised primary production on the plantations and mines located in the colonies or semi-colonies. They also controlled the trade for the raw materials needed in the new industrial markets in the imperialist metropoles, and the commodities sold for consumption by the growing industrial workforce and the middle class. But most private companies, such as the East India and Hudson Bay Companies, were progressively ousted from direct political control of the territories they had previously administered. The imperial state took on this responsibility instead.

Barriers to the exchange of commodities were also broken down, with the help of major improvements in transport and communications, particularly the rapid growth of new steam powered railways, shipping and the telegraph. Furthermore, these new developments gave imperial naval and military forces a much increased and more effective reach, whenever there was resistance to the imperial penetration of societies based on non-capitalist modes of existence.

However, under the 'New Imperialism', which developed from the 1870s, came the growth of various forms of monopoly, associated with large-scale industrial, commercial and financial businesses. Later, orthodox Marxists were to term this phenomenon, 'Finance' (2) or 'Monopoly Capitalist Imperialism' (3). Under this new and increasingly global economic pressure, a counter trend emerged, away from the economically integrated world market based on free trade. The imperialist powers now promoted measures, which tended to break up this world market into a number of competing blocs. These blocs were economically protected by state-imposed tariffs and other 'nation'-state favouring practices. New naval bases and colonial army garrisons provided additional support for their empires. The new colonies, protectorates and chartered territories provided privileged access to land, raw materials and foodstuffs, protected markets and investment opportunities for powerful banks, trusts or companies.

The major imperial states took on direct responsibility for seizing and administering new colonies, to ensure exclusive use for their own nationals. But when states were not able or willing to undertake this job, chartered companies once more took on this role. These included the Belgian King Leopold's private initiative, the Association Internationale Africaine, which set up the grossly misnamed Congo Free State (4), and Cecil Rhode's British South Africa Company (5) in what became Rhodesia.

States, such as Germany and Japan, which faced talready established British global economic domination, and had recently developed their own domestic industries behind tariff barriers, made the transition to imperial protection most readily. The UK faced greater internal political opposition to protectionist economic policies. This was because it had enjoyed the benefits of early industrialisation and world market domination, when its rulers had promoted 'Free Trade Imperialism' earlier in the century. The City was still keen to maintain free trade, as long as sterling remained the world's dominant currency, providing massive profits for the British financial sector. Furthermore, The City had already mastered continued economic dominance in areas beyond direct British imperial control, particularly in the American West and Latin America.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, the era of 'High Imperialism' had triumphed, building on the 'New Imperialism', which had developed the 1870s. 'High Imperialism' was hailed by a new breed of gung-ho politicians, such as Cecil Rhodes and Theodore Roosevelt; welcomed by former Radicals, like Joseph Chamberlain and Georges Clemenceau; and criticised alike by 'free trade' Liberals, such as John Hobson and revolutionary Social Democrats, including James Connolly (6), Rosa Luxemburg (7) and Vladimir Lenin (8).

From the sixteenth century onwards, the earliest phase of European expansion, associated with semi-feudal and mercantile Imperialism, had brought about a whole series of 'holocausts'. First, there was the wave of Native American extinctions and massive population reductions brought about through disease, massacre and enforced labour. This was followed by the break-up of whole African tribal societies to feed the horrific trans-Atlantic slave trade, with its victims heading for vicious exploitation on the plantations of the Caribbean and in North and South America. Large areas of India had faced such widespread economic retrogression, under the East India Company's mercantile monopoly, that massive, death-dealing famines killed millions, particularly in Bengal (9). Tasmania's Aborigines were wiped out by a combination of white settler physical attacks, and by the British colonial authorities' sponsorship of demoralising, ethnocidal policies of Christian missionaries (10).

British-promoted 'Free Trade Imperialism' had brought its own 'holocausts', beginning with 'The Great Hunger' of 1845-9 in Ireland. This was followed by famines in India, during the 1860s, even more lethal than that in Ireland. The UK was also involved in a war in China, between 1838-42, to legalise and promote the opium trade, leading to widespread drug dependency in the Orient. This was followed by another war between 1855-60, after which the Ming dynasty had to make even greater concessions. British ships also gained the right to transport indentured Chinese workers to the USA (11).

'New Imperialism' was to add further 'holocausts' to these horrors. From 1885-1900 further massive famines killed millions in India and also China and Brazil (12). The Congo basin was turned into a charnel house under King Leopold from 1885 (13). Wholesale massacres of the Filipino resistance took place during the US imperial onslaught of 1898-1902 (14). Genocidal attempts were made to wipe out the Herero and Namaqua peoples of German South West Africa from 1904-9 (15), whilst the Anglo-Peruvian Rubber Company reduced the Amerindian population in Putumayo in Brazil from 38,000 to 8,000 through a policy of enslavement, killing, torture, and rape (16). Ethnocidal policies, aiming for the elimination of Native American and Aborigine cultures, were also pursued in the USA, Canada and Australia.

ii) A world divided into 'nation'-states with their colonies

By the turn of the twentieth century, nearly the whole of the world had been divided up by the major imperial states. The few exceptions were states in Asia like Afghanistan and Siam (Thailand), and in Africa, Abyssinia (Ethiopia). These were left as barrier zones separating competing European powers. Africa's Liberia was merely a US semi-colony. The other 'free' states in Africa - the recently formed Orange and Transvaal Boer white-settler republics - were unable to find a great power with enough clout to prevent them being finally crushed and absorbed by British imperialism.

Elsewhere, the declining Ottoman, Chinese and Persian empires were reduced to semi-colonial status by marauding, better-armed, imperialist powers. The more reformed imperialist powers usually won out over the older, dynastic European empires in the competition for influence and territory. Most of the politically independent South and Central American states became effectively semi-colonies, either of the UK, or increasingly of the USA. The continually expanding USA treated the remains of Spain's shrunken Caribbean and Pacific empire in much the same way as European powers treated the Ottoman, Persian and Chinese empires - like vultures eyeing up dying animals.

The main European powers involved in the scramble for colonies were the UK, France and Germany. Their new imperial territories were acquired in Africa, Asia and the Pacific. In this imperial race, the UK enjoyed the greatest advantage and made the greatest territorial gains. It had inherited considerable territories, trading and staging posts from both its earlier 'Mercantile' and 'Free Trade Empires'. Next came France, which had suffered earlier losses principally to its main imperial competitor - the UK. However, it had retained some territories, especially in and around the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean. France re-emerged as a major colonial power in the early nineteenth century. New colonial opportunities were sought on the North African coast. The already loose Ottoman influence here was declining rapidly. After seizing Algeria, France was able to use this territory as a base to extend its empire further into north, west and central Africa. Later, France extended its influence in the East particularly in Indo-China and the Pacific.

Prussia-Germany was very much a latecomer in the imperial game. Earlier, Prussia had to 'forgo' overseas ambitions to first create a united German 'nation'-state. Indeed, as late as the 1884 Congress of Berlin (17), Prussia-Germany was still seen by the established imperial powers as a mainly disinterested arbiter in the proposed imperial carve-up of Africa. It was rewarded with some African territories 'for its troubles', and so commenced its overseas imperial career. This involved a further spread of its colonial power in Africa, the Pacific, with eyes also set upon the declining Ottoman Empire and China.

The Netherlands, heir to an earlier mercantile empire, was able to hold on to its Caribbean colonies, and to expand its territories in the East Indies during this period. Belgium was one of the first European countries to industrialise but its small size meant that imperial pretensions had first to be precociously pursued by the megalomaniac, King Leopold, in his private initiative in the Congo.

Italy was an even later state creation, with a still yawning gap between a more developed North and an underdeveloped South. However, this did not prevent the emergence of a pro-imperialist tendency here too, able to conjure up a distant Roman, and a more recent Venetian imperial past. This led some to look for opportunities around the Mediterranean, Adriatic and Aegean Seas, and also in Somaliland. However, Italian East African ambitions came unstuck, after the battle of Adowa in 1896 (18), due to defeat at the hands of Emperor Menelik's reinvigorated, but still archaic, Abyssinian state. It was the rapid collapse of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan Wars (19), as late as 1911, which allowed Italy to gain a foothold in Tripolitania and Cyrenaica (Libya) and the Greek-speaking Dodecanese Islands.

Other European countries, where domestic industrial capital had not yet advanced very far, faced a chequered imperial future. Portugal and Castilian Spain still held overseas colonies, mainly in Africa, the western Pacific and India. These were the much-shrunken remains of their earlier semi-feudal, semi-mercantile empires. Portugal managed to hold on to and expand its last colonies in Africa by subordinating its ambitions to more powerful British imperial interests and hence gaining their 'protection'. Imperial Spain faced pressure from the more dynamic USA and from rising national movements. In the process, Spain lost its remaining Caribbean and Pacific footholds between 1898 and 1900 (20). Therefore, the Spanish empire, and the politically antiquated Romanov Russian and Hapsburg Austro-Hungarian empires, had to look south or east towards even more antiquated empires to expand. They achieved this at the expense of Moroccan, Ottoman, Persian and Chinese empires.

Only Sweden was to face the complete loss of historical imperial territories in this period when Norway became independent in 1905. Denmark sold its Caribbean colony during the First World War, but still retained the old 'Viking' colonies of the Faeroes and Iceland, and the mainly Inuit-peopled Greenland, in the North Atlantic.

Beyond Europe, a modernising Meiji Japan looked to the decaying Chinese Manchu Empire to win its first colonies in Taiwan, Korea and Manchuria. Meanwhile, US expansion westwards and southwards further developed the three methods previously used to increase state territory. The seizure and occupation of lands held by 'uncivilised' peoples, first utilised by white Americans against the Native Americans, was now extended to the Hawaiians and Samoans. The earlier wars against Spain (and its local successor state, Mexico), which had added Florida, Texas, California and the wider south-west to the USA, were restarted to add new territories and colonies in Puerto Rico, Cuba, Philippines and Guam. The opportunistic purchase of territory when other states faced difficulties - beginning earlier, when Louisiana was bought from Napoleonic France, the Gadsden strip from Mexico, and Alaska from Tsarist Russia - was to be finished later with the purchase of the Caribbean Virgin Islands from Denmark.

iii) From territorial division to redivision; from international diplomacy to the possibility of world war

As long as there was still territory in the world for the most powerful imperialist states to acquire, then armed conflicts between these powers could be contained. Various incidents and stand-offs could still lead to new agreements and treaties. But the Fashoda Incident (21) in the Sudan in 1896, involving the UK and France, and the Tangiers and Agadir Incidents (22) in Morocco in 1906 and 1911, involving France and Germany, highlighted the dangers for the future. Redivision of existing imperial territory would become the only remaining option for an ambitious imperial power. Thus, the diplomatically negotiated, imperial carve-up of Africa prepared the way for the later militarily contested carve-up of Europe and the world.

When it came to conflicts between mismatched imperial states not yet in wider alliances, such as those between the USA and Spain, or between Meiji Japan and Tsarist Russia, then events could still be allowed to take their course. However, new patterns of shifting alliances drew a wider circle of powers into potentially escalating conflict - the UK, France and Russia on one hand and Germany and Austria-Hungary on the other. It was not until the First World War, though, that Italy and the Ottoman Empire made their final decisions over which alliance to back.

Furthermore, the rise of national movements, particularly within the longer-established imperial monarchies like the UK, Prussia-Germany, Austria-Hungary and Tsarist Russia, provided even more scope for competitive imperial interference. This was highlighted by attempted German support, for the Ulster Volunteer Force and the Irish Volunteers. France took a similar interest in the plight of the Poles in Prussian Germany, and Hapsburg Austria in that of the Ukrainians in the Tsarist Empire.

However, it was the volatile situation, created by the rapid collapse of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans, which was to provide the spark that ignited the conflagration leading to the First World War. The Balkans witnessed multi-layered imperial, national and class conflicts. The Ottoman Empire, like the Tsarist Empire, seemed unable to modernise itself effectively. It was increasingly threatened by new national movements in the Balkans and western Armenia in Anatolia. However, unlike the defeated forces of the 1905 Revolution in the Tsarist Empire, the Young Turks, who led the attempted 1908 Revolution (23), were able to retain their hold over the Ottoman state. But in response to further territorial losses in the 1912-3 Balkan Wars, the Young Turks abandoned their initial multi-ethnic all-Ottoman imperial appeal and became more overtly pro-Turkish.

Hapsburg Austria-Hungary, another decaying dynastic power, was trying to maintain its position at the expense of the even weaker Ottoman Empire. Bosnia and Herzegovina were annexed in 1908, a move as much directed against independent Serbia as against the Ottoman Empire. Behind both the Ottoman and Hapsburg empires lay the more aggressive Prussia-Germany. Its leaders hoped to divert Austria-Hungary's territorial ambitions eastwards towards Tsarist controlled Ukraine, rather than southwards to the Ottoman Empire, the better to subordinate both declining empires to its own longer-term imperial interests. Some of these ambitions were revealed by the German promotion of the Berlin to Baghdad railway (24).

Also looking jealously towards the Balkans was Tsarist Russia, which aimed to control the Bosphorus and access to the Black Sea. What Tsarist Russia lacked in terms of modern capitalist economic development, it appeared to make up for in the size of its territory, population and armed forces. When not attempting to promote the widest pan-Slav unity, Tsarist Russia revealed an even grander ambition. This was to unite the whole of Eastern Orthodox Christianity. This provided 'legitimacy' for its claim to the old Byzantine imperial capital of Constantinople.

Added to this was the attempt by Italy to revive the former Venetian empire on the Adriatic and Aegean coasts. Italy looked to those largely Italian peopled cities in Dalmatia and to the Albanians (with their substantial Catholic minority) to gain a foothold in the Balkans. The annexation of the Greek-speaking Dodecanese Islands was seen as a possible initial step in reviving the Ancient Romano-Greek Empire, with the 'Roman' Italians once more in overall control.

However, those territories in dispute, between these older and newer empires, also included areas where wider pan-nationalist movements competed both with each other, e.g. Southern Slav (25) and with the narrower ethnic nationalisms of Serbia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Greece and later Albania.

Two successive, quickly fought, Balkan Wars anticipated the problems other European Social Democrats would have in the face of the First World War. The local Social Democratic rallying call for unity - a Democratic Federation of the Balkans (26) - was brushed aside; just as the official Second International calls for strike action against any impending great power conflict were to be in 1914 (27).

iv) The political impact of imperialist populism

Imperialist ideologues sponsored a new populist culture with its own mass press. In the UK, Harmondsworth's *Daily Mail* and Pearson's *Daily Express* were established in 1896 and 1900 (28). New organisations were promoted to advance the imperialist cause, such as the Imperial Federation League in 1884 (29) and the British Empire League in 1895 (30).

Military, naval and other grand imperial displays and jamborees were organised, including Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee in 1897 (31).

The beneficiaries of the ‘New Imperialism’ tried to remould the constitutional monarchies and established republics, in an attempt to create a more suitable framework within which to advance the new imperial politics. Attempts were made to change the existing political parties. In the UK, the Conservatives became allied to the Liberal Unionists, whilst an openly pro-imperial group developed inside the Liberal Party too, despite the desertion of the earlier Liberal Unionists from their ranks. The Liberal Unionists, themselves, were just one example of the party splits promoted, or temporary political organisations sponsored, to better advance the new imperialist cause (32).

Conservative imperialist politicians played the ‘parliamentary game’. In most countries this was still heavily stacked towards the more traditional elements of the ruling class. Nevertheless, gung-ho conservative imperialists were also prepared to mobilise military officers with colonial experience, as well as new imperial populist alliances aimed at the petty bourgeoisie, sections of the better-off working class, and those socially atomised by the latest economic developments. These forces could be utilised as a political battering ram to overcome any formal democratic obstacles in the imperialists’ path.

France had witnessed the rise of General Boulanger (33), who had been active in Indo-China, attempted a coup d’etat in 1889; as well as being a promoter of the anti-Semitism behind the Dreyfus Affair from 1894-1900 (34). To the east, particularly in Austria, Right populist parties, such as the anti-Semitic Social Christians led by Karl Leuger (35), had been growing in influence, since their first appearance in the 1870s. In the UK, the Conservatives and Ulster Unionists organised extra-parliamentary opposition to the Liberals Irish Home Rule Bill. They gave their backing for the mobilisation of the Ulster Volunteer Force in Ireland in 1912 (36) and the Curragh Mutiny in 1914 (37).

The populist press and imperialist politicians whipped up chauvinist and anti-immigrant sentiment. In this way they a hoped to prevent the massive new metropolitan industrial and residential centres from evolving into ‘melting pots’, which might dissolve nationalities into a new multinational and militant working class. The Westminster Parliament passed the Aliens Act in 1905 (38), after a concerted populist campaign directed against Jewish asylum seekers.

Imperialists also established and enforced a rigid hierarchy of jobs in the overseas offices, factories, railroads, shipping lines and fields. Thus, the workforce was officially divided by race for most aspects of their lives. Occupational, residential and recreational colour codes and segregated workplace compounds and labour reservations were established.

In an era when the metropolitan working class was gaining extensions to the franchise, imperialist politicians saw the value of pursuing their divide-and-rule populist politics directly amongst the new working-class parties. So, as well as promoting various Right populist forces, they also sought out Social Democratic and Labour leaders to convince them, both of the ‘benefits’ of imperial tribute to finance welfare reforms, and of the need for ‘living space’ in the new white colonies. These proposals were their ‘solutions’ for the ‘surplus’ population living in the overcrowded, poverty-stricken, metropolitan urban slums.

When white workers moved to the colonies they were often placed in supervisory roles over indigenous workers, whilst their trade unions often applied their own colour bars. Those Social Democratic and Labour Parties, formed in the colonies by both the existing settled and migrant white workers, promoted policies that stretched from paternalism to an outright racism, for example, in Australia and South Africa. Meanwhile, in the metropolitan countries, themselves, most Social Democratic and Labour leaders could also be depended upon to support such anti-migrant measures as the Aliens Act.

v) The victims and the resistance

Yet this Imperialism still brought about its own resistance. It included the new, concentrated, industrial workforces in the huge plants and transport systems, and living in the massive new urban concentrations found within the imperial heartlands. It also included the movements of nations and ethnic groups, which had either lost out, or were being increasingly brought into political life, in the social maelstrom created by the ever-expanding ‘High Imperialism’. Tribally organised peoples also put up a spirited resistance in Africa, South America, Asia and Oceania. Earlier industrial capitalist expansion in Europe had totally disrupted the traditional lives of the peasants and artisans bequeathed by the previous feudal order. Now new groups, whether of tribally organised peoples, peasants or lower castes became subjected to forced labour in the colonial mines or plantations.

Many indigenous peoples found themselves occupying lands wanted for their valuable raw materials or agricultural potential. Some of these people were ejected from the land to make them join a new colonial working class. Others lived in an intermediate limbo-land, still trying to make a living on their drastically reduced lands, from other depleted resources, or by uncompetitive handcraft industries. In this impoverished role, accentuated by newly imposed heavy colonial taxes, they could also act as a massive reserve army for casual employment, whenever required by the imperialist employers, their local agents, or aspiring new local bourgeoisies.

And if these ‘incentives’ failed to provide the required labour, then both the metropolitan businesses and imperial states operating in these colonies would resort to various forms of ‘unfree’ labour, especially indentured and corvee, obtained either locally or from overseas, e.g. Chinese and Indians. The appropriation of surplus value from waged labour may be central to capital accumulation, but capitalism has always been prepared to benefit from other forms of labour - domestic, child, chattel slave, indentured and corvee, especially when this led to super-profits.

From the sixteenth century, mercantile capital’s expansion contributed to a ‘Second Serfdom’ in eastern Europe, in contrast to the extension of waged labour in western Europe (39). From the later sixteenth, through to the eighteenth centuries, this mercantile capitalism also brought about a massive expansion of black chattel slavery, particularly in the Americas and Caribbean, alongside the continued extension of waged labour in Europe and to a white workforce in the colonies. The Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century, brought about a further expansion of black chattel slavery in the Americas, particularly in cotton production, at the same time as waged labour largely replaced most forms of pre-capitalist labour, with the exception of unpaid domestic work, and some remnant small farmer (tenant and owner) based agricultural production in Europe and the USA. The rise of ‘New’ and ‘High Imperialism’, at the end of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, also had a regressive effect in the colonies and semi-colonies. Many more people were subjected to unfree labour – indentured, corvee - and to debt peonage.

This disruption to traditional social organisation was to have a particularly calamitous effect when it was imperially imposed from without. Africa, for instance, was largely divided up to give very arbitrary political boundaries (40). These completely disrupted the pre-existing patterns of economic and social intercourse. Imperial apologists liked to highlight the ending of the locally organised, cross-continental slave trade. But these new frontiers also disrupted a lot of other, more beneficial, long-distance trade links. They broke up the old archaic states, traditional tribal lands and nomadic migration routes. These had at least offered some form of subsistence and a shared culture. Now, under the heel of the ‘New’ and ‘High Imperialism’, Africans, Asians, Amerindians and others were denied their own autonomous paths of development, and their cultures denigrated, to subordinate them more effectively to the interests of those running the imperial metropoles.

This period of Imperialism undoubtedly provided Social Democrats and Labour organisations with major challenges. Although the whole world was now, for the first time, divided into recognised state territories, most of this area was not organised as nation, nor even nationality states. Instead, they formed the subordinate colonies of European powers, the USA and Japan, which drew up their boundaries in deals with other imperial states.

Early communists, such as Marx and Engels, had envisaged the possibility of new nation-state creation in the areas where earlier archaic empires had provided some previous state experience - such as China, India, Persia, Egypt, and even Algeria, and what later became Indonesia. However, only a very small minority of Social Democrats, in this era of ‘High

Imperialism', supported these countries' right to political independence.

Where 'uncivilised' tribal peoples occupied land coveted by incomers, then genocide or ethnic cleansing was practised, paving the way for new white settler states, such as the Commonwealth of Australia, formed in 1901 (41). Following the precedent of the early USA, growing political forces in the British colonies sought greater independence from the imperial metropole. In the process, the previously subordinate Canadian, Australian and New Zealand element of these colonists' and their descendants' hyphenated British identities came to be upgraded. However, rarely were the indigenous peoples invited to join these new nations-in-the-making. Instead, they were subjected to a Christian paternalism, which was designed to 'civilise' them, they were left in reservations 'out of harm's way' or were otherwise persecuted and killed.

Some of these indigenous peoples had little or no internal state experience. So, they would have been classified, not as 'non-historic' but as 'pre-historic', by those hard-headed advocates of a people's 'right to survival' only on the grounds of their 'degree of civilisation'. However, most colonies retained an indigenous majority, too large to be marginalised on reservations or destroyed, but who could be profitably exploited in other ways. Therefore, a calculated decision had to be made, about whether to eliminate or marginalise those peoples whose lands and resources were desired, or whether to super-exploit the labour of larger populations. A new breed of unsentimental and thoroughly racist imperialists made such calculations. They also influenced the thinking of many Social Democrats in the Second International. This helped to give rise to the political phenomenon of **social imperialism**.

Furthermore, the political divisions in this 'High Imperialist' world went much deeper than the superficial impression gained by looking at the latest globes and atlases. Huge swathes of pink, green, brown or orange marked out the British, French, German and Russian empires. However, the 'nation'-state at the centre of each ethnically diverse empire also presided over subordinate nations and/or ethnic groups at its core. This was true of the imperial states headed by the British Crown in parliament, e.g. the Irish; the French parliamentary republic, e.g. the Corsicans; the German kaiser in consultation with his ministers, e.g. the Poles; or the Russian tsar advised by the tsarina and Rasputin, who presided over a 'prison house of nations'.

Therefore, Imperialist politicians sometimes promoted, not only social imperialism, to win working class support for their colonial ventures, but **social chauvinism** too, to divide the working class in their states on nationality lines. This affected the Left, as well as the Right and Centre of Social Democracy.

National movements, in the subordinate nations of the imperial heartlands, were seen as particularly threatening. However, these movements were themselves class-divided, something their bourgeois and petty bourgeois advocates attempted to gloss over through their patriotic populist politics. Furthermore, social chauvinist attitudes, held by Social Democrats from dominant nations or ethnic groups, were to create considerable social and political barriers to bringing about real unity with Social Democrats in the subordinate nations and nationalities. This, in turn, contributed to a **social patriotism** on the Left amongst these peoples.

These divisions were to have a negative effect upon the Left adherents of the Second International too. What was almost lost, in particular, was the tradition of **Internationalism from Below** established by Marx, Engels, and others in the First International.

The Second International demonstrated an increasing amnesia with regard to Marx's and Engels' most developed understanding of the 'National Question'. This was linked to a similar 'forgetfulness' with regard to a genuinely communist attitude towards the state, wage slavery, and the nature of political organisation. Many Social Democrats still celebrated the leading role of certain nation-states (using the old 'degree of civilisation' argument), the need for a strong state and nationalised economy, and the position of the heroic, waged, male worker. What became increasingly obscured was the human emancipatory and liberatory view of the Communist alternative.

Yet, despite all the retreats, which took place between the crushing of the Paris Commune in 1871, the final ending of post-Civil War Reconstruction in 1877, and the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, there were still important gains. Not all trade unions were divided on the grounds of nationality/ethnicity. In the USA and beyond, the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) (42) made the most concerted effort to draw all workers into a single union, regardless of ‘race’ or ethnic background. Despite the relentless employer and state attempts to suppress the IWW, this union had a considerable impact. The IWW, however, became split between those advocating an Anarcho-syndicalist anti-politics approach, and those Politicals who also saw the need for party organisation.

During this period before the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave, a number of revolutionary Social Democrats, including Kazimierz Kelles-Kreuz in Poland, and James Connolly in Ireland defended and advanced the legacy of **Internationalism from Below** bequeathed by Marx, Engels and others.

B. THE DEVELOPMENT OF ORTHODOX MARXISM AND THE ‘NATIONAL QUESTION’ BEFORE THE 1904-7 INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY WAVE

i) The Positivist-Materialist and Idealist philosophical split amongst pre-First World War One Social Democrats

Orthodox Marxists were divided over the underlying philosophical approach they based their theories upon, including those dealing with the ‘National Question’. The Positivist-Materialists lay on one side of this divide, the Idealists on the other. These philosophical schools of thought usually discarded Marx’s own dialectical thinking, which linked the material and conscious worlds through the notion of self-determining human practice.

Karl Kautsky (43) of the German Social Democrats (SDPD), and Georgi Plekhanov (44) of the Russian Social Democrats (RSDLP), championed the Positivist-Materialist approach. They greatly influenced Rosa Luxemburg and the pre-First World War, Vladimir Lenin. The Third International, or Comintern, also later adopted this Positivist-Materialist approach, when Josef Stalin established a new Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy, to replace that of the Second International, following the marginalisation of other schools of thought in the Third International.

Positivist-Materialists attempted to use the methodologies of, and to draw their social analogies directly from the physical and biological sciences. Such thinking was common amongst the most prominent theorists of the day, particularly in the SDPD and its various emulators, including some in the RSDLP. Engels had made his own contribution to this mode of thought (45). Lenin was later to show elements of such thinking too. It was most marked in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (46), written in 1908 during the period of reaction after the failed 1905 Revolution in the Tsarist Empire. It was only in his later *Philosophical Notebooks* (47), written in response to the events of the First World War, that Lenin became more aware of the vulgar materialism as practiced by Plekhanov, in particular. Yet Plekhanov had previously been a considerable influence on Lenin's philosophical views, just as Kautsky had been on his political theories. Kautsky thought that Marx's own dialectical method was outdated. He "regarded the Hegelian origins of Marxism as a historical accident of small importance" (48).

The Positivist-Materialist method was partly based on a strongly determinist use of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. Through the further influence of Herbert Spencer and others, a Social Darwinist (49) view of the world developed. Such thinking understood progress to be the result of rational individuals working together to make continuous social adaptations, in order to meet their ever-developing, essentially biologically based needs. Therefore, just as biological evolution produced more complex and advanced organisms in the natural world, so many Social Darwinists believed that a racial hierarchy, headed by the 'higher races', had evolved in the social sphere, partly based on prior biological differences.

Such thinking produced racist and chauvinist practice. Social Darwinists believed that the societies 'created' by the 'higher races' would displace or marginalise those of the 'lower races.' As a result, there were only two possible futures for those 'lower races' still surviving. Many Liberals wanted total assimilation on 'civilised society's terms, whilst the new

Right urged total extinction, with the 'higher races' delivering the final death sentence.

So influential was Social Darwinism, that it had many adherents amongst Right Social Democrats. Kautsky opposed the politics of Social Darwinism but continued to share its physical and biological sciences-influenced, Positivist-Materialist method. However, by the 1890s, many thinkers were beginning to rebel against such Positivist-Materialism. It seemed simultaneously to advocate the 'progressive' nature of the growing bureaucratic power developing under Imperialism, and to reduce human beings to mere cyphers for abstract economic forces.

The counter to this Positivist-Materialism mainly took the form of a return to Idealism. Idealism led to neo-Kantiansm (50), and its call for an ethical dimension to politics; to Henri Bergson's search for life forces (51); to Ernst Mach's philosophy of science (52); to Ferdinand Tonnies emphasis on community (gemeinschaft), as opposed to bureaucratic (gesellschaft) forms of association (53); and to Sigmund Freud's new psychology of the individual mind (54).

Max Adler (55) of the Austrian Social Democrats (SDPO) was influenced by Mach and by neo-Kantism in particular (56). Adler's thinking had considerable influence over the Austro-Marxist school, which defended another version of orthodox Marxism. Idealism underpinned the approaches of the other leading Austro-Marxists, Karl Renner (57) and later Otto Bauer to the 'National Question' Like Kautsky's more Positivist-Materialist thinking, this was first developed to counter the growing Right Revisionists in the Second International.

However, just as Positivist-Materialism could provide philosophical sustenance for a number of political forces, including Social Darwinism, so too could this revival of Idealism. It formed the philosophical underpinning for a new breed of academic. These were employed, in the various state universities, to combat the rising Socialist political challenge associated with Materialism. Philosophical Idealism was also to contribute to the thinking behind a new type of politics - Fascism.

There were strong links between leading figures in the SDPD and SPDO.

Karl Kautsky, Rudolf Hilferding, Max Adler and Otto Bauer came from an assimilated Jewish German culture that straddled the Prussian-German, Hapsburg Austrian (and Tsarist Russian Polish) borders. Kautsky (born in Prague, then in Hapsburg Austria) and Hilferding (born in Vienna) were to make their homes in Germany. But Adler and Bauer remained in Vienna. The 'National Question' presented itself in very different terms in Prussia-Germany, where Germans were the overwhelming majority, and Hapsburg Austria, where they were a minority.

Members of both the SDPD and SDPO wrote for German language journals. These provided a mutually understood debating forum for German and Austrian Social Democrats. These journals also became influential reading for a wider circle of Marxists, particularly those in the Tsarist Russian Empire. Through debates, they tried to establish and defend the outer boundaries of an orthodox Marxism.

ii) From Positivist-Materialist philosophy to mechanical economic determinist theory

A philosophical Positivist Materialism, which underpinned the theoretical economic reductionism of many Marxists, emphasised the 'objective necessity' of economic forces leading to the historical development of capitalism and paving the way for an almost inevitable Socialism. Sometimes this involved attributing reified powers to the alienated categories of capitalism – capital, labour and rent. However, capital is a social relation, which is class-contested. And, unlike previous exploitative social systems, developed capitalism is marked by a separation between distinct economic and political realms. These broadly correspond to the capitalist enterprise and the capitalist state. Economic reductionism tends to underplay the significance of and the interplay stemming from this capitalist-imposed divide, or to unconsciously duplicate it in its theories and politics.

Such an approach has been common in Second International, Social Democratic and Communist (both official and dissident) thinking. However, Kautsky's method also overlapped with that of the emerging Revisionists led by Eduard Bernstein. They both highlighted the progressive nature of capitalism led by the 'economically developed' states, which would progressively lead to socialism. Bernstein argued that a now historically redundant capitalism was preparing the ground for an evolutionary quantitative transition to socialism. He thought that capitalism was now capable of gradual reform into socialism. He outlined this in his *Evolutionary Socialism* in 1899 (58). This formed the theoretical basis for his Revisionist challenge to orthodox Marxism.

Kautsky argued from the same inevitability of socialism premise as Bernstein. But he saw the need for a revolutionary qualitative leap. Kautsky was to the forefront of those opposing Revisionism at the Second International Congress in Paris in 1900. Many other revolutionary Social Democrats, including Georgi Plekhanov, Rosa Luxemburg and Vladimir Lenin joined him. Luxemburg and Lenin were keen to don the orthodox Marxist mantle and saw themselves as adherents of Kautsky's approach until 1910 and 1914 respectively. In the process they adopted aspects of the economic reductionism underpinning the thought of Kautsky and Plekhanov.

However, the Social Democrats in the RSDLP became divided over the issue of Revisionism in Russia. Lenin identified Economism as the specific Russian variant of Revisionism. He claimed that Economists placed their emphasis on championing the immediate economic concerns of the working class and developing legal organisations within Tsarist Russia. They downplayed non-economic aspects of society and also opposed illegal action designed to overthrow the Tsarist regime. Leon Trotsky used the term Politicals to describe those opposing the Economists (59). They produced the émigré RSDLP journal *Iskra* and were led by Plekhanov, Lenin and Julius Martov.

In some respects, the debate between Economists and Politicals was an update of one that had already taken place in the early days of Social Democracy, when Engels was still alive. The early SDPD had been more 'Political' in its thinking under Bismarck's Anti-Socialist Laws. After these laws were repealed in 1890, the newly legal SDPD retreated to what would later be seen as more Economist positions. Engels had criticised the beginnings of this slippage with the publication of the SDPD's *Erfurt Programme* in 1891 (60). This programme dropped any immediate republican political demands despite the limited nature of parliamentary democracy under the Kaiser/Junker dominated, Prussian/German state.

Because of the highly repressive political order in Tsarist Russia, the early Economist trend, which Lenin and other Politicals attacked there, met strong opposition from the majority within the RSDLP. Tsarist Russia lacked parliamentary democracy, legal rights for workers, and presided over the official oppression of nations and nationalities (particularly the Jews), and of women and religious minorities. Opposition to this all-pervading tsarist oppression (and often repression) provided much of the motivation for Lenin's original Political opposition to Economism. Lenin's views on Economism would contribute to his later views on the 'National Question'. However, before the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave, Lenin's handling of the 'National Question' was mainly confined to challenging the Jewish General Workers' Bund, which defended the necessity for an autonomous Jewish section in the RSDLP and hence came up against Lenin's support for 'one state, one party'.

Later, the Austro-Marxists also fell-back on economic reductionist thinking. The SDPO leadership opposed the Czech nationalist parties' demand to restore the historical State Rights awarded to Bohemia under the Hapsburg Crown. Ostensibly, this was because such a demand widened "the reactionary principle of monarchy, yet there was no protest {from the SDPO leadership} against the repressive Austrian monarchy {itself}… In effect they acquiesced in the dominant position of the Germans in the {SDPO} and thus gave succour to the Emperor and the Dual Monarchy" (61). Instead, they emphasised the need for working class unity based on immediate economic issues.

Luxemburg developed her own thinking on Revisionism and wrote *Social Reform or Revolution* (62) in 1899 to counter its influence in the SDPD. But whereas Lenin identified the Economists as the primary vehicle for Revisionism in the Tsarist Empire, Luxemburg took on the Polish Socialist Party, (PPS) led by the social patriot, Josef Pilsudski, as her prime target. She adopted Kautsky's economic reductionist method, building as she saw it upon his theoretical legacy. Luxemburg wrote *Industrial Development in Poland* in 1898) (63). This showed the economic 'impossibility' of creating an independent Poland. This led her into being an intransigent opponent of Polish independence, and especially those who supported it in the PPS and the Second International. Flowing for this, she placed a strong emphasis on opposing autonomous organisation for workers from oppressed nationalities, either within the SDPD in Prussia-Germany or the RSDLP in Tsarist Russia. She became a strong supporter of one state, one party in Prussia-Germany, but was more ambiguous over this in Poland and Russia.

Lenin initially also used fairly mechanistic economic schema to explain the 'inevitability' of capitalist development in Russia. This was shown in his theory of capitalist advance in *The Capitalist Development of Russia* published in 1899 (64). However, Lenin tended to put his economic interpretation to one side and then concentrated more on the political contradictions produced by capitalist development, particularly in Tsarist Russia. This was linked with his rejection of Economism and to his Political approach. From his understanding, he drew up the organisational imperatives he saw necessary for revolutionary Social Democrats, in which his 'one state, one party' stance figured large.

During the period of 'High Imperialism', all Second International tendencies tended to 'forget' Marx's programme for overcoming the capitalist division between the economic and the political. Marx did not draw a vertical line between the economic and the political but showed the dialectical connection between the lower economic and the higher political forms of struggle. This was something the early Lenin was to dismiss as a particular characteristic of Economism - "lending the economic struggle a political character" (65).

Yet, in 1871, Marx wrote that, "The attempt in a particular factory or even a particular trade to force a shorter working day out of individual capitalists by strikes, etc, is a purely economic movement. On the other hand the movement to force through an eight-hour, etc., *law*, is a *political* movement. And in this way, out of separate economic movements of the workers there grows up everywhere a *political* movement" (66).

For Marx, a higher political understanding and activity flowed from worker self-activity, rather than being introduced from without by professional Social Democratic politicians. This latter position was first articulated by Kautsky and was commented favourably upon by Lenin in the first Bolshevik/Menshevik dispute within the RSDLP over organisation in 1903 (67). What began as a debate about the need for professional revolutionaries under conditions of illegality later became generalised by orthodox Marxist-Leninists, and other Social Democratic and Labour Parties as the necessity for having privileged professional politicians.

Marx, saw working class self-organisation as essential. However, he also abandoned organisations, such as the Communist League (1852) and First International (1876), when they lost meaningful contact with the working class and had become sects. Engels retained a critical attitude toward the Second International, and particularly to its key member party the SDPD. He put his weight behind those who opposed political retreats over the minimum/immediate programme, especially in Germany. He thought this could undermine the Second International in any new revolutionary situation. However, Engels died before the Second International was really tested. But it was after the collapse of the 1916-21/3 International Revolutionary Wave that the defence of 'The Party' became further cemented in the Left, no matter how it had conducted itself.

iii) Kautsky and the Austro-Marxists set the terms of the debate on the issue of nationality, nations and nationalism

Prior to the First World War, Kautsky of the SDPD and the Austro-Marxists (Karl Renner then later Otto Bauer) if the SDPO mainly set the terms of the emerging orthodox Marxist debate in the Second International, as well as its constituent Social Democratic parties, over the 'National Question'. In the period before the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave this was not linked in any consistent way to a theory of Imperialism, although Social Democrats were becoming aware of increased colonial rivalry.

Responding to the impact of 'High Imperialism' and the rise of Revisionism within the SPD and Second International, Kautsky wrote *Old and New Colonial Policy* (68) in 1898. This was a reply to leading SDPD member, Eduard Bernstein who, in 1897, had come out in favour of colonialism. "We will condemn and struggle against certain methods of repression of the savage peoples, but not against the fact that they are subjected in order to impose on then the superior law of civilisation" (69). This was ironically a throwback to the position of the pre-1860s Marx (70). In reply, Kautsky argued that, "modern colonial policy was pursued by pre-capitalist reactionary strata, mainly Junkers, military officers, bureaucrats, speculators and merchants, although {he} neglected to mention German banks and heavy industry." (71) In effect, Kautsky was saying that German capitalism had a choice – stay wedded to German reaction or follow a liberal anti-colonial course. Politically this was not dissimilar to the position advocated by the Radical Liberal John A. Hobson in his *Imperialism: A Study*, written in 1902 (72), in response to the Tory government launching the Boer War.

Kautsky had gone further in developing a theory of nation-states. He wrote *The Modern Nationality* as early as 1887. He saw nation-states as the creations of ongoing capitalist development. "In proportion as modern economic development has proceeded, there has grown the need for all who spoke the same language to join together in the same state" (74). Here he was pursuing a similar line of thinking to that of Engels in his *Decay of Feudalism and Rise of National States* (75).

For Kautsky, the geographical extent of particular nation-states was largely based on the territory encompassed by the speakers of the language promoted by its rising bourgeoisie as capitalism expanded. This language acted as the communications medium necessary to develop a wider market area, as well as for more general social intercourse. The bourgeoisie had tried to establish their own political power by creating nation-states they claimed were based on linguistically bounded market areas. But since few such monolingual areas actually existed, they often had to be created by the new nation-states establishing official languages and resorting to a variety of methods to replace or marginalise other languages.

In Kautsky's theory, capitalist expansion was taken something inevitable, and as a necessary stage in human evolution, rather than something which those with very different social visions had contested. These involved alternative paths of non-national, national or international development. Kautsky, however, believed that history had given the bourgeoisie, the promoter of capitalism, its turn to hold the ‘baton’ of social progress. But now, in Germany anyhow, this ‘baton’ should be handed over to the SDPD leadership, to be wielded on behalf of the working class. Although Kautsky was to further refine his theory of ethnic groups and nations, he retained his largely economic reductionist approach with its emphasis upon inevitable progress.

Kautsky could gloss over the issue of Alsace, Posen, Silesia, Pomerania and Schleswig, in a Prussia-Germany where ethnic Germans formed such a large majority of the overall population. However, such a stance was impossible for in Hapsburg Austria with its seventeen Crown lands. Czechs, Italians, Poles, Slovenes, Romanians, Slovaks, Ukrainians and Jews formed other sizeable nations or ethnic groups making various political claims. Here ethnic Germans were in a minority. But the wider Dual Hapsburg monarchy of Austria-Hungary gave constitutional privilege to two nationalities - the Germans and the Magyars.

Kautsky’s economic reductionsism, with its belief in historically determined and inevitable progress, provided no solution to the problem the SDPO faced. Such orthodoxy claimed that the ‘National Question’ should have declining relevance as capitalism and parliamentary democracy developed. This clearly was not what was happening in the Hapsburg Austro-Hungarian Empire. Here nationalism represented a rising political force. It ranged from the anti-Semitic populism of the Social Christians amongst the dominant German speakers to the national populism and social patriotism found amongst many of the oppressed ethnic groups.

Due to the dominant position of the Germans, the national populists’ political influence was strong amongst the non-Germans. Social chauvinism was also to be found amongst the German members of the SDPO. This led to a distinct social patriotic adaptation amongst the non-German members of the SDPO. One of the strongest social patriotic pressures was to be found in Czech-populated Bohemia. The growing Czech opposition was mainly based in the northern, ethnically mixed borderlands, and amongst workers in the smaller workplaces of Bohemia. A clearly social patriotic Czech National Socialist Party (CNSP) broke away from the SDPO in 1897 (76). It gained support from large sections of the ethnic Czech working class in the Crown lands of Bohemia.

As a result, the SDPO reorganised along federal lines at their Brunn (Brno today) Conference in 1899. Parties for the Czechs, Germans, Italians, Poles, Ukrainians and Slovenes were given official recognition (77). The SDPO's federalist organisational compromise was opposed by the party's social chauvinist wing, which dressed itself up in 'internationalist' colours, in the manner of Lafargue and Hales in the First International (78). These social chauvinists tacitly assumed that the Slav members of the working class were more 'backward' and should accept the leadership of its more 'advanced' German workers. Their 'internationalist' aspirations represented a Left version of the thinking of most Germans during the 1848 Revolution in the German Confederation established by the Congress of Vienna (79).

Notwithstanding the upgrading, in 1899, of the autonomous Czech Social Democrats to the Czech Social Democratic Party (CSDP), organisational federation still failed to stem the growth of social patriotism amongst the non-German nationalities within the SDPO (80). After the SDPO reorganisation, Germans still dominated the Party.

The Austro-Marxists had some success, though, in dealing with the growing social patriotic opposition inside the SDPO, following agreement over a new policy at its 1899 Brunn Conference. Here, the SDPO advocated the reform the Hapsburg Empire as a territorial federation of ethnically based states, supplemented by special laws to guarantee the rights of national minorities (81). In effect, this was a political updating of the position of the early Czech nationalist, Palacky, at the Slav Congress held in Prague in 1848 (82). He had also wanted to maintain the territorial integrity of the Hapsburg Empire.

Karl Renner wrote *State and Nation* in 1899 (83) in the same year as the SPDP's Brunn Conference. Over the next decade, the Austro-Marxists developed an alternative theory to that provided by Kautsky to address nations and nationalism. However, this would not become fully theorised until after the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave when Otto Bauer addressed the issue.

But another revolutionary Social Democratic trend emerged which went back to the later Marx's and Engels' 'Internationalism from Below' approach. Its leading spokespersons generally came from nations or nationalities, which suffered from oppression. Kazimierz Kelles-Krauz, (84) a member of that section of PPS operating within Tsarist Russian Empire, had to work under both illegal conditions and as a member of an oppressed nationality. Therefore, he was quick to make the case for the significance of certain political demands, which Luxemburg and Lenin rejected, including Polish independence (which could claim both Marx's and Engels' support). He also defended the need for independent political organisations within the Second International for opposed nations (again resorting to Marx's and Engels' precedent over Ireland).

James Connolly was another figure from an oppressed national who developed an 'Internationalism from Below' position, first in the Irish Socialist Republican Party (ISRP). The ISRP's participation of the ISRP in the 1900 Second International was opposed by the Henry Hyndman, leader of the British Social Democratic Federation. Connolly took a strong interest in international affairs. He was driven by poverty from Dublin to the USA in 1903. He went on to be a co-founder of the Industrial Workers of the World, as the new International Revolutionary Wave hit the USA in 1905.

C. KAZIMIERZ KELLES-KRAUZ TAKES ON THE ORTHODOX MARXISTS

i) Luxemburg and Kelles-Krauz and the division over Poland in the Second International

Poland played a key part in the debates of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century over the significance of the 'National Question'. There had been a number of risings, particularly against Russian rule, including those of 1830, 1848 and 1863. Poland had enjoyed the support of most revolutionary democrats, including Marx and Engels, mainly because of its perceived role as a political barrier to Tsarist Russia.

Polish Socialism, however, initially grew in reaction to the older romantic Polish nationalism. Engels had already identified the major weakness of this new Socialist trend - its political accommodation to the existing oppressive states (85). Towards the end of the nineteenth century industrial capitalism developed apace in Poland. This led to the formation of a new working class, particularly in Dabrowa (in the southern Polish coal basin) and in industrial Warsaw and Lodz. There was a major strike and demonstrations in Lodz in the week beginning on May Day, 1892. These were brutally crushed by the Russian imperial authorities (86).

The Polish Socialist Party (PPS) was formed in the aftermath of the Lodz demonstrations by a number of small political organisations. These included the Proletariat group which Engels had crossed swords with over the issue of Polish independence (87). But following its direct experience of Russian state oppression in 1892, the Proletariat group dropped its previous objection to the demand for Polish independence.

Unlike the ideological leaderships of several Social Democratic organisations in Europe (e.g. the SDPD), the majority of the new PPS leadership did not try to justify its politics by resort to Marxist arguments. ‘Socialism’ was very much the fashion amongst the radical intelligentsia in Europe, but the notion covered a very wide theoretical and political spectrum including Social Liberalism, e.g. the Fabians in the UK (88) and Junker-Prussian ‘Socialism’, e.g. the Katheder-Socialists in Germany (89).

In Poland the dominant form of Socialist thinking was social patriotism. Its central demand was for the restoration of Polish unity and independence. This was partly due to the work of Josef Pilsudski (90), who was to become the leader of the openly social patriotic, PPS-Revolutionary Fraction breakaway in 1906. Many PPS leaders usually invoked Marx’s and Engels’ support for one particular policy – Polish independence.

Rosa Luxemburg, from a middle-class Jewish background, was born in (Russian) Congress Poland (91). She joined the Polish Proletariat group in 1889, and became a member of the PPS, when it was founded in 1893. She was implacably opposed to the independence policy and was not afraid to go straight for the jugular when it came to the reasons given by the PPS leadership for its support. She attacked the idea of any continuing relevance for Marx's and Engels' earlier politico-strategic arguments for Polish independence, the sentimentality of the older leaders of the Second International (meaning primarily SDPD members like Wilhelm Liebnecht and August Bebel), and the social patriotism of the existing PPS leadership.

Later, Luxemburg was to write, "By failing to analyse Poland and Russia as class societies bearing economic and political contradictions in their bosoms, by viewing them not from the point of view of historical development but as if they were in a fixed, absolute condition as homogeneous, undifferentiated units, this view runs counter to the very essence of marxism" (92).

Luxemburg wrote a minority report, for the Third Congress of the Second International in Zurich in 1893, strongly hinting at opposition to Polish independence. The PPS leadership tried to deny Luxemburg delegate credentials (93). This contributed to her decision to join a separate party - Social Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland (SDPKP), which saw itself as the lineal descendent of the original Proletariat grouping (94). In 1899 this became the Social Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania (SDPKPL).

Luxemburg decided to provide Marxist economic reasoning to justify the dropping of the Polish independence demand. These were outlined in her article *An Independent Poland and the Workers' Cause* (95) written in 1895. They were further developed in her university dissertation, *The Industrial Development of Poland* (96), presented in 1897. She argued that recent capitalist developments in Poland made the political demand for independence impossible. Neither the old gentry, nor the new bourgeoisie, had any economic interest in pursuing such a policy. Those advocating independence would only confuse and divide the Polish workers who needed the fullest unity with their Russian and German comrades.

There is a similarity between Luxemburg's essentially economic reductionist arguments, about the 'impossibility' of an independent capitalist road for Poland, and those in Lenin's 1899 book, *The*

Development of Capitalism in Russia, in which he argued the 'inevitability' of a capitalist road for Russian (97). However, Luxemburg tended to draw far more mechanical conclusions about the dominant economic drives and the resultant political movements. Lenin opposed the Populism of the old Russian Narodnik and later, the newer Social Revolutionaries. His theory may have shown some economic reductionist characteristics. But in practical terms Lenin gave primacy to the political not the economic.

With regard to Poland, Luxemburg made some valid criticisms about the continued relevance of Marx's and Engels' earlier politico-strategic views. These had led them to give support to the struggles of 'historic nations' such as Poland and Hungary, against Tsarist Russia and its then ally, Hapsburg Austria (98). However, Luxemburg did not seem to appreciate that Marx and Engels had shifted their grounds of support for Polish independence to wider politico-democratic reasons. Luxemburg's own arguments, which were meant to update Marx and Engels, and contribute to the new orthodox Marxism of the Second International (99), certainly carried weight against the romantic sentimentalism of the social patriotic PPS leadership. Nevertheless, they did not represent a return to Marx's and Engels' developed 'internationalism from below' approach, nor an adequate basis for contesting the national oppression of the Poles, particularly in the Russian, Austro-Hungarian or Prussian-German states.

However, promoting Marxist economic theory was not the concern of the social patriotic PPS leadership. They reacted strongly against Luxemburg's attempt to end Second International support for Polish independence. But another Social Democrat, Kazimierz Kelles-Kreuz, was to emerge from within the ranks of the PPS. He opposed Luxemburg on quite different grounds – those of 'Internationalism from Below'.

Kelles-Krauz was also born in Congress Tsarist Poland (100). He belonged to an old Baltic-German family, which had long become thoroughly Polonised, but came from Lithuania, where Poles only formed a minority of the population. Nevertheless, Poles had dominated official culture there, since Lithuanian speakers were mainly found amongst the economically subordinate and often illiterate peasantry. Kelles-Krauz was from a middle-class background and was introduced to Socialist politics in the clandestine Polish schools. These had been organised to counter the Tsarist state's Russification programme (101). He joined the Polish Socialist Party in 1894 (102).

In response to Luxemburg's attacks on the PPS, Kelles-Krauz wrote *The Class Character of Our Programme* to provide Marxist arguments for the demand for Polish independence, the removal of the non-Socialist patriots from the PPS, and also to argue for more democracy in its workings (103).

ii) Luxemburg and Kelles-Krauz take their differences over Poland to the 1896 Congress of the Second International in London

Both Luxemburg and Kelles-Krauz wanted the issue of Polish independence discussed at the Second International Congress, held in London in 1896 - the first to condemn it, the second to reaffirm traditional International support (104). The Second International was neither a unitary organisation with a centralised international leadership, nor was it a federation of Social Democratic parties. It was, in effect, a loose confederation of existing-state and certain approved national parties, with prestigious party ideologues taking on the Congress organising role.

One of the unspoken assumptions, underlying the conduct of the International Congresses, was that resolutions criticising particular governments' international conduct, or even worse, specific Social Democratic parties' behaviour, were often downplayed. Events put real strains on this self-denying ordinance. Yet it normally held, precisely because the real power lay with the leaders of national parties, particularly those of Germany and Austria and, to a lesser extent, France and Italy. One way, which orthodox Marxists, like Karl Kautsky, 'the Pope of Marxism', were able to maintain ideological supremacy was to largely accept this undeclared practice in the conduct of Second International affairs.

The discussion of the issue of Polish independence was originally understood to be primarily an attack on Romanov Russia. As long as this remained the case, the PPS could expect some support from German and Austrian Social Democrats. However, Kelles-Krauz had not bargained for the hidden fears generated by such a demand (105). It could also impact more directly upon the internal political affairs of Hohenzollern Prussia and Hapsburg Austria, the other two dynasties ruling over Polish territory.

Thus, Kelles-Krauz received only private assurances prior to the Congress from the older leaders, particularly from Wilhelm Liebknecht (SDPD) (106) and Victor Adler (SDPO) (107). Georgi Plekhanov had also reversed his earlier support for Polish independence, now that Russian workers were showing signs of taking action (108). Only Antonio Labriola (Socialist Party of Italy) had actively tried to win public support (109).

Living in exile in Paris, Kelles-Kreuz campaigned amongst French Socialists for support. He argued that, "Poland is more industrially advanced than Russia, and when tsarism collapses would best be served by its own constitution. The PPS supports the Russians in their efforts to gain a constitution but understands that effort as preparation for its own claim to independence. If… revolution in western Europe were to precede the fall of the tsar, the PPS would be a barrier to tsarist reaction…. Polish independence is thus analogous to demands for a republic in Germany and Italy, and for general suffrage in Belgium or Austria" (110). This latter argument was similar to the one Engels had used in 1892.

However, both Jules Guesde of the (111) Workers Party of France, and Jean Allemane (112) of the Revolutionary Socialist Workers Party were also opposed to Polish independence, despite Guesde's earlier support when it seemed orthodox (113), and despite Kelles-Krauz's own support for Allemane's advocacy of the general strike tactic (114). Guesde now understood the Polish independence resolution chiefly as a threat to the existing European order recently cemented by the Franco-Russian alliance in 1891 (115). Allemane, however, advocated what would later be known as a Syndicalist approach (albeit, like some other Socialists, combining this with support for a separate propagandist and electoral Party).

Kelles-Kreuz also had to deal with Luxemburg's attack on the PPS because it retained non-socialists, i.e. social patriots in its party. He replied that, "Non-socialists are found in the French party too" (116). Furthermore, whilst Luxemburg was vehement in her attacks on social patriots like Pilsudski in the PPS, she was soon to work closely with German social chauvinists in the SDPD.

Luxemburg, however, did indeed have cause for complaint against that Pilsudski. In 1892, the PPS had been formed in the aftermath of vicious Tsarist Russian police suppression of Polish workers. In 1896, however, there was a major strike, mainly of women textile workers in St. Petersburg. Pilsudski and the Polish social patriots' contempt for the militancy of Russian workers were now exposed as covers for anti-Russian attitudes.

Kelles-Krauz did not hold to this view and wanted to work with Russian Social Democrats (117). However, he refused to make a straight equation between industrial militancy and wider political consciousness, despite being a strong supporter of militant industrial action. Yet, militant industrial action in Russia probably also undermined Luxemburg's position in the eyes of the Second International leadership, since most were strongly opposed to any perceived Anarchist-influenced Syndicalism at the London Congress. Therefore, Luxemburg had little more success with her move to get the Congress to condemn Polish independence.

It was left to Kautsky to attempt to paper over the cracks. He was acutely aware that the issue of Polish independence was political dynamite in Prussia-Germany. It had only been six years since the SDPD had achieved legal status. This position would be threatened by the Prussian Junker dominated German state, if either the SDPD itself championed Polish independence, or let its autonomous Polish section - the Polish Socialist Party of the Prussian Partition (PPSzp) – openly campaign on the issue. Kautsky wrote a pamphlet, *Finis Poloniae*, largely agreeing with Luxemburg that the issue of Polish independence no longer had politico-strategic importance but disagreeing with her in allowing Polish Social Democrats to retain the demand in their programmes (118).

Quite clearly, Kautsky was trying to project his own practice in the SDPD on to Polish Social Democrats. This allowed for the continuation of a programme with advanced political demands, provided they remained only on paper; whilst a mechanical analysis of the current political situation formed the basis for the real party policy of pursuing minimum economic, social and, less frequently, political reforms. The resultant day-to-day political practice of the party was therefore left increasingly in the hands of the Right, who were only interested in 'achievable' economic and social reforms, growth in the paying membership and electoral successes. They were less interested in ideology at this stage. This could still be left, unconsummated by practice, in the hands of the orthodox Marxists, who themselves had no revolutionary strategy.

The Right, when they did not actually quietly support the colonial and military policies of their state governments, did very little to oppose them. As the 'High Imperialism' gained momentum, colonial seizures and war preparations occurred more frequently. Even as early as the 1896 Congress, Rightist Social Democrats were to be found hiding under the umbrella of new imperialist alliances. Some French socialists saw the new alliance with Tsarist Russia as a protection against a Prussian Junker-dominated Germany, which had 'humiliated' republican France, and which continued to occupy Alsace and a part of Lorraine.

Therefore, the Second International Congress's orthodox Marxist organisers tried to avoid raising embarrassing issues like Polish independence, or the Prussian-German annexation of Alsace-Lorraine. This is one reason why Kautsky had preferred to give support to the general principle of "the full right to self-determination of nations" at the 1896 Second Intentional London Congress (119), rather than being specific about its application.

The British Social Democratic Federation (SDF) delegate and Christian pacifist, George Lansbury, went further and successfully added opposition to colonialism to the original resolution. "Under whatever pretexts of religion or civilising influence colonial policy presents itself, it always has as its goal the extension of the field of capitalist exploitation in the exclusive interests of the capitalists" (120). However, once again this was without specific reference to a concrete case – in Lansbury's case, British colonialism. When, at the next Congress in Paris, in 1900, British policy towards the white Boers was specifically criticised, the SDF delegates, Henry Hyndman and Harry Quelch, were quick to compile a dossier of other imperial powers' 'transgressions', and push once more to "condemn the policies of 'countries of European civilization, including the United

States'" (121).

Luxemburg also promoted this more generalised, non-specific approach. Kelles-Krauz opposed this mode of operation - suppressing the discussion of concrete issues by means of adopting lofty principles (122). "The use of internationalist language to hide national interest was fast becoming a habit in the Second International" (123). Thus, when the 'full right to self determination of nations' resolution was passed, it could safely be interpreted by the 'big players' as applying to other states' oppressed nations and nationalities, but not to their own. Even Luxemburg was perfectly happy at this stage to let such a principle pass, quietly assuming it did not apply to Poland!

Later, Luxemburg did come out against the 'right of nations to self-determination'. This was in response to the RSDLP writing this principle into its programme in 1907. However, retrospectively justifying her 1896 vote, Luxemburg later claimed in the SDPKPL journal, *Przeglad Socjalistyczny*, that, "There can be no doubt that this principle was not formulated by the Congress in order to give the international workers' movement a practical solution to the national problem" (124). On this Kelles-Krauz would at least have agreed!

Kelles-Krauz was also one of the first to see the wider political significance of the general strike tactic. This was the subject of the biggest debate at the London Congress. Most of the Right and the orthodox Marxists united against this tactic, condemning it as just another manifestation of Anarchism. Kelles-Krauz supported the general strike proposal, seeing it as a revolutionary tactic, and as a necessary antidote to the timid course pursued by the Right and the orthodox Marxist wings of Social Democracy.

However, in marked contrast to its principal advocate, Allemane, Kelles-Krauz also saw the general strike tactic as being even more appropriate for political demands, such as universal suffrage, the republic and political independence. He was one of the earliest revolutionary Social Democrats to appreciate the political importance of the struggles in Belgium for universal suffrage in 1891 and 1893 (125). Here the general strike tactic had been successfully used. Quite clearly, general strike action taken to extend the franchise meant something quite different to what the anti-political Anarchists understood. Kelles-Krauz had arrived at the concept of the mass political strike, something Luxemburg was only to champion a decade later.

Kelles-Krauz noted Luxemburg's support for the anti-general strike line at the Congress. He understood the link between the argument that the orthodox Luxemburg used to oppose Polish independence and the argument the orthodox Guesde used to oppose the general strike tactic. "When the working class is strong enough for independence (Luxemburg), or for a general strike (Guesde) it will be strong enough to start a revolution, so there is no point in concentrating attention on any goal but the final one" (126).

This style of argument once more offered political cover for the Right, since it left everything to be solved in the distant 'socialist' future. It left the orthodox with a very diminished immediate programme. In practice this left social patriots in charge of addressing the 'National Question' in the oppressed nations; whilst the Social Democratic Right, particularly in the dominant nation-states, was given a clear field to get on with its piecemeal reforms and 'wheeler-dealering'.

iii) Luxemburg and Kelles-Krauz continue their struggle at the 1900 Congress of the Second International in Paris

Kelles-Krauz's early experiences around the 1896 London Congress reinforced his particular 'Internationalism from Below' understanding of events. He was determined to get the next Congress in Paris to take an approach to concrete issues. So, when Kelles-Krauz attended the next pre-Congress meeting in Brussels in 1899, he asked for the following issues to be placed on the Congress agenda - the Tsar's latest proposed Hague peace conference (which he strongly opposed), the issue of Alsace-Lorraine, Polish independence and the future of the Balkans (127). With the exception of the first proposal, these specific issues were once more rejected in favour of more general declarations against 'militarism' and for 'peace'.

Just as at the 1896 London Congress, Kelles-Krauz opposed this adoption of lofty principles without regard to the concrete circumstances. "Socialist pacificism, so popular in countries which have political freedom... We understand that war is a relic of barbarism... But we must also understand that peaceful slavery is a hundred times worse" (128).

Luxemburg, now part of the German (SDPD) delegation, was to the forefront of the anti-militarist/pro-peace resolution at the Paris Congress in 1900. Long after Kelles-Krauz's death in 1905, the Second International continued in the same vein, urged on by the orthodox Marxists. Massacre after massacre, annexation after annexation, and political crisis after political crisis went on, sometimes without specific condemnation or, more often, meaningful organised action from the Second International. The leaders of the dominant national Social Democratic parties set the limits to any such opposition.

As the international situation steadily worsened, more of the orthodox Marxists, including Luxemburg, eventually lost confidence in their national party leaderships. Yet, right up until 1914, they still retained faith in the Second International itself. Yet the small power it had was completely dependant upon the very national party leaders who had proved largely ineffective in resisting the belligerent policies of their own imperialist states (129).

Boosted both by the political defeat of what was seen as Anarchism at the 1896 Congress, Eduard Bernstein argued for purely reformist road to Socialism at the 1900 Congress. Others on the Right did not feel the need for a distinctive ideology. SDPD Secretary, Ignaz Auer, wrote to Bernstein suggesting, "My dear Ede, one does not formally make a decision to do the things you suggest, one doesn't *say* such things, one simply *does* them" (130). And despite successive Congress victories for the orthodox Marxists over the next few years, this is exactly how the Right continued to behave, drawing its strength from its control of much of the party and trade union machine, and its day-to-day links with the employers and the state, both nationally and locally.

iv) Kelles-Krauz challenges Luxemburg's Radical Left and Auer and Winter's Right social chauvinist alliance in the SDPD

The same Auer, who had quietly given his advice to Bernstein, enjoyed rather close political relations with Luxemburg round this time. They both wanted to close down the SDPD's autonomous PPSzp, which was organising Polish workers in Prussian Germany. Up until Luxemburg's appearance, the SDPD leadership was having some difficulties with Polish workers. This was because these German leaders often displayed their own social chauvinist anti-Polish prejudices.

Just as many French Social Democrats were 'soft' on Russia, because they saw this state as an ally against Germany, many of the SDPD leadership wanted to hang on to the Prussian Polish territories to act as a barrier, in the event of an invasion from autocratic Tsarist Russia (131). In 1898, Auer told Luxemburg that the SDPD "couldn't do Polish workers a better favour than to Germanise them" (132). This was at a time when the Prussian government was pushing through its own Germanisation offensive in Polish majority areas in Posen, Upper Silesia and Pomerania.

Luxemburg opposed this particular state policy and wrote a pamphlet *In Defence of Nationality* in 1900 (133). She was against the forceful imposition of either German or Russian culture upon the Poles. However, there can be little doubt that Luxemburg thought that Poles in Prussia would eventually assimilate as Germans, just as she, with her own Jewish Polish background, had personally assimilated. Luxemburg opposed any autonomous organisation for Polish workers within the SDPD.

This made Luxemburg an ideal front person for the German chauvinist Right in the SDPD, whose opposition to enforced Germanisation was at best superficial and, more often, non-existent. When it came to 'one state, one party' these leaders usually meant one German-nationality state and party, and the quicker the Poles assimilated the better. Luxemburg worked with August Winter in the SPD's own Party 'Germanisation' offensive (134). Winter believed that "good Polish socialists spoke German to their children, that Polish workers really understood German, but were merely less intelligent than their German comrades." (135)

Kelles-Krauz noted that Luxemburg and Winter formed two wings of the anti-Polish offensive. People like Luxemburg, who "were possessed of simpleminded radicalism, skip over present reality and relegate national emancipation to a time after the socialist revolution", whilst people like Winter, "using the sophistic theory of historical necessity of the superiority of the civilisation of the conqueror, demand that we renounce our national goals, without taking the trouble to combat the aggressive chauvinism" (136) of their own governments.

Luxemburg's orthodoxy, over opposition to the general strike tactic at the 1896 London Congress, had gone unnoticed in the 'unseemly' clamour she had then tried to cause over her opposition to support for Polish independence. By the time of the 1900 Paris Conference, however, she could become the champion of the orthodox. Polish independence had become even more threatening to an SDPD leadership enjoying the fruits of legality. Now that a 'decent time' had passed, Kautsky and others thought it was time to quietly drop it. Developing a revolutionary strategy to take on the Prussian-German state was not part of Kautsky's politics.

Luxemburg's tirade against Polish nationalism at the Congress was so vituperative that Kelles-Krauz and the PPS were outraged. However, so indeed were four out of the six members of the new SDPKPL delegation, which Luxemburg was also a member of. They even signed a later letter of protest (137). Luxemburg was formally banned from being in the PPS after her behaviour. However, unlike other former SDPKP members, who had (re)joined the PPS in Russian Poland after their organisation's collapse (138), Luxemburg had never done so. Instead, she joined a revived SDPKPL (with addition of Lithuanian Social Democrats) formed by Felix Dzierzhinsky in 1899 (139).

Yet, at the same time, Luxemburg remained a member of the PPSpz, the PPS's subordinate organisation within the SPD, in Prussian Poland. The ban on her membership of the PPS was meant to extend to the PPSpz. However, so useful had Luxemburg become to the Right, that the SDPD leadership insisted she should be given a continued leading role in the PPSzp, the better to undermine it (140). In this role she actively prevented any compromise agreement between the PPSzp and the SDPD. She was even party to the overthrow of an agreement whereby centrally nominated

SDPD candidates would be accepted in Prussian Poland, provided they were bilingual. Luxemburg's ally, Winter, was imposed instead in Upper Silesia as the German-speaking monolingual SDPD candidate (141).

Luxemburg's and Winter's final move to break the PPSzp was their attempt to impose a secret protocol upon the organisation. This protocol insisted that the PPSzp had no distinct programme. and recognised that the SDP's Erfurt Programme was silent about Polish independence (142). And, as Engels had already pointed out, that programme was silent about most challenges to the Prussian-German state.

v) Kelles-Krauz takes on Kautsky of the SDPD and Renner of the SDPO.

Kelles-Krauz's response to this protocol was to write *an Open Letter to the SDP* comparing it to 'agreements' imposed by colonising powers (143). He appealed to Kautsky over Luxemburg's and Winters' attempt to eliminate any PPSpz autonomy in the SDPD. Kelles-Krauz wrote two letters, in the second of which he appealed to '"justice and revolutionary principles' and called the SDPD's attitude towards the PPSzp 'the worst sort of revisionism'" (144). However, Kelles-Krauz failed to appreciate the full extent of social chauvinism in the SDPD. Kautsky did not offer his support.

This forced Kelles-Krauz to take on Kautsky too, in the pages of *Neue Zeit*, the SDPD's most influential theoretical journal. Kelles-Kreuz began to realise that Kautsky's orthodox Marxist commitment to 'revolution' was somewhat superficial. Germany was thought by most Social Democrats to offer the best prospects for Socialist advance in the world. Kelles-Krauz now argued that "the SPD {had} no clear idea to the form a revolution would take in Germany and {criticised} Kautsky in particular for his vagueness on this point" (145). "In suggesting the SPD support Polish independence, as well as in proposing the SPD actually consider scenarios for taking power, Kelles-Krauz was trying to force Kautsky to consider concrete steps toward revolution" (146).

Kautsky was able to avoid such steps. SDPD organisers believed that, "Since the revolution was predetermined by scientific laws, so long as the party's electoral results were improving and its membership lists bulging, there was no reason to think in very specific terms just how the existing system would be displaced" (147). Kelles-Krauz thought that, "the SPD should come to terms with the fact that its accession to power by peaceful means in {the Kaiser's} Germany was unlikely, and should begin to consider practical steps toward a revolution, such as recruiting within the army, awakening its labour unions to the political possibilities of strikes, or supporting Polish socialism" (148).

In the face of Kelles-Krauz's challenge, Luxemburg rushed to the defence of Kautsky. How dare Kelles-Krauz attack the theoretical leader of the SDPD and the Second International! "Having striven vainly for years with the help of pseudonyms {!} to gain a name for himself… {Kelles-Krauz} gains his notoriety by stomping on the corns of the famous in the street" (149). Luxemburg avoided dealing with Kelles-Krauz's arguments in her anthology on the 'Polish Question'. Yet, her anthology included Polish social patriotic contributions, which she could more easily dismiss (150). And Kelles-Kreuz used a pseudonym because expressing his views in Tsarist Russian Poland would have brought the attentions of the secret police, the Okhrana.

Already, five years prior to Luxemburg's and nine years prior to Lenin's break, Kelles-Krauz had come to a clearer understanding of Kautsky's orthodox Marxism. However, realising that the Okhrana was making any life in Congress Poland very difficult, Kelles-Krauz decided to move to the Hapsburg Austrian controlled part of Poland (151), where there was another section of the PPS, which enjoyed real autonomy. This was the PPSD, a large section of the SDPO, heavily influenced by the Austro-Marxist approach to the 'National Question' developed first by Karl Renner in his *State and Nation* (1899) (152).

Kelles-Kreuz had already realised the limitations of SDPO leader, Victor Adler, when he only received lukewarm support in his struggle to combat the German chauvinism, which he found directed against the PPSpz in 1901 (153). Like other leading Germans in the SDPO, Adler accepted the existence of the PPSD (and CSDP) autonomous sections, if it helped to maintain the party's organisational unity, but not if these organisations threatened the SDPO’s continued legality.

Kelles-Krauz had now to consider the politics of the SDPO more closely, and its particular solutions for the ‘National Question’. This meant he had to address the thinking of Karl Renner. Renner was a strong advocate of the SDPO’s official policy of reforming the Hapsburg Austria into a federation of nations. And, in 1902, Renner had also suggested that the SDPO adopt the additional policy of cultural autonomy for ethnic groups.

The SDPO’s official policy of national federation, and later advocacy of national cultural autonomy, were both designed to maintain the territorial unity of the existing state, as far as possible. Lenin's later criticisms directed against the SDPO Centre, and the Austro-Marxist, Otto Bauer in particular, were not so much against their wish to maintain the territorial integrity of Hapsburg Austria. Lenin's primary objection was that the SDPO sought piecemeal national and ethnically based reform within the existing Hapsburg state, rather than pursuing a united revolutionary strategy to overthrow it.

Kelles-Krauz would have agreed with Lenin over this. However, Kelles-Kreuz would also have argued that a coordinated, in effect, ‘Internationalism from Below’ revolutionary strategy to break-up the Hapsburg Empire was more viable than what became Lenin’s implicit support for an SDPO Austro-German centrally led revolution. Kelles-Krauz believed his strategy of ‘the break-up of empires’ should also have been pursued by Social Democrats in the Tsar’s Russian and the Kaiser’s Prussian/German imperial states.

By 1903, Kelles-Krauz already "noted {that} Austrian socialists emerged as defenders of the territorial integrity of the imperial lands" (154). He questioned the orthodox Marxist view that "democratic reform would end national conflicts by sweeping away the reactionary feudal elements {then} in power...” (155). He argued that, in contrast, any democratic reform would be the “midwife of the Empire's dissolution... {He} recognised that national feeling in Austria would proceed in train with modernisation {and} believed that a democratic Austria {on the basis of the Hapsburg’s imperial territories} was very unlikely and predicted that the Empire would collapse during an international crisis" (156). He was to be proved correct.

Kelles-Krauz was also implicitly attacking the strategy of Ignacy Daszynski (157), the leader of the PPSD (158), whose support, along with that of Adler, he had also sought in the past (159). Like the leaders of that other influential national autonomous section of the SDPO, the Czech SDP, the formal policy of the PPSD was to win full territorial autonomy within the existing Hapsburg Empire. The fact that, in addition, the PPSD programme included the paper policy of full Polish state reunification (i.e. the ending of the eighteenth-century partitions) could make the PPSD a possible conduit for Hapsburg imperial designs in the future in eastern Galicia (western Ukraine), within the Tsarist Russian Empire.

Kelles-Krauz also sought Polish reunification, but as part of his strategy to break-up the three major imperial powers of Tsarist Russia, Prussia-Germany and Austria-Hungary. Furthermore, as well as Kelles-Kreuz's important theoretic contributions to revolutionary Social Democracy, he remained a political militant. He lived to see the beginnings of the 1905-7 International Revolutionary Wave. Shortly before his death in 1905, he argued, "I now consider we must retreat before nothing. We must strive for an armed revolution" (160).

vi) Kelles-Krauz's contribution on the issue of national minorities - the case of the Jews

Kelles-Kreuz made his own theoretical contribution to the 'National Question'. He appreciated that oppressed nations and ethnic groups might initially confine themselves to demands for greater autonomy or federation. Kautsky's more limited call for the recognition of 'the right of national self-determination', or Luxemburg's promise of autonomy *after* the revolution, might also enjoy apparent support. However, Kelles-Kreuz thought that this was due to the political immaturity of the national democratic movements, where they faced oppression and repression under the dominant nationality-state. He realised, however, that when such political restraints were removed, particularly in a revolutionary situation, the clamour for greater democracy and equality would most likely take the form of demands for political independence. If the Left ignored this, then other forces would champion this course of action for their own anti-democratic ends.

Kelles-Krauz developed an 'Internationalism from Below' approach. He began by addressing the issue of the national minority in the Tsarist Empire, which was then the touchstone of internationalism - the oppressed and often repressed Jewish population. This meant challenging the orthodox Marxist view. The orthodox maintained that the rise of capitalism would lead to the ending of Jewish political and social exclusion from wider society. They would become fully assimilated members of the dominant ethnic group and nation-state in which they lived, with their religion being a private matter. The personal experiences of Marx, Kautsky, Bauer, Adler, Luxemburg and others in England, Austria and Germany had tended to buttress this orthodox view (161).

It was only in 1867 that Jews had become legally emancipated in the Hapsburg Empire. Yet crushing poverty remained the fate of many Jews, particularly those living in Galicia (the west of which was predominantly ethnically Polish, whilst the east was mainly ethnically Ukrainian). Things were even worse in the Jewish Pale of Settlement in Tsarist Russia, most of which also lay in what had once been in the historic Kingdom of Poland. Here there was both legal oppression and extreme poverty. Oppression and poverty forced tens of thousands of Jews to move to imperial cities like Vienna and Warsaw, although many more emigrated to Germany, France, the UK and the USA.

In the Hapsburg Austrian capital of Vienna, Jewish migrants came up against the Right populist Christian Social Party (CSP), which drew much of its support from German-speaking artisans and workers. The CSP were opposed to those from other ethnic groups, but particularly to the Jewish migrants, flocking to the city. Their leaders' anti-Jewish German chauvinism was also designed to undermine the rising internationalist Social Democratic challenge, as the franchise was extended to the working class. The CSP originated as a lower orders movement and, as such, was initially opposed by the Hapsburgs.

In the Russian imperial, Pale of Settlement, however, the landlord backers of the Tsar largely initiated the anti-Jewish pogroms from above. These occurred in 1881, after the assassination of the Tsar, and again in 1903, in Kishinev (now Chisinau in Moldava) (162) as democratic opposition to the regime arose once more. Furthermore, Kelles-Krauz understood the political significance of the Dreyfus Affair (163) in France.

Dreyfus, a Jewish senior army officer, had been wrongly tried for high treason, in 1894, and then jailed on the notorious Devil's Island, in French Guiana, after a Right-led, anti-Jewish campaign. Anti-Jewish sentiment was no longer confined to 'backward' Eastern Europe. It was being actively revived in the West in the conditions created by the 'High Imperialism'. More than a decade before the publication in Tsarist Russia of the notorious forgery, the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, another book, *La France Juive*, written by Edouard Drumont in 1886, was to have considerable influence in France. Arguing from the viewpoint of the new 'scientific racism' of the day, Drumont called for a new racial, anti-Semitism to replace the older, largely religiously based Judeophobia (164).

This new racism was often directed against the asylum seekers and economic migrants of the day - those Jews escaping oppression and poverty who sought refuge in Western Europe. Moreover, a major political motivation for this anti-Semitism, in the West, was the same as that in Central and Eastern Europe. It was designed to split and marginalise the growing Socialist challenge - whether it was the recent memory of the openly revolutionary Paris Commune, or the as yet unknown political and social future heralded by the growth of Social Democratic and Labour Parties.

Furthermore, although sections of the ruling class were now prepared to concede economic, social and political reforms that benefitted the working class, this came at a definite cost. Workers were increasingly divided on 'racial' grounds. Those who could prove their shared 'racial' connection to the ruling class were expected to show their support for their 'superiors' imperial ventures, so they could benefit from any state granted reforms. Whilst those who could not became the target of new immigration laws, discrimination, scape-goating and worse. At a time when non-European immigrants were still relatively rare, Jewish people became the prime targets for the Right. Even worse, from the rulers' point of view, many Jewish refugees declared their support for some variety of Social

Democracy or Anarchism. Making their homes in many countries, Jews were often labeled as unpatriotic ‘rootless cosmopolitans’, or plotters of ‘international conspiracies’.

One consequence of the increased external pressure Jews felt, in their East European urban ghettoes and rural shtetls, was the growing influence of outside secular and political influences. This led to the rapid rise of a new, vibrant, secular, Yiddish culture (165). Therefore, Kelles-Krauz challenged the orthodox Marxist view that the Jews constituted a caste-like group, a remnant dating from the medieval and feudal past, who would become assimilated as capitalism progressed. He understood the pattern of recent capitalist developments. The racist politics, stemming directly from the ‘New Imperialism’, and taking greater root under ‘High Imperialism’, meant that the likelihood of Jewish assimilation was being reduced in Eastern Europe, particularly for recent Jewish artisan and working-class migrants to the cities. Even Western European pro-assimilation, middle class Jews had been badly unnerved by the Dreyfus Affair in modern republican France.

Kelles-Krauz argued that Jews would not follow a path from caste to assimilation but were instead changing from being a caste to forming a new ethnic group (166). Hence, they were now following a similar path to many other new politically aware ethnic groups that had developed in Central and Eastern Europe. Kelles-Krauz pointed to the great cultural renaissance occurring amongst Jews. He began to learn Yiddish (167). Kelles-Krauz showed that European Jews were making the transition from a particular religious to a new ethnic identity.

Kelles-Kreuze also saw the early Zionist movement (168) as another indicator of this rising national consciousness. Zionism was seen to be a response to anti-Semitism. Kelles-Kreuz, however, separated the political aims of Zionism from its actual existence as a political manifestation of growing Jewish national consciousness (169). There is no indication that he was aware of the imperialist sponsorship sought by prominent Zionist leaders, including Theodore Herzl’s meeting with Tsarist Russian minister, Count von Plehve (responsible for the pogrom of 1903) (170). Yet, such ‘unholy alliances’ had not been unusual amongst other earlier and contemporary national movements, or indeed Social Democratic Parties.

Ferdinand Lassalle, who formed the largest party, which later joined the SDPD, had flirted with Bismarck (171). Henry Hyndman of the SDF had accepted 'Tory gold' (172).

In contrast to most other national movements, the Zionists sought to create their new ethnic Jewish state on territory peopled mainly by others, primarily the Muslims of Palestine (and even the small Jewish Palestinian population largely opposed Zionism). For Kelles-Krauz, and for most orthodox Marxists, at the time, this fact merely confirmed the utopian nature of the Zionists' ultimate political aims (173). Utopian ideas had and would still accompany many other political and social movements, so Zionism was not unique in this respect. Kelles-Krauz was well able to make the distinction between a national movement, and the political nature of any particular political party that sought to lead it. The largest political force amongst Poles was the Right-wing, racist and anti-Semitic, National Democrats, led by Roman Dmowski. Kelles-Krauz had a particular detestation of Dmowski and his anti-Semitism. He wanted the PPS to lead the Polish national movement, rather than have it sullied by such filth (174).

vii) Kelles-Krauz and organisation amongst oppressed minorities

Kelles-Krauz looked for the Left within the rising Jewish national movement, not within the Zionists, but in the General Jewish Labour Bund (175). This organisation was formed in 1897 to organise all Jewish Social Democrats and, in particular, the workers and artisans in the Tsarist Empire. Yiddish was the main language used by the Bund, reflecting its widespread use amongst the Ashkenazi Jews of Central and Eastern Europe (176). Although the PPS did have some assimilated Jews amongst its membership and had encouraged Jewish Social Democrats in Poland since 1893 to write in Yiddish rather than Russian (177), the new Bund was hostile to the PPS's political demand for Polish independence. The Bund thought that this would divide Jews, whilst the possible threat from an anti-Semitic, Polish Right, did not make the idea of any new, formally democratic, Polish state that much more appealing, despite the very real threats in anti-Jewish, Tsarist Russia (178).

This division was further accentuated by another distinctive feature of the PPS. In contrast to Rightist Polish independence seekers, who desired an ethnic Polish state, the PPS supported a wider federation, which included Lithuania and eastern Galicia (now western Ukraine). In this respect, they upheld the old Polish gentry-led republican tradition, associated with the Polish/Lithuanian Commonwealth, which had disappeared in the eighteenth century partitions (179). The PPS stance allowed for the existence of autonomous Lithuanian and Ukrainian Social Democratic organisations. Therefore, the PPS leadership argued that the Bund members should join the Lithuanian and Ukrainian Social Democratic organisations, if they lived in these particular areas.

Although the PPS had its own autonomous organisations, in the three ruling states of the Polish partition (Russia, Austria and Prussia-Germany), its leaders overestimated the attractiveness of a similar option for the Bund, especially since Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine were all areas where anti-Semitism was on the increase. Therefore, the Bund had joined the new all-Russia, empire wide, RSDLP when it was formed in 1898 (180). This at least ensured that all Bund members would be united within a single party.

Russians, such as Plekhanov and later Lenin, dominated the RSDLP, but it also included assimilated Jews, such as Martov, Trotsky (and later, Luxemburg, after the SDPKPL partially joined at the 1903 RSDLP Congress and fully joined at the 1907 Congress). They believed that the further development of capitalism and political democracy would lead to the assimilation of all Jews. In the meantime, and in anticipation of such developments, the maximum unity of Socialists demanded a unitary Social Democratic organisation - ‘one state, one party’. This reasoning led them to an attack any Bund pretensions to autonomy within the RSDLP.

Yet, despite the shrill calls for unity, particularly from Plekhanov and Lenin, at the second RSDLP Conference in 1903, there had not been many Russian Social Democratics there to physically defend Jews in the recent pogroms in Kishinev (181). At the 1903 Conference, the Bund found they faced the same demand from Lenin and the RSDLP majority that they had earlier faced from Pilsudski and the PPS majority - subordinate yourselves to the wider party.

Part of the political background, to the Bund's participation at the RSDLP Conference, was the shock of the very recent Kishinev pogrom, following from the earlier 1881 pogroms, and the ongoing Dreyfus Affair in France. Orthodox Marxism (of which Plekhanov, Lenin, Martov, Trotsky and Luxemburg were then proud adherents) had failed to get to grips with the real political trajectory of the Jewish people in Central and Eastern Europe. Therefore, the attempt by the RSDLP majority to reduce the distinctive position of Jews in the Tsarist Empire to an organisational issue - 'one state, one party' - contributed to the Bund's walkout from this conference. Engels, if he had still been alive, would probably have had little hesitation in equating the RSDLP majority stance to that of a certain Mr. Hales' attitude towards the Irish (182).

There was an indicator of the lack of understanding by the PPS majority and the RSDLP of what was at stake. When both parties made limited attempts to produce material in Yiddish, far from siphoning off support from specifically Jewish organisations, this only increased Jewish workers' appetite for more. This increased demand was met by the Bund (183), not the PPS nor the RSDLP, which only mounted tokenistic efforts in this regard. Yiddish was also held in contempt by many Zionists who wanted to revive Hebrew (184) in preparation for the 'return to Israel'.

Kelles-Krauz, almost alone amongst non-Jewish Socialists, appreciated that the 'Jewish Question', in Central and Eastern Europe, now presented itself, not as an issue of equal rights for individuals of a different religion, nor a particular concession to those still speaking a language which would eventually 'disappear', but as an issue of national democracy for a particular ethnic group.

However, this new Jewish ethnic group had one very distinctive feature compared to the Czechs, Poles, Slovenes, Ruthenes and others living in Hapsburg Austria. Jews lived mainly in cities (usually in ghettoes) and shetls (some of the latter with 90%+ Jewish population) separated by rural areas peopled by more extensive, territorially based, non-Jewish ethnic groups.

The Bund found this a hard issue to grapple with. Furthermore, the Bund was under more immediate pressures than any other Social Democratic group, facing both the threat of pogroms, and a growing competitor in Zionism. The Zionists wanted to set up a Jewish state, with the help of a number of possible imperialist powers. After other possibilities, Palestine was adopted as the favoured option at the World Zionist Congress in 1904 (185). The combination of rampant anti-Semitism from the Right, the growth of Zionism and the opposition from the rest of the Left - first from the PPS, and then the RSDLP - all forced the Bund away from its initial policy of 'equal rights now and assimilation *after* the revolution'. The social chauvinist pressure on the Left from those holding to a 'one nation' or 'one state, one party' stance was already pushing many in the Bund towards a more social patriotic stance.

Kelles-Kreuz, after his own experience with the SDPD, could understand what was happening to the Bund. Therefore, after the break between the Bund and the RSDLP in 1903, he decided to approach them. He wrote an article for the Polish political journal, *Krytyka*, in 1904, entitled *On the Question of Jewish Nationality* (186). This was a personal article, not endorsed by the PPS leadership. In it, Kelles-Krauz outlined his theory of the rise of new nationalities (ethnic groups) and nations under capitalism and the emergence of the Jewish nationality. He took on the popular argument of the Left, which claimed that if Jews organise as a nationality, rather than assimilate, they should not be surprised if anti-Semitism increased. He said that such reasoning could only sound like a threat and further strengthen the Jewish/non-Jewish divide (187).

Kelles-Krauz also held little sympathy for the views of assimilated, Social Democratic Jews like Victor Adler and Otto Bauer. Bauer saw the rise of the Social Christians in Austria as 'the socialism of dolts.' Adler believed the Social Christians were merely preparing the ground for real Socialism (188). Here were the shades of The Peoples' Will earlier response to the 1881 pogroms (189), and of the later German Communist Party's, "After Hitler our turn" (190)!

Kelles-Krauz argued that the Bund should join the PPS as an autonomous section, and that it should accept the demand for Polish independence (191). However, this raised the question of what particular national demands the Bund would seek within Poland. Kelles-Kreuz could see that Jews did not share the more obvious territorial nature of other nationalities in Central and Eastern Europe. He probably also understood that, even where Jews formed majorities in urban areas, their traditionally low status was not likely to encourage many non-Jewish Poles, living in these areas, to adopt Yiddish as the local lingua franca.

Therefore, Kelles-Krauz recommended a hybrid cultural autonomy/assimilation policy, whereby Jews who wished to have separate cultural provision (something he understood, given the continued oppression they suffered) could do so, but where other Jews could opt for Polish language use, including for schooling, as their first choice. Either way, he wanted to encourage a free intermingling of the best of both cultures (192).

Kelles-Krauz did not go so far as to outline how his suggested hybrid cultural autonomy/assimilation policy would work in practice. In the absence of any immediate likelihood of establishing Yiddish as a wider lingua franca, it might have been possible to establish particular areas with bilingual signs, and to provide bilingual schools, where Yiddish and Polish were both taught.

However, it is not necessary to consider such historical 'might-have-beens'. Kelles-Krauz was taking forward aspects of Marx's and Engels' 'internationalism from below' thinking and anticipating later 'heretical' thinking. Marx and Engels had, of course, called for the Irish to have their own autonomous organisation in England, as part of the First International (193). Later, both Stalin and Trotsky would support the idea of Black self-determination in the American South (194).

viii) Kelles-Krauz's theory of nation and ethnic group formation

Kelles-Krauz also used his *Krytika* article to outline a more general theory of nations and ethnic groups. He understood that there was a clear distinction to be made between the numerous pre-nation groups, which existed under pre-capitalist conditions, and the development of new nationalities/ethnic groups and nations under capitalism. He viewed the creation of nations in much of the world as a modern development, alongside the growth of capitalism (195). Far from being likely to ‘disappear’, nationalities and nations would further develop and become an increasingly important political actors as capitalist social relations spread.

The earliest signs of modern nationality and nation formation usually took on a cultural form. A new nationally aware intelligentsia strove for a standardised and written form for their chosen language. They also made historical claims for their own particular nationality’s long-continued existence. However, this was done in a new way, since the emerging national intelligentsia was much more aware that its own nationality or nation existed in a wider world of nation-states. Therefore, many wanted to emulate those established nations, which practiced modern, national, parliamentary democratic politics. They often saw themselves to be applying universal, not particularistic, aims. They saw their own particular nation as forming a part of the new international order of nation-states.

Kelles-Krauz was surely right when he demonstrated that capitalism had developed a tendency to create new nationalities and nations. Once this is accepted, it can also be seen that there are paths to ethnic formation, other than those followed by the majority of nationalities in Central and Eastern Europe, which took up so much of the time of pre-World War One orthodox Marxists.

The Jews, as a mainly urban, and hence largely non-territorial ethnic group, provided one particular route to ethnic formation. Europe also had the non-territorial, semi-nomadic Roma (Gypsies) (196) and the ‘no property in land’, yet territorial, nomadic Sami (Lapps) (197). These peoples were later to adopt other paths to ethnic group development - once again in the face of capitalist expansion and political oppression. The routes to ethnic group formation followed by these particular peoples might appear unusual in Europe. However, similar paths were much more common elsewhere in the world. Therefore, Kelles-Krauz’s new theory of the development of what we today call ethnic groups, particularly his analysis of the formation of the new Jewish nationality, can be considered to be another contribution to ‘Internationalism from Below’ theory on the ‘National Question’.

D. JAMES CONNOLLY'S EARLY CONTRIBUTIONS TO 'INTERNATIONALISM FROM BELOW'

i) James Connolly uses the language issue to point the way to a new 'internationalism from below'

Volume 2, Chapter 4vii highlighted the emergence of James Connolly, (198). He was born in Edinburgh in Scotland into a poor working class family from an Irish background. He served in the British Army and then returned to Edinburgh to work and help organise Socialist and trade union activity in that city, before moving to Ireland. Here, he helped to set up the Irish Socialist Republican Party (ISRP). Later, back in Scotland, and then the USA, Connolly became a member of the Socialist Labour Party, which was led by Daniel de Leon. In each of these political arenas he further developed the 'Internationalism from Below' approach first advanced by the social republican, Michael Davitt (199). Connolly took a keen interest in Poland. Indeed, the ISRP's *Workers' Republic* had more coverage of Poland than Lenin wrote on this topic over the same period. It was Connolly's 'Internationalism from Below' approach that drew him to the issue of Poland.

Connolly made his own useful contribution to the issue of nationality and nation, when he used an article from the Polish magazine, *Krytyka* (to which Kelles-Krauz had contributed), to outline his views on the need for a universal language. Whilst supporting the creation of an international language, Connolly, in contrast to orthodox Marxists, did not see such a development leading to the elimination of other spoken languages. Neither, unlike Kautsky, did he equate a new international language with the language of the dominant nationality, Russian, German, or by implication, English.

"As a socialist, believing in the international solidarity of the human race, I believe the establishment of a universal language, to facilitate communications between the peoples is highly to be desired. But I incline also to the belief that this desirable result would be attained sooner as the result of a free agreement which would accept one language to be taught in all primary schools, in addition to the national language, than by the attempt to crush out the existing national vehicles of expression. The complete success of attempts at Russification or Germanisation, or kindred efforts to destroy the language of a people would, in my opinion, only create greater barriers to the acceptance of a universal language. Each conquering race, lusting after universal domination, would be bitterly intolerant of the language of every rival, and therefore more disinclined to accept a common medium than would a number of small races, with whom the desire to facilitate commercial and literary intercourse with the world, would take the place of lust for domination" (200).

Here Connolly was using the word 'race' when we, today, would use 'nationality' (ethnic group). It took the rise of Nazism before the distinction between race (biologically based) and ethnicity (culturally based) was more widely appreciated. Whilst outlining the impact of economic "commercial" and cultural "literary" factors, Connolly also highlighted the importance of the continuing political factor. In this period of 'High Imperialism', and even under the relatively advanced democratic parliamentary conditions of the time in Western Europe, each "conquering race" was still trying to impose its dominant language.

There is some evidence that Connolly took an interest in Esperanto (201). This was an attempt, launched in 1887, to create a universal language. Esperanto was specifically designed to overcome the association of the major languages with particular dominant states. Later, Eastern European Communists were to adopt Esperanto with some enthusiasm.

Connolly also took an interest in the Irish language, which was undergoing a revival. Later, in 1908, he returned to his earlier promotion of a universal language for international communication but saw no contradiction between this and his support for the growing Irish language movement. "I have heard some doctrinaire {i.e. orthodox} Socialists arguing that Socialists should not sympathise with oppressed nationalities or with nationalities resisting conquest. They argue that the sooner these nationalities are suppressed the better, as it will be easier to conquer political power in a few big empires than in a number of states" (202).

He answered this by stating, "It is well to remember that nations which submit to conquest or races which abandon their language in favour of that of an oppressor do so, not because of altruistic motives, or because of the love of the brotherhood of man, but from a slavish and cringing spirit. From a spirit which cannot exist side by side with the revolutionary idea" (203).

Therefore, Connolly envisaged a situation, whereby the ending of the promotion of a single official language by the dominant 'race' (ethnic group) in particular states, would lead to a greater proliferation of vernacular languages, alongside a more acceptable universal language. This universal language would act as a lingua franca to facilitate wider communication, not as a replacement for existing languages. The lived cultural experience of most people would still be articulated using these languages.

Connolly's approach anticipated the later philosophical view, which has largely replaced the progressive simplification and homogenisation belief, encouraged by mechanical economic reductionist theories, held by both orthodox Marxism, and the wider Social Democracy of the day. This view had been reinforced by widely held theories of 'progress', which argued that increased economic development and integration would directly manifest themselves in cultural assimilation with a resultant common culture.

Today, the need for diversity, whether it is ecological, genetic or social, is far more widely appreciated. The basis for such a rich cultural diversity lies in greatly increased economic, social and political equality. Today's class-divided cultural experience, rich for the few, impoverished for the many, reflects the reality of capitalist economic inequality and oppression.

ii) Kelles-Krauz and Connolly find common ground over the business of the 1900 Paris Congress

Connolly and Kelles-Krauz never met. Yet, their political trajectories followed similar paths. This was because they were both attempting to find an alternative revolutionary Social Democratic course, to challenge the imperial populists and social chauvinists (and imperialists), who dominated the Social Democratic Parties in the Second International; and the populist patriots and social patriots, who dominated their own nations' political cultures. They were moving towards the political retrieval of the 'Internationalism from Below' approach of the later Marx and Engels.

The paths of Connolly and Kelles-Krauz crossed, if unknowingly, as a result of the 1900 Congress of the Second International held in Paris. The British SDF delegation, not having much international clout, had to suffer the indignity of seeing the ISRP delegation given official recognition at the Paris Congress that year. The Congress organisers probably felt that, since they were now abandoning some of their previous 'Polish sentimentalism', they could cover themselves with some 'Irish sentimentalism', at little immediate political cost, since the SDF was a relatively minor force. The British SDF, however, would probably have gained some consolation in Luxemburg's scathing attack upon the PPS at the Congress, which they could have interpreted as also applying to the ISRP.

The Paris Congress was mostly marked by the ideological attacks on Revisionism, which could unite all the orthodox Marxists. However, there was another hotly contested issue at this Congress. Leading Socialist, Jean Millerand, had joined a French government, which included General Galliffet, the 'butcher of the Paris Commune'. This caused such great opposition amongst French Social Democrats that, despite it being a particular national issue, there was enough support in France to have it publicly aired at the Paris Congress. The orthodox Marxists Jean Guesde and Paul Lafargue were prepared to lead the attack (204).

However, the leading orthodox Marxist, Kautsky, was unhappy about an outright condemnation of such a policy. He drafted a compromise resolution, which condemned Millerand for not seeking the permission of his party first. As James Connolly's biographer, C. Desmond Greaves, put it, "Individual sin was castigated, collective sin was condoned" (205). When the vote was taken over the two resolutions, the German, Austrian and British delegations voted for Kautsky's compromise; other delegations (including the Polish) were split. Only the Bulgarian and Irish delegations voted in their entirety for the principled Guesde motion, but Kelles-Krauz was one of the Poles who did so vote (206). Connolly, not himself a delegate, wrote enthusiastically in defence of the ISRP stance taken at

Congress (207).

Orthodox Marxists had split when it came to this concrete challenge. Ever wary about the politics of the orthodox, Kelles-Krauz also went on to criticise Guesde too, despite voting for his motion. One excuse Millerand had used for entering the French government was to aid the release of Dreyfus, the victim of a rabid anti-Semitic campaign in France. Kelles-Krauz attacked Guesde's Economistic argument for opposing Social Democratic participation in the Dreyfus campaign, because it was merely an issue of bourgeois politics (208). Kelles-Krauz believed it was exactly such political issues that Social Democrats should try to take the lead of - only in a militant republican fashion, not by joining bourgeois parliamentary coalitions.

Of course, this militant republican approach was similar to that Connolly had also advocated, ever since he had helped to set up the ISRP in 1896. Connolly was also a strong opponent of the anti-Semitism found amongst the leaders of British Unionism, the Irish Parliamentary Party (and later to emerge in Arthur Griffith's Sinn Fein too). In 1902, Connolly published his Dublin Council election address in Yiddish (209). Connolly and Kelles-Krauz were in the same political camp, that of 'internationalism from below'.

iii) Summary of the impact of 'High Imperialism' on Social Democratic politics

a) 'High Imperialism' grew out of the 'New Imperialism' (addressed in Volume 2, Chapter 3A). It extended from around1895 to the First World War and the beginning of a new International Revolutionary Wave in 1916.

b) It was under 'High Imperialism' that most of the world was divided up by the main imperialist powers. The older empires in Asia and Africa, and the early Spanish empire became targets for rising new empires. There was an extended period of inter-imperialist competition, leading to new territorial gains, but this was preparatory to

inter-imperialist wars of territorial redivision.

c) **A new populist imperialist politics emerged which pushed chauvinism and racism making inroads not only amongst the marginalised petty producers and traders but also sections of the working class. This led to an ethnic hierarchy amongst the workforce, with the support of both trade unions and Labour parties. It also led to resistance in the colonies and in the metropolitan countries, particularly from migrant workers.**

d) **One response to social chauvinism amongst those nations and nationalities discriminated against in the metropolitan countries was social patriotism. 'Internationalism from below' re-emerged to challenge social chauvinism and imperialism on one hand and social patriotism on the other.**

e) **The initial attempts by Social Democracy to provide an overall view of Imperialism were provided by the orthodox Marxists, e.g. Kautsky and the Austro-Marxists. There were divisions amongst the orthodox, partly reflecting a philosophical divide between Positivist Materialism and Idealism, and also a political divide between Economism and the Politicals. These contributed to the debate on the 'National Question' within orthodox Marxism, between Kautsky (supported by Luxemburg and Lenin) and by the Austro-Marxists, initially Max Adler and Karl Renner.**

f) **The advocates of 'Internationalism from Below', such as Kaziemerz Kelles-Krauz and James Connolly were more able to see the pretences and weaknesses of the dominant, Social Democrats and their social chauvinism and social imperialism. Kelles-Kreuz, in particular, began to make theoretical advances, which also informed his political practice.**

g) **Most orthodox Marxists understood that the creation of nations and nation-states directly reflected an**

objectively necessary stage of capitalism. The highly contested breakdown of feudal (and other tributary) social systems by social and political forces other than the bourgeoisie was ignored or downplayed, in favour of a dogmatic assertion of the need for a period of bourgeois capitalist rule over (preferably) large nation-states.

h) Only once this 'necessary' stage had been completed would it be possible to form a new Socialist society, which directly took over the 'highest achievements' of capitalism – including the large multi-national states. Therefore, any attempts to set-up new independent states, by breaking up existing multi-national states (except in areas where pre-capitalist social relations still prevailed), should be opposed. Kelles-Krauz and Connolly openly contested this view.

i) There was also considerable confusion amongst the orthodox Marxists over the origins of nationalities. Here Marx's and Engels' resort to the Enlightenment category, 'non-historical nations', and their earlier use of the term, 'residual fragments', continued to muddy the theoretical waters, despite Engels' own later distinction between a non-ethnic, territorial nation and a non-territorial, ethnic nationality (see Volume Two, Chapter 2Ci).

j) Most orthodox Marxists claimed that nationality would largely disappear as a political issue as capitalism fully developed. The assimilation path followed by the Jews in early Britain, France, Germany, and by middle class Jews in urban Austria-Hungary, was assumed to anticipate the likely cultural and social path of other such groups, especially the smaller nationalities.

k) Kelles-Krauz understood that the 'actually-existing' capitalism they lived under (Imperialism) tended to create new nationalities, with representatives advancing new political claims. This unanticipated course was accentuated by the rise of dominant-nation chauvinism in

the multi-national states, e.g. the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, Prussian-German, British and French empires in the political climate created by 'High Imperialism'. This development provoked resistance from the minority nationalities. Furthermore, Kelles-Krauz, by highlighting the distinctive path followed by Jews in forming a nationality, prepared the way for a wider understanding of the world, where other paths to ethnic group formation became more common.

l) Kelles-Krauz understood that there was also a distinction to be made between the numerous pre-nation groups, which existed under pre-capitalist conditions, and the modern nationality. What distinguished the many pre-nation groups was their extremely varied characteristics. There were, for example, kinship (real or imagined) groups, castes and religious groups. The formation of the modern nationality, however, tended to be marked by the promotion of a standard and written language, along with an imagined national history.

m) Whilst Connolly did not develop his own theory of nation or nationality formation, he understood that capitalism did not display its progressive side by the elimination of lesser-spoken languages. The main political reason for such developments lay in the dominant-nation chauvinism found in all imperial states, whatever their current 'stage of civilisation', or their political form - monarchist or republican, absolutist or parliamentary. Connolly specifically supported the Irish language, seeing it as the language of earlier vernacular communal struggles against feudalism, and of the contemporary land struggles of Ireland's small farmers, particularly in the West. He was also in favour of an international language, freely chosen by all nationalities, not as a replacement for existing languages, but as a lingua franca, to allow all peoples to communicate with each other. The development of Esperanto at this time highlighted the wider appreciation of the need for new

forms, which supported a practical 'Internationalism from Below'.

n) **Kelles-Krauz and Connolly faced the problem of growing social chauvinism and social imperialism, which was reflected organisationally within the dominant-nation Social Democracy as support for 'one state, one party'. They also faced the problem of the rise of a new populist (and often ethnically exclusive) nationalism in response to Imperialism. This populist nationalism sought to unite all classes within the oppressed nation under the leadership of bourgeois (or substitute bourgeois) forces. Kelles-Krauz and Connolly were determined to combat both forms of nationalist politics.**

o) **Kelles-Krauz sought the unity of Polish workers with the Lithuanians, Ukrainians, and with Jewish workers, all living in Polish historical state territory. He supported the right of full political independence for the Lithuanian and the Ukrainian nations, and some form of autonomy for the Jewish nationality in Poland. He also supported autonomous Socialist organisation for Lithuanians and Ukrainians and the right of autonomy within the PPS for Jews.**

p) **'Internationalists from below', such as Kelles-Krauz and Connolly, initially looked to the Second International for an organisation capable of achieving their International Socialist aims. In both cases, this involved their advocacy of independent organisation for Social Democrats in oppressed nations, in line with Marx's and Engels' thinking. However, they found that Imperialist politics had poisoned the orthodox Marxism of the Second International. This resulted in social chauvinism and social imperialism dominating the Second International.**

q) **This, in turn, contributed to a new social patriotism in the leaderships of subordinate nation, Social**

Democracy/Socialism. This became more accentuated as the Second International acted as a diplomatic 'fig leaf' for competing dominant nation, chauvinist and imperialist Social Democratic parties. Advocates of 'Internationalism from Below' faced either vituperative attacks, or dubious backing, when it aided the interest of a particular dominant-nation party.

References for Chapter 2

(1) Bernard Semmel, *The Rise of Free Trade Imperialism - Classical Political Economy and the Empire of Free Trade and Imperialism, 1750-1850* (*I&SR*) (Cambridge University Press, 1970, London)

(2) http://www.marxists.org/archive/hilferding/1910/finkap/index.htm

(3) http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp-hsc/ch07.htm

(4) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Congo_Free_State

(5) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_South_Africa_Company

(6) Desmond Greaves, *The Life and Times of James Connolly* (Lawrence & Wishart, 1986, London)

(7) Peter Nettl, *Rosa Luxemburg* (*RL*) abridged edition, (Oxford University Press, 1969, London)

(8) Neil Harding, *Lenin's Political Thought – Theory and Practice in the Democratic and Socialist Revolutions* (Macmillan Press Ltd. 1983, London & Basingstoke)

(9) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bengal_famine_of_1770

(10) Brian Catchpole, *The Clash of Cultures – Aspects of Cultural*

Conflict from Ancient Times to the Present Day, pp. 135-9 (Heinemann Educational Books, 1981, London)

(11) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_Opium_War#Aftermath

(12) Mike Davis, *Late Victorian Holocausts - El Nino and the Making of the Third World* (Verso, 2002, London)

(13) Adam Hochschild, *King Leopold's Ghost – The Story of Greed, Terror and Heroism in Colonial Africa* (Pan Books, 2003, London)

(14) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philippine-American_War

(15) *German_South-West_Africa 2.1. The Herero and Namaqua wars* **on** http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Namibia

(16) http://www.personal.umich.edu/~sperrin/brazil2007/history/The%20Putumayo%20 Affair.htm

(17) Volume 2, Chapter 3Ai.

(18) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Adowa

(19) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balkan_War

(20) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fashoda_Incident

(21) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agadir_Crisis **and** http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tangier_Crisis

(22) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dissolution_of_the_Ottoman_Empire#Young_Turk_Revolution

(23) **s**http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baghdad_Railway

(24) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creation_of_Yugoslavia#Origins_of_the_idea

(25) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balkan_Wars

(26) Vangelsi Koutalis, *Internationalism as an Alternative Political Strategy in the Modern History of the Balkans* **on** http://www.okde.org/keimena/vag_kout_balkan_inter_0603_en.htm

(27) *To Prevent War – Manifesto of the International Congress at Basel*, http://www.marxists.org/history/international/social-democracy/social-democrat/1912/12/manifesto.htm

(28) Bernard Semmel, *I&SR*, op. cit., p. 47

(29) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imperial_Federation_League

(30) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_Empire_League

(31) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Victoria_of_the_United_Kingdom #Diamond_Jubilee

(32) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal_Unionist_Party

(33) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georges_Boulanger

(34) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dreyfus_affair

(35) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Lueger

(36) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ulster_Volunteer_Force_(1912)

(37) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Curragh_Mutiny

(38) Robert Winder, *Bloody Foreigners – The Story of Immigration to Britain*, pp. 254-9 (Abacus, 2004, London)

(39) Henry Kamen, *The Iron Century, Social Change in Europe 1550-1660*, pp. 246-51 (Cardinal, 1976, London)

(40) Basil Davidson, *The Black Man's Burden* - *Africa and the Curse of*

the Nation-State (James Currey Ltd., 1992, London)

(41) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federation_of_Australia

(42) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iww

(43) Dick Geary, *Karl Kautsky* (*KK*) p. 106 (Lives of the Left, Manchester University Press, 1987, Manchester) and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Kautsky

(44) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georgi_Plekhanov and http://www.marxists.org/archive/plekhanov/

(45) Volume 2, Chapter 3Ci.

(46) http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/mec/index.htm

(47) http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/cw/volume38.htm

(48) Timothy Snyder, *Nationalism, Marxism and Modern Central Europe, A Biography of Kazimierz Kelles-Kreuz* (1872-1905) (*NMMCE*) p. 123 (Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University Press, 1997, Cambridge, USA)

(49) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_Darwinist

(50) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neo-Kantianism

(51) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henri_Bergson#Élan_vital

(52) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ernst_Mach #Philosophy_of_science

(53) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ferdinand_Tonnies #Gemeinschaft_and_Gesellschaft

(54) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freud #Development_of_psychoanalysis

(55) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max_Adler_(Marxist)

(56) Tom Bottomore & Patrick Goode, *Austro-Marxism* (translated texts) (*AM*), p. 11 (Clarendon Press, 1978, Oxford) **and** http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Austro-Marxism

(57) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Renner

(58) https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/bernstein/works/1899/evsoc/index.htm

(59) www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1904/tasks/ch03htm

(60) Frederick Engels, *Critique of Draft S.D. Programme of 1891*, **in** *K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. 3*, pp. 433-7 (Progress Publishers, 1983, Moscow)

(61) Bernard Wheaton, *Radical Socialism in Czechoslovakia – Bohumir Smeral, the Czech Road to Socialism and the Origins of the Czechoslovak Communist Party (1917-21)* (*RSiC*), p. 36 (East European Monographs, 1986, Boulder, 1986)

(62) https://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1900/reform-revolution/index.htm

(63) www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/industrialpoland/index.htm

(64) https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1899/devel/index.2Htm

(65) Vladimir Lenin, *Collected Works*, No. 24, p. 150, quoted in Neil Harding, *Lenin's Political Thought, Vol. 1 - Theory and Practice in the Democratic Revolution* (*LPT*) p. 147 (Macmillan Press, 1983, London and Basingstoke)

(66) Karl Marx, letter to Bolte, 23.11.1871, in Kenneth Lapides (editor), *Marx and Engels on Trade Unions*, p. 113 (International Publishers,

1987, New York)

(67) Kaul Kautsky, letter on *The New Draft Programme of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party* in *Neue Zeit*, XX, I, no. 3 **in** Lenin, *What Is To Be Done?* pp. 39-40 (Progress Publishers, 1978, Moscow)

(68) Richard B. Day and Daniel Gaido, *Discovering Imperialism – Social Democracy to World War I*, (*DI*) p. 18 (Haymarket Books, 2011, Chicago)

(69) Enzo Traverso, *TMatJQ*, op. cit., p. 73.

(70) Volume 2, Chapter 1Ciii, summary point e.

(71) Richard B. Day and Daniel Gaido, *DI*, op. cit., p. 18

(72) http://files.libertyfund.org/files/127/0052_Bk.pdf

(73) Karl Kautsky, *The Modern Nationality*, **in** Horace B. Davis, *Nationalism and Socialism*, *Marxist Theories of Nationalism to 1917* (*NSMTN*) p. 140 (Monthly Review Press, 1973, New York)

(74) Volume 2, Chapter 3Cii.

(75) Bernard Wheaton, *RSiC*, op. cit. p. 29.

(76) Ephraim Nimni, *M&N*, op. cit. p. 126.

(77) Volume 2, Chapter 2B and iv

(78) Volume 2, Chapter 1Biv

(79) Bernard Wheaton, *RSiC*, op. cit. p. 35

(80) Ephraim Nimni, *M&N*, op. cit. p. 128

(82) Book 2, 1Bv

(83) Karl Renner, *State and Nation* in *National Cultural Autonomy and Its Contemporary Critics*, edited by Ephraim Nimni (Routledge, 2005, London)

(84) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit.

(85) Volume 2, Chapter 2Dii.

(86) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit., p. 33.

(87) Volume 2, Chapter 3Ciii.

(88) Bernard Semmel, I&SR, op, cit. pp. 54-62.

(89) ibid. p. 6.

(90) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Josef_Pilsudski

(91) Peter Nettl, *Rosa Luxemburg* (*RL*) abridged edition, (Oxford University Press, 1969, London)

(92) Rosa Luxemburg, *Foreword to the Anthology - The Polish Question and the Socialist Movement*, **in** Horace B. Davis (editor) *TNQ*, op. cit., p. 62.

(93) Peter Nettl, *RL*, op. cit., pp. 46-8.

(94) ibid., pp. 48-9.

(95) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit., p. 68.

(96) Peter Nettl, *RL*, op. cit., p. 68.

(97) https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1899/devel/index.2Htm

(98) Volume 2, Chapter 1Ci iv and D.iii.

(99) Rosa Luxemburg, *The National Question and Autonomy (TNQaA*), pp. 70 and 77, **in** *The National Question: Selected Writings by Rosa Luxemburg*, edited by Horace B. Davis (Monthly Review Press, 1976, New York)

(100) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit. p. 5.

(101) ibid. p. 12.

(102) ibid. p. 41 and 58.

(103) ibid. pp. 62-4 and 74-5.

(104) ibid. p. 91.

(105) ibid. pp. 94 and 177.

(106) ibid. p. 95.

(107) ibid. p. 95.

(108) ibid. p. 94.

(109) ibid. pp. 87-9.

(110) ibid. p. 92.

(111) ibid. p. 96 and 99.

(112) ibid. pp. 71 and 90.

(113) ibid. p. 82.

(114) ibid. p. 65 and 82.

(115) ibid. p. 96.

(116) ibid. p. 92.

(117) ibid. p. 141.

(118) ibid. pp. 94-7.

(119) Michael Lowy, *FME*, op. cit. p. 44.

(120) Horace B. Davis., *NSMTN*, op. cit. p. 129.

(121) ibid. pp. 129-30.

(122) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit. pp. 150-1.

(123) ibid. p. 101.

(124) Rosa Luxemburg, *TNQaA*, op. cit. p. 108.

(125) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit. pp. p. 65.

(126) ibid. p. 64.

(127) ibid. p. 150.

(128) ibid. p. 151.

(129) ibid. p. 152.

(130) Peter Nettl, *RL*, op. cit. p. 101.

(131) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit. p. 177.

(132) ibid. p. 177.

(133) Peter Nettl, *RL*, op. cit. p. 120.

(134) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit. p. 177.

(135) ibid. p. 178.

(136) ibid. p. 150.

(137) ibid. p. 79-80.

(138) Peter Nettl, *RL*, op. cit. p. 67.

(139) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit. p. 177.

(140) ibid. p. 180-1.

(141) ibid. p. 181.

(142) ibid. p. 181.

(143) ibid. p. 182.

(144) ibid. p. 182.

(145) ibid. p. 182.

(146) ibid. p. 183

(147) ibid. p. 184.

(148) ibid. p. 184.

(149) ibid. p. 184-5.

(150) ibid. p. 189.

(151) ibid. pp. 178-81.

(152) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Renner - Political beliefs and scholarly contributions

(153) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit., p. 189-90.

(154) ibid. p. 190.

(155) ibid. p. 190.

(156) ibid. p. 190.

(157) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ignacy_Daszynski

(158) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polish_Social_Democratic_Party_of_Galicia

(159) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit., 179-80.

(160) ibid. p 219.

(161) Volume 2, Chapter 3Biv.

(162) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anti-Jewish_pogroms_in Russian_Empire

(163) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dreyfus_affair

(164) Israel Shahak, *Jewish History, Jewish Religion - The Weight of Three Thousand Years*, p. 67 (Pluto Press, 1994, London)

(165) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yiddishist_movement

(166) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit. p. 195.

(167) ibid. p. 195.

(168) *Establishment of the Zionist movement, 1897-1917* on http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Zionism

(169) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit., op. cit., p. 199.

(170) Ralph Shoenman, *The Hidden History of Zionism and the Jews*, Chapter 6 **on** https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/document/mideast/hidden/ch06.htm

(171) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ferdinand_Lassalle#Relations_with_Bismarck

(172) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_Hyndman#Political_career

(173) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit. p. 195.

(174) ibid. p. 200.

(175) ibid. p. 195.

(176) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yiddish_language

(177) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit., p. 191

(178) ibid. p. 192.

(179) Timothy Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations* - *Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania and Belarus, 1569-1999*, p. 41 (Yale University Press, 2003, New Haven and London)

(180) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit., p. 192.

(181) ibid. p. 197.

(182) Volume 2, Chapter 2Biv.

(183) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit., p. 197.

(184) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revival_of_the_Hebrew_language#Revival_of_spoken_Hebrew

(185) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zionism#Territories_considered

(186) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit., p. 196-197.

(187) ibid. p. 197.

(188) ibid. p. 199.

(189) Volume 2, Chapter 3Biv.

(190) C.L.R. James, *World Revolution, 1917-1936*, pp. 334-5 (Humanities Press, 1993, New Jersey)

(191) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit., p. 196.

(192) ibid. pp. 199-200.

(193) Volume 2, Chapter 2Biv.

(194) Harry Haywood, *Black Bolshevik - Autobiography of an Afro-American Communist*, pp. 227-35 (Liberator Press, 1978, Chicago) **and** Leon Trotsky, *On Black Nationalism and Self-Determination*, pp. 20-32 & 52-5 (Pathfinder Press, 1972, New York)

(195) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit., p. 198-9.

(196) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Romani_people

(197) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sami_people

(198) Volume 2, Chapter 4vii.

(199) Volume 2, Chapter 4ii.

(200) James Connolly, *Workers Republic*, 2.12.1899, quoted in *Connolly - The Polish Aspect*, pp. 65-6 (Athol Books, 1985, Belfast)

(201) Ken Keable, *Was Connolly an Esparantist?* in *Irish Democrat*, August/September 2001 (Connolly Association, London) **and** https://www.communist-party.org.uk/international/38-analysis-a-briefings/65-james-connolly-and-esperanto.html

(202) James Connolly, *The Language Movement*, in *James Connolly, Edited Writings*, edited by P. Berresford Ellis, p. 287 (Pelican

Books, 1973, Harmondsworth, Middlesex)

(203) ibid. p. 288.

(204) C. Desmond Greaves, *LTJC*, op. cit. p. 127.

(205) ibid., p. 127.

(206) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit. p. 153.

(207) C. Desmond Greaves, *LTJC*, op. cit. p. 132

(208) Timothy Snyder, *NMMCE*, op. cit. p. 153.

(209) Manus O' Riordan, *Connolly, Socialism and the Jewish Worker*, in *Saothar*, Journal of the Irish Labour History Society (1988, Dublin)

2. THE IMPACT OF THE 1904-7 INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY WAVE

A. THE INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY WAVE

i) The impact of workers' and peasants' struggles

The years from 1904-7 witnessed a sharp rise in the tempo of class and national struggles. This amounted to a new International Revolutionary Wave. The epicentre of this wave lay in the Tsarist Russian Empire. The 'Russian' Revolution initially strengthened the Left in the Second International. This put the previously ascendant social chauvinist and social imperialist Right, which had gained strength under 'High Imperialism', on the back foot.

In the Tsarist Empire, the working class was to the fore of the International Revolutionary Wave. In the process they created new organs of struggle - the soviets. Working class pressure was placed upon both wings of the RSDLP – Bolshevik and Menshevik, from the General Jewish Labour Bund (1) and the Socialist Revolutionaries (2), as well as others to work together in these soviets. However, no significant force during the revolution saw the soviet as an organ of a new socialist (semi-) state, in the way that the 1871 Paris Commune had been viewed and celebrated, or the way that the Bolsheviks would view soviets in 1917.

Instead, the soviets came to be viewed by the Bolsheviks in 1905 as key organs in the overthrow of the tsarist regime. These would underpin a provisional workers and peasants' revolutionary government necessary to establish a radical form of capitalist state, until the economy had been developed further. Whereas the Mensheviks viewed the soviets as providing pressure for the creation of a bourgeois led government, which they saw as the precondition for developing a capitalist economy. The Bolsheviks, however, believed that the bourgeois parties, e,g. the Kadets, fearful of the power of workers and peasants, would compromise with the Tsarist order, rather than overthrow it. This is why they placed no trust in the new Duma, very reluctantly forced on the Tsar in 1906, but still designed to consolidate his rule.

It was the leading position of workers and their challenge to the tsarist political order which inspired workers elsewhere. It became a significant point of reference, as they confronted the more traditional Right wing Social Democratic, Labour and trade union leaders. This was recognised at the time by various ruling classes. The Prussian Minister for Internal Affairs noted that, "The Russian revolution has overflowed the boundaries of the Russian empire and is exerting its influence on the entire international Social-Democracy giving it a very radical aspect and adding a certain revolutionary energy" (3). Conversely, once the 'Russian' Revolution began to ebb after the defeat of the Moscow Uprising in December 1905 and ended in 1907, Right Social Democrats and others more confidently denigrated 'Russian methods' (4) and strongly upheld the existing constitutional order in their states.

In the West, probably the most significant development in the International Revolutionary Wave was the creation of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) in Chicago, USA in June 1905 (5). The IWW was formed in response, not to the widely acknowledged brutality of the oppressive pre-capitalist regime found in Tsarist Russia, but to the brutality imposed on workers by the world's most up-to-date corporations, particularly in the mining industry. Furthermore, the US federal state sanctioned the employers' resort to the use of private armed forces, e.g. Pinkertons (6), whilst local state governments, particularly in the west, were often in the pockets of major mining and railway corporations.

The IWW was open to all ethnic groups. This included black workers (7) previously shunned by most trade unions. Those workers who joined the IWW, many of whom were recent migrants, had no illusions in capitalist 'free' labour, or depending upon 'free' collective bargaining. The IWW openly declared that, "The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of the working people and the few, who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life. Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the means of production, abolish the wage system, and live in harmony with the Earth." (8). And challenging the old trade union leadership, the IWW declared that, "Instead of the conservative motto, 'A fair day's wage for a fair day's work,' we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, 'Abolition of the wage system.'" (9)

And, when the First World War broke out in 1914, it was not only the Bolsheviks and the majority of Mensheviks, steeled by the experience of the 1904-7 'Russian' Revolution, who were able to hold out against the capitulation of Social Democracy and the Second International to the respective ruling classes' war drive. So too did the IWW in the USA. The Irish Transport & General Workers Union and the Irish Citizen Army – a workers' militia formed in the context of the 1913 Dublin Lockout - opposed the war as well. James Connolly was a founder member of the IWW in 1905 and, along with Jim Larkin, used its experience in their struggles.

Spurred on by the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave, rising working class militancy was to be found throughout western Europe. The ebbing and defeat of the 'Russian' Revolution did not lead to the ending of strike action in these countries. "Between 1905-7, more than 31,000 strikes involving about 5 million people took place in nine different countries. The number of strikes and strikes was the highest in 1906. The year 1907 brought about a decline" (10). But in the UK, the most significant action was the Belfast Dock Strike and Lock Out from April to August in 1907 (11), which united Catholic and Protestant workers. Other important workers' actions included political strikes in Austria, Bohemia and Hungary for democratic reforms, and the extension of the franchise. There were mass demonstrations throughout Prussia-Germany on the first anniversary of the 'Russian' Revolution (12).

The tsarist regime's ongoing failures in the Russo-Japanese War, which started in February 1904 (13), and the killing and wounding of hundreds of unarmed civilians in St. Petersburg on Bloody Sunday in January 1905 (14), are often seen as the initiating events leading to the Russian Revolution. Although worker unrest had been growing in Russia since

December 1904 (15), there had also been more widespread but disconnected peasant unrest for a number of years. The most striking incidence of this was the formation of the Gurian Republic (16) in western Georgia, following a local dispute over grazing rights as early as 1902. Although the RSDLP was loath to become involved in a peasant struggle, its local Menshevik wing gave support. One of its members, Benia Chkhikvishvili became president (17), when the wider 'Russian' Revolution provided a further impetus to the struggle in Georgia.

Nevertheless, it was the actions of workers, particularly in St. Petersburg and Moscow, which provided the focus and increased the intensity of what had previously been largely disconnected peasant actions. The main explosion of peasant revolt took place after tsar had been forced to concede the *October Manifesto* in 1905 following the action of the working class (18). The tsarist regime saw the workers' struggle as the main challenge, devoting its forces first to crushing the Moscow Rising in December. Having achieved this, it then used the forces at its disposal to crush each peasant rising and disturbance in turn.

But as well as worker revolts, peasant revolts also spread beyond the borders of the Tsarist Empire. The army killed thousands when the Romanian peasants rebelled between February and April 1907 (19). The initial revolt spread from the north near the Russian imperial border.

ii) The impact of national democratic struggles within the Tsarist Russian Empire

However, in many parts of the Tsarist Russian Empire, peasants and workers faced the additional factor of being members of oppressed nations or nationalities. In the 1904-7 Revolution, struggles emerged by those pushing for greater national self-determination. These occurred in the older nation of Poland, the more recent nation of Finland, and the nations-in- formation in the Baltic countries and Ukraine. The revolutionary outbreak in Poland closely followed events in Russia in January 1905. There were major strikes and armed resistance in the capital Warsaw and industrial Lodz, culminating in an insurrection in the latter city in June. Short-lived republics were declared in the coal mining Zaglebie in

November and the coal and steel town of Ostroweic in January 1906 (20). More Russian troops were sent into Poland than fought in the Russo-Japanese war (21).

As in Russia itself, the working class put pressure on the main Socialist parties, in Poland's case the Left of the Polish Socialist Party (PPS), the Social Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania (SDPKPL) and the Bund to cooperate, not only in the face of the Russian authorities but the Right led anti-Semitic National Democratic Party. Rural unrest was more muted than in many parts of Russia, the Baltic region and Ukraine, but the peasantry was of little concern to the Socialist parties in Poland. Now that the chance of a united struggle with Russian Socialists was a possibility, the Left ditched Pilsudski's Polish nationalist strategy. They took over the PPS at the February 1906 congress, and opted for Poland's autonomy after the revolution and immediately joined with others in the struggle for a reformed Russian Empire (22). This allowed for a link up with other revolutionary movements in the Tsarist Empire, and for coordinated action with possible revolutionary governments in Lithuania (at Vilnius) Russia (Petrograd) and elsewhere, until the revolution had been secured. Such an orientation also allowed for Poland to hold out by declaring independence if the revolution failed in Russia itself; whilst also permitting a number of self-determination options if the revolution was more successful - independence, federation or autonomy - all of which enjoyed some support amongst workers.

By 1907 the revolutionary wave in Poland has been defeated. The ousted social patriotic PPS leader, Josef Pilsudski had formed the PPS-Revolutionary Faction (PPS-RF) in 1906. PPS-RF was committed to mounting an armed struggle against Tsarist Russia (23), with the backing of any interested imperial power. Hapsburg Austria was its main hope (24).

In Finland, the Social Democratic Party (SDPF) was in a unique position within the Tsarist Empire, in that it enjoyed legal status. This was partly because, like the Kingdom Poland and the Duchy of Lithuania, the Duchy of Finland lay beyond the boundaries of Tsarist Russia, although the tsar remained the head of state. But, since 1899, attempts had been made to mount a Russification campaign in Finland (Poland had been subjected to such campaigns more frequently because of its rebellious traditions). There were also growing class conflicts as capitalist social relations and wage labour were extended from the cities into the rural areas, where commercial timber extraction, and wood and paper mills producing for export were located.

During the Finnish workers' general strike in 1905, Red Guards were set up (25). A new single chamber assembly, the Eduskunta, replaced the old estates-based Finnish Diet in 1906. It also had a greatly increased franchise raised from 125,000 to 1,125,000. Women's suffrage was introduced for the first time in Europe. The SDPF emerged as the largest party in the 1907 election winning 80 out of 200 seats (26). In contrast to the loss of all the democratic gains made in the rest of the Tsarist Empire by 1907, Poland included, the Eduskunta was retained (although marginalised in practice) and the tsarist regime's attempt to resurrect the Russification campaign from 1908, was largely ineffective.

Many Finns had only recently joined the urban working class and retained contact with small farmers or rural workers in the processing industries. So, unlike Poland (and most western European states), the SDPF enjoyed support from small farmers and considerable support from rural workers. Indeed, this went even further. In 1905, a 400 strong congress of the semi-nomadic Sami expressed its support for SDPF policies (27).

Although already multi-ethnic in practice, in 1906, the SDPF officially declared that it was open to Finns, Swedes and Russians (28) in opposition to the Right Finnish nationalists with their racial nationalism. The SDPF was more like the PPS Left in supporting a multi-ethnic nation and internationalism. Their stance also contrasted with social patriotism of Pilsudski's wing of the PPS, and the SDPKPL's denial of the relevance of the 'National Question' (or the possible revolutionary role of peasantry). When the next International Revolutionary Wave broke out from 1916, and especially in 1917, the SDPF's understanding of the importance of the 'National Question', made it far better placed than the divided Polish Socialists. The SDPKPL was also hamstrung by Rosa Luxemburg's and dismissal of the 'National Question' as an issue in Poland.

Kelles-Kreuz had already realised, that the orthodox Marxists unilinear theory of nation-state formation, was not a historically pre-destined path that all ethnic or ethno-religious groups were bound to follow. Nor were all of these groups going to accept assimilation in the existing or new nation-states. Since the 1847-8 International Revolutionary Wave (29) the dominant political thought and political practice already assumed that in Europe at least (and perhaps North and South America), the existing states set-up would be remoulded into nation-states; or compromises made, such as in the Austria-Hungarian Empire, where reforms would take place acknowledging the state's multi-nation character. But even if the new dominant nationalist intelligentsia were confident of the long-standing historical 'national' basis of their nation-states, there was also a tacit acceptance that many, particularly amongst the peasantry, had a much looser concept of their identity. Therefore, one of the key tasks of any state, which was now considered to be nation-state, was to 'nationalise' the 'lower orders', e.g. to make them French (30) and Italians (31).

Throughout the nineteenth century, new nation-states were adopting secularism (e.g. France), or maintaining a particular 'nationalised' established church (e.g. Lutheranism in Prussia-Germany). Yet there were still considerable numbers of people whose religious identities were more important than the official nationality of the state, or would-be nation state, where they lived. Furthermore, even a secular nation-state like France claimed jurisdiction over Roman Catholics in the Ottoman Empire. In this they joined the reactionary Russian Orthodox Tsarist Empire's claims over a wide range of Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire.

The 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave gave a further impetus to nationalism. Nevertheless, even in Poland, with its long prior history as a state, and its succession of national revolts from 1794, 1830-1 1846 to 1863-4, Polish speakers belonging to the Mariavite Church sided with the Tsarist Russian government authorities. They received state backing as a counterweight to the Roman Catholicism of many Polish nationalists, at a time when the Papacy had declared the Mariavites heretics (32). Nevertheless, the struggle against the Tsarist Russian authorities widened the basis amongst peasants for a Polish national identity, which given many Socialists' hostility to the plight of the peasantry and the significance of the 'National Question' left them in the hands of the Right Polish nationalistm.

When the International Revolutionary Wave broke out in 1905, Jews in the Tsarist Russian Empire often faced official and unofficial forces of law and order, e.g. the Okhrana (33) and the Black Hundreds (34). But they also sometimes faced the violence of the peasantry, still influenced by the anti-Semitic Russian Orthodox Church. In the process, Jewish people became involved in heated debates over the relevancy or need for national self-determination, and the political form it should take.

iii) The impact of national democratic struggles outside the Tsarist Russian Empire

Whereas Jewish Socialists were very much part of a wider secularisation process amongst Jews in western and central Europe and North America, elsewhere a new nationalism emerged which retained stronger religious roots. Ethno-religious based nationalism tended to reject not only assimilation, but also integration in a non-nationality civic state. Instead, ethnic and ethno-religious nationalists sought ethnic supremacy for their chosen nationality within their proposed new 'nation'-state. Depending on political circumstances, this could be accompanied by measures of toleration, enforced assimilation or the ethnic cleansing of other nationalities.

An ethno-religious basis for growing nationalism was strong in the Balkans. Much of the Balkans had been dominated by the Ottoman Empire for centuries. The Ottoman state was not based on national identification in any form, but on Moslem supremacy with an organised system of state toleration for other religions based on the millet system. This gave official recognition to Greek (and later other) Orthodox Christians, Armenians, Assyrians, Jews and Roman Catholics. This system had allowed the survival of many Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire, whereas Moslems and Jews had been 'religiously' cleansed from Spain and other areas of Christian Europe.

In the nineteenth century, European imperial powers with growing designs upon the Ottoman Empire - the UK, France, Hapsburg Austrian, and Tsarist Russia - increasingly 'adopted' Christians living there to gain greater influence and to extend their markets within the Ottoman Empire. The external imperial powers and their favoured local Christian partners gained exemptions from Ottoman law (known as Capitulations). More confident through enjoying the external backing of these powers, new capitalist groups from a Greek or Slav Orthodox or an Armenian Oriental Orthodox background began to pursue a more confrontational western style-nationalism. They challenged their official religious leaders, who owed their privileges to the official Ottoman millet system.

However, the new nationalism in the Balkans was still largely based on a key aspect of the inherited legacy of the millet system, religion, but it was now transformed into a new ethno-religious nationalism, e.g. the Orthodox Greek 'nation', or the would-be 'nation' of Oriental Orthodox Armenians. Furthermore, towards the end of the nineteenth century, this emerging ethno-religious nationalism became further divided. Already in western and northern Europe, the extension of the franchise had broadened the basis of nationalism to include those using the spoken language of the 'lower orders', as opposed to the language of the once dominant elite.

The new nationalisms in the Ottoman Empire looked beyond the liturgical language of the official churches. Thus, many once belonging to the Greek Orthodox millet, developed their own Orthodox churches, e.g. the fully separate Serbian Orthodox Church from 1879, the Romanian Orthodox Church from 1872 and the Bulgarian Orthodox Church from 1870 (which was given official Ottoman jurisdiction over the Orthodox in autonomous Bulgaria and much of Macedonia and Thrace).

As the Ottoman Empire weakened, many nationalists, basing themselves on these religio-linguistic 'nations', mounted campaigns for greater autonomy and later for political independence. They hoped to get the backing of imperial sponsors, including Tsarist Russia and the UK, although other states, France, Hapsburg Austria and later Prussia/Germany and Italy also became involved for their own increasingly conflicting imperial reasons.

If the reactionary Russian tsars had promoted anti-Semitic pogroms, since 1881, then the reactionary Sultan Abdul Hamid II had been promoting massacres of Armenians since 1890, using his Hamidiye regiments (35).

This anticipated the tsarist regime's later use of the Black Hundreds. In response the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (the Dashnaks) (36), and their Armenian adversaries, the nominally more left wing Social Democratic Hunchakian Party (Hunchaks) (37), were founded in 1890. These new nationalist parties maintained armed organisations, especially for use against the predations of the Hamidiye.

New ethno-nationalist organisations also appeared in the Balkans. The Bulgarian-backed Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation (IMRO) founded in 1893 (38) which, like the Armenian organisations, was designed to defend Bulgarian Macedonians against local persecution, often organised independently of Istanbul. But IMRO, the Dashnaks and Hunchaks also resorted to terrorist actions to provoke a more centralised and brutal response from the Ottoman government. They hoped that this would lead to intervention by the major European powers or the newly independent Bulgaria in IMRO's case. The most recent and doomed action with this end in mind had been the IMRO-led Ilenden-Preobrazhenie insurrection in 1903. This led to the very short-lived local Krusevo and Strandzha Republics (39), and the predicted brutal Ottoman clampdown. But, despite verbal protests and tentative agreements, there was no effective external help, since the imperial powers had become more divided over their approach to the Ottoman Empire.

One recurrent feature of such ethnic or ethno-religious nationalism, especially in the context of the ethnically mixed Ottoman Empire, was a resort to ethnic cleansing by their armed organisations. They often envisaged their future 'nation' states as being mono-ethnic. Those from other ethnjc groups who hadn't been killed or had fled elsewhere would be subjected to enforced assimilation, particularly through state schooling, in the new 'nation'-states. And the growth of ethno-religious nationalism in Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece, meant that violence between these groups began to outgrow the violence directed at Ottoman officials or local Muslims (40).

However, as the International Revolutionary Wave spilled over to the south, and into the Balkans and eastern Anatolia, this produced a new countervailing political pressure. This initially brought about greater inter-ethnic cooperation in the demand for reform. Within the Ottoman Empire, the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) (sometimes called the 'Young Turks') launched a constitutional revolution in 1908. CUP was a secret organisation, which had penetrated the Ottoman army (exclusively Muslim) and sections of the administration. It was heavily influenced by French nineteenth century thinking and by freemasonry. But the underlying thinking of the CUP was to reform the Ottoman Empire, not to overthrow it. CUP wanted to modernise the Ottoman system, the better to withstand outside interference. After the 1908 Revolution the reactionary Sultan Hamid II was retained.

The 1908 Revolution gained active support beyond the Ottoman Muslim population. "There was public fraternisation between members of the different religious communities and armed Bulgarian, Albanian and Serb bands came down from the hills to take part in the celebrations. The main Armenian organisations took an active part in the celebrations. The slogan that was propagated by the CUP and that was visible everywhere in these days, was 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity and Justice.'" (41)

In a similar manner to the 1906 Tsarist Duma, a representative government was introduced, but in the name of the Ottoman Sultan. Instead of ruling with the assistance of official Ottoman state approved religious leaders under the millet system, the CUP gained the backing of nationalist politicians in the new assembly in Istanbul. But Ottoman-supporting Muslims were still in overall charge. In the first 1908 Ottoman general election, 147 Turks, 60 Arabs, 27 Albanians (all still mainly identifying as Muslims), 26 Greeks, 14 Armenians and 10 Slavs (mainly identifying as nationalists) and 4 Jews (Sephardic Jews who were still more religiously orientated than the Ashkenazi Zionist nationalists in Tsarist Russia) were elected (42). However, the CUP itself only commanded the direct support of 60 of these representatives, so their control in this arena was fragile.

Whereas the working class had been a major actor in the 1905-7 'Russian' Revolution, it was only after 1908 Constitutional Revolution that strikes broke out in the Ottoman territories, particularly multi-ethnic Istanbul (43) and Selanik/Salonika (44). The CUP-led government response to this was to ban strikes in key sectors, and initial working-class support ended (45).

The inability of the government to meet the demands of Greek, Bulgarian and Armenian nationalists looking for rapid improvement in their political, social and economic status, and of workers looking for economic reforms, soon broke the unity of the CUP, producing two main factions. This gave reaction a chance to overthrow the new constitutional order. There was a counter-revolutionary revolt in Istanbul in March 1909, involving soldiers in the Ottoman army ranks and the lower level clergy. They took control of Istanbul, restoring the reactionary Sultan Hamid to full power, and reintroducing full Sharia law. This was accompanied by the massacre of thousands of Armenians in eastern Anatolia.

But the real base of CUP support continued to be from well-placed army officers. And, once again, whatever reservations the nationalist parties held towards CUP, they understood what would happen if the reactionary restoration went unchallenged. CUP army officers were able to organise the Army of Action, and with the backing of 4000 Bulgarians, 2000 Greeks and 700 Jews (46), retook Istanbul in late April. Sultan Mehmet V replaced Sultan Hamid II and the 1908 constitution was restored.

However, a series of Ottoman Empire-shattering events soon undermined the tentative renewed unity of CUP with the Balkan and Armenian nationalist parties. Imperial powers had already effectively detached large chunks of Ottoman territory, nominally still under the Sultanate – Tsarist Russia took Kars and Ardahan (in eastern Anatolia) in 1878, Hapsburg Austria took Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1878 and the Sanjak of Novi Pazar from 1878-1908 (both in the Balkans). The UK took Cyprus in 1878, Egypt in 1882 and Kuwait in 1899. France took Tunisia in 1881. The UK, France, Russia and Italy jointly occupied Crete from 1898 before it was handed to Greece in 1908. But in 1911, the Italians also seized Tripolitania and Cyrenaica (in present day Libya) and the Dodecanese Islands (in the Aegean Sea). Thus, the nationalist parties in the Balkans and the Armenian nationalists in eastern Anatolia still had another option, if the time proved right. This was the imperial-backed secession of their chosen territories from the Ottoman Empire.

The continual exposure of Ottoman state weakness, combined with a growing rapprochement between the UK and Tsarist Russia over the future of the Ottoman Empire, contributed to a joint Serbian, Montenegran, Bulgarian and Greek state invasion of Ottoman Balkan and Aegean territory during the First Balkan War in 1912. IMRO and other nationalist organisations now transferred their allegiance to one of these states and took part in the ethnic cleansing of Turks and other Muslims. Muslim Slavs in Bosnia and Herzegovina were saved from this since they were under the jurisdiction of Hapsburg Austria (which viewed Muslims as being a counter-balance to the Serbs both within and outside the empire).

As late as 1912, Albanian Muslims had been taking their own action to create a new larger Albanian vilayet, still within the Ottoman Empire (47). This Greater Albania would have included present-day Albania, Kosova, and the Sanjak of Novi-Pazar (now in Serbia), northern Epirus (now in Greece) and parts of present-day western Macedonia. However, the First Balkan War overwhelmed this project. In the face of the collapse of Ottoman power in the Balkans, some Albanian Muslims developed their own ethno-religious nationalism and pushed for an independent Albanian state. During the Balkan Wars, their proposed Greater Albania became very much reduced, and Albania possibly only survived due to other conflicting Balkan nationalist forces - Serbian, Montenegran, Bulgarian and Greek - and the interference of imperial powers, including Hapsburg Austria, Italy and the UK. These powers backed a treaty signed in London in 1913, which turned out to be very tentative (48).

Albania's largely Muslim ethno-nationalism was just the latest addition to other ethno-religious nationalisms in the southern Balkans – those of the Greek, Serbian, and Bulgarian Orthodox Christians. And the Second Balkan War, which stared in 1913 almost as soon as the First Balkan War had finished, showed that tensions between different 'Christian' ethno-religious nationalist forces could lead to just as much brutality as when directed against Ottoman Muslims. Greeks ethnically cleansed Bulgarians from much of Macedonia and western Thrace in the Second Balkan War in late 1913. (The Ottomans also used this as an opportunity to ethnically cleanse Bulgarians in eastern Thrace.)

Under all these pressures, the cross-ethnic support the CUP enjoyed from 1908-9 was undermined. This was very much accentuated by the ethnic cleansing of Turks and other Muslims from the CUP's main base in Macedonia during the First Balkan War. CUP member and later Turkish

Republican president, Mustapha Kemal (Ataturk) came from Selanik in Macedonia, whilst another CUP member and later rival, Ismail Enver (Pasha), had family roots in Albania and Macedonia. As a consequence of these major setbacks, Kemal and Pasha came to lead what became the two main trends to emerge out of the CUP - the largely secular Muslim, ethnic Turkish nationalism of Ataturk, and the more overtly ethno-religious, Muslim, pan-Turkish nationalism (extending to Central Asian Turkestan) of Enver Pasha.

But the 'Young Turks' had also been part of a wider Muslim modernist and more secular movement known as Jadidism (not to be confused with jihadists). This had its strongest base within the Tsarist Empire, amongst the Bashkirs, Tatars, Turkmens and other Muslims in the Caucasus and Central Asia (49). The post-1906 'Russian' Duma was based on a franchise with seats divided between four electoral colleges. These were allotted to the official Russian Orthodox, or ethno-religious male population (which included Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians). But a separate franchise and 32 out of 497 Duma seats were also set up for 'non-natives' (50). Thus, the electoral system resembled a hybrid between the old north and west European feudal estates-based parliaments and a modified version of the Ottoman-style millet system for subordinate 'non-native' groups.

The new Duma initially created a political space, which the Jadidists could contest. But the electoral system not only under-represented those belonging to non-Russian ethnic, religious or ethno-religious groups, in the wider Tsarist Empire, it also gave the Russians the same number of representatives as the Muslims in Tsarist Turkestan. Yet here Russians only formed 10% of the population (51). The Jadidists made no political headway in their demand for reforms. Instead, many now turned to the example of 'Young Turks' in 1908 (52). The Young Bukharians formed in 1909 was one such group (53).

During the 1905 Revolution Russian Social Democrats became linked to one of these Jadidist influenced groups, the Hummet (Endeavour) party (54). This party had been founded in 1904 in Baku, the most industrialised city in the Muslim world, located in the Baku governate of Tsarist Russia's Caucasus Viceroyalty. Baku was then the world's largest oil producing city. It drew its workforce from local Muslims (then often called Tatars, but later Azeris) and those from across the border of the Qajar realms including Persians. A shared Shia Muslim identity united Turkic and Persian language speakers. There were also Russians and Armenians with the latter two groups often in the more skilled jobs and acting as overseers (as well disproportionately holding the higher administrative or commercial jobs). In addition, there were smaller numbers of Georgians and Jews.

Similar divisions between a section of the Armenians and the Muslims in the Ottoman Empire had already led to Ottoman state-sanctioned bloody 'pogroms' against Armenians, in a manner akin to the Tsarist state-sanctioned pogroms against Jews. However, in 1905, the 'Russian' revolution had led to working-class unity involving Russian and Polish Social Democrats and the Jewish Bund. Such unity was much harder to achieve in the Caucasus Viceroyalty. Although claiming to be Social Democrats, the Armenian Dashnaks made no attempt to form an ethnically mixed working-class party, especially one with Muslims in it. They saw the Caucasus 'Tatars' as another group of the Turks and allied Muslims under whom they had suffered in nearby eastern Anatolia. In 1905, the Dashnaks, along with their traditionalist Muslim adversaries, fought against each other with Armenian-Tatar massacres in Baku, Nakhchivan and Ganja (55). Hummet and those few Armenians in the RSDLP did not have enough influence to prevent these massacres.

However, a different situation arose in the nearby Qajar Persian Empire, which underwent its own Constitutional Revolution between 1905 and 1911. From the late eighteenth century, and particularly the first quarter of the nineteenth century, eastern Armenia, Georgia and what would later be Azerbaijan, were lost to the Qajar shahs and became part of the Tsarist Empire's Caucasian Vice-Royalty formed in 1801 (56). Under successive Persian shahs, the local Christian, eastern Armenian and Georgian rulers had been allowed to remain as tributary rulers. After the Tsarist Russian conquest, Armenians and Georgians formed majorities in some of the governates and oblasts, although in most of the rest and overall Muslim 'Tatars' remained a majority.

‘Tatars’, Persians and others worked and moved throughout the Caucasus governates and oblasts, with Baku being a major attraction since 1872 (57). There was more movement for work and commerce across the Tsarist Caucasus Vice-Royalty and Qajar Persian border than across the Ottoman frontier. The latter had become more contested in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, with Russia making further advances at Ottoman expense. Unlike Ottoman western Armenia, and the neighbouring tsarist Erevin governate, there was no area in Qajar Persia, where there were significant territories occupied by Armenians. In Qajar Persia’s cities, where Armenians constituted part of the commercial class, they were a minority. This had an important consequence for the Armenian nationalist parties here, especially the Dashnaks, who never made any territorial claims.

The Constitutional Revolution in Persia had its origins in a series of Muslim merchant-led protests directed against the Qajar shah’s sale of concessions, especially over tobacco sales to outside interests, including the British (58), and to his borrowing from Tsarist Russia, to finance his lavish lifestyle (59). The merchant-controlled bazaar and the ulama (Shia Muslim scholars) went on strike (60). Out of this grew a major protest in 1906 demanding a Majlis – or parliament (61). When the dying shah conceded this, it was even more restrictive than the Russian Duma or the Ottoman parliament. But, as in the latter case, it preceded a wider flowering of political activity, and as in both cases, it was still to be opposed by the sitting ruler, in this case the reactionary new Shah Mohmmed Ali. He turned to the British and Russians who had come to an agreement over their respective imperial spheres of influence in Persia (62). A Russian-officered Persian Cossack brigade shelled the Majlis in Tehran in June 1908 and executed several leaders of the 1906 Constitutional Revolution (63).

However, as in the case of the Ottoman Constitutional Revolution in 1909, the Persian Constitutional Revolution was to get a second lease of life in the same year. Pro-constitutionalist forces from Persian Azerbaijan, Gilan and Isfahan rook control of Tehran after a five days battle. And in a similar manner, the new constitution was restored, and the reactionary shah was deposed and another more compliant shah installed (64).

But whereas the Armenian Dashnaks' support for the CUP and the 'Young Turk' revolution turned out to be short lived, they remained a component of the Persian Constitutional forces. Khetcho, who had taken part in the Armenian-'Tatar' clashes in 1905, played an important role in the forces restoring the Persian constitution in 1909 (65). Yeprem Davidian, who co-led the Azerbaijan component of the Persian constitutional forces, even became the Majlis-appointed Police Chief (66).

The secular Muslim, Sattar Khan worked closely with Davidian. He was the most significant leader in Tabriz, the main city in Persian Azerbaijan. He highlighted the importance of cross border Tsarist Russian and Qajar Persian links. Khan was a 'Tatar' (Azeri) member of the Persian Social Democrat Party. This was an offshoot of the RSDLP-affiliated Hummet Party in Baku (67). By 1910, though, Khan had become aligned with the Moderate Socialist Party (MSP) (68) (in reality a landed aristocratic and middle-class moderate Islamic party). He also fell out with his former ally, Davidian. He was killed in Tehran in 1910. Bagher Kham, an Azerbaijani bricklayer, was another member of the MSP, who took an important part in the restoration of the Majles in 1909 (69) before returning to the Persian Azerbaijani provincial capital at Tabriz.

By this time, Tabriz was seen as such a hotbed of revolt by the Tsarist Russian authorities, that they occupied the city from April 1909 to February 1918, after shelling it and executing 1200 people (70). By 1911, the Russians were in a position to dictate the terms of the Majlis elections in Tehran (71). It would take another International Revolutionary Wave to end reactionary Russian intervention and to open up the prospects of revolutionary change in Persia once more.

The impact of the 1905-9 International Revolutionary Wave spread further. It had a considerable influence on the growing national movements in British imperial India. Bal Gangadhar Tilak (72) first raised the demand for political independence, seeing the British authorities as the equivalent of those in Tsarist Russia (73). The 'Russian' Revolution also spilled over into China, where Tsarist Russia had occupied Manchuria. In January 1907 Chinese and Russian workers organised a political strike in Harbin to commemorate the second anniversary of Bloody Sunday (74). However, like some 'Young Turks', and the new Indian nationalists, the infant Chinese nationalist forces were more influenced by Japan's defeat of Tsarist Russia. Sun Yat Sen wrote, "We regarded the Russian defeat as the defeat of the West. We regarded the Japanese victory as our own victory" (75).

Despite Japan's own imperial annexation of Taiwan (Formosa) (1895), Liaodong, Korea and southern Manchuria (1905), and its major role in suppressing the Boxer Rebellion (1899-1901), many Chinese nationalists saw Japan as a model to emulate and looked for official Japanese backing. Sun Yat Sen lived in exile in Tokyo between 1905-7 (76). The rampant white racism promoted by all the European and US imperial powers in the period of 'High Imperialism', and the national humiliations imposed on Qing imperial China, since the First Opium War in 1839, meant that the new Chinese nationalists equated imperialism with the white West. They saw Japan's successes, as due to its ability to modernise following the Meiji restoration in 1860, and the extension of its power to China, as a necessary transitional step to overcome the reactionary and incompetent Qing regime. During the period of Napoleon Bonaparte's greatest influence from 1803-14, some leading German and Italian thinkers held a similar attitude to invading French forces (77).

B. SOCIAL DEMOCRATS CONSIDER THE ISSUE OF IMPERIALISM AND DIFFERENT PATHS OF DEVELOPMENT

i) Kautsky and Bauer and the different challenges from the three wings of the International Left

In response to the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave, Karl Kautsky and Otto Bauer were to the forefront of those trying to develop a new Marxist orthodoxy over the 'National Question'. Kautsky refined his earlier theory of nationalism. He placed more emphasis on the wider imperial or colonial context than the significance of the 'National Question' within the economically advanced European states. Bauer theorised the Austro-Marxist stance on the 'National Question' and highlighted the significance of increased inter-imperialist conflict for the future of Hapsburg Austria.

The revolutionary wave also produced the **International Left**, which went on to stand out against the First World War. It had three components – the **Radical Left** (with Rosa Luxemburg as its most prominent spokesperson), the **Leninist wing of the Bolsheviks**, and those supporting **Internationalism from Below**, best represented by James Connolly in Ireland and Lev Iurkevich in Ukraine. Kazimierz Kelles-Kreuz, who had died in 1905, had been a representative of such thinking in Poland.

Rosa Luxemburg and Vladimir Lenin revisited the 'National Question'. They strongly opposed Otto Bauer and the developing Austro-Marxist approach. Initially, they both saw themselves as upholders of Kautsky's orthodox Marxism. However, Luxemburg was to go on and develop her own distinctive Radical Left approach. Lenin felt uncomfortable with this attempt to create a new orthodox Marxist approach to the 'National Question'. He upheld the 1896 London Congress of the Second International's support for 'the right of national self-determination'. Nevertheless, Lenin's subsequent attempts to uphold this eventually stretched his own orthodoxy to near breaking point.

By 1914, neither Kautsky's nor Bauer's would-be Marxist orthodoxy prevented the SDPD or SPDO from capitulating to their war-mongering governments. Luxemburg had already broken with Kautsky in 1910, highlighted by her *Theory & Practice* (78). Lenin didn't break with Kautsky until after the outbreak of the First World War, when he published *Dead Chauvinism and Living Socialism* in December 1914 (79).

However, 'Internationalism from Below' advocate, Kaziemerz Kelles-Kreuz, had already examined Kautsky's and Bauer's attitude to the 'National Question' in 1904. He had anticipated their political trajectory. In the aftermath of the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave, others including James Connolly and Lev Iurkevich would take up the 'Internationalism from Below' legacy. They also opposed the First World War, the uniting feature of the International Left wing of Social Democracy.

ii) Kautsky's and Bauer's differences over solution of the 'National Question' mask their agreement over the maintenance of their existing territorial states

Kautsky's and Bauer's contributions to Marxist orthodoxy were initially a continuation of their earlier debates with the Social Democratic Right. However, divisions emerged between them and their respective supporters when they addressed the 'National Question'. Kautsky was originally from Prague in Hapsburg Austrian Bohemia. He was from an assimilated Jewish German background. This made it relatively easy when he moved to Germany and joined the SDPD. Bauer was also from an assimilated Jewish background but remained in Austria. For middle class Jews living in Prussia-Germany or Hapsburg Austria (or often in Tsarist Poland), their shared first language was first German. German speaking Marxists contributed to the well-established, Germany based *Die Neue Zeit* and to the new Vienna based *Der Kampf* theoretical journals.

However, Kautsky's immediate motivation in addressing the 'National Question' lay not with the nations and nationalities living within Europe, but in how to address German colonialism in Africa. The Prussian-German ruling class mounted a major political offensive against the SPDP in the January 1907 general election. This followed the state's ongoing war and genocide against the Hereros and Namaqua of German South West Africa (Namibia) (80). This election, termed the 'Hottentot election', in many ways resembled the 1901 'Khaki election' in the UK during the Boer War, with its whipped-up jingoism. The ruling class's political offensive led to a big increase in voter participation, from which the parties they backed benefitted. Although the SDPD increased its number of votes, it lost nearly half of its seats in the Reichstag (81). As a result, the SDPD Right, which had been openly chauvinist and imperialist since the late 1890s, and whose main election concern was the number of seats gained, came out in support of a pro-imperialist policy at the party's 1907 Stuttgart Congress.

Kautsky replied to the Right in his *Socialism and Colonial Policy* (82). Here he opposed the imperialist powers' resort to 'colonies of exploitation', in which indigenous workers were brutally exploited. However, he also defended 'colonies of work', such as the USA and

Australia. Kautsky argued that in these states a new workforce (many, themselves, subject to exploitation) had ‘displaced’ the original inhabitants, rather than exploiting them directly (83). Presumably, since these ‘former’ inhabitants were ‘non-historical’ peoples, the manner of their ‘displacement’ was of little concern; nor was the miserable and marginal labour reserve status of the survivors. This ‘oversight’ fitted in with Kautsky’s view of the inevitability of capitalist ‘progress’.

Otto Bauer (84) was also to write about Imperialism in the aftermath of the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave. He used his articles to develop the Austro-Marxists’ post-1899 SDPO Brunn Conference policy. This had been designed to maintain the territorial extent of Hapsburg Austria. Imperialist designs and shifting alliances affected the constituent ‘nations’ of this empire in different ways. This led to greater instability. The most immediate threat arose from the ‘Slav Question’. Slav nationalists following in the tradition of Palacky (85) had been campaigning for the Hapsburg Empire to move from being a Dual German/Hungarian state to becoming a Triple German/Hungarian/Slav state.

In the face of this and pressured by other nationalists, the ‘National Question’ remained central to the Austro-Marxists’ thinking. In 1907 Otto Bauer published *The Nationalities Question and Social Democracy* (86). He felt the need to challenge Kautsky’s theory, which dominated Marxist thinking within the Second International, but which Bauer felt did not adequately explain what was happening in the Hapsburg Austria. Bauer’s debt to Idealist thinking is clear in his definition of the nation as “the totality of men bound together through a common destiny into a community of character” (87). He acknowledged the contribution of Tonnies to his thinking (88). Bauer tended to see nationalities and nations as autonomous cultural entities which, like life and death, socialist society would have to accommodate as much as capitalist society.

Kautsky had recognised the Czechs as being a nation. So, in this he had moved beyond Engels’ dismissive comments in the first half of the nineteenth century (89). He could see that the Czech language had been maintained and extended to urban areas of Austrian Bohemia. Indeed, since Engels wrote, Prague had changed from being a majority to a minority German-speaking city (90). However, Kautsky’s followers still thought that the problems facing oppressed nations and ethnic groups, particularly in central and eastern Europe, represented a ‘temporary’ political obstacle, which would be overcome as ‘normal’ or ‘progressive’ capitalist development asserted itself, assimilating most ethnic groups and smaller nations in the process.

Here, Kautsky’s understanding of the inevitability of capitalist ‘progress’, associated with the large states, played its theoretical role. He argued that the Czechs’ democratic aspirations could be met within a wider democratic republican state of Germany. This would emerge from the demise of both the German-Prussian and Austro-Hungarian empires. In the longer term, though, Kautsky argued that, "Once we have reached the state in which the bulk of the population of our advanced nations speak one or more world languages besides their own national language, there will be a basis for a gradual reduction leading to the total disappearance of languages of minor nations, and finally, to the uniting of all civilised humanity into one language and one nationality" (91). Therefore, the Czech language was ultimately doomed.

Bauer, whilst recognising the importance of languages, attacked Kautsky’s identification of a nation-state with language (92). Bauer was arguing for the political legitimacy, from a Social Democrat point of view, of a state that gives different nations and nationalities a constitutional basis beyond their peoples’ individual democratic rights. The Swiss nation-state officially recognised three major and two minor languages.

In contrast to most other Marxists, Bauer believed that Jews, who had become more widely distributed in Central and the Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, had formed a distinct ethnic group (93). Other Marxists believed they had formed a caste - a state and Catholic hierarchy imposed hereditary identity (or pre-nation group). Bauer used his own particular understanding of the historical position of people of Jewish ethnicity to address the contemporary issue of ethnic groups within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. He suggested that the empire’s dispersed ethnic groups now constituted ‘nations’ but on a non-territorial basis.

Bauer's rejection of the territorial basis for nations led to him pointing the existence of smaller ‘nations,’ in reality nationalities (specific ethnic groups), which were living, either dispersed amongst others, or thoroughly mixed together in the major cities, especially Vienna. He argued that each national community should be given the opportunity to form a non-territorial, legal, public corporation to organise its own cultural affairs. This policy was known as **national-cultural autonomy** (94). It came to have a much wider impact in eastern Europe, especially amongst the Social Democrats in the Tsarist Empire. This policy became the object of particularly sharp attacks both from Luxemburg and Lenin in particular.

In the 1907 Hapsburg Austrian general election, held after a successful strike to widen the franchise, the Club of German Social Democrats (CGSD) (formed by the SDPO for electoral purposes) won 50 seats (an increase of 38), and the new federal Clubs – the Bohemian (Czech) Social Democrats 24 seats, the Polish Social Democrats 6 seats, the Italian Social Democrats 5 seats and the Ruthene Social Democrats 2 seats (95). Bauer's political policies on the 'National Question' were enough to keep the other SDPO-affiliated parties – the Czech, Polish, Italian, Ruthene and Slovene - on board. The SDPO had ceased to be a centralised party in 1899, but it remained a federalised party, albeit with its parliamentary CGSD still dominant.

Bohumir Smeral (96), a leading member of the Czech Social Democratic Party (CSDP) attempted to develop a specifically Czech position on the 'National Question' to dovetail with that of the SDPO leadership (97). They both wanted to reform the Hapsburg Empire as a democratic national federation. Smeral, like the SDPO leaders, continued to support the unity of the Hapsburg Empire until this position lost all credibility during the First World War. This appeasement of German social chauvinist and imperialist forces allowed the leadership of the CSDP to fall to the social patriots in 1916 (98). They, in their turn, appeased the Czech bourgeoisie and the Czech nationalist parties, as the Hapsburg Empire finally began to fall apart. They later ended up looking to the imperial victors in the First World War in their own belated support for Czech independence. Neither the German nor the Czech version of Austro-Marxism was able to develop the politics necessary to make a revolutionary Social Democratic/Communist advance possible in the International Revolutionary Wave from 1916. Smeral, though, later went on to join the Czech Communist Party.

However, there were still some other longer-term implications for the differences between Kautsky and Bauer over the 'National Question'. Kautsky still held to a central concept of the future Communist order, which Marx and Engels had envisaged. The full flowering of Socialism/Communism would be a global affair, with worldwide planned economic integration of production and distribution. This new social order would initially make use of the prior international division of labour achieved under the capitalist world market.

But Kautsky could not decide whether his future cosmopolitan world order would develop through the eventual merging of already economically advanced societies, which had been won to Social Democratic majority rule; or to a Socialist International inheriting the gains of Imperialism, which had already created its own integrated global economy. He was to hint at this latter possibility in his *Theory of Ultra-Imperialism*, written just as the First World War started in 1914 (99).

In contrast to Kautsky, Bauer envisaged a future international socialist order in confederal terms, based on the 'nationality principle'. "Even the smallest nation will be able to create an independently organised national economy; while the great nations produce a variety of goods, the small nation will apply the whole of its labour-power to the production of one or a few kinds of goods, and will acquire all other goods from other nations by exchange" (100**)**.

Thus, Bauer wanted to freeze this 'nationality principle' within the individual states constituting his ideal version of international socialism. He argued that, "The unregulated migration of individuals, dominated by the blind laws of capitalist competition will then cease {after socialist victory} and will be replaced by the conscious regulation of migration by socialist communities… This deliberate regulation of immigration and emigration will give every nation, for the first time, control over its linguistic boundaries. It will no longer be possible for social migration to infringe again and again the nationality principle, against the will of the nation" (101).

In Bauer, we can see one of the origins of the 'socialist' immigration policy, which characterises much of today's social chauvinist Left, particularly those whose intellectual formation has been framed by the orthodox Marxist-Leninism, which developed in the Third International under Stalin. After the defeat of the Kronstadt Rising in 1921, and the consolidation of the bureaucratic Party-State in the USSR, the theory of 'socialism in one country' largely displaced the earlier International Socialism of the early Communists. A new Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy developed, policed by the CPSU, backed by the repressive apparatus of the USSR.

Ironically, considering Lenin's and the Bolsheviks' earlier strong antipathy towards the national federal system (and by extension even more so to confederalism), advocated by the Austro-Marxists, the conception of 'international socialism' as a confederal system later came to dominate official Communist thinking. This 'international socialism' retained relations of economic exchange and political diplomacy between 'nation' states. Such a conception of 'international socialism' has even had an impact upon some Trotskyist tendencies too, such as the British-based Committee for a Workers' International. Yet, Trotsky was a noted upholder of a single global communist order.

Despite the political differences between Kautsky and Bauer, they still shared important political characteristics. They both assumed that their own Social Democratic Parties would inherit the full extent of the existing state in which they lived – Prussia-Germany and Hapsburg Austria respectively, although Kautsky also wanted to include German Austria in his proposed Greater Germany. They were both unable to retrieve Marx's and Engels' mature 'Internationalism from Below' stance, especially with regard to the approaches to be taken by Communists/Socialists from the dominant nation, or by ethnic groups living in their respective imperial states.

Kautsky and Bauer were both to adopt a similar shocked political response to the declaration of the First World War. They initially clung on to 'their' states and the failed Second International. After the end of this war, and the spread of the new International Revolutionary Wave, they both joined the 'Two-and-a-half International' (102). This was formed to counter the impact of the new Third International, associated with the Internationalist Left. The 'Two and a half International' soon collapsed, with most of its adherents rejoining the Second International.

(iii) The 'National Question' - old issues sharpened and new issues raised - the Jews and the Muslims

Before the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave, Kaziemierz Kelles-Kreuz had been the only significant non-Jewish Social Democrat to consider the implications of the emergence of Ashkenazi Jews from being a primarily religious Judaic group to becoming a new Jewish nationality (ethnic group).

At this time there was still some common ground between the majority in the RSDLP and the Bund. Initially they both struggled for general democratic rights, which would also end Tsarist Russia's anti-Semitic laws (103). But, unlike the RSDLP majority, the Bund also saw the need to maintain an autonomous political organisation until the tsarist regime had been overthrown and general political rights had been guaranteed.

However, following the Bund's experience of continued anti-Semitism during the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave, it now argued that specific Jewish national rights would need constitutional recognition. In this they became more influenced by the Otto Bauer. The Bund opted for Jewish cultural autonomy within the Tsarist Empire, on the model recommended by Bauer for the ethnic groups of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (104). Although Bauer himself, as an assimilated Austrian German Jew, did not support cultural autonomy for Jews. He thought that other Jews migrating to the cities would become assimilated (105).

But there were other Jewish forces on the Left in the Tsarist Russian Empire (and beyond). The Jewish Socialist Workers Party (JSWP) was founded in April 1906 (106). The Russian Socialist Revolutionaries influenced its thinking. The JSWP campaigned for some form of territorial autonomy for Jews within the Russian Empire (107). In the same year Paole Zion, which claimed to be a Marxist Party, extended itself from England, Austria, the USA and Canada to Ukraine. It followed the mainstream of Zionism in seeking Jewish migration to Palestine and the setting up of a specifically Jewish state (108).

Within the emerging Internationalist Left, Rosa Luxemburg and the SDPKPL opposed any special political recognition for Jewish people. They continued to believe that if a Social Democratic party was seen to champion general democratic rights, then Jews would assimilate to the dominant nationality of the state where they lived, as economic developments marginalised the basis for anti-Semitism. Despite other emerging differences over the 'National Question', Lenin's wing of the Bolsheviks continued to share much of Luxemburg's thinking with regard to the Jews and the Bund, because they also did not recognise Jews as an emerging nationality.

However, whereas Luxemburg was contemptuous of the Yiddish language, the Bolsheviks wrote some of their propaganda in Yiddish, since this was the main language of many Jewish workers. But in this, they were acting rather like the Society in Scotland for Propagating of Christian Knowledge in the eighteenth century, when it eventually published a *New Testament* in Gaelic (109). This was done as a transitional means of getting Highlanders and Islanders to become 'civilised' and to speak English.

Furthermore, it was not only in the Tsarist Russian Empire where pogroms occurred during the International Revolutionary Wave. Here, state backed anti-Jewish attacks had been supplemented by those of the peasants in the countryside, and by economically marginal labourers and petty traders in towns and cities. In the Caucasus, the equivalent of the anti-Jewish pogroms in Russia and attacks in Poland, were the Armenian-'Tatar' massacres, only in this case with both sides bearing responsibility. There had been some success by the RSDLP and the Bund in Russia, and by the SDPKPL, PPS-Left and Bund in Poland to develop a united working class response, but in the Caucasus neither the Muslim Social Democrats in Hummet, nor those Armenians in the RSDLP had been able to counter effectively the Muslim traditionalists nor the Armenian Dashnaks during the massacres.

However, the local Bolsheviks, in marked contrast to this RSDLP faction's hostile attitude towards the Bund, had good links with Hummet (110). This was clearly in breach with Lenin's usual insistence upon 'one-state, one party'. But, even if not theorised, maybe there was some understanding that the second argument underpinning Bolshevik hostility to the Bund did not apply in the Caucasus and particularly Baku. In Russia, the Bolsheviks shared the much wider Social Democratic view that Jews would assimilate to the majority nation as economic and political progress would undermine anti-Semitism. Yet, the Bolsheviks could no doubt see that assimilation was not likely to happen to the majority Moslem population in much of the Tsarist Caucasus Vice-Royalty, including Baku.

There was an absence of ethnic-based nationalism in Muslim societies. From the end of the nineteenth century, many Muslims experienced modernisation in the Jadidist secular Muslim form. This was happening in the Tsarist Russian Empire, amongst the Volga Tatars and the Bashkirs and in the Tsarist Protectorates – the Emirate of Bukhara and the Khanate of Khiva. Those influenced by Jadidism showed as much reluctance to move to an ethnically based nationalism, as the Islamic traditionalists (e.g. the Sunni Ottoman Sultan Hamid II or the Shia Shah of Persia) and the later Islamic revivalists (e.g. the Salafists), albeit for quite different reasons.

Various Jadidist-influenced organisations were to go on and perform a significant role in the 1916-23 International Revolution Wave and beyond. But they and their successor organisations came into conflict with the infant USSR's attempt to break-up largely Muslim Turkestan into ethnically based Soviet Socialist Republics - Turkmen and Uzbek, an Autonomist Tajik SSR and the autonomous oblasts of Kara-Kirghiz and Karakalpak in 1924 (111). They also opposed the abolition of the Bukharan (112) and Khorezm Peoples Soviet Republics (113) (based on the old Emirate of Bukhara and Khanate of Khiva).

iv) The International Left - the Radical Lefts, Rosa Luxemburg and the Balkan Social Democrats

Within the **International Left**, the three political trends - the Radical Left, Lenin's wing of the Bolsheviks and those supporting 'Internationalism from Below' - all went on to oppose the First World War. They began to challenge, not only the Social Democratic Right, but the emerging Social

Democratic Centre, led by Kaul Kautsky and other members of the SDPD, and by Otto Bauer and other members of the SPDO. The most influential of these trends until the outbreak of the next International Revolutionary Wave in 1916 was the Radical Left.

Radical Left theoreticians mainly consisted of nationally assimilated individuals, despite being from oppressed nationalities or nations, e.g. its foremost representative, Rosa Luxemburg (Jewish Polish-Russian), Karl Radek (Jewish Polish-Russian) (114) and Grigori Pyatakov (Ukrainian-Russian) (115). Or they came from the dominant nationality in the state where they lived, e.g. Nicolai Bukharin (Russian) (116), Herman Gorter (Dutch) (117), Anton Pannekoek (Dutch) (118), and Joseph Strasser (Austro-German).

For the Radical Left, Imperialism meant the era of progressive national struggles had ended, at least in Europe and North America. In these areas, they opposed 'the right of national self-determination' as a meaningless slogan, which could only be reactionary or utopian under Imperialist conditions. During the First World War, Bukharin, Pyatakov and other Bolsheviks became supporters of the most Radical Left stance. They opposed the ‘right to self-determination’ anywhere in the world, claiming it was either impossible or reactionary under Imperialism. Such thinking distanced Social Democrats from ongoing democratic struggles over national self-determination. They promised that socialism/communism would ‘solve’ the ‘National Question’ (and other issues such as the ‘Women Question’) after the revolution, whilst opposing the social forces in the here and now, which could ensure such an outcome.

The Balkans, particularly Bulgaria and Serbia, included a group of Social Democrats, who developed a specific form of Radical Left politics, adapted to the political conditions in south east Europe. Two of its leading members were Dimitrije Tucovic (119) of the Serbian Social Democratic Party (120) and Dimitur Blagoev (121) of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Labour Party (‘Narrow Socialists’) (122) (this party took its inspiration from the Russian SDLP).

Like Luxemburg, these Balkan Social Democrats were little concerned with the struggles of the peasantry, or how they could contribute to the overthrow of the existing reactionary socio-economic order in the Balkans. In a south-eastern Europe, where the working class was a relatively small proportion of the population, they looked forward to the days when capitalist 'progress' had flung the peasantry into its growing ranks. Luxemburg, however, was prepared to support struggles for national liberation led by bourgeois forces in pre-modern imperial states, e.g. the Ottoman Empire, since this would allow capitalism to mature in these areas, creating a modern working class. However, the Balkans also the contained petty successor states, especially Greece, Serbia, Romania and Bulgaria. Like Tsarist Russia, she would have considered that these had passed over into the capitalist world, albeit in such a fragmented form, as to make them easy prey for the machinations of major European imperialist powers. Such was the mayhem caused by impact of the 'National Question' in the Balkans' complex political situation, with competing petty states and imperial intervention as the Ottoman Empire broke up, that Social Democrats here had to develop their own thinking on this issue.

Within the Tsarist Russian Empire, Luxemburg supported political autonomy for Poland, but only **after** a successful revolution bringing about a unified Russian republic. But she strongly opposed Social Democrats who fought for Polish self-determination before such a revolution. Unlike Tsarist Russia, the politically fragmented Balkans were not starting from an already united state territory. In the new context of a much more politically divided Balkans and the emergence of the 'Young Turk' revolution, Balkan Social Democrats came out in support of a Balkan Republican Federation. This was raised in the Bulgarian Social Democratic journal, *Workers' Spark* (123).

The proposed Balkan Republican Federation included the Balkan territories still under Ottoman imperial control, those states which had broken away, and those largely southern Slav peopled areas in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, including today's Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Slovenia. The state of Montenegro, allotted no specific territory in the proposed Balkan Republican Federation, was probably seen as part of the Serbian nation. Indeed, Montenegro was sometimes considered to hold a similar position in Serbia's national development to Piedmont in Italy's. It was also the only Balkan area to remain largely free of Ottoman control.

But at this time, Montenegro and Serbia were separated by the Ottoman Sanjak of Novi Pazar, recently brought under Hapsburg control.

But in 1910, other nationalities, such as the Albanians were not given recognition by the Balkan Social Democrats. The largely, but not exclusively, Muslim Albanians were probably seen as a component part of the wider Ottoman population in the Balkans. Despite speaking their own language, it was thought by many that they had not developed a nationality consciousness. Their primary identity was seen to be Muslim, along with other Muslims, who spoke Serb in Bosnia and the Sanjak, Croat in Herzegovina (although the official Orthodox/Catholic divide between these two mutually comprehensible languages was irrelevant to Muslims), Bulgarian in Thrace (the Pomaks) or the Turkish spoken by Turks living throughout the European vilayets of the Ottoman Empire.

Two other groups not considered by the Balkan Social Democrats were the Gypsies and the Vlachs (124). The Vlachs were a mainly pastoral, part-nomadic, Romanian language speaking people living throughout the southern Balkans. But beyond Finland, where Social Democrats had begun to engage with the nomadic Sami, such peoples did not figure in Social Democratic thinking. They drew even less Social Democrat attention than the tribally organised peoples of Africa, who had been resisting European colonial encroachment. However, the Radical Left Balkan Social Democrats were very much in the initial stages of putting flesh on their own proposed Balkan Republican Federation. They had not considered what specific arrangements should be made for nations, nationalities, or indeed those people who did not consider themselves belonging to either of these categories.

In 1910, the First Balkan Social Democratic Conference was held in Belgrade in Serbia, with delegates from Serbia, Bulgaria (the ‘Narrows’), Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia, and the Armenian Hunchaks (with a telegram of solidarity from the Greeks) (125). Some other Social Democrats had been excluded from the First Balkan Social Democratic Conference because of the illusions they held that ‘Young Turks’ were leading a successful bourgeois revolution. These other Social Democrats saw this as a necessary stage to prepare the economic grounds for socialism (126). Their leading light was the Bulgarian born, but

Romania adopted, Christian Rakovsky (127). Others who were excluded for similar reasons including the Bulgarian 'Broads', the Left wing of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation and the Jewish dominated Workers' Federation of Salonika (128). Their stance resembled that of the Austro-Marxists and Kautsky (129) and has been called 'Turko-Marxist' (130).

In some ways, the First Balkan Social Democratic Conference represented another 'International' in eastern Europe. This added to that of the now federated SDPO in the Hapsburg Austria - sometimes considered to be the 'Vienna International'. But whereas the SDPO had moved from being a centralised to an increasingly federalised party, the constituent parties represented in the First Balkan Social Democratic Conference were trying to move in the other direction, seeking greater unity. However, they never moved beyond acting as a mini-'International'.

Tensions were growing under the 'Young Turk' regime, in the aftermath of its restoration in 1909. Furthermore, war was threatening, due to the manoeuvrings of the European imperial powers and their local Balkan client states. This could only lead to a further and bloody break-up of the Ottoman Empire and internecine conflict. Although the resolution coming from the conference (131) did not mention the Balkan Federal Republic, the Bulgarian Social Democrat, Dimitur Blagoev reminded Balkan Social Democrats that this has been their shared understanding (132). But the second planned conference to be held in Sofia in Bulgaria in 1911 was cancelled.

The next year, the First Balkan War broke out (133). This pitted Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro against the Ottoman Empire. It was supported by many Social Democrats because it appeared to herald the end of Ottoman oppression. This prompted leading Serbian Social Democrat, Tucovic to point out that the Serbian kingdom participated in the war not for national liberation, but for territorial expansion and in the process was conducting brutal attacks on other nationalities. Whilst desperately seeking a united campaign of the peoples of the Balkans, Tucovic acknowledged that, "the general national revolt of the Albanian population against the barbaric behavior of their neighbours, Serbia, Greece and Montenegro, {is} a revolt that is a great step forward in the national awakening of the Albanians" (134). And this war was soon to be followed by the Second Balkan War (135), which now pitted Serbia, Greece and Romania against Bulgaria, once again all fighting for territorial aggrandisement.

Thus, the Balkan Social Democrats were thrown into the cauldron of growing inter-imperialist and petty nationalist armed conflicts before their comrades attending the Second International Social Democratic at Basel in November 1912 considered the prospects of a wider European inter-imperialist war. Since the 1907 Second International Conference in Stuttgart and the 1910 conference in Copenhagen, Social Democrats mainly living in the northern and western European imperial states faced rising imperial tensions. But when the First World War broke out in July 1914, none of the Social Democratic parties in Prussia-Germany, Hapsburg Austro-Hungary, France or the UK withstood this pressure. They capitulated before their war-promoting governments.

When the First World War broke out it, the Serbian Social Democrats voted against participation. Yet, the Serbians faced far more serious immediate threats than Social Democrats living in the major imperial powers. Prussia-Germany, France, Austro-Hungary and Tsarist Russia wanted war to annex some border territories ruled by their adversaries, but their prime aim along with the UK, was to re-divide each other's colonial territories (or the Ottoman and Qajar empires), not to eliminate their rival states. Hapsburg Austria, however, wanted to eliminate Serbia altogether. Even Rosa Luxemburg, who had a low opinion of such small states, wrote that "threatened by Austria in its very existence as a nation, forced by Austria into war, {Serbia} is fighting, according to all human conceptions, for existence, for freedom, and for the civilisation of its people" (136).

Dragisa Lapcevic, the sole Social Democratic deputy attending the Serbian parliament, now relocated from Belgrade to Nis, claimed that, "Austria-Hungary would not have dared attack had Serbia committed itself to forging a Balkan federation." (137). But equally, if Social Democrats in the major imperial powers, had committed themselves to a strategy of taking the lead of the movements for national self-determination to break-up these states, then the Hapsburgs might have been faced with a multi-national challenge to its existence. Serbian Social Democrat leader

Tucovice tragically died in the war, in November 1914. He had resolutely opposed the petty nationalism of the Serbian state, (138).

v) Imperialism - the new Centre takes the theoretical lead but is challenged by Rosa Luxemburg

It is not possible to understand the International Left's differing attitudes to national and colonial issues without appreciating their distinctive views about Imperialism and paths of capitalist development. Today communists, seeking to understand this period of developing Monopoly Capitalist Imperialism, usually look to the piece written by Lenin in 1916 - *Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (139). Yet, Lenin's now famous critique was produced too late to contribute to revolutionary Social Democratic thinking on these issues in the pre-First World War period.

Although, as has been shown, both Kautsky and Bauer had written material on Imperialism, they did not provide new general theories. The most significant pre-war contribution came from Rudolf Hilferding, a one-time member of the SDPO, but now member of the SDPD. He published *Finance Capital* in 1910 (140). Hilferding emphasised the merging of industrial and banking capital in a new stage of capitalist development - finance capital. Finance capital favoured the formation of cartels and trusts and other forms of monopoly to eliminate competition and to safeguard the investments involved in costly new capital formation. Finance capital also favoured the active intervention of the state to ensure the implementation of protective tariffs, and the seizure of colonies for raw materials, protected markets and areas for capital export.

This work impressed both Kautsky and Lenin, and formed part of a new wider shared, orthodox Marxist analysis of Imperialism. However, it did not satisfy Rosa Luxemburg. She was already beginning to note the rightwards slide of the SDPD over the issue of Imperialism. She had been one of the first Social Democrats to see the significance of 'High Imperialism'. In a letter to her lover and comrade, Leo Jogiches, written in 1899, Luxemburg had pointed out the world importance of Japan's attack on China in 1895 (141). In 1905 she publicly criticised the failure of the SPD to oppose German imperialism over the first Morocco Crisis

(142); and did so again over the second Morocco Crisis (the Agadir Incident) in 1911 (143).

Therefore, the emerging Radical Left leader, Luxemburg took the lead on the Internationalist Left when he wrote *The Accumulation of Capital - A Contribution to an Economic Explanation of Imperialism* (144), in late 1913. In this contribution, she took Marx's schemas for further expanded capitalist reproduction, presented in *Capital* (Volume 2), and revised them to show that, once Imperialism had conquered the world, there was no longer any basis for further capitalist expansion. More recently, Raya Dunayevskaya illustrated the abstract and mechanical economic reductionist nature of Luxemburg's theory of Imperialism, and its failure to understand Marx's fundamental critique of political economy (145).

In *The Accumulation of Capitalism*, Luxemburg wrote passionately about the devastating effect of both Boer and British government attacks upon the Black peoples of South Africa, as well as the genocidal war waged by the German government in South West Africa (Namibia) against the Hereros. However, Dunayevskaya highlighted Luxemburg's weakness. Her "revolutionary opposition to German imperialism's barbarism against the Hereros was limited to seeing them as suffering rather than revolutionary humanity. Yet, both the Maji Maji revolt in East Africa and the Zulu rebellion in South Africa had erupted in those pivotal years, 1905-6 {the years of the revolutionary uprisings in the Tsarist Empire}.... Luxemburg had become so blinded by the powerful imperialist phenomena... that she failed to see... that the oppression of the non-capitalist lands could also bring about powerful new allies for the proletariat" (146).

Whilst Kautsky and Hilferding of the emerging Centre could elaborate quite sophisticated arguments in order to explain the latest economic and social developments, what was largely absent, in their contributions, were the many concrete struggles against Imperialism. Instead, economic developments, taking place 'above the heads' of the working class and the wider oppressed, were seen to be 'objectively' providing the basis for an inevitable future socialism. This 'inevitable' course was seen to be registered in the numerical growth of Social Democrat and trade union organisation and support.

In contrast, Luxemburg was good at identifying the working class as a revolutionary subject, particularly in the great period of revolt, in the Tsarist Empire, between 1904-7. However, she could not extend that view to the resistance offered by other oppressed classes, especially the peasantry. Neither did she appreciate the political nature of the resistance of those living in oppressed nations or as oppressed nationalities.

Marx's own developed method had identified the new rising forces of resistance struggling to break free from the deadly embrace of capital and its political representatives. He highlighted the new social contradictions, which these struggles brought about, and outlined the best road to be followed to reach the fullest human emancipation and liberation. In the last phase of his political activity, he included the resistance of the oppressed peoples of the colonial world amongst those forces challenging imperialism (147).

vi) Luxemburg and Lenin on different paths of capitalist development

Lenin, like Luxemburg, contributed to Social Democrats' understanding of the world, long before his work, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, was published in 1916. Lenin became much more aware than Luxemburg of the revolutionary role of other oppressed and exploited classes, particularly following his experiences of the 1904-7 Revolution.

In the aftermath of the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave, Lenin revealed his wider framework for understanding capitalist development in Russia, in *The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-7* (148). He outlined two paths of development in areas where agrarian production initially dominated the economy. There is a strong parallel with the two paths of capitalist development already indicated by Marx (149). Lenin's 'Prussian path' resembled Marx's earlier conservative path. Both depended upon 'progress' imposed from above. This had strong theoretical implications for externally enforced development under imperialist and colonialist conditions.

In Lenin's 'Prussian path', "Serfdom may be abolished by the feudal-landlord economies slowly evolving into Junker-bourgeois economies, by the mass of peasants being turned into landless husbandmen... by forcibly keeping the masses down to a pauper standard of living, by the rise of small groups of... rich bourgeois peasants, who inevitably spring up under capitalism from among the peasantry" (150). This path has been followed in many of the world's colonies and semi-colonies.

Lenin contrasted this 'Prussian path' to the 'American path'. "It, too, involves the forcible break-up of the old system of landownership... But this essential and inevitable break-up may be carried out in the interests of the peasant masses and not of the landlord gang. A mass of free farmers may serve as a basis for the development of capitalism without any landlord economy whatsoever... Capitalist development along such a path *should* proceed far more broadly, freely, and swiftly owing to the tremendous growth of the home market and the rise of the standard of living, the energy, initiative, and the culture of the *entire* population" (151).

Whilst this comparison is valid, in so far as it goes, it also reveals the limits of revolutionary Social Democratic thinking in the pre-First World War period. In making this twofold distinction, Lenin's main concerns still lay primarily with Europe (including Russia) and North America. The revolutionary movements in Persia (Iran), the Ottoman Empire, and later the establishment of a republic in China in 1911, certainly did extend Lenin's vision. However, at this time, Lenin understood all these new revolutionary upheavals as representing the further geographical extension of the capitalist economic order and consequently democratic opposition to pre-capitalist societies with pre-existing state experience. They were being drawn into the historical mainstream. Therefore, there was little understanding of the role of many of the 'non-historic peoples' in history.

Yet the other side of the 'American path' - poverty-stricken sharecropping, Jim Crow Laws and Ku Klux Klan lynchings, which marked the lives of oppressed Blacks in the South - was absent from Lenin's two paths of development. What was also missing from Lenin's recommended 'American path' was the brutal dispossession of the Native Americans. This was dismissed as just another "forcible break-up of the old system of landownership", like the ending of feudal landholding. Indeed, Lenin went on, in advocating the 'American path' for Russia, to point out the "vast lands available for colonisation" (152) - many of course still occupied by tribally organised peoples in the Tsarist Empire.

However, when the International Revolutionary Wave of 1916-21 drew in the colonised peoples of the world, Lenin's appreciation of the revolutionary role of the peasantry and oppressed nationalities in Russia gave him a head start compared to the Radical Left. As a result, Communists were able to encompass all the peoples of the world within their vision. That leaden legacy of 'historic', 'non-historic', and by implication, 'prehistoric' peoples, could now be replaced by a universal humankind, but one still divided by Imperialism into classes, nations and nationalities.

vii) Luxemburg and Lenin on two worlds of development and their differences on the role of the peasantry

Throughout the pre-First World War period, Lenin and Luxemburg still shared much common ground in their understanding of capitalist development. Their agreement was based on a further development of the 'level of civilisation' view generally held then by orthodox Marxists. This was based on the thinking of the earlier Marx and Engels, and rendered orthodox in the Second International, particularly by Kautsky. The 'level of civilisation' was equated with the 'level of economic development' brought about by inevitable capitalist 'progress'.

In effect, Luxemburg and Lenin saw 'two worlds' of development. The 'first world' included those countries where the bourgeoisie had succeeded in making capitalist relations the dominant economic, social, cultural and political force in society. There was also much agreement between Luxemburg and Lenin on the nature of the 'second world'. It mainly comprised those societies, which were still largely under the sway of pre-capitalist economic relations. In those decaying Asiatic empires, still dominated by despotic political regimes, support should be given to bourgeois-led national movements for independence. This would speed up the development of capitalism, creating a working class, thus preparing the way for socialism (153).

For both Luxemburg and Lenin there were still important political tasks, which remained to be completed in their ‘first world’ before socialism was achieved. These tasks depended on the degree of democratic freedoms already attained. States like France and 'England'/UK had already achieved real parliamentary democracy, and had, by implication, solved any ‘National Questions’. Luxemburg specifically cited Ireland as an example! (154) Despite the dominance of capitalist economic relations within Germany, Luxemburg and Lenin believed that Germany still had remaining semi-feudal, political features. These were mainly associated with continued Prussian Junker political domination under the Kaiser, supported by the other princes of the German Empire. Therefore, Social Democrats should demand a centralised German Republic to challenge these anachronisms and speed up further capitalist development to more thoroughly prepare the grounds for socialism.

However, Luxemburg and Lenin ended up drawing different geographical boundaries between their ‘first’ and ‘second worlds’ of development. Luxemburg believed that Russia was now clearly following the economic path of the capitalist states of Western Europe. Therefore, she located Russia in the ‘first world’. She emphasised the economic aspect of the situation, the recently achieved economic domination of capitalist relations. The primary task of Social Democrats in Russia, as in Germany, was to establish a centralised democratic republic, in order to speed up capitalist development and the creation of a large working class. All attempts to oppose state centralisation, through federation or national independence, were to be opposed as reactionary.

Lenin, however, whilst agreeing on the increasingly capitalist economic nature of Russia, emphasised its remaining semi-Asiatic and despotic political features. Here we can see a return to his more Political understanding of the situation Social Democrats faced in Tsarist Russia. First, "bourgeois-democratic revolutions in Western, continental Europe... {had by 1871 drawn} to a close… {However} in Eastern Europe and Asia the period of bourgeois democratic revolutions did not begin until 1905” (155). Therefore, Lenin’s difference with Luxemburg lay in his placing of the Tsarist Empire in the less developed ‘second world’. This had important implications for his views on the importance of ‘the right of national self-determination’.

Furthermore, the 1905 Revolution triggered off revolts, particularly in the Persia and the Ottoman Empire. Revolution also occurred in the Chinese Empire and a republic was declared there in 1911 - a fact Lenin then used to pour scorn on those who talked about the ‘backward’ East (156). Later, in response to the growing worldwide resistance to the First World War, Lenin was to further divide his 'second world'. He created a new 'third world', which now included "the semi-colonial countries, such as China, Persia and Turkey, and all the colonies {where} the bourgeois-democratic movements have hardly begun or have a long way to go” (157).

Following upon his post-1905 Revolution break with much orthodox Marxism, over the role of the peasantry in revolutions, Lenin began to look to wider forces to help bring about change, not only in the Tsarist Empire but, also later, in this new ‘third world’ of colonies and semi-colonies. Luxemburg, in contrast, looked only to effective bourgeois forces, spurred on by Social Democracy, to bring about capitalist modernisation within those relatively undeveloped areas still trapped in her ‘second world’.

Thus, Luxemburg supported the struggle by bourgeois-led national movements, such as those of the Greeks, and the Armenians in eastern Anatolia, against the Ottoman Empire (158). This empire still lay in the ‘second world’ on the other side of the necessary ‘level of economic development’ divide, along with the rest of the East and the colonies. However, Luxemburg was not persuaded of the possibility of a new Indian nation-state. This was probably because of the massive social weight of the peasantry compared to the incipient Indian bourgeoisie. She doubted the ability of the small Indian bourgeoisie to unite the disparate peoples of the sub-continent (159). Without a dominant bourgeoisie she thought the Indian national movement was neither likely to be successful, nor to lead to any real progress.

Luxemburg's championing of ‘more civilised' nations and nationalities (i.e. ones with a significant bourgeoisie) trapped in 'less civilised' pre-modern states, combined with her uncertainty about the possibilities of independent development in 'less civilised’ countries fighting imperialism, could bring her allies from the Social Democratic Right (160). When Luxemburg wrote an article championing national struggles in Crete

(Greece) and Armenia, Eduard Bernstein wrote, "From the contents of this article the reader will be able to judge how much I agree with the arguments and conclusion of that excellent work" (161).

Luxemburg also wrote extensively about the protracted dissolution of ‘non-civilised’ societies, based on primitive communism. She closely studied recent anthropological research. Whilst vocal in her denunciation of the brutality of this process under Imperialism, Luxemburg could see little positive reason to resist the ‘inevitable’ capitalist development. She hoped that enough descendents would survive the onslaught, so that they could form part of a new working class (162).

In line with much orthodox Marxist thinking at the time, Luxemburg was also dismissive of the role of the peasantry. She saw them mainly as a feudal relic, which needed to be broken-up by a modernising capitalism. She argued that, “the peasant class stands in today’s bourgeois society outside of culture, constituting rather a ‘piece of barbarism’ surviving in that culture. The peasant is always and a priori a culture of social barbarism, a basis of political reaction, doomed by historical evolution” (163). This was to have considerable bearing on her view of national movements.

In adopting this position, Luxemburg drew heavily upon historical stance she understood had been taken by the early Marx and Engels. She mentioned Engels’ dismissive attitude, in 1847, towards, “the struggle of the early Swiss against Austria… They won their victory over the civilisation of that period, but as a punishment they were cut off from the whole later progress of civilisation” (164). She wrote that the Swiss “movement formally bore all the external characteristics of democratism, and even revolutionism, since the people were rebelling against absolute rule under the slogan of a popular republic” (165). Yet to Luxemburg, this movement was still ‘reactionary’, since it was an “uprising of fragmented peasant cantons… {whereas} the absolutism of the princely {Hapsburg} power, moving towards centralism, was *at that time* an element of historical progress” (166). Obviously, Luxemburg had more contemporary struggles in mind, when she invoked this example. Furthermore, she could also draw upon the rather narrow view of historical national developments still present in some of Engels’ later writings (167).

Interestingly though, it was to Marx's and Engels' main political adversary within the German Socialist movement, Ferdinand Lassalle, to whom Luxemburg turned in her final put-down of the role of the peasantry. "Lassalle regarded the peasant wars… in Germany in the sixteenth century against the rising princely power, as signs of reaction" (168). She appears not to have recognised that Engels had a far more sympathetic attitude towards the German peasants and Anabaptism in this struggle (169).

Lassalle was the main propagator, within the German socialist movement, of the 'iron law of wages' (170). Luxemburg wanted her own 'iron law of progress', which seemed to privilege a small 'band' of historical actors. This had a major impact on wider Radical Left thinking. Its dogmatic and fatalistic determinism could repel those otherwise attracted to Social Democracy. For example, the Socialist Labour Party (SLP) in Great Britain was an early example of a group partly influenced by Radical Left thinking (171). The SLP was a breakaway from the Social Democratic Federation (SDF). One of the SLP's leading theoreticians, John Carstairs Matheson, a Scottish member of Gaelic-speaking origins, was a vocal supporter of the Highland Clearances on the grounds they helped to create a new industrial working class.

However, John Maclean, on the Left of the SDF, had little sympathy for the anti-human and fatalistic mode of thinking, which could underpin some Radical Left thinking. He supported the Highland Land League in its struggle to defend and promote crofters' rights (172). Unlike Connolly (who joined the SLP for a period before leaving) Maclean was not attracted to the SLP at this time. Its leader Daniel de Leon (173), like Luxemburg, imposed an external, unilinear framework on historical development. Connolly though also came to oppose de Leon. He continued to show a great deal of sympathy with small tenant struggles. He took forward the social republicanism of Michael Davitt (174), the Irish Land League leader, giving it a new socialist republican grounding. Both Connolly and Maclean (after 1919) were supporters of an 'Internationalism from Below' approach.

It was Lenin's understanding of the role of other exploited classes in revolutionary struggles, which helped to place the Bolsheviks in a much stronger position than Luxemburg's SDPKPL when the next International

Revolutionary Wave developed from 1916. Luxemburg, and the whole Radical Left, viewed the peasantry as a hostile class force. This led to the SDPKPL's lack of a suitable agrarian programme for Poland. Combined with its rejection of the Polish national democratic movement's struggle for independence, this contributed to her organisation's relative isolation and to its inability to make more substantial gains in the International Revolutionary Wave that began in 1916.

viii) Luxemburg and Lenin clash over 'the right of nations to self-determination' and national autonomy

Luxemburg and Lenin also developed their own theories of nationality, nations and nationalism, using those already developed by Kautsky. These predated their later works on Imperialism. The celebrated polemic between Lenin and Luxemburg, over 'the right to self-determination', began with reference to national problems within the major European imperial states themselves, particularly the Tsarist Empire, rather than in their colonies.

Yet, before his experiences of the 1905 Revolution, Lenin originally shared what later became the Radical Left's position, mainly associated with Luxemburg. In 1903, Lenin wrote, *The National Question in Our Programme* (175). Here he pointed out that, "The Social-Democratic Party considers it to be its positive and principal task to further the self-determination of the proletariat of each nationality rather than that of peoples or nations" (176). This viewpoint, confining 'the right of self-determination' only to the proletariat, was to strongly re-emerge amongst the international Radical Left during the International Revolutionary Wave, after the February 1917 Revolution. Lenin then had to put a lot of effort into opposing Bolsheviks who supported what had once been his own position.

The 1905 Revolution gave Lenin a greater appreciation of the role of national movements in the revolutionary process. This followed his break from most orthodox Marxists with regard to the role of the peasantry. Therefore, by 1907, Lenin gave his full support to the ninth point of the agreed programme to reunite the RSDLP – "That all nationalities forming the state have the right to self-determination" (177).

Luxemburg wrote a major series of articles, *The National Question and Autonomy* (178), between 1908-9 to oppose 'the right of national self-determination', particularly in the RSDLP's programme. These articles provided a very comprehensive historical treatment of the 'National Question' as interpreted in her version of orthodox Marxism. Although the focus was on the Tsarist Empire, and Poland in particular, a lot of evidence was presented from the Austro-Hungarian and Prussian-German Empires too.

In these articles Luxemburg attacked 'the right of nations to self-determination'. "What is especially striking about this formula is the fact that it doesn't represent anything specifically connected with socialism nor with the politics of the working class" (179). She claimed that the 1896 London Congress of the Second International had merely adopted "the complete right of all nations to self determination" formulation (180) as a rhetorical flourish in its preamble to the real policy, which followed. This "calls upon the workers of all countries suffering national oppression to enter the ranks of international Social Democracy, and to work for the realisation of its principles and goals" (181).

Luxemburg's and Lenin's differences over the geographical boundaries of the 'second world', and the role of the peasantry, contributed to their division over the 'right of self determination'. They both began by believing that Russia (and especially Tsarist Poland) was now firmly on the path of capitalist development. Furthermore, they both thought that the situation was now quite different to the period when Marx and Engels had declared their original support for Polish independence.

Luxemburg even recognised that there was still a genuine issue of national consciousness in Poland. She thought that the Polish bourgeoisie represented one of the most advanced social and economic classes in the relatively backward Tsarist Empire. The Polish bourgeoisie desired greater political freedom to pursue their interests, but they were not interested in full political independence, since they valued the wider market, which the Tsarist Empire provided for them. Therefore, Luxemburg thought that Polish national autonomy, within a future unitary

Russian republic, would satisfy the Polish bourgeoisie's demands (182).

In contrast to the situation in Poland, Luxemburg dismissed most other national movements in the Tsarist Empire, such as the Lithuanians, Byelorussians and Ukrainians, because they were largely peasant based. She followed the Marxist orthodoxy of many in the Second International in seeing the peasantry as a largely reactionary political force. If they expressed any support for nationalism, it could only be for "the quite passive preservation of national peculiarities… speech, mores, dress and… religion" (183). Given the very different class nature of the various national movements in the Tsarist Empire, in 1908 Luxemburg thought that the RSDLP should jettison the outdated, over-generalised, "'right of nations' which is… nothing more than a metaphysical cliché of the type of 'the rights of man'" (184).

Lenin, though, was not prepared to drop the demand for 'the right of national self-determination'. Nevertheless, it was not until early 1914 that Lenin took up the cudgels against Luxemburg in *The Right of Nations to Self Determination* (185). Lenin had more pressing political battles to pursue, in the period of reaction following the defeat of the revolution in Russia. However, Luxemburg's theories began to inspire an international Radical Left and started to make inroads amongst the Bolsheviks and other revolutionary Social Democrats.

To counter Luxemburg, Lenin emphasised the remaining semi-Asiatic, political despotic features of the Tsarist Empire. In those parts of the 'first world' agreed by Luxemburg and Lenin, "to seek the right of self-determination in the programmes of West-European socialists... is to betray one's ignorance of the ABC of Marxism… {But} it is precisely... because Russia... {is} passing through this period {of bourgeois democratic revolution{placing it in the 'second world'} that we must have the clause in our programme on the right of nations to self-determination" (186).

However, Luxemburg had provided a further reason, apart from the lack of a developed bourgeoisie, and the politically reactionary nature of the peasantry, to oppose 'the right of national self-determination' for the oppressed nationalities of the Tsarist Empire. She pointed to the small size of many of the national minorities, and the ethnically mixed nature of many of the territories in which they lived (187).

Partly to answer such objections, Lenin, and the Bolshevik Duma members in Tsarist Russia, made a number of proposals to remove the oppression of national minorities in 1913. (188). They advocated the rights of small territorial nationalities. Lenin suggested groups as small as 50,000 people could form autonomous areas within a larger unitary Russian state. The language of the main nationality in each autonomous area should be used as the lingua franca there (189). In addition, members of (even very) small non-territorial national minorities could claim the right to have supplementary educational provision (language, history, etc.) provided in, or in close association with, the state schools, wherever they lived, whether it was in Russian, non-Russian, or mixed (particularly city) areas of the state (190). Lenin believed that it was inevitable that these nationalities would want the Russian language taught too, in order to more effectively communicate with others in the ethnically mixed industrial workforces, and in wider commercial transactions, social interactions and conducting political activities.

Luxemburg thought that, following the western European experience, the majority of the ‘peasant nations’, or more accurately the pre-nation groups, would become assimilated into the majority nation. There was no need to offer such ‘nationalities’ their own autonomous territories. Lenin, in contrast, thought that even if ‘nations’ were largely peasant in their make-up, and fairly circumscribed in their geographical area, a case could be made for their national autonomy.

Yet, Lenin still undoubtedly thought, like Luxemburg, that the long-term future for most nationalities, particularly the smaller ones, would become assimilated into the larger nations. Following Kautsky, he welcomed this too. Lenin asserted that, with "mature capitalism", the predominant trend "is the development and growing frequency of international intercourse in every form {and} the breakdown of national barriers..." (191). “Capitalism’s world-historical tendency {is to} obliterate national distinctions, and to *assimilate* nations - a tendency which manifests itself more and more powerfully with every passing decade and is one of the greatest driving forces transforming capitalism into socialism” (192).

One aspect of Lenin’s adoption of Kautsky’s thinking revealed here is his emphasis on the needs of ‘economic man’, not of fully emancipated human beings with their wider cultural, as well as material, needs. Many orthodox Marxists believed that, if a given socio-economic system could potentially fulfill people’s material requirements, then a cultural hankering after ‘non-historical’ languages and culture was not only unnecessary, but also reactionary. Yet, despite holding to a more mechanical economic reductionist theory of necessary and inevitable ‘progress’ under capitalism, Luxemburg, with her deeply felt humanism, still understood human motivations. "To the credit of mankind, history has universally established that even the most inhumane material oppression is not able to provoke such wrathful, fanatical rebellion and rage as the suppression of intellectual life in general or as religious or national oppression" (193). There is the same ambiguity in this statement as in Engels' description of the Taipeng Rebellion (194), but the key phrase nevertheless is, "to the credit of mankind". The problem was that this more sympathetic observation was not properly integrated into her theory of human liberation.

The quest for greater freedom – emancipation, liberation and self-determination (in its widest sense) - is part of the human condition, even if expressed in different forms, with different needs and demands, under changing conditions of economic and social existence. Non-official, or minority languages, and their associated cultures, can also transmit different national groups’ accumulated lived experience. This might include a resistance to oppression, and an assertion of democratic aspirations, which give pride and meaning to people’s lives. James Connolly had already clearly expressed this point (195). Yet this was not fully recognised by Luxemburg, and would likely have been written off by Lenin, at this time, as another example of "refined nationalism" (196). Luxemburg’s and Lenin’s own positions were similar to that Marx recognised in the French cosmopolitans (197). They tended to view longer-term progress, for much of the area encompassed by the Tsarist Empire, as tied up with the extension of the Russian language.

Nevertheless, Lenin did not apply his "refined nationalism" adage (May 10th. 1914) to his own writings just a few months later following the breakout of the First World War (December 12th. 1914). “Is a sense of national pride alien to us, Great-Russian class conscious proletarians? Certainly not! We love our language and our country...”! (198)

One thing, which continued to unite Luxemburg, the wider Radical Left and Lenin, was their support for the organisational principle of ‘one state, one party’. They claimed argued that this was the organisational basis on which the Second International was formed, although here it was usually treated as an ideal to be attained with certain admissible exceptions. And even Lenin did not extend this principle to Finland, or always to Poland, and the Bolsheviks had acted differently towards Hummet in Baku.

To give this ‘one state, one party’ theoretical underpinning, Luxemburg and Lenin drew upon Kautsky’s theories of ‘progressive’ national assimilation under capitalism. They were both very critical of Bauer and his policy of ‘national-cultural autonomy’, which they argued undermined this organisational principle. This was partly because Bauer’s SDPO had been reorganised on the basis of a federation of national parties. In 1910, the Czech Social Democrats declared their independence of the SDPO. There was also a break-up of the trade unions in the Hapsburg Austrian Empire along nationality lines (199).

Luxemburg, using Kautsky as an authority, criticised the SDPO’s national ‘cultural autonomy’ policy in *The National Question and Autonomy* (200). Bauer’s policy proposals were also subjected to attack by others, who were later also to form part of the Radical Left - SDPO member, Joseph Strasser, in his *The Worker and the Nation* and the Dutch socialist, Anton Pannekoek, in his *Class Struggle and the Nation*, both written in 1912 (201).

Luxemburg drew upon the experience of Jews in Western Europe, and the major cities of Central and Eastern Europe, when she attacked the notion of territorial and cultural autonomy for ‘non-historical’ nations. “Capitalist development does not lead to a separation of Jewish culture, but acts in exactly the opposite direction, leading to the assimilation of the bourgeois, urban intelligentsia” (202). To Luxemburg, it was only the backward, small town or ‘shetl’ culture many petty bourgeois Jews still adhered to in eastern Europe that perpetuated any remaining Jewish national sentiment. This, in some ways, was parallel to her thinking on peasants trapped in a backward rural culture. In particular, she was dismissive of the "'developing Yiddish culture'… which can not be taken seriously" (203). This also represented a swipe at the cultural autonomists in the Jewish Bund, an organisation affiliated to the RSDLP.

In 1913, the Bolsheviks produced their own major theoretical work on the issue of nationalities, nations and nationalism. Josef Stalin wrote *Marxism and the National Question* (204), primarily as an attack on the notion of 'national cultural autonomy'. This policy, along with the notion of a political federation of nationality-based states, was having some resonance amongst certain sections of the Social Democrats in the Russian Empire. It had been taken up by the Bund, especially after the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave, and was getting increased support in the Caucasian section of the RSDLP, and amongst other non-Russian Social Democrats outside RSDLP, e.g. the Ukrainians.

Stalin defined a nation as "an historically constituted, stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture" (205). This eclectic mix tried to bridge the gap between the Positivist Materialist approach of Kautsky, with its drawing together of "language, territory {and} economic life", and the Idealist notions of Bauer, with its resort to "psychological make-up" and "community of culture".

Although Stalin invoked history, he used it to justify the evolutionary formation of a stable national community. Even Bauer's conception of the historical nation allowed for a more open and contested understanding than Stalin's. Bauer wrote that, "There is no moment when a nation's history is complete. As events transform this character... they subject it to continual changes... Through this process national character also loses its supposed *substantial character*, that is the illusion that national character is a fixed element" (206). What is missing from Stalin's and Bauer's definitions, though, is the constantly class-divided, and hence politically contested, nature of nationalities, nations and nation-states.

Unlike Lenin at this time, Stalin considered federation to be an acceptable form of self-determination, but not as an immediate practical policy for the Tsarist Russian Empire. This was because Stalin's article distinguished between the situation found in Hapsburg Austria-Hungary and other countries, where constitutional parliamentary politics had some real life, and that found in Tsarist Russia, where the Duma was a ‘democratic’ sham fronting the tsar’s autocratic rule (207). In addition, Stalin also supported the right of national minorities to have their own schools (208), whereas Lenin wanted people from the national majority and all the national minorities in a particular autonomous area to be taught in the same school (209).

Lenin though still opposed to federation on principle. This is highlighted in his letter to Armenian Bolshevik, Stepan Shahumyan (210). Stalin, the Georgian Bolshevik and fellow Caucasian, had influenced Shahumyan, with his suggestion that federation was a possible form of self-determination. But Lenin, in his reply to Shahumyan, stated that, “We are opposed to *federation*. We support the Jacobins against the Girondins... The right of self-determination... does not imply the right to federation. Federalism means an association of equals, an association that demands a *common* agreement. How can *one* side have a right to demand that the other side should *agree* with it? That is absurd. We are opposed to federation in principle, it loosens economic ties, and is unsuitable for a single state. You want to secede? All right, go to the devil... You don’t want to secede? In that case, excuse me, but don’t decide for me; don’t think that you have a ‘*right*’ to federation” (211).

Therefore, Lenin dismissed any fraternal overtures towards greater voluntary unity, effectively saying it’s a choice between unity on dominant nation terms or economic catastrophe, take it or leave it - some attempt to bring about greater unity! However, by 1914, Lenin was to look more favourably on the notion of territorial federation when national oppression was an issue (212).

x) Lenin on the “democratic and socialist element” in national culture and the case of Norway

Nevertheless, Lenin did make a significant point which went beyond Kautsky's Positivist-Materialist, Bauer’s Idealist, and Stalin’s eclectic definitions of nations and nationalities. Lenin added something to the distinction between nation and nationality first outlined by Engels (213).

He highlighted the class-divided nature of nations and nationalities, and the socio-cultural and political divide this led to.

"The *elements* of democratic and socialist culture are present, if only in rudimentary form, in *every* national culture, since in every nation there are toiling and exploited masses, whose conditions give rise to the ideology of democracy and socialism. But *every* nation also possesses a bourgeois culture (and most nations a reactionary clerical culture as well) in the form, not merely of 'elements' but of the *dominant* culture. Therefore, the general 'national culture' is the culture of the landlords, the clergy and the bourgeoisie" (214).

Lenin emphasised the existence of these two contrasting cultures, in both nations and nationalities. He pointed out that, "There is the Great Russian culture of the Purishkeviches, Guchkovs and Struves {reactionaries and liberals} - but there is also the Great Russian culture typified in the names of Chernyshevsky {democrat} and Plekhanov {socialist}. There are the same two cultures in the Ukraine as there are in Germany, in France {all nations}, among the Jews {a nationality}, and so forth" (215). However, at this time, Lenin was still supporting the assimilation of non-Russian language speakers. So, in a revolutionary democratic future, he envisaged a decline in the number of national cultures, not a new wider culture based on 'Internationalism from Below'.

However, Lenin also developed another line of thought, which broke more decisively from virtually all of orthodox Marxism's underlying assumptions. He turned to the example of Norway where, "despite the very extensive autonomy which Norway enjoyed (she had her own parliament, etc.), there was constant friction between Norway and Sweden for many decades after the union the Norwegians strove hard to throw off the yoke of the Swedish aristocracy" (216).

In a poll with 80% participation, conducted by the autonomous Norwegian Parliament in 1905, 368,200 people had voted for independence from Sweden, with only 184 against. Somewhat coyly, Lenin assumed, "that the Norwegian socialists left it an open question, as to what extent the autonomy of Norway gave sufficient scope to wage class struggle freely, or to what extent the eternal friction and conflicts with the Swedish aristocracy hindered the freedom of economic life" (217).

Long before the referendum, any Social Democratic party had to clearly ascertain the wishes of the people, especially of the working class and small farmers. Given the eventual miniscule 'No' vote, for the existing state of affairs, this was unlikely to have been a problem. Only then could such a party have given a clear lead in the struggle for political independence, by giving it a specifically socialist republican orientation.

Lenin's coyness was partly tied up with his remaining gratefulness towards Luxemburg. She was the most consistent non-Russian and, even better, specifically Polish, supporter of a 'one-state, one party' view. Lenin needed her example to buttress his position in the RSDLP against a whole host of challenges. However, leaving the policy of 'self determination for Poland' to his Polish allies to decide came at an eventual heavy political cost. The counter example of Norwegian independence was still so glaring, that Lenin's elementary stating of the facts completely undermined his purported support for 'internationalism' if it were ever applied to Poland. Russians should support independence if the Poles voted 'Yes', but it would be better if the Poles, themselves, voted 'No'.

Lenin went on - but he did not berate socialists for becoming involved in the struggle for Norwegian independence. His epigones from the dominant nation, social chauvinist school, and the Radical Left would most likely have called upon Swedish and Norwegian workers to turn their backs on such 'nationalist division-mongering'. Instead, Lenin wrote that, "After Norway seceded, the class-conscious workers of Norway would naturally have voted for a republic. (Since the majority of the Norwegian nation was in favour of a monarchy while the proletariat wanted a republic, the Norwegian proletariat was, generally speaking, confronted with the alternative: either revolution, if conditions were ripe for it or submission to the will of the majority and prolonged agitation and propaganda work)" (218).

Lenin then went further still. "Their complete fraternal class solidarity *gained* from the Swedish workers' recognition of the right of the Norwegians to secede… The dissolution of the ties imposed on Norway by the monarchs of Europe and the Swedish aristocracy strengthened the ties between Norwegian and Swedish workers" (219). Such solidarity could not be achieved by the Swedish Social Democrats' prior dictation of the form that any future unity should take.

In his enthusiasm to dismiss Luxemburg's opposition to 'the right of self determination', Lenin also turned to Marx's writings on Ireland. After quoting extensively, he finished up with a flourish. "If the Irish and English proletariat had not accepted Marx's policy and had not made the secession of Ireland their slogan, this would have been the worst sort of opportunism, a neglect of their duties as democrats and socialists, and a concession to *English* reaction and the *English* bourgeoisie" (220). Here Lenin slides from his more usual recognition of the 'right of self determination' to the advocacy of "secession".

Lenin now had to overcome his earlier argument, which placed Norway and Ireland in the 'first world', where the issue of self-determination should no longer have been an issue for these particular nations. This sort of dispute should only arise in Lenin's 'second world', where democratic rights were violently trampled upon and meaningful autonomy suppressed. However, he now came up with a new argument. He pointed out that Sweden was a "mixed national state" (221). However, this argument applied to other states in Lenin's 'first world', including the UK and Prussia-Germany, especially in relation to Alsace -Lorraine.. Lenin had stretched his basic theoretical positions to near breaking point. He was to stretch them further still, after the impact of the Dublin Rising in 1916. But Lenin's continued adherence to 'one state, one party' meant he was unable to fully break from the limitations this imposed.

xi) Summary of the impact of the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave on Social Democratic politics

a) The 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave spread out from its epicentre in Russia. The working class, for the first time, was in the lead of a state-wide revolutionary offensive. The impact of this revolutionary wave led to a new Left challenge in the other European Social Democratic parties

and the Second International, where, under the influence of 'High Imperialism' the Right had been advancing.

b) A second potentially revolutionary centre emerged in the USA, with the formation Industrial Workers of the World in 1905. This revolutionary Syndicalist union organised migrant and black workers and declared its opposition to wage slavery. James Connolly, one of its founders, was to take this experience with him to Ireland.

c) The 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave widened the geographical area of revolutionary experience, which revolutionary social democrats could draw upon, particularly in Asia. Revolutionary social democrats began to give support to movements there both for independence and against, either archaic dynasties or, colonial powers. However, there was still relatively little thought given to political organisation in these areas.

d) The 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave raised issues over the role of the peasantry and national democratic movements both in the Tsarist Russian Empire and in the Ottoman Empire and wider Balkans, the Persian and Chinese Empires and in colonial India. The orthodox Marxists' assumed paths of capitalist and nation-state development were found to be wanting.

e) Karl Kautsky wrote *Socialism and Colonial Policy* to challenge the Prussian-German Right after the 1907 'Hottentot election' in which the SDPD lost many of its Reichstag seats. In its attitude towards colonies of exploitation' and 'colonies of work' it left an ambiguous legacy, particularly towards 'non-historic' peoples.

f) Otto Bauer emerged as the main Austro-Marxist leader, producing his key work, *The Nationalities Question and Social Democracy* to provide a theoretical basis for an Austria state of federated nations and for national cultural

autonomy. This also underpinned the SDPO's policy for maintaining the territorial integrity of Hapsburg Austria. The idea of federalism and national cultural autonomy were also to have a considerable influence on the Bund, and Social Democratic parties in the Balkans and Tsarist Russia.

g) Although Kautsky and Bauer contended with each other for the orthodox Marxist banner over the 'National Question', they both were trying to uphold the territorial integrity of their respective states. This was a key factor in their break from revolutionary Social Democracy to becoming key figures of the Social Democratic Centre bowing to pressures from the Right in the lead up to the First World War.

h) In the period between the end of the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave and the First World War the Internationalist Left emerged. It had three main components, the Radical Left, most influenced by Luxemburg (but with a distinctive component in the Balkans), the Leninist wing of the Bolsheviks and the 'Internationalists from Below' including James Connolly and Lev Iurkevich.

i) Although Kautsky, Bauer and others developed orthodox Marxist thinking on Imperialism, the two most ambitious works were Rudolf Hilferding's *Finance Capital* written in 1910 and Rosa Luxemburg's *The Accumulation of Capital – A Contribution to an Economic Explanation of Imperialism*, written in 1913. Hilferding's work enjoyed wider support at the time, although he soon followed others in the SDPD in not actively opposing the First World War. Luxemburg's thinking did not allow any progressive role for national democratic opposition in oppressed nations, nor for oppressed nationalities. Support for her theory of Imperialism was largely confined to sections of the Radical Left.

j) Lenin wrote *The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-7.* This provided an analysis of the two paths of capitalist development, the 'Prussian' and the 'American'. This further developed the two paths, conservative and revolutionary, which Marx had already highlighted. In its new form this tended to highlight the difference between economic and social progress flowing from internal national self-development and economic and social retrogression resulting from foreign imperialist domination. Lenin opened up the way to a more sympathetic view of the oppressed nations and nationalities amongst later orthodox Marxists.

k) Both Luxemburg and Lenin adhered to a 'two worlds' view of capitalist development. However, they drew different geographical boundaries between their 'two worlds'. Luxemburg used a more economic reductionist method to define her capitalist and non-capitalist worlds, whereas Lenin used a more Political method to define his distinction.

l) Luxemburg and Lenin opposed Bauer's theories because they undermined their support for one state/one party.

m) Whilst Lenin did not theorise the difference between nations and nationalities, he was able to make a significant theoretical advance, which had implications for both, as well as for a much wider understanding of the path to emancipation and liberation. Lenin highlighted the class-divided nature of all nations and nationalities. He pointed out those "elements of a democratic and socialist culture" in every nation and nationality, which arose because of the existence of the "toiling masses" facing exploitation.

n) Lenin's view of the positive democratic outcome of the struggle for Norwegian independence stands out in contrast to most orthodox Marxist thinking at the time, as well as to much of his own contemporary writing on the Tsarist Empire. The seeds of a possible new revolutionary

democratic resolution of national conflict were evident here. However, the prospects for future growth were held back by the shadow of 'one state, one party' politics. Indeed, this over-riding factor mightily contributed to the persistent failure of Lenin to prevent Radical Left thinking on the issue from swamping sections of the Bolsheviks.

References for Chapter 3

(1) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General_Jewish_Labour_Bund

(2) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialist_Revolutionary_Party

(3) Igor Krivoguz, *The Second International, 1889-1914*, (*TSI*) p. 206 (Progress Publishers,1989, Moscow)

(4) ibid.

(5) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrial_Workers_of_the_World#Founding

(6) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pinkerton_(detective_agency)

(7) Melvyn Dobofsky, *We Shall Be All - A History of The Industrial Workers of the World*, p.9 (Quadrangle/The New York Times Book Co, 1969, New York)

(8) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrial_Workers_of_the_World#Founding

(9) ibid.

(10) Ivor Krivoguz, *TSI*, op. cit. p.206

(11) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1907_Belfast_Dock_strike#The_lockout

(12) Ivor Krivoguz, *TSI*, op. cit. p.209

(13) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russo_Japanese_War#
Campaign_of_1904

(14) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bloody_Sunday_(1905)#Events_of_
Sunday_22_January

(15) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bloody_Sunday_(1905)#
Prelude

(16) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Republic_of_Guria#Formation_of_
the_Republic

(17) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Republic_of_Guria#1905_
Revolution

(18) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian_Peasants_uprising_ of_1905–6

(19) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1907_Romanian_Peasants%_27 revolt

(20) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revolution_in_the_Kingdom_
of_Poland_(1905–07)#The_revolution

(21) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revolution_in_the_Kingdom_
of_Poland_(1905–07)#Aftermath

(22) Han B de Weydenthal, *The Communists of Poland – An Historical Outline*, p.4 (Hoover Institution Press, 1978b Stanford, California)

(23) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Combat_Organization_of_the_
Polish_Socialist_Party#History

(24) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Józef_Piłsudski#Early_life

(25) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1905_Russian_Revolution#
Finland

(26) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1907_Finnish_parliamentary_election

(27) Igor Krivoguz, *TSI*, op. cit. p. 211

(28) Max Engman, *Finns and Swedes in Finland* in *Ethnicity and Nation Building in the Nordic World*, editor, Sven Tagil, p. 199 (C. Hurst & Co, 1995, London)

(29) Volume 2, Chapter 1B.

(30) Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen – The Modernization of Rural France 1870-1914* (Stanford University, 1976, Standord, California)

(31) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massimo_d%27Azeglio#Writings_and_publications

(32) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revolution_in_the_Kingdom_of_Poland_(1905–07)#Aftermath

(33) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Okhrana#Overview

(34) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black_Hundreds

(35) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hamidian_massacres#The_Hamidiye

(36) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Armenian_Revolutionary_Federation

(37) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_Democrat_Hunchakian_Party#Activities_in_the_Ottoman_Empire

(38) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internal_Macedonian_Revolutionary_Organization

(39) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ilinden–Preobrazhenie_

Uprising

(40) https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00263206.2019.1566124 – The events of July 1908

(41) ibid.

(42) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1908_Ottoman_general_election

(43) Leon Trotsky, *The War Correspondence of Leon Trotsky – The Balkan Wars, 1912-15*, p.13 (Pathfinder Press, 1980, New York)

(44)

(45) Mark Mazower, *Salonica – City of Ghosts, Christians, Muslims and Jews 1430-1950*, pp. 287 (Harper Perennial, 2004. London)

(46) ibid. p. 289

(47) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ottoman_countercoup_of_1909# Counterrevolution

(48) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albanian_revolt_of_1912# Events

(49) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Independent_Albania#London_ Treaty

(50) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jadid

(50) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1906_Russian_legislative_ election#Composition_of_the_1st_State_Duma

(51) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jadid#Central_Asia

(52) https://www. tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00263206. 2019. 1566124 – Influences on the Young Turks

(53) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Young_Bukharians

(54) Alexandre A Bennigsen and S. Enders Wimburg, *Muslim National*

Communism in the Soviet Union: A Revolutionary Strategy for the Colonial Works, (*MNCitSU*) p. 12 (Pheonix Book, University of Chicago Press, 1979. London)

(55) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Armenian–Tatar_massacres_ of_1905–07

(56) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baku#Discovery_of_oil

(57) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tobacco_Protest

(58) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persian_Constitutional_ Revolution#Background

(59) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persian_Constitutional_ Revolution#First_protests

(60) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persian_Constitutional_ Revolution#Creation_of_the_constitution

(61) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglo-Russian_Convention #Terms

(62) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1908_bombardment_of_the_ Majlis#History

(63) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Triumph_of_Tehran

(64) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khetcho

(65) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yeprem_Khan

(66) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sattar_Khan#Revolutionary

(67) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moderate_Socialists_Party

(68) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baqir_Khan

(69) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian_occupation_of_Tabriz

(70) http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/constitutional-revolution-v

(71) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bal_Gangadhar_Tilak#Indian_National_Congress

(73) Ivar Spector, *The First Russian Revolution – Its Impact on Asia*, p. 100, Prentice-Hall, 1962, Eaglewood Cliffs, New Jersey)

(74) ibid. p.78

(75) ibid. p.81

(76) ibid. pp. 92-3

(77) Volume 2, Chapter 3Ci

(78) https://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1910/theory-practice/index.htm

(79) https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1914/dec/12.ht

(80) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herero_Wars#Rebellion

(81) Richard B. Day and Daniel Gaido, *Discovering Imperialism Social Democracy to World War I*, p. 23 (Haymarket Books, 2011, Chicago)

(82) https://www.marxists.org/archive/kautsky/1907/colonial/index.htm

(83) ibid.

(84) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Otto_Bauer

(85) Book 2, Chapter 1B.v

(86) Otto Bauer, *The Nationalities Question and Social Democracy* (*TNQaSD*) in Tom Bottomore & Patrick Goode, *AM*, op. cit.

(87) ibid. p. 107.

(88) Michael Lowy, *Marx and Engels Cosmopolites* in *Fatherland or Mother Earth?* (*FME*) pp. 48-9, (Pluto Press, 1998, London)

(89) Volume 2, Chapter 1Bi.

(90) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prague#Habsburg_era

(91) Karl Kautsky quoted in Ephraim Nimni, *M&N*, op. cit. p. 49

(92) Ephraim Nimni, *M&N*, op. cit. p. 161

(93) Horace B. Davis, *NSMLTN*, op. cit. p. 153

(94) Michael Lowy, *FME,* op. cit. p. 45

(95) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1907_Cisleithanian_legislative_election#Results

(96) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bohum%C3%ADr_Šmeral#Political_career

(97) Bernard Wheaton, *RSiC,* op. cit. pp. 4-9

(98) ibid. pp. 41-4.

(99) www.marxists.org/kautsky/1914/ultra-imp/indes.htm

(100) Otto Bauer, *TNQaSD,* op. cit. p. 114.

(101) ibid. p. 115

(102) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Working_Union of_Socialist_Parties

(103) Enzo Traverso, *The Marxists and the Jewish Question: The History of a Debate, 1843-1943*, (*TMatJQ*) p. 98 (Humanity

Books, 1994, New York)

(104) ibid.

(105) Horace B. Davis, *NSMLTN*, op. cit. p. 154

(106) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jewish_Socialist_Workers_Party

(107) Enzo Traverso, *TMatJQ,* op.cit. p. 45

(108) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Poale_Zion#Formation_and_early_years

(109) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Society_for_Promoting_Christian_Knowledge#SSPCK_in_Scotland

(110) Alexandre A Bennigsen and S. Enders Wimburg, *MNCitSU*, op. cit. p. 12.

(111) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soviet_Central_Asia#Turkestan_Autonomous_Soviet_Socialist_Republic

(112) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bukharan_People%27s_Soviet_Republic

(113) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khorezm_People%27s_Soviet_Republic

(114) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Radek

(115) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georgy_Pyatakov

(116) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nikolai_Bukharin

(117) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herman_Gorter

(118) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antonie_Pannekoek

(119) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dimitrije_Tucović

(120) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serbian_Social_Democratic_Party_(Kingdom_of_Serbia)

(121) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dimitar_Blagoev

(122) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bulgarian_Social_Democratic_Workers%27_Party_(Narrow_Socialists)

(123) *Workers' Spark*. 15.2.1909 in *The Balkan Socialist Tradition – Balkan Socialism and the Balkan Federation 1871-1915*, *Revolutionary History*, (*TBST*) Volume 8, No. 3, pp. 117-9 (Socialist Platform Ltd, 2003, London)

(124) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vlachs

(125) Andreja Zivkovic, *The Balkan Federation and Balkan Social Democracy – Introduction* (*TBDaBSD*) in *TBST* op, cit., p. 152, note 6.

(126) ibid. p. 155.

(127) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christian_Rakovsky

(128) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialist_Workers%27_Federation

(129) Andreja Zivkovic, *TBDaBSD*, ibid. p. 153

(130) Andreja Zivkovic, *The Revolution in Turkey and the Balkan Aftermath* in *TBST*, op. cit. pp. 105-6.

(131) Dimitrije Tucovic, *The First Balkan Conference* in *TBST*, op. cit. pp. 164-6.

(132) Dimitur Blagoev, *The Balkan Conference and the Balkan Federation* in *TBST*, op. cit., pp. 195-8.

(133) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Balkan_War

(134) Dimitrije Tucovic, *Serbia and Albania* in *TBST*, op. cit. p. 224

(135) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_Balkan_War

(136) Dragan Plasvic, *The First World War and the Balkan Federation - Introduction* in *TBST*, op. cit. p. 229

(137) ibid. p. 227

(138) ibid. p. 226

(139) www. marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp-hsc/index.htm

(140) Rudolf Hilferding, *Finance Capital: A Study in the Latest Phase of Capitalist Development* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981, London, Boston and Henley)

(141) Raya Dunayevskaya, *Rosa Luxemburg, Womens' Liberation and Marx's Philosophy of Revolution* (*RLWLMPR*) p. 5 (Harvester Press, 1982, England)

(142) ibid. p. 24

(143) ibid. p. 25

(144) www.marxists.org/luxemburg/1913/accumulation-capital/index.htm

(145) Raya Dunayevskaya, *RLWLMPR*, op. cit. pp. 31-48.
(146) ibid. p. 37

(147) Volume 2, Chapter 3Bii (references 84-5) and Franklin Rosemont, *Karl Marx and the Iroquois*, in *Arsenal – Surrealist Subversion*, p.207 and p. 210 (Back Swan Press, 1989, Chicago)

(148) Vladimir Lenin, *The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-7,* in Lenin, *Alliance of the Working Class and Peasantry* (*AWCP*)

(149) Volume 2, Chapter 2Aiii

(150) Vladimir Lenin, *AWCP*) op, cit. p.181

(151) ibid. p. 182.

(152) ibid. p. 182.

(153) Vladimir Lenin, *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination* (*TRNSD*) in *Questions of National Policy and Proletarian Internationalism* (*QNPPI*), pp. 53-4 (Progress Publishers, 1970, Moscow)

(154) Rosa Luxemburg, *The Polish Question at the International Congress*, in Horace B. Davis, *TNQ*, op. cit. p. 57

(155) Vladimir Lenin, *TRNSD,* in *QNPPI,* op cit. p. 56.

(145) Vladimir Lenin, *Backward Europe and Advanced Asia* in Lenin, *On National Liberation and Social Emancipation* (*ONLSE*) p. 158 (Progress Publishers, 1986, Moscow)

(157) Vladimir Lenin, *Socialist Revolution and Self Determination*, in *ONLSE*, op. cit. pp. 157-8

(158) Rosa Luxemburg, *The National Question and Autonomy (TNQaA)* in Horace B. Davis, (editor) *The National Question, Selected Writings by Rosa Luxemburg* (*TNQ*) p. 114 (Monthly Review Press, 1976, New York

(159) ibid. p. 133

(160) Volume 3, Chapter 2Ev

(161) Eduard Bernstein, *German social democracy and the Turkish disturbances*, in Ephraim Nimni, *Marxism and Nationalism – Theoretical Origins of a Political Crisis*, (*M&N*) p. 67 (Pluto Press, 1991, London)

(162) Rosa Luxemburg, *The Dissolution of Primitive Communism*, pp. 71-110, in *The Rosa Luxemburg Reader*, edited by Peter Hudis & Kevin. B. Anderson (Monthly Review Press, 2004, New York)

(163) Rosa Luxemburg, *TNQaA*, op. cit. p. 264

(164) ibid. p. 119

(165) ibid. p. 120

(166) ibid. p. 121

(167) Volume 2, Chapter 2Dii

(168) Rosa Luxemburg, *TNQaA)* in *TNQ*, op. cit. p. 121

(169) Volume 2, Chapter 2Bi, and Frederick Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany* (*Lawrence & Wishart*, *1969*, *London*)

(170) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/iron_law_of_wages

(171) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialist_Labour_Party_(UK,_ 1903)

(172) James D. Young, *John Maclean - Clydeside Socialist*, p. 27 (Clydeside Press, 1992, Glasgow)

(173) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daniel_De_Leon

(174) Volume Two, Chapter 4ii

(175) www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1903/jul/15.htm

(176) Vladimir Lenin, *The National Question in Our Programme*, in *ONLSE*, op. cit. p. 32

(177) Rosa Luxemburg, *TNQaA*, in Horace B. Davis, *THQ*, op. cit. p. 102

(178) www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1909/national-question/index.htm

(179) Rosa Luxemburg, *TNQaA*, in Horace B. Davis, *THQ*, op. cit. p. 102.

(189) ibid. p. 107

(181) ibid. p. 107.

(182) Rosa Luxemburg, *TNQaA*, in *TNQ*, op. cit. pp. 255-9

(183) ibid. pp. 263-4

(184) ibid. p. 110

(185) https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1914/self-det/

(186) ibid. p. 56.

(187) Rosa Luxemburg, *TNQaA*, in *TNQ*, op. cit. p. 274-80

(188) Vladimir Lenin, *Bill on the Equality of Nations and the Safeguarding of the Rights of National Minorities*, in *NLSE*, op. cit. pp. 120-1

(189) Vladimir Lenin, *CRotNQ*, in *NLSE*, op. cit. p. 115

(190) ibid. pp. 109-11

(191) ibid. p. 94

(192) ibid. p. 95

(193) Rosa Luxemburg quoted in Horace B. Davis (editor) Introduction, *TNQ*, op. cit. p. 23

(194) Volume 2, Chapter 1Bii, reference 33

(195) Volume 3, Chapter 2Di., reference 218

(196) Vladimir Lenin, *Corrupting the Workers with Refined Nationalism*, in *NLSE*, op. cit. pp. 122-4

(197) Volume 2, Chapter 1Cii

(198) Vladimir Lenin, *On the National Pride of the Great Russians*, in *NLSE*, op. cit. p. 126

(199) Horace B. Davis, *NSMTN*, op. cit. pp. 143-9

(200) Rosa Luxemburg, in Horace B. Davis (editor) *TNQ*, op. cit. pp. 103-7

(201) Ronaldo Munck, *DDMN*, op. cit. pp. 57-60

(202) Rosa Luxemburg, *TNQaA*, in Horace B. Davis, *THQ*, op. cit. p. 267

(203) ibid, p. 267

(204) Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question* in *Marxism and the National-Colonial Question* (*MNCQ*) (Proletarian Publishers, 1975, San Francisco)

(205) ibid. p. 22

(206) Otto Bauer quoted in Michael Lowy, *FME*, op. cit. p. 47

(207) Joseph Stalin, *MNCQ*, op. cit. pp. 44-5

(208) ibid. p. 91

(209) Vladimir Lenin, *CRotNQ*, in *ONLSE*, op. cit. pp. 110-1

(210) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stepan_Shaumian

(211) Vladimir Lenin, *A Letter to S.G. Shahumyan*, 6.12.1913, in *NLSE*, op. cit., p. 83

(212) Vladimir Lenin, *Proletariat and the Right to Self Determination*, in O*NLSE*, op. cit. p.146

(213) Volume 2, Chapter 2A

.

(214) Vladimir Lenin, *CRotNQ*, in *ONLSE*, op. cit. p. 91

(215) ibid., p. 99

(216) Vladimir Lenin, *TRNSD*, in *QNPPI*, op. cit. p. 77.

(217) ibid. p. 78

(218) ibid. p. 78

(219) ibid. p. 79

(220) ibid. p. 92

(221) ibid. p. 75

3. PURSUING AN 'INTERNATIONALISM FROM BELOW' STRATEGY BETWEEN THE TWO INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY WAVES

A. The further development of 'Internationalism from Below'– James Connolly

i) Connolly uses some parallel arguments to Lenin on the "socialist and democratic element" in his *History of Irish Labour*

In the pre-First World War period, the most significant Second International debate amongst orthodox Marxists over the 'National Question' was seen to be that between Kautsky and Bauer. Prior to the First World War, both Luxemburg and Lenin wanted their writings on the 'National Question' to be seen as a contribution to the doctrines of orthodox Marxism. But it is only since the Bolshevik Revolution that Lenin's writings largely displaced Kautsky's as the new Marxist orthodoxy. In the post-1917 period, the primary debate on the 'National Question', amongst those uncritical and critical defenders of the Bolshevik-led Revolution, has been between those claiming to uphold Lenin's positions (although often departing from them in practice, and those basing their thinking on Luxemburg's theories.

However, even before the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave, another political trend began to develop, which became part of the International Left, which went on to oppose the First World War. This 'Internationalism from Below' grouping included Kaziermerz Kelles-Kreuz, a Polish Social Democrat. Witnessing Kautsky's and the early Austro-Marxists' response to the 'National Question' in Poland, he anticipated their later likely political trajectory. He died in 1905, but James Connolly was also developing an 'Internationalism from Below' approach. Another key representative of this trend was Lev Iurkevich, a Ukrainian Social Democrat (1).

Connolly had earlier made his own striking contribution to an understanding of Imperialism. In 1897, he anticipated the possibility of Imperialism turning to indirect, neo-colonialist methods of control, if forced to do so by significant political opposition. "If you remove the English army tomorrow and hoist the green flag over Dublin Castle, unless you set about the organisation of the Socialist Republic, your efforts would be in vain. England would still rule you. She would rule you through her capitalists, through her landlords, through her financiers, through the whole array of commercial and individualist institutions she has planted in this country…" (2).

Connolly was living in the USA at the time of the 1904-7 International Revolutionary Wave (3). He has been forced by poverty to emigrate from Ireland in 1903, following his earlier emigration from Edinburgh to Dublin in 1898. He became a founder member of the revolutionary Syndicalist, Industrial Workers of the World. Much of his work was with migrant workers. Connolly saw the need for autonomous political organisation for different migrant groups (and for women workers). He formed the Irish Socialist Federation in the USA and published *The Harp* (4).

Unlike, the pure Syndicalists in the IWW, Connolly also saw the need for political organisation. He became a member of the Daniel de Leon-led Socialist Labour Party and later the Socialist Party of America (SPA) (5). In practice, Connolly oscillated between two different ideas of a party. The first was a Socialist propagandist party, e.g. the ISRP, SLP and later the Socialist Party of Ireland (6). The second was a wider electoral party to directly reflect militant Syndicalism. This was shown in Connolly's support for the SPA, and particularly its leading IWW members Bill Haywood and Eugene Debs. He also supported the Irish Trade Union Council and Labour Party in 1912 (7). He hoped this would become a political reflection if the militant Syndicalist Irish Transport & General Workers Union, of which he became the Belfast organiser on his return to Ireland in 1910. During the 1913 Dublin Lock Out (8) Connolly took a leading part in forming the Irish Citizen Army (9) a workers' militia.

Living in oppressed nations like Poland and Ireland, within wider imperialist empires, led to a focus upon Political or democratic demands. This had led the Kelles Kreuz and Connolly to support national independence, as a strategy to break-up the Tsarist Russian Empire and the

British Empire. Both came up against the problem of Economism. Whereas the now deceased Kelles-Krauz mainly had to deal with the Left form of Economism in Poland represented by Luxemburg; Connolly in Ireland had to challenge a Right form of Economism. This was highlighted in *The Walker/Connolly Controversy* (10) with British Independent Labour Party member, William Walker, in Belfast. And this issue became linked with support for or opposition to 'one state, one party'.

Interestingly, Connolly, in 1911, like Lenin later, used the Norwegian example, in his arguments with the Economists. He debated with Walker, over Irish independence. Connolly quoted Jean Jaures, speaking at Limoges in 1905. "*It is very clear that the Norwegian Socialists who, beforehand, had by their votes, by their suffrages, affirmed the independence of Norway*, would have defended it even by force against the assaults of the Swedish oligarchy... But at the same time that the Socialists of Norway would have been right in defending their national independence, it would have been the right and duty of Swedish Socialists to oppose, even by the proclamation of a general strike, any attempt at violence, at conquest, and annexation made by the Swedish bourgeoisie." (11)

Connolly made other contributions, which also paralleled some of Lenin's thinking. Although Connolly did not face conditions of illegal political work (before the First World War), resistance was habitually dealt with more harshly in Ireland than elsewhere in the UK. Such conditions made it easier to appreciate the need for a Political, rather than an Economist approach.

Lenin later pointed to the "democratic and socialist element" and a dominant "bourgeois… {and} reactionary clerical culture" in every nation (12). However, in 1910 Connolly wrote his *Labour in Irish History*, one of the best attempts, before the First World War, to grapple with a 'two (or more) cultures in a nation' approach (13). He identified first, the English, then the later British imperial, Unionist and Orange monarchist traditions; and secondly, the Stuart, Jacobite, Irish Home Rule, and early Sinn Fein, monarchist and Irish nationalist traditions. To these Connolly counterposed the vernacular communal, the revolutionary democratic, the social republican and the socialist republican traditions in Ireland. Connolly faced hostility from Irish-British Unionists, Irish nationalists, and much of the British Left of the day.

Connolly also strove to unite Catholic and Protestant workers in Ireland. However, he faced the problem of combating the politics of an imperially created, Irish-British 'nationality'. This politics found its main, but not its sole support in the north east of Ireland. Those belonging to this Irish-British imperial 'nationality' saw themselves as part of a wider British 'nation' and Empire. There was no genuine democratic, or socialist element, to the imperialist and unionist politics that united all its wings, from ultra-Toryism to Labourism. Pro-imperialist, social chauvinist, anti-Catholic, Loyalist Orange politics enjoyed considerable support amongst large sections of the Protestant working class, particularly around Belfast. Such thinking bore some resemblance to the politics of the anti-Semitic, Social Christians in Vienna.

Irish nationalist and populist politics also took on its own religio-racial colouring, with its Catholic emphasis on 'Faith and Motherland', and its Celtic 'racial' origins. This turning back, from the United Irishmen, Young Ireland and Irish Republican Brotherhood ideal of a Catholic, Dissenter and Protestant, united Irish nation, came about as the direct consequence of adaptation to British imperialism. An example of this was the formation of the exclusively Catholic, Ancient Order of Hibernians, set up to emulate the exclusively Protestant Orange Order. Therefore, it was not surprising that John Redmond and Joe Devlin, of the nationalist, Irish Parliamentary Party, threw their weight behind the British imperial war effort in 1914 (14). Even Arthur Griffiths, when setting up Sinn Fein in 1905, initially sought a Dual (British/Irish) Monarchy and Empire on the Austro-Hungarian model.

Connolly, however, tried to recreate the original United Irishmen's notion of an Irish nation. He also championed the early vernacular communal, and the later 'democratic and socialist elements', in Ireland's long history, and its more recent nation formation.

ii) Connolly comes up against the limitations of ‘one state/one party’ politics

Luxemburg and Lenin supported the Second International’s ‘one state, one party’ principle (the future orthodox qualification for separate party organisation in the colonies only slowly impinged on Social Democratic consciousness). In contrast to Marx and Engels, they believed that the issue of national and nationality division could only be overcome by having a ‘one state, one party’. Connolly was to come up against the limitations of this policy, in the very context that Marx and Engels had first raised it - Ireland and the UK (15). He opposed ‘one state/one party’ thinking and supported independent political organisation for Irish socialist republicans. After British trade union officials’ betrayal of Irish workers’ struggles, he moved to supporting independent, fighting, Irish trade unions too, including autonomous organisation for women (16).

Luxemburg and Lenin failed to appreciate that ‘one state, one party’ organisation could very easily become the conduit for dominant nation, social chauvinism and for social imperialism. Thus Luxemburg, whilst opposing any Social Democrat joining the then social patriot-dominated PPS, was quite happy to remain in the SPD, which was be dominated in practice, if not in words, by the Right’s advocates of social chauvinism and social imperialism. She had even aided their German chauvinist policies when it came to (dis)organising Polish workers.

Both Lenin and Luxemburg could point to the earliest signs of social patriotism amongst the Poles, Jews and others, but took considerably longer to spot the Great Russian and German social chauvinist and imperialist tendencies in Plekhanov and Kautsky. Whilst parties, which openly displayed or conciliated social chauvinist and social imperialist politics, dominated the Second International, it is not surprising that the Left, in the parties of the smaller and oppressed nations, found considerable difficulty in combating domestic patriotic populism. The resultant subordinate nation, social patriotism got much of its support through its opposition to dominant nation, social chauvinism, sometimes hiding behind the mask of ‘one state/one party’.

Interestingly, Lenin had not addressed the issue of Irish Socialist

Republican Party support for independent Irish representation at the Second International Congress in Paris in 1900. This was very much in breach of the 'one state, one party' principle he advocated. Lenin could not have missed the fact that only the Irish delegation, along with the Bulgarian, voted in its entirety against Kautsky's compromise motion on participation in bourgeois governments. Yet Lenin chose to ignore the ISRP's 'internationalism from below' organisational basis.

It took the 1904-7 Revolutions to highlight the falsity of the divisions artificially created by the rigid application of the 'one state, one party' principle. Luxemburg had refused to countenance work in the PPS, except to disrupt the organisation of its PPDzp affiliate in the SDPD. She supported the SDPLPL. Despite the growth of the PPS-Left in Russian Poland, she had not helped them oppose the PPS's social patriotic leadership. When the revolution in Poland was finally crushed the PPS split, with Pilsudski's social patriotic wing forming the smaller separate PPS-Revolutionary Fraction. The majority in the PPS-Left clearly opposed social patriotism (17). However, disorientated by the growing reaction, the PPS-Left also abandoned the struggle initiated by the now deceased Kelles-Krauz, to develop an 'internationalism from below' approach. Instead, they moved closer to the Radical Left position of the SDPKPL on the 'National Question'.

In the dark days of reaction following the revolution's defeat, Luxemburg continued with her sectarian attitude towards the PPS-Left, despite growing opposition to this stance within her own party, the SDPKPL (18). Disputes also arose over activity in the semi-legal trade unions, which Luxemburg opposed (19). In addition, she increasingly fell out with her new Bolshevik allies, partly due to her support for the Menshevik orthodox Marxist, anti-peasant stance (20) and her wider stance on the 'National Question'. In response, the Bolsheviks increased their backing for the growing internal opposition, to Luxemburg and her allies, inside the SDPKPL.

The SDPKPL split in 1911, leaving the 'one state/one party' position in tatters in Poland (21). There were now, in effect, two SDPKPLs - the exiled Main Praesidium, led by Luxemburg, and the Regional Praesidium - each grappling with the split in their parent RSDLP, in which one faction, the Bolsheviks, was moving towards an independent party, which also went on to organise some Polish members directly. The Bolsheviks would bypass the previously officially approved, autonomous SDPKPL, when this suited Lenin's purpose. Luxemburg could retaliate in kind and became embroiled in the internecine disputes within the RSDLP, falling out with her former allies, Lenin and the Bolsheviks, in the process (22). Meanwhile, beyond the divided RSDLP, and its also divided and subordinate SDPKPL, lay the PPS-Left, which was a component of the International Left, highlighted by its opposition to the First World War, and participation in the Zimmerwald (23) and Kienthal (24) anti-war Social Democratic conferences.

In 1914, Lenin wrote *The Rights of Nations to Self Determination*, an extended attack on Luxemburg's positions. He thought that Luxemburg's total opposition to 'the right of national self-determination' in the Tsarist Empire would undermine any attempt to build an all-Russia Party with Great Russians at its core, but also attractive to non-Russians. Yet, Lenin was still careful to show solidarity in his defence of Luxemburg's right to deny any meaningful support for Polish self-determination. "No Russian Marxist has ever thought of blaming the Polish Social Democrats for being opposed to the secession of Poland. These Social Democrats err only when, like Rosa Luxemburg, they try to deny the right to self-determination in the Programme of the Russian Marxists" (25).

There can be little doubt that the failure of the widened forces of Polish Social Democracy to unite around the approach to Polish independence adopted by Kelles-Kreuz in 1905, contributed to later Polish Communists becoming much more isolated, when the possibility of realising this demand arose at the end of the First World War. Instead, from 1918, the national and social patriots (as in what became Czechoskovakia) took the lead, declaring and mobilising for Polish independence, in alliance with the victorious Allies, particularly France.

Meanwhile, in Ireland, in 1911, Connolly also took on the issue of 'one state/one party'. Walker, the 'gas and water' Socialist, argued that workers in Ireland should join the British-based ILP. In his reply, Connolly argued for international recognition of the Socialist Party of Ireland. Connolly advocated a return to the organisational principle first outlined by Marx and Engels (26). "The Socialist Party of Ireland considers itself the only International Party in Ireland, since its conception of Internationalism is a free federation of free peoples, whereas that of the Belfast branches of the ILP seems scarcely distinguishable from Imperialism, the merging of subjugated peoples in the political system of their conquerors" (27).

Connolly found himself placed in a similar position to Kelles-Krauz, when Luxemburg and Winter tried to impose a secret protocol upon the PPSpz. Therefore, Connolly attacked the {not so} "unique conception of Internationalism, unique and peculiar to {the ILP in} Belfast. There is no 'most favoured nation clause' in Socialist diplomacy, and we as Socialists in Ireland, can not afford to establish such a precedent" (28).

And when the First World War broke out, any appeals to the 'internationalism' of the Second International would be of no avail, whilst the British Labour 'internationalists', and the leadership of the British Social Democratic party, the British Socialist Party (the former SDF), gave its wholehearted support to the war.

iii) The outbreak of the First World War and the responses of the International Left up to the 1916 Dublin Rising

Rosa Luxemburg had observed Kautsky's accommodation to the Right since 1910. When the First World War started, she formed Die Internationale, soon to become the Spartacus League, along with Karl Leibknecht (the only Reichstag deputy to vote against war credits), Clara Zetkin, Franz Mehring, Leo Jogiches, Ernst Meyer and Pail Levi (29). Luxemburg and others were imprisoned in 1916 for their anti-war activities.

Karl Radek was another SDPD member, originally from the SPDKPL. However, he had fallen out with Luxemburg and Jogiches in the party's internecine struggles (30). But he remained influenced by Radical Left thinking. He was close to the Bremen Left, and had already criticised Kautsky's thinking (31). At the outbreak of the First World War, Radek moved to Switzerland, where there were other revolutionary Social

Democratic emigres, including Lenin, Grigory Zinoviev and Lev Iurkevich.

However, it took the shock of the betrayal by Kautsky and other Centrist leaders in the Second International, when the First World War was declared, to push Lenin to break with the Centre Social Democrats. To mark this, Lenin wrote *Dead Chauvinism and Living Socialism.* But he also spent time writing his *Philosophical Notebooks* (32). This study of Hegel's work contributed to the dialectical approach developed in Lenin's new theories of 'Imperialism' and the 'National Question'.

For those Socialists from oppressed nations within the imperial states, such as Connolly in Ireland, official Social Democratic and Labour capitulation in 1914 probably came as little surprise. Connolly had long witnessed the thinly disguised social chauvinism and imperialism of the Independent Labour Party (ILP) and the Social Democratic Federation. In response to the First World War, Connolly advocated and made preparations for an Irish insurrection. "The working class in Europe, rather than slaughter each other for the benefit of kings and financiers, {should} proceed tomorrow to erect barricades all over Europe, to break up bridges and destroy the transport service that war might be abolished" (33). This position stemmed directly from his longstanding support for working class leadership in the struggle for Irish liberation.

Connolly and the Irish Citizen Army joined with members of the Irish Republican Brotherhood to launch the Easter Rising in 1916, and to proclaim a new Irish Republic, in defiance of the British war regime. The British Army shot him for his part in this rising. Thus, Connolly, as a supporter of 'Internationalism from Below', practised what Lenin at this stage could only preach - turning the imperialist war into a civil war. To Lenin's credit he was one of the few in the wider International Left to see the real significance of this rebellion - Leon Trotsky and Karl Radek not excluded (34).

Lenin was in the process of writing his *Imperialism* at this time, but he had also taken time to write *The Socialist Revolution and the Right of National to Self-Determination (Theses)* in January 1916 (35). It opened up with, "Imperialism is the highest stage in the development of capitalism." Using his recent dialectical studies to great effect, he saw that, under Imperialism, monopoly developed out of capitalist competition. Furthermore, Lenin now specifically linked ‘the right to self-determination’ with the impending International Socialist revolution, which he could see being ushered in by the global impact of the First World War.

Lenin ‘forgot’ his earlier distinction between national democratic demands in his ‘first’ and ‘second worlds’. Whilst ‘second world’ Russian revolutionary Social Democrats should “demand freedom to separate for Finland, Poland, the Ukraine, etc., etc.”, so now should ‘first world’ British revolutionary Social Democrats “demand freedom to separate for the colonies and Ireland” and German revolutionary Social Democrats “demand freedom to separate for the colonies, the Alsatians, Danes and Poles” (36). He had earlier qualified his distinction between those western and northern European states where the ‘National Question’ no longer had any relevance, when he had allowed for the exception of the multi-national state of Sweden. But there were other exceptions, not least the original capitalist state, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, where Engels had recognized the existence of four nations (37). Now, in identifying “Alsatians, Danes and Poles”, Lenin was pointing to the relevance of the ‘National Question’ even in Germany.

He now began to appreciate more clearly what the ‘Internationalism from Below’ advocates had long understood. Capitalist development, under Imperialist conditions, even where parliamentary democracy exists, does not necessarily lead to a dilution of national strife within the ‘advanced’ countries, but can lead to its aggravation. Imperialism tended to more and more negate the democratic advance that orthodox Marxists associated with rising capitalism.

Lenin realised, however, that such arguments could also give succour to the Radical Left. They had considerable influence upon the International Left, and not least upon his fellow Bolsheviks. For the Radical Left, it was precisely this Imperialism, which rendered obsolete the demand for national self-determination (except for the pre-capitalist colonies). They claimed that only socialism could now solve the problems brought about by Imperialism, so any lesser demands were utopian or reactionary.

Others from the Radical Left now ditched Luxemburg's support for Polish autonomy within a future united Russian republic. This new mutation, or neo-Luxemburgist version of Radical Left thinking, denied the relevance of a call for national autonomy even *after* a revolution. Whether it was western or eastern Europe they saw one integrated revolution, which would inevitably be socialist. Therefore, "We have no reason to assume that economic and political units in a socialist society will be national in character... For the territorial subdivisions of socialist society, insofar as they exist at all, can only be determined by the requirements of production... To carry over the formula of the 'right of self-determination' to socialism is to fully misunderstand the nature of a socialist community" (38).

Lenin pointed out that this put the new Radical Left in the position of tacitly supporting imperialist annexations, both past and ongoing. He quoted from their document, "Social Democracy... does not by any means favour the erection of new frontier posts in Europe or the re-erection of those swept away by imperialism" (39). A little earlier, Lenin had stated that, “Increased national oppression does not mean that Social Democracy should reject what the bourgeoisie call the ‘utopian’ struggle for the freedom to secede but, on the contrary, it should make greater use of the conflicts that arise in this sphere *too*, as grounds for mass action and revolutionary attacks on the bourgeoisie” (40). The emphasis on the “too” was to overcome the traditional one-sided Economistic emphasis on economic and social struggles, and to underscore the need for democratic political struggle. “The socialist revolution may flare up not only through some big strike, street demonstration or hunger riot, but also as a result of a political crisis such as the Dreyfus case... or in connection with a referendum on the succession of an oppressed nation, etc.” (41).

Nevertheless, the hold of Radical Leftism was strong on sections of the Bolsheviks. It was not long before Lenin found himself having to confront the Ukrainian-Russian Bolshevik, Grigori Pyatakov, arguing along such lines. In reply to Pyatakov, Lenin wrote *A Caricature of Marxism,* between August and October 1916. With his own work on Imperialism in progress, he began on common ground with the Radical Left. “Being a ‘negation’ of democracy in general, imperialism is also a ‘negation’ in the national question (i.e. national self determination): it seeks to violate democracy" (42). However, looking for the real, self-determining, opposite pole of the Imperialist contradiction (as opposed to an ideal, abstract, propaganda alternative) he went on to sharply differentiate himself from the Radical Left. "National struggle, national insurrection, national secession are fully 'achievable' and are met with in practice *under* imperialism... {Imperialism} *accentuates* the antagonism between {the mass of the population's} democratic aspirations and the anti-democratic tendency of the trusts" (43). Lenin accused Pyatakov of advocating Imperialist Economism.

But it was the 1916 Easter Rising in Dublin, which led Lenin to more clearly identify the range of evolutionary subjects in opposition to Imperialism. He now felt the need to return to his January *Theses* and updated them as *The Discussion on Self Determination Summed Up* in December 1916. "The dialectics of history are such that small nations, powerless as an *independent* factor in the struggle against imperialism, play a part as one of the ferments, one of the bacilli, which help the *real* anti-imperialist force, the socialist proletariat, to make its appearance on the scene" (44). Section 10 of this article was entitled, *The Irish Rebellion of 1916*, and was the culmination of Lenin's most developed writing on the 'National Question'.

Lenin also used the opportunity to further develop his already fairly heretical views on Norway. "Until 1905 autonomous Norway, as part of Sweden, enjoyed the widest autonomy, but she was not Sweden's equal. Only by her free secession was her equality manifested *in practice* and proved... Secession did not 'mitigate' this {Swedish aristocratic} privilege (the essence of reformism lies in *mitigating* an evil and not in destroying it) but *eliminated* it altogether" (45) - the principal criterion of a revolutionary programme.

Clearly, Lenin was now pointing beyond a neutral 'right to self-determination', support for national autonomy within a centralised republic, or a federal republic, in a multi-national state. For, even he admitted that Norway enjoyed "very extensive autonomy", with its own parliament and more extensive democratic rights than existed in most other countries. Therefore, if relations between Sweden and Norway could still justify Norwegian political independence, then a similar course of action had much wider application, particularly under Imperialism. Lenin's previous 'first world'/'second world' distinction was breaking down with regard to subordinate nations within imperialist states. Here we have another example of a more general theory trying to break out. However, he was moving towards the position that supporters of 'Internationalism from Below' had long supported.

It was also in section 10 of *The Discussion on Self Determination Summed Up* that Lenin chronicled the actions of new oppositional colonial forces in Asia, and Africa. "It is known that in Singapore the British brutally suppressed a mutiny among their Indian troops; that there were attempts at rebellion in French Annam and in the German Cameroons" (46). Lenin was beginning to see the forces, which had been assembling for some time in a truly worldwide struggle against Imperialism, and the need for a theory and organisation, which would encompass their resistance.

Imperialism enabled Lenin to provide an integrated global theory, which examined the root causes of the First World War, and which undermined the pre-war orthodox Marxist strategy of socialist advance in the western Europe and capitalist advance in eastern Europe. Colonial revolts, national rebellions in the imperial heartlands, mutinies in the armed forces, and working class struggles against wartime austerity, were all seen as an interconnected whole, which pointed in one direction - **International Socialist revolution**. Although the Radical Left's superficially similar theory also rejected an East-West split in its strategy, it was Lenin's identification of the range of forces resisting Imperialism which made his theory superior.

The Radical Left analysis outlined the latest economic developments in the capitalist-imperialist world system but drew abstract political conclusions. 'The proletariat' would mechanically respond to the economic imperatives enforced by the Imperialist war drive and begin to look for leadership from a new International, which the neo-Luxemburgist Radical Left was keen to see established. Other forces, such as the peasants and oppressed nations and nationalities were rejected as possible allies. The negative consequences of this approach were to be most marked in those areas of the Tsarist Empire where the Radical Left made their influence felt. This

Radical Left also included Bolshevik supporters in Poland and Ukraine.

Lenin clearly saw the need for a new International to break from the social imperialism of the Second. He spent much of his time during the First World War trying to establish this new International. He was to participate in the two International Conferences, held in September 1915 at Zimmerwald, and in April 1916 at Kienthal, the second of which was clearly International Left in nature. This included some from the Radical Left, Lenin's Bolsheviks and Left Mensheviks. The 'Internationalism from Below' supporter, Lev Iurkevich, although not in attendance, submitted a paper on the 'National Question' (47). The outbreak of the second 'Russian' Revolution in February 1917 was to place Lenin at the very centre of this new international movement. He thought that the Tsarist Empire was the weak link in the imperial chain. When the new 1916-21 International Revolutionary Wave broke out, Russia soon lay at its epicentre.

B. The further development of 'Internationalism from Below'– Lev Iurkevich

i) The Tsarist Empire - a 'prisonhouse of nations'

The Tsarist Empire was a multi-national state, with its dominant Russian nationality forming less than 50% of the population. Yet, because Lenin was himself a Russian, in a state where Russians constituted by far the largest nationality, he tended to view the prospect of revolution in this Empire through Russian eyes.

After the 1905 Revolutions, however, it was hard to ignore the role of the rising national movements of non-Russians throughout the Tsarist Empire. Lenin, unlike many orthodox Marxists, had come to appreciate the role of the peasants and their attacks on landlordism in that Revolution. Similarly, Lenin was keen to gain the support in the oppressed nations and amongst the oppressed nationalities. By 1916, he envisaged workers, peasants and national movements together forming an elemental democratic force, which would overturn Tsarist reaction and set up a unified republic throughout the former Tsarist Empire. This would trigger a wider International Socialist struggle that would sweep Europe and then permit socialist advance in Russia too.

Lenin was realistic enough to contemplate the possibility of the temporary loss to any Russian republic of Finland and Poland in the future struggle, since they were already more economically and socially advanced. He also conceded that some culturally distinct peoples, who had had their own earlier state experience, were also likely to separate. This would especially be the case where these peoples' former territories were now divided, with some members 'trapped' within the Tsarist Empire and others outside, such as the Persians and Mongolians of Central Asia (48). However, Lenin thought that a Russian republic would retain the support of most other Slavic, Baltic and Caucasian peoples, and the more Russian-influenced peoples of Central Asia and Siberia.

Lenin argued that, if certain 'guarantees' were made, then these other nations and nationalities would want to stay part of a unified democratic republican Russia. To Lenin, a major underlying argument for continued unification remained economic. Lenin thought that large states with already developed networks of common economic activity would be in the best interests of all the nationalities of Russia. This would become even more obvious in the new state once tsarist oppression and repression were removed.

Each constituent nation, which so desired it, was to be given territorial autonomy, whilst the members of each nationality were to enjoy equal rights with others, wherever their members lived. Just to show that Lenin's proposed new unified Russian republic was democratically motivated, he insisted that, what had been the Second International's policy of 'the right of national self-determination', should be written into any new post-revolution state constitution.

Lenin found himself fighting on two fronts with the other forces on the International Left over 'the right of national self-determination'. The Radical Left opposed the slogan, believing that, within the Imperialist states themselves, the slogan pandered to petty nationalism. Luxemburg believed that Imperialism had rendered the issue redundant under capitalism and only socialism could offer real autonomy, whilst the neo-Luxemburgist Radical Left saw the issue as irrelevant under socialism too. Those from the 'Internationalism from Below' tendency, however, believed that it was the merest hypocrisy to support the abstract right and only promise something concrete in the future, whilst opposing Social Democrats fighting for greater autonomy, federation or independence in the here and now.

Famously, as a counter to these two tendencies, Lenin used the analogy of 'the right to divorce', stating that expressing one's support for such a right did not mean that you advocated divorce in every case (49). However, this argument tended not to satisfy many. As with oppressive and unequal human relationships, the issue of relationships between oppressor and oppressed nations or nationalities tends only to be discussed, in relation to 'divorce' or secession, when it already involves a very real and troubled history. In other words, once a concrete case is raised then hiding behind an abstract right is not much use - a particular solution has to be recommended. Furthermore, as with human relationships, sometimes a 'complete break' is the best way to bring the two partners together on a new basis.

Marx had already come to acceptance of this view with relation to Ireland and Britain (50), whilst Lenin had come to a similar view for Norway and Sweden. Yet both of these examples belonged to the more economically developed capitalist world where more 'civilised' political relations (longstanding parliamentary democracy) had been well established. Compared to these examples the Tsarist Empire was a 'prison house of nations' with a particularly sustained record of brutality, abuse and denial of rights.

So, how did Lenin deal with this contradiction of (retrospectively) giving support to secessionist movements outside the Tsarist Empire, whilst opposing any revolutionary Social Democrat participation in national movements within this very oppressive empire? The most likely answer is that he thought that the Tsarist Empire was nearer to revolution. This was based on his experience of 1905, and his growing belief that the First World War would undermine the tsarist order even more effectively than the Russo-Japanese War, which had preceded the 1905 Revolution.

Therefore, for Lenin, it was a revolutionary imperative for all Social Democrats to subordinate themselves to an all-Russia strategy. This necessitated being part of a one-state party.

That such a Russian nationality-dominated party would be treated with considerable unease by Social Democrats from other nationalities, who championed much greater autonomy for their respective nations, was something that Lenin wrote off as bourgeois or petty bourgeois nationalism. Yet, it was an elementary feature of the democratic upsurge of national movements within the Tsarist Empire, that they wanted real freedom and became less and less convinced of the need to 'hold back' for the possible promise of a larger, 'more democratic' state in the future.

Revolutionary Social Democrats supporting 'Internationalism from Below', who were prepared to place themselves at the head of the national democratic movements in the oppressed nations. But they also fully appreciated the need for cooperation between Social Democrats of other oppressed nations (and nationalities) and also with Social Democrats from the dominant nation within the existing state. 'Internationalism from Below' counterposed such cooperation on the basis of genuine equality to the 'bureaucratic internationalism' of the 'one state/one party' advocates, and to patriotic populist alliances with 'their own' bourgeoisie.

Supporters of 'Internationalism from Below' were also perfectly aware of the wider international situation in which they operated, and hence saw the need to make their own international connections beyond the existing state boundaries (e.g. Polish and Ukrainian Social Democrats both operated in Tsarist Russia and Austro-Hungary), as well as being part of an International. However, there was little way they could hope to form the leadership of national democratic movements in their own countries if they appeared to be under the control of parties with their headquarters in the dominant nation. Once again this was something that Marx and Engels would have appreciated (51). This was particularly the case when these existing state-based parties openly displayed social chauvinist tendencies, which mirrored the oppressive or dismissive attitudes of the leaders of the dominant nationality-state.

International cooperation had to be on the basis of genuine equality and not hierarchical subordination. Social chauvinism in the dominant nation, feeding social patriotism in the subordinate nations, launched a poisonous self-propelling dialectic. This played itself out with profoundly negative results in the 1916-21 International Revolutionary Wave. By reifying 'one state/one party', its advocates contributed to this negative outcome. They refused to get to the root of the basic contradiction, and to give voice to those seeking a stronger, more democratic basis for unity through real equality and internationalism.

ii) Lenin and the influence of developments in Finland, Poland, Georgia and Latvia

A key feature of Lenin's understanding of democratic politics was his belief that, "The closer a democratic state is to complete freedom to secede the less frequent and less ardent will the desire for separation be in practice" (52). Yet the reality was (even in relation to Norway with its own parliament) that the more autonomy a nation gained, the more likely its people were to express their democratic aspirations in a desire for political independence in a period of heightened political awareness and activity.

This was not immediately apparent to those Social Democrats in the oppressor nation, nor indeed to all those in the oppressed nations. Because most national movements (with the exception of the Finnish and Polish) in the Tsarist Empire were at a fairly embryonic level, or the political consequences of raising the issue were draconian, they did not initially seek independence but sought greater autonomy or federation.

Furthermore, when bourgeois nationalists did appear, advocating independence for Poland, Finland, and later Ukraine, many Social Democrats in the national movements rejected their 'independence' road. This was because the bourgeois nationalists were so obviously still prepared to make deals with the leaders in the oppressor state to protect their own class privileges; to continue with the oppression of national minorities in their claimed territories; to make their own irredentist claims; and to seek sponsorship from (and often subordination to) other powerful imperialist states.

Lenin, who took more interest in the 'National Question' than most other Bolsheviks, had quite a varied non-Russian nationality experience from which to draw upon in the Tsarist Empire. However, his writings are thin on the economic, social, cultural and wider political history of any of these oppressed nations. They tend to concentrate instead on what he saw as the political consequences of any opposition to his 'one state/one party' view. Organisational politics remained Lenin's central concern.

It is hard, for example, to find much published by Lenin on Finland before 1917, although it formed part of the Tsarist Empire. In practice Finnish Social Democrats pursued their own political course, with little reference to the RSDLP. There appeared to be a general acceptance that Finland was a 'special case', which may well go its own way. Finnish Social Democrats enjoyed a greater legal freedom to operate. The Finnish Social Democrats did not challenge the RSDLP either nor attempt to provide much theoretical justification for their independent course of action.

When it came to Poland the situation was rather different. Lenin also had little to say on Poland, until Luxemburg became involved in the RSDLP. Lenin was attracted to the SDPKPL, and its stance of opposition to Polish independence, because it provided striking support for his all-Russia revolutionary strategy and his 'one state/one party' viewpoint. When Luxemburg's SDPKLP had eventually affiliated to the RSDLP (accepting the supremacy of an all-Russian centre in theory, but hardly in practice!) she did not initially oppose the Party's position on the general right of self determination, which Lenin felt was necessary for a Russian nationality-dominated party.

In this case, Luxemburg's indifferent stance, when the general principle of 'the right of self-determination' was being adopted by the RSDLP, was similar to that she took at the 1896 Congress of the Second International, when it first became official Social Democratic policy. However, Luxemburg became vehement in her opposition whenever self-determination was linked with Poland. When Lenin crossed polemical swords with Luxemburg it was mainly to ensure that Luxemburg's opposition to this right was confined to Poland, which he welcomed, and not generalised, which he strongly opposed. Yet, leaving Poland to Luxemburg and her Radical Left allies came at considerable political cost.

During the First World War, Social Democrats in Poland were much more marginal than in Finland, where Social Democrats appreciated the significance of the demand for national self-determination. However, Lenin’s over-riding concern, which he shared with Luxemburg, was upholding the ‘one state/one party’ position, so Luxemburg remained a very useful ally when others challenged this position.

Two other parties, which were officially affiliated to the RSDLP, provided Lenin with very different experiences. The Georgian Social Democrats were originally an integral part of the RSDLP. They came under the overwhelming domination of the Mensheviks. In marked contrast to the timidity of Mensheviks elsewhere in Tsarist Russia, their local leader, in Georgia, Noy Zhordaniya, built a widely supported national liberation movement, backed by workers, peasants, small traders and the intelligentsia. For two whole years, between 1904-6, the Menshevik-dominated RSDLP in Georgia has been able to establish and maintain the Gurian Republic in defiance of tsarist forces. This peasant-based Gurian Republic was the first of its kind and in some ways a predecessor of the later Chinese liberated areas or ‘red bases’ (53).

Yet, despite the effective autonomy temporarily gained, the Georgian RSDLP did not seek independence, nor even federation for Georgia. Autonomy within a united republican Russia was the Georgian Mensheviks’ maximum national democratic demand. The degree of Russian settlement was still relatively light, the threat to the Georgian language was not critical, and the Georgians gained confidence by drawing on their own medieval state history, which could be seen as their admission ticket to ‘civilised’ nation status.

One reason for the Georgians' more pro-Russian orientation was their longstanding antipathy towards their Muslim neighbours, following from their one-time subordination within the Persian Empire. As fellow Christians, the Russians had been seen as ‘liberators’ from the Persian Muslim yoke. This fear was accentuated in the First World War, when Georgians witnessed the wholesale Ottoman state-initiated massacre of the neighbouring, mostly Christian Armenians (who also formed a significant portion of the urban population in Georgia itself.)

A different situation existed in Latvia. The Latvian Social Democrats joined the RSDLP in 1906. Although the Menshevik/Bolshevik split did not take place there until 1917, the Latvian Social Democrats were then to come overwhelmingly under the influence of the Bolsheviks (54). They were, in many ways, the Bolsheviks' 'jewel in the crown'. In contrast with most other non-Russian nationality areas, the Bolsheviks in Latvia mainly consisted of members of the dominant local nationality, the Latvians (Letts) (whilst including Russians and Jews too) and they had a press in the Latvian language.

Like the Georgians, the Latvians' main national antagonism was not directed against the Russians, but in their case, against the traditional Baltic-German landlord class, descendents of the conquering Teutonic knights. The Latvian Social Democrats also opposed the independence and federal options, seeking autonomy within a united republican Russia. However, unlike the Georgians, the Latvians could not claim any long-lost history as a state.

iii) Ukraine challenges the social chauvinism of the RSDLP before the First World War

It was the Ukrainians who were to present the RSDLP, and later the Bolsheviks, with the greatest challenge. It was here that the 'one state/one party' policy was to come under the most sustained attack. The Ukrainian lands within the Tsarist Empire had developed economically in a very uneven manner. Rapid industrialisation and urbanisation had occurred in the mineral-rich area, east of the Dnipro/Dneiper, whilst Odesa/Odessa grew as a major port and commercial centre on the Black Sea coast, following its annexation to the Tsarist Empire as 'New Russia'. This process of industrialisation and urbanisation in Ukraine had mainly involved Russians, people from other non-Ukrainian nationalities (including Jews), but only a minority of ethnic Ukrainians. Furthermore, Kyiv/Kiev, the largest city in Ukraine, although located within a predominantly ethnic Ukrainian agricultural region, was an important tsarist administrative centre, and as such Russians dominated this city too.

Multi-nationality cities in Ukraine rapidly became Russified, partly due to government and company policies designed to ensure that Russian became the dominant language. The Ukrainian language enjoyed no official status and was actively suppressed. However, the majority throughout rural Ukraine, and in the towns of the less economically advanced western Ukraine, remained overwhelmingly Ukrainian by nationality and language. This may have been partly due to the lack of schooling. Many Russians refused to recognise the existence of a distinct Ukraine, only differentiating between ‘Great’ and ‘Little Russia’. Ukrainians were often disparagingly dismissed as 'kholkols' (topknots). Other areas where Ukrainians formed the majority of the population lay within eastern Galicia and parts of Bukovyna, within Hapsburg Austria; and in Sub-Carpathia/Ruthenia, within Hapsburg Hungary.

Unlike ‘Great Russia’, there was no historical legacy of ‘mir’ communal lands in ‘Little Russia’. When Cossack leaders turned to the tsar for help in breaking Polish overlordship of Ukraine, in the mid-seventeenth century, they took on a new landlord role and policing function. They acted in a similar manner to Scottish clan chieftains who accommodated to and served the British state in the later eighteenth century. The Ukrainian landlords had growing links with their Russian and Polish counterparts in the Tsarist Russian and Hapsburg Austro-Hungarian Empires. They were treated with suspicion by the other rural classes, especially the small peasantry and the landless. These groups had been growing in number since the emancipation of the serfs. A distinctive feature of Right Bank Ukraine (west of the Dnipro) by the early twentieth century, however, was the importance of large-scale capitalist farming estates, which employed land-starved small peasants as wage labourers (54).

The government-promoted cultural divide, between urban and rural areas, encouraged a Russian chauvinist/Ukrainian patriot division, which was analogous in some ways to the British worker/Irish peasant politico-cultural divide promoted in Ulster. The development of Social Democracy in Ukraine reflected such a split. Workers in the Russified cities joined the RSDLP. After the political split, Russian and Russified workers divided their support between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. The majority of Ukrainian-speaking workers, however, lived in smaller towns or the countryside and took longer to organise.

However, as far back as 1900, some Ukrainians, primarily from the intelligentsia, had joined the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (RUP). This was a radical nationalist party. It soon divided as a result of growing class differentiation. Left sentiment grew rapidly, with the majority of members calling themselves socialists, until the RUP's politics more resembled those of the social patriotic-led Polish Socialist Party. The radical nationalists opposed this leftwards development and broke away. They joined with others to form the Ukrainian Peoples Party (55).

As the political climate heated up in the Tsarist Empire, a more definite Social Democratic current emerged within the RUP. This became the Ukrainian Social Democratic Labour Party (USDLP), under the impact of the 'Russian' Revolution in 1905. However, before this occurred, one section of the Left, impatient with the pace of change in the RUP, had already split and formed the Ukrainian Social Democratic Union, or Spilka, after failing to win a majority of the whole party in 1904. In some ways, Spilka resembled Luxemburg's SDPKPL in its Radical Left approach to the 'Nationality Question'. It sought Ukrainian autonomy after, and as a consequence of, an all-Russia democratic revolution (although, of course, Luxemburg, herself, was strongly opposed to any Ukrainian self-determination). However, there remained a major difference. Spilka's base lay amongst the small peasantry, many of whom also acted as a rural semi-proletariat. It welcomed the attacks on the landlords, and the strikes of the semi-proletarian peasants in the 1905 Revolution.

This rural support also placed Spilka in a much better position than the USDLP in the 1905-6 Revolution. The USDLP had moved left in a similar manner to the PPS-Left in Poland. The USDLP was also influenced by orthodox Marxism, leading it to condemn the peasant attacks on landlords and large estates, which accompanied the Revolution. Instead, it tried to concentrate its attentions upon the urban workers. However, the majority of these workers were either Russian or Russified. They were attracted to the RSDLP instead. When elections took place to the Second Duma in 1907, the Spilka, drawing upon its wide rural support, won 14 members, whilst the USDLP only won one (56).

Both Spilka and the USDLP applied to join the RSDLP during the 1905-6

Revolution. The USDLP asked for autonomy within the RSDLP. This was rejected. It continued to organise independently, largely adopting orthodox Marxist politics, except for its insistence on the importance of the Ukrainian 'National Question'. Ironically, Spilka was made an autonomous section of the RSDLP, but it was initially given a specific remit to organise Ukrainian-speaking rural workers. This was not what Spilka members had intended. They saw a role for themselves similar to that of the Latvian Social Democrats in the RSDLP. They wanted to unite all Social Democrats in Ukraine, from whatever nationality, producing literature in Ukrainian as well as Russian.

Spilka had not reckoned with the Russian social chauvinism of both the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks within the RSDLP. These two groups' common attitude effectively split the RSDLP in Ukraine on nationality lines. The established Russian and Russified RSDLP branches continued as before, as if they were the Party, leaving Spilka very much a second-class section aimed at Ukrainian speakers only. Spilka produced the Ukrainian language *Pravda*. It was taken over by Trotsky and converted into a Russian language paper instead (57). So, in this respect, Bolsheviks and Mensheviks who formally supported the 'right of self-determination', behaved no differently from the Radical Left Luxemburg, when she joined with the German social chauvinists of the SDP to try and close down the party's 'autonomous' PPS-pz.

Not appreciating the strength of social chauvinism in the RSDLP, Spilka found it was prevented from uniting rural and urban workers, or Ukrainian and Russian speakers, as they had originally intended. This naive internationalist grouping became squeezed and, after a series of arrests in 1908, began to wither until 'killed off' by the RSDLP leadership in 1912. One result of Spilka's bitter experiences in the RSDLP was that its formerly internationalist leaders did not move over to the USDLP, but instead moved right over to the radical nationalist camp in the First World War (58). The dominant nation, social chauvinism of both wings of the RSDLP produced, in this case, not a subordinate nation, social patriotic response, but a collapse into Ukrainian patriotic populism. This tragic dialectic was to reappear in the 'Russian' Revolution.

iv) The background to Lev Iurkevich and his role in Ukrainian Social Democracy

Events in Ukraine contributed to wider communist developments and thought, including that of the Radical Left (non-Bolshevik and Bolshevik), Lenin's wing of the Bolsheviks, and the 'Internationalism from Below' tendency (which, after 1918, also included some Bolsheviks). Therefore, it is worth examining the transitional period, between the demise of Spilka in 1912, and the outbreak of the February Revolution in 1917. It was during this period that Lev Iurkevych played an important role. Most Communists only know of Iurkevich through Lenin's dismissive comments. These began in his 1913 *Critical Comments on the National Question* and continued in his 1916 writings on the 'National Question' (59).

Iurkevich was a prominent member of the USDLP. With the collapse of Spilka in 1912, the USDLP had been able to increase its influence. Iurkevich, moulded by pre-war revolutionary Social Democracy, with its undoubted shortcomings, is an interesting figure. He highlights some of the contradictions of the time. Before the First World War, Russian Social Democrats tended to take their lead from Germany and, in particular, Kautsky. Ukrainian Social Democrats, however, tended to look to Austria and to Bauer. Ukrainians enjoyed greater cultural and political freedoms in Austrian eastern Galicia and northern Bukovyna than in Tsarist 'Little Russia'. There was a separate Ukrainian Social Democratic Party (USDP) in Austrian Galicia and Bukovyna (together forming a large part of western Ukraine), which had fraternal relations with the USDLP.

Iurkevich, like Kelles-Kreuz and Connolly, struggled against the consequences of those Social Democratic policies that produced social chauvinism and social patriotism/populism as opposing poles. He looked to an integrated revolutionary strategy based on genuine equality between socialists from oppressor and oppressed nations and nationalities - 'Internationalism from Below'. He always remained a strong internationalist. In the period leading up to the 1905 Revolution, Kelles-Kreuz had opposed Luxemburg's proposed solution to the 'National Question' In the period up to the 1917 Revolution, Iurkevich opposed Lenin's answers to the same question.

v) Iurkevich and Lenin debate the nature of Imperialism and the forthcoming revolution

In 1916 Iurkevich wrote, *The Russian Social Democrats and the National Question* (60), his reply to Lenin's *The Socialist Revolution and the Right of National to Self-Determination*, published earlier that year. The limitations in Iurkevich's position stand out most clearly, when he poured scorn on Lenin's claims of what the Bolsheviks would achieve once they seized power. "We would offer peace to *all* belligerents on condition of the liberation of colonies and *all* dependent, oppressed and underprivileged peoples. Neither Germany, nor England and France, under their present governments, would accept this condition. Then we would have to prepare and wage a revolutionary war... systematically rouse to revolt all the peoples now oppressed by the Russians, all the colonies and dependent countries of Asia... and - in the first place - we would arouse to revolt the socialist proletariat of Europe... There can be no doubt whatever that the victory of the proletariat in Russia would present uncommonly auspicious conditions for the development of revolution in Asia and Europe" (61).

Yet this was "revolutionary nonsense" according to Iurkevich. History, however, shows Lenin to have been remarkably prescient, even if he did later show reluctance to conduct such a revolutionary war against Germany, England or France. This was because Lenin, after his study of dialectics and his work preparing for *Imperialism*, had already arrived at the idea of an International Socialist revolution, which would encompass both Western and Eastern Europe, supported by national democratic struggles in the colonies. Revolutionary Russia would play a key role because it formed the weakest link in the imperialist chain.

Iurkevich, however, still held to the orthodox Marxist, dualist view of socialist revolution in the advanced West, but bourgeois democratic revolution in the backward Tsarist Empire. Certainly, Iurkevich was a theoretical supporter of international socialism. "Socialism aspires to the elimination of all national oppression by means of the economic and political unification of peoples, which is unrealisable with the existence of capitalist boundaries" (62). However, for Iurkevich, International Socialist revolution was not yet on the political agenda, whilst democratic revolution in the Tsarist Empire was a very real prospect. Without Lenin’s integrated vision of International Socialist Revolution, Iurkevich was unable to foresee events in Russia would have such a dramatic international impact. Therefore, until the outbreak of the ‘Russian’ Revolution he could not anticipate the real significance of developments in Russia, or their wider effects on the world.

Yet Iurkevich still had a strong understanding of the Imperialist nature of the times and its permanent propensity to war. He was involved in expelling Dmytro Dontsov from the USDLP. Like former Italian socialist, Mussolini, Dontsov later turned to fascism. But in 1912 Dontsov was expelled from the USDLP for advocating the separation of the Ukrainian territory from the Tsarist Empire in order to unite with the eastern Galician territory in a federal Austria-Hungary (63). Iurkevich opposed Dontsov’s pro-Austrian policy because it would convert the USDLP into a cat’s paw of the Hapsburgs in the looming imperial conflict.

Iurkevich’s suspicions were confirmed when the First World War broke out. An avowedly nationalist Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (SVU) was formed, which also included former Spilka members, and the majority of the USDP. It was funded by the Hapsburg state. The SVU called for an independent Ukraine in former Tsarist Russian territories, a united autonomous Ukrainian territory within an Austrian constitutional monarchy with parliamentary democracy and agrarian reform (64). Following the precedent set by the Polish social-patriotic leader, Pilsudski, who formed a Polish Legion, the 'patriotic' Ukrainians created the Sich Rifles to serve in the First World War (65). The SVU became the principal object of Iurkevich’s attacks in the Ukrainian Left's (USDLP and USDP) emigre journal, *Dzvin* (66). He wrote an open letter to the second Zimmerwald International Socialist Conference, held in Kienthal. This letter condemned the SVU and the imperialism of both the Central Powers and Tsarist Russia (67).

Iurkevich outlined the methods and aims he thought were needed for a revolutionary championing of the actual exercise of self-determination. “As for the proletariat and the democrats of the oppressed nation, their national-liberation strivings will be expressed at decisive moments by *barricade* warfare with an autonomist democratic programme, and by *trench* warfare with a programme of secession. We shall make no secret of the fact that we, for our part, prefer barricade warfare, that is political revolution, to trench warfare, that is war" (68).

Iurkevich's opposition to Ukrainian independence in 1916 was conditioned by the contemporary political situation of imperialist war. He wrote, "The difference between the autonomist movement and the separatist movement consists precisely in the fact that the first leads democrats of *all* nations oppressed by a 'large state' onto the path of struggle for political liberation, for only in a free political order is it possible to achieve democratic autonomy, while the second, the separatist, which is the concern of a *single* oppressed nation struggling not against the order that oppresses it but against the state that oppresses it - can not fail, in the present strained atmosphere of antagonism between 'large states', to turn into an imperialist war combination" (69).

However, if this "present strained atmosphere between 'large states'" could be removed, as happened with the collapse of the Central Powers in 1918, and the spread of revolution to Austria-Hungary and Germany, then the aims could change too. Then support for independence would begin to reflect a democratic clamouring for equal rights, not a source of collaboration with another imperial power.

From 1918, the newly formed Ukrainian Communists were to be energised by the massive national democratic movement. This eventually forced them to abandon the earlier Ukrainian Social Democratic support for an all-Russia solution with Ukrainian autonomy. Iurkevich unfortunately died from an illness, early in the revolutionary process, in an uncanny repeat of Kelles-Kreuz's fate in the 1905 Revolution. It was left to other USDLP members to make the political shift from support for autonomy or federalism to support for independence.

vi) The contradictions of federalism

However, even in 1916, there was still a key distinction between Lenin and Iurkevich, despite their apparent shared support for national autonomy within a reformed and reconstituted 'Empire' at this time. Lenin supported the policy of national autonomy in the abstract but concentrated instead on the more nebulous 'right of self-determination'. Whereas Iurkevich thought that socialists should give leadership to the movements struggling for the actual exercise of self-determination. Iurkevich did not make a real distinction between autonomy and federation, seeing federation as a more advanced form of autonomy. Iurkevich got his inspiration for a federal solution for the Russian Empire from the Austrian Social Democrats' 1899 Brunn Conference. Iurkevich, like most Social Democrats, could easily see that different political conditions then existed in Austria-Hungary, compared to the Russian Empire. It was possible to imagine a kind of federal state being achieved by purely constitutional change in Austria-Hungary, but in the autocratic Tsarist Empire only revolution could bring about such an outcome. Stalin could also see this in 1912 (70).

Iurkevich was unclear as to how his proposed all-Russia Federation would be constituted, other than the constituent nations would have very extensive autonomy. Lenin had highlighted the problem in his earlier putdown, when fellow Bolshevik Shahumyan advocated support for a federation. "Federalism means an association of equals... You don't want to secede? In that case don't decide for me; don't think you have a *'right'* to federation" (71). In other words, the Great Russians would also have to agree to federation too.

Lenin made the distinction between federation and autonomy accepted by most political theorists today. In a unitary state the right to exercise sovereignty is concentrated in a single central body. There may be autonomy for subordinate areas (nations or regions) but the central state assembly decides the extent of this autonomy. This means that any autonomy can be revoked. A federal state, however, divides its sovereignty between two levels - the overarching federal state assembly, and the subordinate national or regional assemblies. However, although any subordinate assembly may have extensive guaranteed powers under a federal system, it still can not withdraw its specific territory from the state without the majority agreement of the federal assembly itself. It is only in a confederal state, where sovereignty remains with each member state (such as the seventeenth century Dutch United Provinces and Switzerland before 1848) that the individual constituent units have this right.

Yet, in 1913, Lenin had famously advocated the 'right of secession' for national autonomous areas, even within the proposed centralised republic he advocated for Russia. However, Lenin's support for autonomous national areas right to secede was a paper policy. The Bolsheviks, at this stage, made no attempt to give leadership to existing national movements, which were written off as bourgeois and divisive. Those states, which did eventually secede - Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania - did so through military action (also backed by the major imperialist states), not through a constitutional exercise of their ‘right to separate’ from the young Russian revolutionary state.

Lenin did change his views on the immediate universal need for centralised republics. He even became a supporter of a federal constitution, both for the infant Russian Soviet Republic in 1918 (72), and the new USSR in 1922. Lenin then took up the cudgels against his old comrades’ continued defence of previous RSDLP/Bolshevik/Leninist orthodoxy - a centralised all-Russia republic with autonomous territories (73). Lenin still supported 'the right of national self-determination', including secession, but now he transferred this right to the nations within his new federation. However, equally clearly, he opposed the exercise of this right. He preferred to see the subordinate federated units as constituting a step towards the further merging with the larger unit in the not too distant future (74).

The 'right to national self-determination' seemed to form the 'decorative' part of Lenin's proposed democratic constitution. He did not believe that this right would ever be invoked in his new federal republic. Iurkevich thought it, "A strange freedom is it not, which the oppressed nations will renounce the more nearly they approach its attainment!" (75) He would not have been surprised when the constitutions of the future Russian Federation, the USSR, or the individual federal republics provided no mechanism to allow for the exercise of this right.

Iurkevich recognised the dominant nation chauvinism masquerading behind the theories of those Russian advocates of federation. "Federal 'internationalism'... has turned in the current Russian liberal movement into a political program of Russian aggressive imperialism, openly hostile to the national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples of Russia... If {Russian Social Democrats} have replaced its old liberal revolutionary character with a newer, proletarian one, the content of the program has nevertheless remained for the most part unchanged" (76). Bolshevik hostility towards most national democratic movements in the 'Russian' Revolution after the October 1917 Revolution, and the post-1921 reality of the bureaucratically centralised, one-Party controlled USSR, meant that any effective exercise of the 'right of national self-determination' remained a dead letter.

Thus, any success for Iurkevich's own 1916 vision of a federal all-Russia state depended on two conditions. First, it required that an all-Russia Social Democratic Party be organised on federal lines. This would allow Social Democrats in the oppressed nations to take the lead in organising the national democratic movements in their own countries, whilst also getting the active support from their comrades in Russia. Ironically, the second condition of success, for any such federal project, not then recognised by Iurkevich, was the need for Russian Social Democratic support for Ukrainian independence. This was so that any future federation could come through the agreement of equal partners. Neither condition was to be met. This made it all the more necessary for Ukrainian Social Democrats to maintain their own independent organisation and to seek wider international socialist support for Ukrainian independence.

vii) Iurkevich investigates the historical roots of Russian social chauvinism and imperialism.

Other parts of *The Russian Social Democrats and the National Question* highlight Iurkevich's 'internationalism from below' perspective. He showed why it was that Socialists from oppressed nationalities {such as Kelles-Kreuz in Poland and Connolly in Ireland} had been much quicker to acknowledge the real political significance of the growth of Imperialism. Far from ameliorating the position of oppressed nations and nationalities, and encouraging voluntary assimilation, Imperialism usually worsened their position, leading to resistance.

Iurkevich demonstrated the link between the national chauvinism, directed against the subordinate nations within the dominant state, and the growth of imperialist chauvinism and racism directed against the peoples of the colonies. “The capitalist states’ strivings for conquest serve as a kind of continuation of the system of oppression of the nations within these states. The Muscovite state, for example transformed itself into the modern Russian empire, only when it subjugated Poland and Ukraine... The oppression of nations within a state, like the oppression of a colonial population, is conducive to the development of imperialist greed in the government of a ‘large state’, which, in order to make its war plans, makes use not only of its own people, but the vast masses of oppressed peoples that, in Russia, as in Austria, comprise the majority of the population. From the nations that it oppresses the centre extracts great resources, which enrich the state treasury and allow the government to maintain the army and bureaucracy that protect its dominance” (77).

This line of political thinking has much wider relevance. The United Kingdom and British Empire is a good example. Iurkevich’s statement could be rewritten as follows. ‘The initial medieval Norman-English state transformed itself, over many centuries, into the modern British empire, only when it subjugated Wales and Ireland, and later won the support of the Scottish ruling class, for cooperation in a joint imperial venture.

Even though modern empires continue to oppress whole nations and nationalities, they are also capable of gaining the enthusiastic backing of one-time adversarial ruling classes, the better to conduct the shared business of exploitation. This was true, not only of the rising Anglo-Scottish (British) mercantile empire in the eighteenth century, but also of backward empires like Tsarist Russia in the early twentieth. Here Baltic-Germans, Cossacks and Ukrainian landlords all gave support to the tsarist regime. Whilst feudal and mercantile empires undoubtedly have a different economic, social and political dynamic to later capitalist empires, there can be little doubt that earlier imperial endeavours often contributed to the development of some of the more modern imperial states.

Iurkevich's historical analysis formed the background to his examination of the ideological roots of Bolshevik hostility to Ukrainians exercising their right to self-determination. These lay in Lenin's belief in the 'objectively' progressive nature of the growth of Russia, despite the unsavoury Asiatic methods pursued by the Tsarist regime to achieve this. Lenin came from a long radical Russian tradition in this respect. Iurkevich found "unanimity on the national question between {Herzen} the father of Russian liberalism... in its idealistic youthful stage {when} his Russian patriotism assumed a revolutionary form... and {Lenin} the leader of contemporary Russian socialism" (78).

"They both recognise that nations have 'the full inalienable right to exist as states independent of Russia', but if you ask them whether they actually want the secession of nations oppressed by Russia, they will answer you cordially with one voice, '*No we do not want it!*' They are opponents of the 'break-up of Russia', and, recognising the 'right of self determination' only for the sake of appearances, they are actually fervent defenders of her unity. Herzen because he proceeds from the assumption that 'exclusive nationalities and international enmities constitute one of the main obstacles restraining free human development' and Lenin, because 'the advantages of large states both from the point of view of economic progress and from the interests of the masses are indubitable'" (79).

Lenin's support for "the advantages of large states", despite his new understanding of Imperialism, represents a real throwback to the early Marx, with 'economic progress' privileged over the struggle for democracy (80). Thus Iurkevich, with some justification, wrote that, "The national programme of the revolutionary Russian social democrats is nothing but a reiteration of the Russian liberal patriotic programme in the age of the emancipation of peasants" dating from the 1860s (81).

Tellingly, Iurkevich turned Lenin's own polemical method against Lenin. Lenin loved to find a bourgeois politician who expressed a similar opinion to whatever hapless Social Democrat he was attacking at the time. Therefore, Iurkevich pointed to the liberal, Kadet-supporting, Prince Trubetskoi, who wrote that, "If we set ourselves the goal of *merging* the Galicians {Ukrainians} with the native Russian population, we should from the beginning instill in them the conviction that to be Russian means for them not to renounce their religious beliefs and national peculiarities, but to preserve them" (82). Iurkevich pointed out that, "These words testify to Lenin's solidarity on the national question not only with Herzen, but also Prince Trubetskoi, as both Prince Trubetskoi and Lenin promise the oppressed nations - the former - 'preservation of their national peculiarities' - and Lenin - 'the right to self-determination', but both for the purpose of merging these nations" into Russia! (83)

viii) Iurkevich's opposition to 'the right of self-determination'

Lenin had accused Iurkevich of being simultaneously a bourgeois nationalist and an opposer of 'the right of self-determination'. Lenin utilised the dubious amalgam technique that lumped together people of very differing political positions. This was later to be used by others to create the 'Kronstadter/White' and 'Trotskyist/Fascist' blocs.

Iurkevich did oppose the use of the slogan, 'the right of self-determination'. He asked, "What is the 'right of nations to self-determination'?" He answered, "The bourgeoisie of the oppressor nation makes use of this 'right' to arouse patriotic feelings of devotion to 'large states' {e.g. the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, Prussian/German and British empires} in its own and foreign oppressed nations. Like Herzen and Lenin, who promise to 'guarantee' the 'right to self-determination' in a future free and democratic Russia, the bourgeoisie and its governments also usually promise liberation to oppressed nations *after* something, for example, *after* war" (84).

Iurkevich thought there was also little chance of self-declared democrats, from one-state parties in the dominant nations, putting their programme of 'the right of self-determination' for oppressed nations into practice. There was always a more pressing need for delaying it - until *after*. So, it proved, when the Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, in the post-February 1917 Revolution Provisional Government, wanted to put the issue off until *after* the election of the Constituent Assembly. After the October Revolution, the Bolsheviks counterposed their centre-directed, all-Russia Revolution to the multi-centred, revolutionary situation, which actually developed in the empire. This meant that any exercising of 'the right of self-determination' would once more have to wait until *after* the victory of the 'Russian' Revolution.

In order to maintain the supremacy of the Bolshevik-controlled centre, empty promises were made to oppressed nations and nationalities, and hollow bureaucratic forms of 'autonomy' were promoted. Several revolutionary initiatives in the non-Russian republics were crushed, creating widespread disillusion and driving some into the arms of counter-revolution. This simultaneously reinforcied those Great Russian chauvinist elements who became increasingly attracted to the new 'Soviet' state because of its ability to reimpose 'Russian' order.

Iurkevich highlighted the unlikelihood of any future Russian democratic republic conceding the constitutional principle of the right of self-determination. "For if a democratic system is actually established in Russia, then, taking as an example the development of the West European states and also considering the blatantly reactionary character of the Russian bourgeoisie, one can say with certainty that it will not only not oppose the weakening of tsarist centralism but will strengthen it, turning it from an exclusively bureaucratic system into a social system for the oppression of the Russian Empire" (85). Unwittingly, Iurkevich was remarkably far-sighted in this prediction. Only it was not the Russian bourgeoisie, but the USSR Party-State, which was to bring about such a system under Stalin.

Now Iurkevich was aware of the case that Lenin made for the achievability of independence under Imperialism. Lenin cited Norway and Sweden, and he later wrote about the struggle in Ireland. Iurkevich pointed out that Norway "exercised 'self determination' peacefully {by its declaration of independence} and by governmental means. On the other hand, the struggle for Irish autonomy {Home Rule} expressed itself in a prolonged and stubborn revolutionary struggle... {Lenin} identifies the forms of liberation of nations with the means of achieving their liberation" (84). Here Iurkevich was pointing out that a militant struggle for autonomy could be more revolutionary than a constitutional campaign for independence, invoking the right of self-determination.

However, there is a further point not made by Iurkevich. Norway did not achieve independence because of a 'right of self determination' given in the

Swedish constitution, but because it already had its own autonomous parliament, which organised a referendum in defiance of the Swedish state. Neither was Norway's struggle purely constitutional. War with Sweden was only averted because of the overwhelming majority in favour of independence in Norway, and the strong support given by Swedish Social Democrats.

And of course, Ireland, within the UK, but without its own parliament, highlighted the methods oppressed nations would most likely need to utilise under Imperialism, even where wider parliamentary democracy existed. In other words, oppressed nations are usually only able to achieve genuine self-determination when they have the power to force the issue, not because of any constitutional recognition of 'the right of self-determination'. And as Iurkevich was writing, the Irish national democratic struggle was moving beyond a constitutional campaign for Home Rule towards an insurrectionary movement for a Republic.

Iurkevich had also come across the most common version of the opposition to 'the right of self determination' amongst the International Left. Luxemburg and her followers on the Radical Left expressed this. Iurkevich would have agreed with Luxemburg, when she wrote, "'The right of nations to self-determination'… gives no practical guidelines for the day-to-day politics of the proletariat, nor any practical solution of nationality problems. For example, this formula does not indicate to the Russian proletariat in what way it should demand a solution of the Polish national problem, the Finnish question, the Caucasian question, the Jewish, etc." (86).

Only, in contrast to Luxemburg, Iurkevich supported actual national democratic movements pursuing their own self-determination. But he opposed the programmatic adoption of what he saw as the abstract 'right of self determination', particularly by parties or governments in the dominant nations. In his experience this 'right' was used to promote the 'merging' of the oppressed and the oppressor nation, substantially on the latter's terms, not the implementation of genuine self-determination. Therefore, he would also have added Ukraine to Luxemburg's list of "national problems" and "questions".

ix) Iurkevich identifies the common ground held by Lenin and the Radical Left

Lenin had pointed out that Iurkevich shared his opposition to the use of the slogan, 'the right of self-determination', with the Radical Left. However, Iurkevich's reasoning and political conclusions were very different. He persuasively argued that it was Lenin, despite his personal support for 'the right of self-determination', who shared far more, in practice, with the Radical Left.

Iurkevich was astute in identifying the purpose of Lenin's 're-re-revolutionary' dismissal of "autonomy as a reform {which} is distinct in principle from freedom of secession as a revolutionary measure" (87). Counterposing the 'revolutionary' demand for 'freedom of secession' (which Lenin believed should not be exercised by the oppressed nations in the Tsarist/Russian Empire) to the 'reformist' demands for actual autonomy, or federalism, and later independence (all of which had, or would in the near future, mobilise oppressed peoples in a potentially revolutionary struggle) was another example of the false method of argumentation used by the "revolutionary phrasemongers", which Lenin attacked over other issues. It was also Luxemburg's method of argument that Kelles-Kreuz had attacked earlier.

In common with Lenin, some Radical Left adherents could be accused of "prom(ising) liberation *after* something" - *after* the revolution. This had been the attitude of Luxemburg with regard to Poland. Furthermore, as a result of her 'one state,/one party' position, she held more in common with Lenin than their frequently quoted secondary differences over the 'National Question' suggest.

Moreover, during the First World War, other members of the Radical Left began to oppose any raising of the idea of self-determination in imperialist states, which had forcibly annexed neighbouring lands - even *after* the revolution. They believed that Imperialism had already performed a progressive role by 'merging' nations and nationalities.

Lenin had once made very similar points, particularly with regard to

Ukraine. "For several decades a well-defined process of accelerated economic development has been going on in the South, i.e. the Ukraine, attracting hundreds of thousands of peasants and workers from Great Russia to the capitalist farms, mines and cities. The 'assimilation' - within these limits - of the Great Russian and Ukrainian proletariat is an indisputable fact. *And this fact* is *undoubtedly* progressive" (88). There was absolutely no recognition here of the cultural oppression that Ukrainians faced, nor that, under Tsarist and company enforced 'Russification', this 'assimilation' was a one-way process! Now, however, Lenin strongly opposed the political conclusions drawn by the neo-Luxemburgist Radical Left.

Iurkevich, in contrast, would at least have recognised this new Radical Left's honesty in rejecting 'the right of self-determination' altogether. But he also opposed Lenin's support for the 'exercise' of this 'right' in the Russian Empire, but only *after* the revolution, when Lenin believed it would no longer be necessary because Ukrainians would voluntarily assimilate into the Russian nation.

x) Iurkevich highlights the connection between the exercise of self-determination and the need for independent parties

Iurkevich pointed out that, without an autonomous socialist organisation, there could be no substance behind the exercise of 'the right to self-determination' - indeed worse, it would be left to the bourgeois nationalists to champion.

Therefore, Iurkevich attacked Lenin when he claimed, in a letter to Ukrainian Social Democrats, to be "profoundly outraged by the advocacy of the segregation of Ukrainian workers into a separate {Social Democratic} organisation."(89) Iurkevich countered, "Throughout the whole nineteenth century and our own, Ukraine has been in the position of a Russian colony; moreover, the repression of the tsarist government has always been merciless. The Ukrainian printed word was banned for thirty years before the {1905} revolution and has now been banned once more since the beginning of the present war" (90).

The RSDLP, including the Bolsheviks, continued to support the ‘civilising’ role of Russian assimilation for Ukrainians. They thought their own Russian parties to be superior. Their attitudes bore a family resemblance to those of the British socialists in Belfast. They looked down, instead, upon those poor benighted Irish or 'Paddies' from the 'bogs of Donegal’, who still peddled a 'hopelessly outdated' claim for Irish independence, just as many Russian Social Democrats had a lofty contempt for 'Little Russians' or 'kholkols'.

Indeed, without autonomous national organisations to raise the issue, Russian Social Democrats ignored very real instances of great power oppression. Although Lenin had attacked Radek and Pyatakov's tacit support for imperialist annexations, Bolshevik practice was still found to be somewhat wanting. The Russian army had invaded and annexed Austrian Galicia in 1915. This had been done with a great deal of brutality and had aroused press outrage across Europe. The Russian nationality-dominated Bolshevik organisation had met clandestinely in Kharkhiv/Kharkhov, in eastern Ukraine soon afterwards. Yet little was made of this Russian state repression of Ukrainians in Galicia. Understandably, Iurkevich was incensed (91) in a similar way to the Bund’s reaction to the inability of the 1903 RSDLP Congress to deal with the Kishinev pogroms.

Here Bolshevik advocacy of a ‘one state/one party’ policy was revealed to be a cover for a thinly disguised, anti-Ukrainian, Great Russian chauvinism. Iurkevich’s opposition to, as he saw it, the empty and hypocritical slogan of 'the right of self determination’ highlighted what was common to Lenin and the Radical Left - their dogmatic refusal to give leadership to existing national democratic movements, whether they were striving against annexations, for autonomy, federation (or later, independence). They hid instead behind paper slogans.

Iurkevich was far from hostile to joint work with Russian Social Democrats, something he always advocated. He had wanted the USDLP to join the RSDLP in 1905, but as an autonomous section. The only way the wider interests of the Ukrainian working class could be represented, and fought for, was by having its own Social Democratic organisation - again something Marx and Engels would clearly have agreed with (92).

Therefore, he opposed the RSDLP's social chauvinist refusal to recognise the right of Social Democrats within the oppressed nations of the Tsarist Empire to organise autonomously within the wider all-state party. He thought that the attitude of the RSDLP stifled the wider revolutionary movement, which included those from the non-Russian nations like the Ukrainian, Georgian and Latvian Social Democrats.

However, since there was little support to be had from Russian Social Democrats (just as Kelles-Kreuz found in the case of German Social Democrats, and Connolly in the case of the British SDF and ILP) then Iurkevich would also look for wider international support. He supported the attempts by the International Left to organise the Kienthal Conference. Here he found himself in agreement with the compromise resolution eventually adopted by the Zimmerwald International Left. "As long as socialism has not brought about liberty and equality of rights for all nations (compare with Lenin's 'further merging'), the unalterable responsibility of the proletariat should be energetic resistance *by means of class struggle against all oppression* of weaker nations and a demand for the defence of national minorities on the basis of full democracy" (93).

Iurkevich went on to highlight the difference between the Left Zimmerwald {Kienthal} Theses and Lenin's theses (*The Socialist Revolution and the Right of National to Self-Determination*). Lenin, "while recognising the right of nations to self determination, actually supports a policy of hostility to the liberation of nations, counterposing to the Zimmerwald 'liberty and equality of rights for all nations' {his} own 'further merging.' Supporting the struggle for national liberation, the Zimmerwalders display a concern deserving of every recognition for 'national minorities' and demand democratic autonomy for oppressed nations" (94).

xi) Towards the 'Russian' Revolution

Iurkevich's dismissal of the likelihood of Russia emerging as the revolutionary beacon to the world proved to be very much misplaced. However, as the International Socialist revolution developed in the Russian Empire, the best Ukrainian Social Democrats rapidly dropped their old orthodox Marxist shibboleth of advocating different types of revolution East and West. They became Communists, and advocates of International Socialist Revolution, seeking links with the Bolsheviks. They attempted to join the new Third (Communist) International. They strongly believed in united action involving Communists of all the nations and nationalities within the tsarist state and beyond. Yet they retained their support for a Ukrainian party, whilst going on to support independence for Ukraine.

However, Lenin's theory of 'progressive assimilation', coupled to his support for a centralised all-Russia Party, prevented the adoption of a viable wider Communist strategy that could relate to these clamourings for national freedom. Indeed, Lenin's own theory of simultaneous support for assimilation and 'the right (but not the exercise) of national self-determination' was so contradictory it fell apart, particularly in Ukraine. Instead, Radical Left Bolsheviks, like Pyatakov, initially used the invading, largely Russian, Red Army in Ukraine to enforce assimilation; whilst those Bolsheviks from Ukraine, such as Serhii Maziakh and Vasyl' Shakhrai, who seriously began to address the ‘National Question’ in Ukraine, gave their support to the exercise of Ukrainian independence, becoming advocates of 'Internationalism from Below' (95).

When Lenin and the Bolsheviks were finally able to stabilise their state power after 1921, both the Radical Left vision of a unitary soviet Russia, and the Ukrainian Communists' vision of an independent soviet Ukraine, were marginalised. However, it was not Lenin's original vision of a unitary republic, or later, a federated soviet republic with the right to secede, which triumphed either. Instead, the USSR’s new federal constitution emphasised the limits to the powers given to each constituent national and autonomous republic. It provided extensive cultural rights rather than any genuine political self-determination.

This was more in line with the Austrian Social Democratic Brunn programme of 1898, and with Bauer's thinking. But Iurkevich would have had little difficulty in recognising the political imperative shared by the pre-War Austro-Marxists and the post-Revolution Bolsheviks - the defence of existing state territory. Only now it was the one-Party state in the USSR that performed the role previously performed by the state bureaucracies of the imperial monarchies of the Hapsburg and Romanov Empires.

Therefore, even in the changed conditions after 1918, Iurkevich, had he survived, would probably still have said, “We are against the Petrograd government’s and the Petrograd central committee’s centralising in their hands, first, all political power over the Russian Empire, and second, all organised power over Russian social democracy” (96). And any serious examination of the course taken by the Revolution, particularly in Ukraine, soon reveals why, on this issue, in challenging the ‘one state, one party’ supporters, he would have been right.

xii) Summary of the thinking of James Connolly and Lev Iurkevich

a) Connolly provided one of the best examples of historical analysis based on an exploration of the different class-based traditions within the Irish nation - in *Labourin Irish History*. This provided the theoretical basis for Connolly’s active advocacy of working class leadership in national democratic struggles in an oppressed nation.

b) Connolly strove to unite the Catholic and Protestant workers in Ireland. He sought to unite them through independent trade unions and political organisation for Irish Socialists. He looked to extend support for struggles on an ‘internationalism from below’ basis, as shown in the 1913 Dublin Lock Out.

c) When the First World War broke out, Connolly’s socialist republicanism led him to organise a challenge to the UK state and British imperialism. This culminated in the 1916 Dublin Rising, which was the harbinger of the 1916-21 International Revolutionary Wave.

e) Following the 1916 Dublin Rising Lenin wrote *The Discussion of Self-Determination Summed Up*. He realised that working class discontent, mutinies in the armies and national revolts were breaking down the previous divide between his ‘first’,

'second' and more recently 'third' worlds and providing the basis for International Socialist revolution. Unlike the Radical Left, who looked only to the working class, Lenin identified a wider range of revolutionary subjects.

f) Lenin, the RSDLP leader, who was most aware of the significance of national democratic movements, could draw on the experiences of Social Democrats in the Bund, Finland, Poland, Georgia and Latvia. However, his support for the 'right of self-determination', but opposition to its exercise, was linked to his support for the assimilation of smaller nations into larger ones and for 'one state, one party'. These were a barrier to Lenin being able to relate the national democratic movements.

g) The Ukrainian revolutionary Social Democrat Lev Iurkevich wrote *The Russian Social Democrats and the National Question*, as a critique of Lenin's shortcomings with regard to Ukraine. He opposed Lenin's support for Ukraine's assimilation into Russia. Iurkevich highlighted the link between the capitalists' promotion of Russian language and culture and tsarist oppression in Ukraine.

h) Iurkevich argued that the RSDLP's and the Bolsheviks' support for 'one state, one party' represented a further extension of a long-standing Russian chauvinism. He showed how deeply Lenin's attitudes were rooted in Russia's populist and liberal traditions. He highlighted the contradictions inherent in upholding the theoretical 'right of self-determination' but opposing its actual exercise.

i) Iurkevich took longer than Lenin to appreciate the all the tensions arising from the First World War had opened up the prospect of International Socialist revolution. He remained active in the wider International Revolutionary Left. He supported national parties in oppressed nations, a federal link with other parties in their wider state, and their active participation in an International. Like Kelles-Kreuz, Iurkevich died just as revolution was breaking out in his homeland. His

legacy was passed on to others including a wing of the Bolsheviks in Ukraine led by Serhii Maziakh and Vasyl' Shakhrai.

References for Chapter 4

(1) http://cius-archives.ca/files/original/26062c334dcdfcf 572187c6d6ddfbdb6.pdf

(2) James Connolly, *Socialism and Nationalism* in *James Connolly - Collected Works*, Volume One, p. 307 (New Books Publications, 1987, Dublin)

(3) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Connolly#Socialist_ Involvement

(3) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Irish_Socialist_Federation

(5) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialist_Party_of_America# Early_history

(6) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialist_Party_of_Ireland_ (1904)

(7) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Irish_Trades_Union_ Congress#History

(8) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dublin_lock-out

(9) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Irish_Citizen_Army

(10) James Connolly, *The Walker/Connolly Controversy on Socialist Unity in Ireland*, (*TW/CC*) (Cork Workers Historical Reprint, no. 9, n.d., Cork)

(11) Vladimir Lenin, *Critical Remarks on the National Question*, in *ONLSE*, op. cit. p. 91

(13) https://www.marxists.org/archive/connolly/1910/lih/

(14) Pat Walsh, *The Rise and Fall of Imperial Ireland* (Athol Books, 2003, Belfast)

(15) James Connolly, *The Socialist Symposium on Internationalism, and Some Other Things*, in *James Connolly - Political Writings, 1893-1916*, edited by Donal Nevin, p. 350 (SIPTU, 2011, Dublin)

(16) Mary Jones, *These Obstreperous Lassies - A History of the Irish Women Workers' Union*, pp. 1-20 (Gill & Macmillan, 1988, Dublin)

(17) Jan B. de Weydenthal, *The Communists of Poland - An Historical Outline* (*CPHO*) p. 4 (Hoover Institution Press, 1978, Stanford)

(18) Peter Nettl, *RL*, op. cit. p. 345

(19) ibid. p. 345

(20) ibid. p. 339

(21) ibid. pp. 344-53

(22) ibid. pp. 356-60

(23) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zimmerwald_Conference

(24) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kienthal_Conference

(25) Vladimir Lenin, *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination* in *QNPPI*, op. cit. p. 80

(26) Volume 2, Chapter 2Av, references 31-2, 34

(27) James Connolly, *TW/CC*, op. cit. p. 2

(28) ibid. p.3

(29) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rosa_Luxemburg#During_the_War

(30) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Radek#Germany_and_"the_Radek_Affair"

(31) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Radek#World_War_I_and_the_Russian_Revolution

(32) https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1914/cons-logic/index.htm

(33) James Connolly, *Irish Worker*, 8.8.1914, in P. Beresford Ellis, *James Connolly - Selected Writings*, p. 237

(34) Leon Trotsky, *The Lessons of Events in Dublin*, Karl Radek, *The End of a Song*, and Vladimir Lenin, *The Irish Rebellion of 1916* in *The Communists and the Irish Revolution*, edited by D.R. O'Connor

(35) https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/jul/x01.htm

(36) Vladimir Lenin, *The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self Determination (SRRNSD)* in *Questions of National Policy and Proletarian Internationalism* (*QNPPI*) p. 121 (Progress Publishers, 1970, Moscow)

(37) https://marxists.catbull.com/archive/marx/works/1891/06/29.htm

(38) Karl Radek et al, *Imperialism and National Oppression* in *Lenin's Struggle for a Revolutionary International – Documents: 1907-1916, The Preparatory Years (LSRI)*, p. 348 (Monad, Pathfinder Press, 1986, New York)

(39) Vladimir Lenin, *The Discussion on Self Determination Summed Up (DSDSU)* in *QNPPI*, op. cit., p. 137. **and** http://www.marxists.org/ archive/lenin/works/1916/jul/x01.htm

(40) Vladimir Lenin, *SRRNSD* in *QNPPI*, op. cit., p. 113

(41) ibid. p. 112-3

(42) Vladimir Lenin, *A Caricature of Marxism (ACM)* in *ONLSE*, op. cit. p. 194 and http://marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/carimarx/2.htm

(43) ibid. p. 201-2

(44) Vladimir Lenin, *DSDSU*, in *QNPPI*, op. cit. p. 161

(45) ibid. p. 14

.

(46) ibid. p. 157

(47) https://libcom.org/library/russian-social-democrats-national-question-lev-rybalka **and** Lev Iurkevych (L. Rybelka), *The Russian Social Democrats and the National Question (RSDNQ)* **in** *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (*JUS*)

(48) Vladimir Lenin, A*CM* in *ONLSE*, op. cit. pp. 218-9

(49) ibid. pp. 223

(50) Volume 2, Chapter 2Aiv

(52) Volume 2, Chapter 2Av

(53)

(52) Vladimir Lenin, *SRRNSD* in *QNPPI*, op. cit. p. 113

(53) Teodor Shanin, *Russia, 1905-07, Revolution as a Moment of Truth*, pp. 261-7 (Macmillan, 1986, Basingstoke)

(54) Andrew Ezergailis, *The 1917 Revolution in Latvia*, East European Monographs, No. VIII (Columbia University Press, 1974, New York and London)

(55) Robert Edelman, *Proletarian Peasants*, pp. 35-81 (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1987)

(56) Nadia Diuk, *The Ukraine before 1917*, in *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of the Russian Revolution*, pp. 217-8, edited by Harold Shukman (Blackwell, 1994, Oxford)

(57) Iwan Majstrenko, *Borot'bism - A Chapter in the History of Ukrainian Communism (B-CHUC)* p. 19 (Research Programme on the U.S.S.R., Edward Brothers, 1954, Ann Arbor)

(58) Jurij Borys, *Political Parties in Ukraine*, in *The Ukraine, 1917-21: A Study in Revolution*, p. 133, edited by Taras Hunczak (Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, Cambidge, 1977, Mass.)

(59) Iwan Majstrenko, *B-CHUC*, op. cit, p. 20

(60) http://marxists.anu.edu.au/archive/lenin/works/1913/crnq/index.htm and http://marxists.anu.edu.au/archive/lenin/works/1916/jan/x01.htm and http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/jul/x01.htm

(61) Lev Iurkevych, *RSDNQ*, **in** *JUS*, op cit. pp. 57-8

(62) ibid. pp. 57-8

(63) ibid. p. 76

(64) http://cius-archives.ca/files/original/26062c334dcdfcf572187c6d6ddfbdb6.pdf

(65) Chris Ford, *War or Revolution - Ukrainian Marxism and the crisis of International Socialism, Part 2* in *Hobgoblin* No. 5, p. 32, (London Corresponding Committee, 2003, London)

(66) ibid. p. 32

(67) ibid. pp. 31-2

(68) https://libcom.org/library/russian-social-democrats-national-question-lev-rybalka

(69) Lev Iurkevych, *RSDNQ* in *JUS*, op. cit. pp. 73-4

(70) ibid. pp. 61-2

(71) Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question*, in *Marxism and the National-Colonial Question*, p. 46 (Proletarian Publishers, 1975, San Francisco)

(72) Vladimir Lenin, *A Letter to S.G. Shahumyan*, 6.12.1913, in *NLSE*, op. cit., p. 83

(73) Vladimir Lenin, *Centralisation and Autonomy* in *Critical Remarks on the National Question*, and *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, in *QNPPI*, op. cit. pp. 37-43 and pp. 45-104

(74) Vladimir Lenin, *Declaration of the Rights of the Working and Exploited People* and *From the original version of the 'Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government'*, in *ONSLE*, op. cit., pp. 259-64

(75) Vladimir Lenin, *The Question of Nationalities or "Autonomisation"* **and** *The Question of Nationalities or "Autonomisation" (Continued)* in *QNPPI*, op. cit. pp. 164-170

(76) Lev Iurkevych, *RSDNQ* in *JUS*, op. cit. pp. 60-1.
(77) ibid. pp. 65-6

(78) ibid., p. 74

(79) ibid. p. 65

(80) ibid. p. 65

(81) Volume 2, Chapter 1Ciii

(82) Lev Iurkevych, *RSDNQ* in *JUS*, op. cit. p. 62

(83) ibid. p. 67

(84) ibid. p. 67

(85) ibid. p. 66

(86) ibid, p. 61

(87) ibid. pp. 73-4

(88) Vladimir Lenin, *Critical Remarks on the National Question* **in** *ONLSE*, op. cit. p. 97-8

(89) Lev Iurkevych, *RSDNQ* in *JUS*, op. cit. p. 77

(90) ibid. p. 77

(91) ibid. p. 71

(92) Volime 2, Chapter 2Av, reference 31

(93) Lev Iurkevych, *RSDNQ* in *JUS*, op. cit. p. 73

(94) ibid. p. 73

(95) Serhil Mazlakh and Vasyl' Shakhrai, *On the Current Situation in the Ukraine*, edited by Peter J. Potichnyj (The University of Michigan, 1970, Ann Arbor)

(96) Lev Iurkevych, *RSDNQ* in *JUS*, op. cit. p. 76.