THE MENSHEVIKS IN 1917

BY

OLEG KHRIPKOV

Bachelor of Arts

Moscow State Pedagogical Institute

Moscow, USSR

1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
July 1992

THE MENSHEVIKS IN 1917

Thesis Approved:

George F. Jewsbury
Thesis Advisor

[signature]

Joel M. Jensvold

Thomas C. Collins
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to Dr. George F. Jewsbury and Dr. Joel M. Jenswold for their encouragement and advice throughout my graduate program. Many thanks also go to Dr. W. Roger Biles for serving on my graduate committee. Their suggestions and support were very helpful throughout the study.

To Wann Smith for his expert typing and proofing skills; to Oscar Kursner for his help in translation.

My wife, Yelaina Khripkov, encouraged and supported me all the way and helped me keep the end goal constantly in sight. Thanks go to her for her undivided time in the final stages of the project. She provided moral support and was a real believer in my abilities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

IN THE TEXT

SDs	Social Democrats
SRs	Social Revolutionaries
VTsIK	Vserossiiskii tsentralnyi ispolnitelnyi komitet (All-Russian Executive Committee of Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets)

IN THE NOTES

IzvPS	Izvestiia Petrogradskogo soveta rabochikh i sol datskikh deputatov
RD	Revoliutsionnoe dvizhenie v Rossii
RG	Rabochaia gazeta
RPG	Browder and Kerensky, eds., Russian Provisional Government

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Russian Revolution of 1917 possesses a paradoxical quality: the farther time flows away from those stormy and tragic events, the closer attention is paid to them in the West and in Russia itself. The revolutionary events of the last seven years connected with the rise of Perestroika and the collapse of the communist system have made analysis of the Revolution of 1917 still more relevant both in theoretical and practical aspects because it not only reveals the tendencies and inner logic of the current revolution, but also sheds light on the seventy-five year old events. In comparing recent events to that of 1917, there are notable coincidences which help reveal the constancy of the Russian mentality, and contribute to new approaches to the problem of revolutions in general andunderstanding of the Russian Revolution in particular.

The dull uniformity and over-simplification of the interpretations of the Russian Revolution that dominated in the first forty years after it in the West (almost all of them negative) and in the USSR (all positive) set the stage for discussions and a search for alternative approaches in the 1960s and 1970s.[1] In this respect Russia, as usual, fell behind the West and only since the end of the 1980's, during the period of "Glasnost," have Soviet historians been

allowed to discuss freely and honestly their own history and its turning point -- the Revolution of 1917.

The Main Approaches to the Study of the Russian Revolution in American Historiography

In the 1930's and 1940's the leading approach to the Russian Revolution in American historiography was most fully expressed in the book by William H. Chamberlin, *The Russian Revolution.*[2] In spite of the balanced evaluations, the book suffered from an exaggerated focus on the personalities of the main participants, namely Lenin, Trotskii, Kerenskii, Miliukov and others.

The beginning of the Cold War and the necessity to "know the enemy" increased the interest of Western and American historians in Soviet studies. The absence of deep and specialized works during the previous period resulted in the creation of an over simplified model explaining the origin and essence of the Soviet socialist system. This model, called "totalitarianism", seemed to eliminate the necessity for a more specialized analysis of its initial point -- the Revolution of 1917. The founders of this approach -- Leonard Schapiro, Merle Fainsod and Michael Karpovich, stimulated Soviet Studies in America, but at the same time they set a narrow approach to the subject, stressing the role of politics at the expense of other aspects of society.[3] The best example of this approach was the book by Robert Daniel, *Red October.*[4]

In addition, during the same period of time (the end of the 1940's - beginning of the 1950's) an attempt was made to

"humanize" and rehabilitate the Russian Revolution. Bertram D. Wolfe, a former communist and then an enemy of Marxism, created a best-selling triple biography of Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin.[5] Isaac Deutcher, a convinced marxist and a veteran of the Trotskyist movement attracted public attention by his biographies of Trotsky and Stalin.[6] But the biggest achievement of this trend was E.H. Carr's monumental *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917 - 1923.*[7]

In the 1960's Western scholars got access to Soviet libraries and archives and revealed new aspects of the Revolution. One of the pioneering works was written by Oliver Radkey who thoroughly studied the ideology and politics of the Bolsheviks' opponents - the Socialist Revolutionaries (SR's), the largest party of revolutionary Russia.[8] This trend was continued by Rex Wade and William G. Rosenberg, both of whom concentrated their attention on Russian liberals and shifted emphasis from outstanding personalities to large political institutions.[9]

In the mid 1960's, a new sociological view of the Russian Revolution appeared. The book by Theodore H. Von Laue, *Why Lenin? Why Stalin?* placed the fate of tsarist and revolutionary Russia in the comparative context of global modernization.[10] This approach was designed to answer quite new questions: what was accidental and what was inevitable in the course of the Revolution; was there any regularity and historical sense in those events? But the modernization theory appeared to be too deterministic and abstract for the perception of human activity, freedom of choice, responsibility of personality, impact of ideologies. Focus on such basic processes as international competition and industrialization

obscured the roles of not only emperors and revolutionaries but also the differences between landlords and the tsarist bureaucracy and between the Bolsheviks and the labor movement.

Leopold H. Haimson and his successors managed to overcome the extremes of the previous trends. In ground-breaking articles published in 1964 and 1965, Haimson introduced a social historical approach with the focus on social stratification and polarization of society which undermined social stability and finally brought Russia to revolution and civil war.[11] Contrary to Shapiro, who viewed Bolsheviks as isolated conspirators and skillful manipulators of the working class, and to Von Laue, who didn't see the Bolsheviks' influence on the labor movement at all, Haimson, for the first time, depicted the workers as independent agents of the Revolution and revealed the dynamics of their relationship with the different political forces of Russia. Fifteen years later Haimson, together with his students, published a collective volume in which this approach was applied to rural Russia.[12]

In the following decade the social and structural contradictions within tsarist Russia were examined by two historical sociologists who, nevertheless, arrived at quite opposite conclusions. Theda Skocpol studied the negative impact of the political competition between the tsarist government and landed aristocracy.[13] But following Von Laue's thesis, she decided that not the internal social conflict, but the war with Germany proved ruinous for Russia. Skocpol's structuralistic approach didn't allow her to appreciate the role of the workers in the Russian Revolution.

This point became a focus of analysis for Tim McDaniel, who found the main source of social polarization and revolution in the nature of "autocratic capitalism," namely, in the conflict between the two goals of the tsarist state - promotion of economic modernization on the one hand and maintenance of stability of the autocratic power on the other. "Autocracy and capitalism, in their fateful interdependence, undermined each other and thus prepared the ground for a revolution against both."[14] McDaniel showed that by the beginning of the War the autocratic state had become unable to effectively overcome the ruinous consequences of the social and economic changes which it had initiated. Thus the War was only the final burden that broke the back of tsarism.

Beginning with the mid 1970's a group of American historians started publishing the works where they undertook a comprehensive revision of the traditional Western view on the Russian Revolution.

Haimson, who created the whole school, and later Rosenberg became the leaders of this trend. The essence of the revision was in the transition from a political history of the Revolution to a social one. This meant that the Revolution is best understood as a movement of the broad masses of people whose struggle for their interests was relatively independent; and who not only experienced influence from above, from the political parties, but also themselves exerted strong reciprocal influence upon the parties. Such an approach demanded a concrete historical sociological study of the lower classes in Russia, and also of the labor movement in the period of the Revolution. By 1983 there had been published a whole series of such works, which allowed Ronald Suny to speak about a new

paradigm in the study of the Revolution, the essence of which was "the view from below."[15] Due to the works of William Rosenberg, Norman Saul, Allan Wildman, Tsuyoshi Hasegawa, Steve Smith, David Mandel, Diane Koenker, Rex Wade and others,[16] the lower classes, and especially the working class of Russia, have again occupied the central place in the analysis of the Revolution.

These historians studied different processes within the labor movement: self organization into the workers committees, militia detachments and soviets; attempts to cooperate with employers and their failure; the growth of hostility towards the upper and middle classes; increasing radicalism in the workers demands and actions; workers' alienation from the moderate socialists and, at last, their growing respect for the Bolsheviks alternative program, resulting in mass support for the Bolsheviks. Mandel and Smith distinguished three strata of workers -- the politically aware skilled workers, the unskilled ones, and the "worker aristocracy", -- and showed their different attitude towards economic and political issues. One of the main conclusions was that despite the superficial impression of chaos and anarchy, workers' actions in 1917 were an essentially rational and organized process,[17] and also relatively independent from the Bolshevik influence.

The Study of Menshevism in the U.S.

. Analysis of the labor movement has inevitably led historians to the study of the Menshevik party as a political leader and defender of workers' interests. By the mid 1980's American historiography

had accumulated a large amount of primary sources and a number of biographies of the Menshevik leaders, which prepared the basis for more general historical works.[18]

Haimson's works in this field again proved to be seminal. In 1959 he launched the Inter-University Project on the History of the Menshevik Movement and became the director of the Project.[19] The project was carried out by collaboration between the Menshevik émigré community and professional American historians. According to Haimson, one of the Project's immediate aims was to collect and preserve the various records of the history of Menshevism.

Another task was to record the memories of the survivors of the Menshevik movement through interviewing them and encouraging them to write their memoirs and even the history of Menshevism. All these materials have been stored in the Archives of the History of Menshevism established at the Harriman Institute at Columbia University. The second biggest collection of the documents on the Menshevik movement is situated in the Archives of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace in Stanford.[20]

As a result of this tremendous job several books by prominent Mensheviks have been published in Russian and in English during the period of 1960 - 1980.[21]

The main focus of these documents and books about Menshevism is that they describe in detail the periods before February, 1917 and after October, 1917, leaving the most important period -- from February to October - almost totally undeveloped (the memoirs of Tseriteli is an exception).

In 1983, J.D. Basil published the first book that filled this gap.[22] Despite its numerous merits, the book turned out to be rather superficial; it didn't analyze the full variety of trends within Menshevism of that period, the diversity of alternatives that opened to the Menshevik leaders at different phases of the Revolution. The author failed to show the dramatic ideological struggle within the Menshevik party and the dynamics of its relationship with both workers and liberals. All this underscores the necessity for further research of the Mensheviks' activities during that period. The above-mentioned aspects of the history of Menshevism constitute the main topics of the present thesis which belongs to the "revisionist" ideological trend.

Soviet Scholars on Menshevism

A considerable number of books devoted to Menshevism have been published in the U.S.S.R. Most of them emphasize the opportunism and revisionism of the Mensheviks, their betrayal of the working class interests and their struggle against the Bolsheviks. At the same time this literature adds many interesting facts and important documents which allow us to better understand the inner logic of the Menshevik policy and the causes of their defeat.

One of the first works of Soviet historical literature about the Mensheviks was the book of V. Bystrianskii, *Mensheviki i esery v russkoi revoliutsii*, (Mensheviks and SR's in the Russian Revolution), published in 1922,[23] in which the author analyzed the evolution of the Menshevik party and characterized it as the mouthpiece of petty

bourgeoisie. Much attention was also paid to the counter-revolutionary activities of the Mensheviks after October, 1917.

A lengthy book by I. Vardin, *Revoliutsia i menshevism*, (Revolution and Menshevism),[24] published in 1925, describes in detail the program, tactics and strategy of the Mensheviks in the period of the Revolution, and also their deviation from the Marxist program principles under the pressure of practical situations and for the sake of political expediency.

The work of I.M. Maiskii, *Demokraticheskaia kontrrevoliutsia*, (Democratic Counter-Revolution)[25] is rather interesting because the author himself used to be a member of the Central Committee of the Menshevik party (though he turned to the Bolsheviks in 1921) and was quite aware of his party's activity. Unfortunately, most of the book is devoted to the post-October period, especially to the history of the Czecho-Slovak revolt and the creation of the Samara Constituent Government under the leadership of the Mensheviks and SR's.

The most interesting and "objective" work was a four volume account by G. Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, (The Year of Seventeen)[26] which, though written from a Bolshevik position, is rich in facts and data about Menshevik activity in the Petrograd Soviet. It also reveals the complicated and changing relationships between the two Social-Democratic parties of Russia and their fight for the working masses.

During the period from 1930 to 1950 the amount of work about the Mensheviks greatly decreased, firstly due to the disappearance of this party from the political arena and secondly

because of the dramatic narrowing of the officially allowed topics and interpretations. Only in the very beginning of the 1930's was it still possible to publish a few books containing valuable facts; that of I. Mints, *Mensheviki i interventy*, (The Mensheviks and Interventionists)[27] and P. Lepeshinsky, *Mensheviki*, (The Mensheviks).[28]

New opportunities for the study of Menshivism were opened in the 1960's after the Twentieth and Twenty-second Congresses of the CPSU. The policy of destalinization enabled the publication of numerous documents and archived materials which greatly increased the primary resource base for the research.[29]

Thus, M.V. Spiridonov in his book *Politicheskii krakh menshevikov i eserov v professionalnom dvizhenii*, (Political Failure of the Mensheviks and SR's in the Tradeunionist Movement), published in [illegible][30] depicted for the first time Menshevik activities in the trade unions. Spiridonov presented a rich historiographic essay of this topic, making use of new archival and documentary resources. He made an attempt to make serious generalizations and conclusions (of course, from the orthodox-marxist point of view) about the causes of the Mensheviks' loss of influence in the trade unions and in the labor movement as a whole.

During the same year a big monograph was published by V.V. Komin, *Bankrotstvo Burzhuaznykh i melkoburzhuaznykh partii Rossii v period podgotovki i pobedy Oktiabrskoi revoliutsii*, (The Bankruptcy of Bourgeois and Petty Bourgeois Parties in Russia in the Period of Preparation and Victory of the October Revolution).[31] It is seen from the title that the author analyzed the whole spectrum of

political parties, with the exception of the Bolsheviks, and therefore, in spite of the large volume of the book, the Mensheviks are given only slight attention. The author displayed a deep knowledge of Menshevik primary sources and Western historiography. He undertook a serious attempt to understand the Mensheviks "from the inside," proceeding from their statements and their situation, and not from the point of view of Bolshevik values. This approach drew a lot of criticism to the author for his "underestimation" of the role of the Bolsheviks in the disclosure of the Mensheviks inefficiency.

This "underestimation" was "corrected" in the book by N.V. Ruban, *Oktiabrskaya revoliutsia i krakh menshevisma*, (The October Revolution and the Collapse of Menshevism).[32] This book seems to be the only one in the postwar Soviet historiography which is fully devoted to the Mensheviks in their most critical period of March 1917 through the summer of 1918. Despite the use of numerous primary sources, the book suffers from excessive tendentiousness. The author interprets Menshevism as one of the trends of right reformism in the European socialist movement and tries to prove (according to Lenin's directions) the inevitability of the Mensheviks' betrayal of the working class and, in the long run, their slipping into open counter-revolution. In the author's opinion, such behavior under the conditions of revolution in Russia doomed the Mensheviks to ideological and political collapse.

The only interesting study produced in the 1970s which described the struggle between the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks was the book by H.M. Astrakhan, *Bolsheviki i ikh politicheskie*

protivniki v 1917 godu, (The Bolsheviks and Their Political Antagonists in 1917).[33]

A new approach to the problem is represented in a collective monograph, *Neproletarskie partii Rossii: urok istorii*, (Nonproletarian Parties of Russia: the Lesson of History), published in 1984,[34] where the authors drew a wide historical perspective of the evolution of all the main Russian political parties (except the Bolsheviks), starting with the very beginning of the twentieth century, and ending with their elimination after the Civil War. Such comparative analysis, which has revealed the different reactions of various parties to the same events, and the change of their strategies and tactics under changing conditions, has been undertaken in the Soviet Union for the first time. Inspite of Marxist-Leninist phraseology, this approach has produced very interesting material. Naturally, the main conclusion of the authors of this monograph was that the Bolshevik victory and the failure of their antagonists were inevitable.

Sources

The main sources for the study of Menshevism in 1917 are the newspapers of that time and, first of all, the Menshevik central organ *Rabochaya gazeta*, (The Worker's Newspaper).[35] The second important newspaper is the official mouthpiece of the Petrograd Soviet, which was under Menshevik control until September, 1917: *Izestia Petrogradskogo Soveta rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov*, (The News of the Petrograd Soviet of the Workers and Soldiers Deputies).[36] The third important source is *Protokoly zasedanii*

Ispolnitelnogo komiteta Petrogradskogo Soveta, (The Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet Meetings)[37] which reveals inner, often hidden, disagreements among the Menshevik leaders and the detailed reasoning behind their political decisions.

A collection of documents in six volumes, *Revoliutsia 1917 goda: Khronika sobytii*, (The Revolution of 1917: The Chronicle of Events)[38] is especially useful for the reconstruction of the comprehensive picture of the development of the Revolution.

Most significant documents of the Revolution in English translation are gathered in a three volume edition by R.P. Browder and A.F. Kerensky, *The Russian Provisional Government*.[39]

Since the Mensheviks in 1917 were very closely connected with the activity of the Soviets, two collections of documents called *Vserossiiskoye soveshchanie Sovetov*, (All-Russian Conference of the Soviets)[40] and *Vtoroi Vserossiiskii Siezd Sovetov*, (The Second All-Russian Congress of the Soviets)[41] were used as additional sources.

The analysis of the labor movement and its attitude towards the Mensheviks was undertaken on the basis of the many-volumed edition *Revoliutsionnoye dvizhenie v Rossii,* (Revolutionary Movement in Russia)[42].

The situation in the army was reconstructed according to the documents from the book *Revoliutsionnoe dvizhenie v russkoi armii v 1917 g. 27 fevralia - 24 oktiabria. Sbornik dokumentov*, (Revolutionary Movement in the Russian Army in 1917. February 27 - October 24. The Collection of Documents).[43]

The second group of sources consists of the memoirs and historical accounts of the Mensheviks themselves: I.Y. Tsereteli, V.S.

Voitinskii, N.N. Sukhanov (who was formally affiliated with the Independent Internationalists but was practically a Menshevik), O.A. Ermanskii, F.I. Dan, Iu. Martov and others.[44]

No less valuable information is contained in the memoirs and "histories" of the Mensheviks' opponents and allies: P.N. Miliukov, V.V. Shulgin, A.Y. Shliapnikov, A.F. Kerensky, V. Chernov and V.B. Stankevich.[45]

The secondary sources, both by Soviet and American authors, were also of great help, especially those belonging to the revisionist trend.

Themes and Problems

One of the basic conclusions which can be derived from the works of the revisionist trend is that before the Bolsheviks seized power the Mensheviks had already lost it. It was significant that Kerensky was unable to find even three hundred armed men in the entire capital city to defend himself and his government during the October coup. If that is true, the center of the attention should be shifted from the Bolsheviks to the Coalition Provisional Government (which combined the representatives of liberal bourgeoisie and moderate socialists) and to the allied Soviets. An important and sometimes decisive role in both ruling bodies was played by the Mensheviks, more exactly, the faction that called itself Revolutionary Defensists. Hence, one of the key topics in the study of the Revolution of 1917 is the strategy and tactics of the Mensheviks, their relationships with allies and antagonists, and especially with

their social support and constituency -- the workers who finally turned away from the Mensheviks.

The first question that arises here is: why did the Mensheviks lose the game? Until July they possessed powerful authority among wide masses of workers, peasants, soldiers and the democratic intelligentsia. They held decisive control over levers of state power (enjoying the support of the Petrograd garrison and the majority in the army). They made use of their enormous opportunities for oral and printed propaganda among the masses. They had a reasonable program for evolutionary and necessary social and economic reforms (the only program which might have saved Russia from civil war). They had competent and pragmatic leaders. Why, with all this, did the Mensheviks lose? And not only did they lose power, but also opened the door for civil war and dictatorship, against which they had been fighting so hard. This question is the fundamental one for the present research.

The next question is whether the Menshevik leaders had a real chance to prevent the Civil War and dictatorship (it doesn't matter which type -- right or left)? If such a chance existed why was it lost? And what role did the Mensheviks play in it? Could they have at least partly preserved support from the right and above (from liberals and propertied classes) as well as from the left and below (from the Internationalists and workers), and used this support to avert the catastrophe of the Civil War? The author of this research is convinced that this was not a realistic possibility. The works of "the revisionists", which revealed the growing polarization of the society, the growth of interclass hatred, the inefficiency of the government,

and the Mensheviks' inability to satisfy the urgent needs of masses, support this conclusion.

Questions about the mistakes and responsibilities of any political group in Russia (and the Mensheviks, in particular) should be considered within the "right dictatorship" or "left dictatorship", with the inevitability of Civil War in either case. The author is convinced that a right dictatorship would have also led to the Civil War, which in Russia at that time could possibly have resulted not only in restoration of the old regime but also in victory of the proletariat and the Bolsheviks). This second alternative -- a right or left dictatorship -- is clear for us now, in retrospect, but was not at all obvious to the politicians of that time (at least before the Kornilov's revolt ofAugust 27 - 30). Therefore, all attempts of the Mensheviks to preserve the Coalition and maintain civil peace before August, 1917 can be justified. If those attempts failed, it was not the guilt of the Mensheviks, who had made considerable concessions to the liberals. Guilt lies with their right and left rivals: the bourgeoisie and landlords, on the one hand, greedily seeking new foreign lands and monopolistic superprofits and undivided power; and radical SR's, anarchists and Bolsheviks, on the other hand. One should also consider the guilt, or more exactly, the tragic misfortune of Russian peasants and workers who could not respect personal rights, the rights for property and the sovereignty of law.

Already on the eve of Kornilov's revolt (and especially after it) the situation dramatically changed and talks about civil and class peace and cooperation by that time reflected self-deception. At that very moment the Mensheviks made their most serious and fatal

mistake: instead of allowing a terrible, but still lesser evil -- the right dictatorship, they blocked the way to it, thus giving the way to the left, Bolshevik dictatorship, which in its destructive consequences has exceeded the worst possible predictions.

This paper does not pretend to provide a comprehensive examination of the foregoing hypothesis. The activity of the Mensheviks (and their centrist leaders -- Revolutionary Defensists) constituted only one aspect of revolutionary events, but even this aspect is too large and complicated to be fully analyzed within the limits of the Master's Thesis. Therefore, the direct and closest subject of this work is the origin, evolution and collapse of the Menshevik idea and policy of coalition with the liberals. Special attention is also paid to the ideological struggle inside the Menshevik party itself on the key political issues, and to the social and economic causes of the Mensheviks' failure. The analysed period is limited by only eight months: February 28 -- October 25 -- the day where the Mensheviks obtained power till the day they lost it.

CHAPTER II

THE "HONEYMOON" OF THE REVOLUTION

The Necessity for Dual Power

The February Revolution was a surprise for all political parties of Russia. But still bigger surprise became its political result, which came to be known as "dual power." Thus the main question of the present chapter is whether the "dual power" was accidental or it was inevitable. And if it was a necessity, what were the reasons and the rationale for it?

Despite a traditional view that dual power was dictated by the Mensheviks' doctrine, and also their fear of power and responsibility, the facts show that the Mensheviks turned very creative in combining their ideological principles and the practical needs of the moment. Moreover, the strategy they finally agreed on not only was appropriate to the balance of political forces but also was responsive to the strongest sentiments of most workers and soldiers, whom the moderate socialists pretended to lead.

The first meeting of the Petrograd Soviet late on the night of February 27 demonstrated the extreme uncertainty about the revolution's victory. Accounts of different witnesses and participants convey the deep anxiety created by the complete disorganization of those hundreds of thousands of excited but inexperienced

"revolutionaries" who looked on the members of the executive committee as their leaders. In Steklov's words:

> We had not yet succeeded in formulating any political program for the movement and at the same time learned that the (tsarist) ministers were still free. There were rumors that five regiments were marching on us from the north. From minute to minute we expected that they would arrive and if not shoot us, take us away.[1]

In spite of the chaos and the lack of information, the Mensheviks' leaders, from the first days, tried to evaluate the real scale, significance, meaning and perspectives of the events. Naturally, they compared it to the already familiar experience of the Revolution of 1905 - 1907. On March 2, an editorial in the soviet's newspaper warned its readers:

"The lesson of 1905, not to surrender oneself to illusions and not to overestimate the revolutionary forces."[2] Later, Menshevik Ermanskii also drew parallels with 1905, pointing out that a "revolution in times of military defeat may win an easy victory in the short run but may still be crushed in the long run."[3] Very soon the Mensheviks noticed the fact that what had begun as a workers' revolution had won its victory as a "soldiers revolution" -- that is, only the support of the soldiers had ensured the victory. Still further, as Ermanskii observed, this fact brought to the foreground the question of the peasantry and its "cultural and political backwardness."[4] No Menshevik -- whether Internationalist or Defensist -- could envision the peasant-soldiers as a decisive participant of social and political relations, let alone accept them as trusted allies of the working class. In addition, the armed, hungry,

and homeless masses of soldiers represented a real threat to the efforts of the executive committee in organizing and feeding its supporters. In these circumstances, as Sukhanov explained later, the attention of the committee was turned from "high politics" to "technical questions." [5]

Indeed, the earliest actions of the executive committee in the face of perceived threats to itself and the revolution made it the "organizational center of Democracy," around which the masses were called to organize.[6] The process of "self-determination" of masses seeking for leaders to legitimize their revolt was crucial to the evolution of the soviet's political strategy. The "revolutionary forces" imposed on the executive committee the problems of two kinds: those which demanded cooperation with the Duma committee, and those which forced to confront it.

The self-appointed temporary executive committee had already taken steps on the afternoon of February 27 (even before the soviet's plenum had met for the first time) to deal with the two most pressing needs: defense and provisions. It had nominated the Mensheviks Volkov, V.G. Groman, and Frankorusskii to a supply commission, and it had called on S.D. Mstislavskii, an army officer with SR-Internationalist leanings, to come to the Tauride Palace, the headquarters of the Soviets, to organize its defense.[7]

At the second plenum meeting on February 28 the Soviet decided that its military and supply commissions should work independently of the corresponding commissions established by the Duma committee, although keeping in contact with them.[8] But very soon it became evident that the problem of supplying food for the

population of the capital clearly required close cooperation with the Duma committee. Alone, the soviet's supply commission could neither guarantee the cooperation of railroad personnel in shipping food to Petrograd nor gain access to whatever reserves were still in the city. The Duma committee controlled the railroad's telegraphic service therefore capable of declaring itself the principal power, who could thus control the movement of supplies (and troops) to Petrograd.[9] Of no less importance was the pressure from the Central Cooperative of Wholesale Buyers in Petrograd, which offered its services to the Soviet but then demanded that the soviet's supply commission be merged with its Duma counterpart. On February 28, the Soviet did reverse its earlier decision and established a common supply commission with the Duma committee. [10]

On the major issue of the military defense of the Revolution and the question of the army's loyalty, matters were far more complicated, though here too, cooperation seemed unavoidable. The balance of forces in the country at large favored the Duma committee,[11] which controlled the movement of troops on the railroads leading to the capital. More than than, only the Duma committee could claim the loyalty of the tsar's generals in command of the army on the front. Reassured by the Duma's expressed concern for maintaining order and continuing the war effort, the fronts' commanders urged Gen. N. Iu. Ivanov to stop his attack on Petrograd and, on March 2, also recommend the tsar's abdication.[12] The support of the Duma committee prevented a civil conflict and strengthened the moderate and left wing of the revolution. The

army's acceptance of the Duma committee, imposed on the soviet's leadership the imperative of cooperation.

The Duma committee also held the key to the support of the officers of the Petrograd garrison, which numbered some 180,000 men. Signals of loyalty to the Duma on the part of the officers were coming in from everywhere.13 It was essential for the Soviet to "neutralize" the officers and obtain their cooperation, for only they could organize the soldiery into units capable of defense or at least prevent the army's anarchy.[14] Therefore, the first manifesto to the soldiers, issued on February 28 by the executive committee underlined the authority of the officers or the Duma, though in fact its purpose was to resist Rodzianko's attempts to establish the Duma's command over the soldiery -- his "Order to the Troops" that they obey their officers. The soviet's manifesto declared:

> The executive committee of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies does not recommend that soldiers refuse to preserve their regular organization or refuse to obey the orders of the military commission (of the Duma) and its officials. At the same time, it advises all military units to immediately elect representatives to the soviet . . . for the establishment of one, united will for all of the . . . working class.[15]

The restrained language of this document stands in striking contrast to the soviet's second appeal to the soldiers, the Order No. 1, issued just one day later. The events surrounding the creation of these two documents were indicative of the changing pressures on the executive committee as well as of the leadership's quick response to the challenge from its growing constituency, particularly that of the ideologically mistrusted soldiery.

Between February 28 and March 1, a new problem arose, as soldiers in one unit after another refused to allow the return of their officers even after the latter had declared their support for the revolution. In effect, the soldiers were declaring that they would no longer tolerate the relationship of unquestioning obedience that had existed between officer and soldier under the old regime.[16] This challenge from the soldiers' barracks (rather than the workers' quarters) allowed the executive committee to abandon its emphasis on cooperation in favor of open defiance of the Duma committee.

The first soldiers' deputies appeared at the soviet plenum on March 1, and they took the floor immediately to voice their grievances. One soldier began:

> Was it for this that we have made the revolution? For the State Duma to again seat the officers on our shoulders? Now that we have our soviet, and we all realize that in all our units, too, we should introduce committees to manage supplies, let's allow these committees to also watch over the officers.[17]

After soldiers had finished speaking, Sokolov made a draft of the resolution, which was immediately adopted. It stated for the first time the principle of a conditional acceptance of authority: "The soldiers' masses (will obey) the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The opinion of the military organization (i.e., the military commission of the Duma) will be accepted only to the extent that it does not conflict (with the guidance of the Soviet).[18]

In spite of the apparent discrepancy between this resolution and the position taken by the executive committee in its manifesto of the night before, the committee raised no significant objection to

another resolution, brought before it by a deputation of ten soldiers. Instead, the committee entrusted this deputation with the final working out of an order (prikaz) that the Soviet was to issue to the soldiers of the Petrograd garrison. This Order No. 1 was thus the creation of the soldiers themselves but enjoyed the full sanction of the executive committee. The order consisted of three main points: the civil equality of soldiers and officers; a separate self-administration for the soldiers in all but purely military matters (that is, administration of the unit's daily life by elected committees and of political matters by the soldiers' representatives to the soviet); and the conditioning of the soldiers' loyalty to the Duma committee and to the officers on fulfillment of the first two points.[19]

The demands of the soldiers bore a remarkable resemblance to those the workers soon started to send to the soviet. In its handling of these demands the executive committee showed itself ready to respond to the needs and aspirations of those groups that were its natural constituency, and to represent them before the Duma committee. In return, the soldiers, whose political loyalty had been sought by the Duma committee, now began to ally themselves with the soviet.[20] Suddenly, the leaders of the executive committee perceived that the Soviet possessed genuine authority. But what would be the formal division of political authority between the soviet and the Duma committee?

The practical question, then, was how to preserve the young, fragile revolution as well as to expand and deepen it. On this point, there was full agreement between the Internationalists (both Mensheviks and Independents) and all other Mensheviks in the

executive committee: namely, that the organizationally weak and politically isolated "camp of democracy" had to establish an alliance with the "bourgeois camp," because "state agencies, the army, the zemstvos, and the cities . . . might obey (the Kadet) Miliukov, (but) they would not obey (the Menshevik) Chkheidze," and also because, on most issues, though not on that of the war, the bourgeois camp could be pressured into more accommodating positions. For these reasons, Sukhanov argued, Democracy would initially have to yield power to its "class enemy," but the soviet, as the organization of the revolutionary masses, should preserve the "fullest freedom of struggle" against these enemies.[21]

At the March 1 meeting, Sukhanov brought up another element in his scheme for the first time: namely, a formula for conditional support of the Provisional Government.

Three events heightened the Menshevik leaders' sense of power and led them to use it as leverage over the new government. The first of these was the soldiers' appearance (in the midst of the executive committee's discussion of the question of power late on the night of March 1) to ask the committee's support for what would later become Order No. 1. The second was the report of the negotiators sent by the executive committee to the Duma committee on the night between March 1 and 2. Three of the four negotiators were Internationalists -- Sukhanov, Steklov, and Sokolov (Chkneidze was the fourth). Surprisingly, they met almost no opposition to their demands. "Our program," Steklov later recalled, "was accepted by everybody as being unquestionable and unavoidable."[22] Finally, there was the incident on March 2, just before the soviet's final

discussion of the question of power when a large crowd assembled in the Tauride Palace reacted with hostility to a speech by Miliukov defending the monarchy. Sukhanov and Steklov were reassured by the apparent belief of the crowd that "democracy was within reach of a republican structure and a solution to the land question."[23] Thus, the "logic of events" helped the Internationalist SDs to convince the more ambivalent Mensheviks to make their support of the government conditional.

All Russian socialists, began from the assumption that Russia was finally going through its "bourgeois revolution." Disagreements and uncertainty concerned three interrelated issues: the length of the period before the socialist transformation could be attempted; the extent to which social change was possible during the transitional phase; and the roles of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat during this transition. Different answers were given to these questions by different groups of Mensheviks according to their preferred areas of activity and the ideological conceptions they had developed in the past. Yet by all accounts, the Mensheviks in the executive committee responded in unity to the question of power, especially on the socialist participation in government. The Mensheviks and Independents alike found their expectations altered and had to accept the notion that, in the present revolution -- because of society's division into upper and lower strata, the presence of the soldiers among the latter group, and the declared loyalty of the soldiers to the soviet -- the soviet, an essentially working-class institution, had to assume a greater and more precisely defined responsibility for the course of the bourgeois revolution than

Menshevik-Marxist doctrine seemed to allow. In time, the differences between the Internationalists, the Independents, and the more moderate Mensheviks would become apparent, but for the moment, the executive committee of the soviet appeared unified in its support of the political solution of "dual power."

The Essence and Structure of Dual Power

In the historiography of the revolution of 1917, the term "dual power" (dvoivlast') usually refers to the division of political authority that existed in different forms between the Provisional Government and the Soviet Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies between February and October. Here, however, the term will be used to denote the specific political agreement that was concluded on March 2 between the executive committee of the Petrograd soviet and the temporary committee of the State Duma. The agreement was published in the form of joint statements: one by the Provisional Government, which listed its program of promised reforms; the other by the soviet, which called on the masses to "lend support" to the new government" as long as . . . it fulfilled these obligations and struggles resolutely against it (remnants of) the old regime."[24] The eight points of the Provisional Government's program guaranteed civil and political equality for all as well as complete freedom of political activity. Except for the particular case of Kerenskii, there was to be no participation by the soviet in the government, nor were any institutional ties established between the two bodies. The ministers of the Provisional Government were drawn from the parties and the public organizations of liberal, propertied, and "loyal" Russia.[25] The

essence of dual power was a division of authority and responsibility between the two contending social and political forces. As such, it reflected their mutual recognition that the balance of forces made it impossible for either the Duma or the soviet to establish by itself the political order that was to replace the tsarist regime. While the March 2 agreement granted all formal state authority to the liberal bourgeoisie, this did not indicate surrender on the part of democracy or its abdication of its right to influence the course of the revolution.[26] The socialists of the executive committee refused to participate in the cabinet in order to secure the soviet's existence as a separate entity, as well as its right to engage in the work of organizing its followers into a united political force. The dual power would not have worked, nor would it have been morally valid, if it had not corresponded to the attitudes of the workers and soldiers on whose support the soviet's authority and strength rested.

The text of the dual power agreement was submitted to the plenum of the soviet for ratification of March 2. Its authors found reassurance in the results of the vote as well as in the general thrust of the discussion. Only ten out of some four hundred deputies present voted against the resolution proposed by the executive committee, and only nineteen voted for the Bolshevik-sponsored counterrevolution, which called on the soviet to support a "Revolutionary Provisional Government" rather than the existing "antipeople" Provisional Government. At the same time, the Bolsheviks' insistence on the "three-tail" minimum program of Social Democracy (the eight-hour workday, confiscation of the gentry's land, and a democratic republic) was met with "stormy applause."[27]

This showed that the deputies support rested on the belief that the leaders were dedicated to the realization of the social and political changes symbolized in the "three-tail" program. At the same time the workers, distrusting the Provisional Government, decided to take responsibility for the essential aspects of their lives and to ensure their freedom to do so. Meetings held on March 2 in the Rozhdestvenskii district and at some factories created their own food committees and workers' militias in addition to electing delegates to the soviet.[28] The resolution adopted on March 5 by the workers of the Second military equipment factory said:

> The Provisional Government that emerged from the revolution speaks for the interests of the bourgeoisie, and therefore the working class can support this government only insofar as (postol'ku, poskol'ku) its policy will not run against the interests of the broad toiling masses. At the same time, the working class must organize itself for the defense of its class interests and the consolidation of all the achievements of the revolutions.[29]

Dual power provided not only a formula that captured these diverse feelings -- insecurity, suspicion, the desire for equality -- but also a framework within which both workers and leaders might acquire political experience while avoiding responsibilities for which they felt themselves unready. Much of the success of dual power and of the February revolution itself would depend on the ability of the Mensheviks in the executive committee to organize their followers into a powerful and disciplined force. To accomplish this, the leaders had to ensure that the masses' most pressing demands and aspirations were fulfilled. They had to keep pressure on the country's new rulers and yet prevent the pressure from below from

destroying the delicate political arrangement that had been worked out between the soviet and the Provisional Government.

The war became the source of a crisis which the leaders of the soviet would confront throughout the summer and fall of 1917 and also the reason for the unexpected political influence of the peasant-soldier on the outcome of the revolution. Moreover, the soldiers' centrality in the revolution would necessarily affect the balance of forces between the camps of the revolution and thus the relations between the soviet and the Provisional Government.[30] Social Democrats in the soviet would have to overcome their reservations about serving as leaders of the soldiery. Although the garrison's revolt had guaranteed the victory of the workers' demonstrations in February, most Social Democrats still expected the peasant-soldiers to act in future as the revolution's reactionary wing.[31]

In spite of the soviet's consent on March 1 to be a leader of the Petrograd garrison, the executive committee had responded with anxiety to the subsequent news of widespread disobedience and violence against officers in the army on the front and in the navy.[32] Fearing that the army might turn into a mob, the executive committee agreed with Minister of War Guchkov and the army's commanders on the necessity of restoring discipline in the armed forces.[33] At the same time, the executive committee demanded that the new government of "free Russia" begin a fundamental change in the structure of relations in the army, though it suspected that these changes would not go unchallenged.[34] To complicate matters further, the soviet's discussions of the disturbances in the naval bases of Kronstadt and Helsinki placed the executive committee

under menacing pressure from the soldiers. At a meeting of the soviet on March 6, the full force of the soldiers' rebellion against the officers' authority became clear for the first time.[35]

After Sukhanov had spoken in opposition to the soldiers' demands that they be allowed to elect their officers, a soldier blocked his way from the rostrum back to his seat and brandished his fist as he screamed with rage about "gentlemen who had never been in a soldier's skin." Like other Social Democrats, Sukhanov feared that the soviet would be taken over by these "impenetrable muzhiks in their grey overcoats."[36] The dilemma confronting the executive committee was how to satisfy the soldiers' demands and at the same time restrain them and persuade them to accept the need for discipline.[37]

During the first days of the dual-power arrangement, the response of the executive committee to these conflicting pressures was quick, self-assured, and unprovocative. On March 6, the committee issued Order No. 2 to the Petrograd garrison, confirming the basic stipulations of Order No. 1 but adding a new formulation that allowed the soldiers' committees "to object to the appointment of any officer" while the soviet continued to consider the more radical demand for elected officers.[38] The executive committee also named a delegation that was to demand of Guchkov that he add his signature to Order No. 2, accept the principle of election of officers, and institute reforms in the army along the lines set forth in Order Nos. 1 and 2.[39]

On the advice of the generals who were known to be sympathetic to the soviet the executive committee issued Order No.

3, to the soldiers on the front.[40] This order explained that the preceding orders had been meant only for Petrograd and promised the immediate implementation of new rules for the army at large. In the meantime, it called on soldiers and officers to show each other mutual respect.[41] In return for this last pronouncement, Guchkov had to agree to the prompt reforms in soldier-officer relations.[42] While this compromise was being negotiated, the executive committee decided to establish control over the army in Petrograd, and eventually elsewhere, in the form of commissars to be dispatched to all units.[43]

The soviet had forced the government to grant soldiers some basic civil rights and had claimed for itself the right to control over the military and had further declared itself the political leader of the soldiers in Petrograd and their autonomous committees. When guchkov wrote go Gen. M.V. Alekseev on March 9 that the government "did not have any real power over the Petrograd garrison," he was not merely playing the pessimist; the soldier's committees in the capital had declared that they would instruct soldiers not to obey any orders that had not been approved by the soviet.[44]

But the Mensheviks' success in early March was not a guarantee either of the army command's continued cooperation in democratizing the army or of the soldiers' support for future policies of the soviet, especially of the soldiers at the front. The first sign of continuing problems was Guchkov's resistance to the soviet's initiatives on military reform. For example, he refused to sight a Declaration of Soldiers' Rights which had been drafted by the soviet

in consultation with his own commission on military rules, and he encouraged the commanders on the front to take a similar stance.[45] The issue here was not only the commanders' authority or the battleworthiness of the army -- though Guchkov regarded both of these issues as very important -- but the duality of power itself. The issue of the war and the fear of defeat were exploited in a public campaign which the bourgeois forces launched against the soviet in mid-March. Statements by the government, declarations from the Duma, newspaper reports quoting the commanders on the front, and editorials in the nonsocialist press all warned of immediate military danger, and these warnings were given force by the defeat of the Russian forces at Stokhod on March 22.

Until the middle of March, the only tension between the soldiers and the executive committee involving the war had concerned the reluctance of units of the Petrograd garrison to serve on the front, where they would be beyond the soviet's protection of their new rights and of course exposed to the dangers of combat.[46] But the soldiers as a whole, especially those on the front, neither had formed a clear view of what the revolution meant for the execution of the war nor were they aware of the soviet's differences with the Provisional Government on this point.[47] Most soldiers were not enthusiastic about fighting as such, and those on the front often argued that they had done their duty and it was now someone else's turn (be it a worker or a soldier of the rear garrison); they expected the revolution to bring about immediate victory, peace, and demobilization.[48] Moreover, in contrast to the soldiers' revolt against military authority in Petrograd -- and the the soviet's swift

response to it, which had had the effect of forming a bond of loyalty between the garrison and the soviet -- the revolution had taken a different path on the front. There, officers had usually been rejected when suspected of pro-German or pro-tsarist sentiment; the soldiers' committees had quickly been recognized by the command, in an effort to both restrain them and integrate them into the existing structure of authority; and the officers of "democratic" social origins and of non-commissioned rank (many of them Menshevik Defensists) exerted the greatest influence in the soldiers' committees, helping to articulate a mood of patriotism based on the premise that a "new nation" had been born of the revolution.[49] For these reasons, soldiers on the front were slow to turn against the war. Beginning around the middle of March, the court of the Tauride Palace became the scene of many demonstrations staged by military units proclaiming "The Preservation of Freedom Means Victory over Wilhelm." On March 16, the soldiers of the Guards' Reserve Artillery Battalion promised to sacrifice themselves for the Provisional Government, and on March 17, the Izmailov Regiment called for the continuation of the war to victory, while the Guards' Petrograd Regiment appeared with banners declaring "War for Freedom," "Soldiers to the Trenches," "Workers to the Benches," and "Confidence in the Provisional Government."[50] Such demonstrations were seen daily at the Tauride Palace for the next two weeks, but in the last week of March, following the defeat in Stokhod, the slogans suddenly became hostile to the workers and the soviet. On March 27, a meeting of delegates from the front called on workers to work overtime, and a meeting of eighty-nine of Petrograd's garrison units

demanded that workers forsake the eight-hour workday. On March 28, a deputation from the First Army (59 officers and 145 soldiers) pleaded with the soviet to strengthen its solidarity with the Provisional Government in order to ensure military victory.[51] At one point, Skobelev, who was by no means an Internationalist, was nearly lynched by the soldiers for expressing reservations about the war.[52]

This fact was both encouraged and exploited by the Duma deputies touring the front, as well as by the nonsocialist press, which channeled the soldiers' vague misgivings against the soviet and especially against the workers' demands.[53] For a while, it seemed to the Social Democrats on the executive committee as if the bourgeois camp would succeed in turning the soldiers against the workers, the soviet, and dual power and altering the balance of forces between the two camps of the revolution. Mistrust of the soldiers had made these Social Democrats slow to recognize the shakiness of the progovernment mood in the army. But, once the soldiers had come face to face with the workers, heard their complaints, and taken note of the divisions between the soviet and the Provisional Government, they invariably sided with "democracy."[54] Nevertheless, the initial uncertainty about the army's loyalty kept the soviet and the Provisional Government in mutual dependence, and prolonged the dual-power arrangement.

Establishing of the Revolutionary Defensist Policy

Long before the February insurrection, the Mensheviks were divided on the war issue into four major groups. At one extreme stood Plekhanov's faction. It had abandoned the revolutionary effort, at least for the duration of the war, and worked for the defeat of the Central Powers. It stood beyond the bounds occupied by most Mensheviks; in this respect Plekhanov did indeed separate himself from other Menshevik groups. A step to the left of Plekhanov stood the self-defensists whose best known spokesman was Potresov. His faction encouraged socialists to support defensive warfare and all military measures designed to protect Russian borders. To the left of Potresov stood moderate Zimmerwaldists. They were prepared to participate in the Russian War Industry Committees (a form of defensism), but at the smae time called for a socialist peace in Europe. To the far left stood the extreme Zimmerwaldists. Their principle figure was Julius Martov who opposed all military measures and all financial or political shcemes that might result in continuing military action. He spoke only of concluding a universal socialist peace in Europe. On the eve of the revolution most Mensheviks were to be found supporting either Potresov's point of view or that of the more moderate Zimmerwaldists.

The realities of the Revolution opened before the Mensheviks new opportunities for solving the problem of war. Many foreign policy issues that had divided the party were now obviously gone, and the chief problem was how to reconcile the different factions and views and to present a uniform Soviet policy. Something had to be done in a hurry because the Provisional Government was already informing the Allies of Russia's official position. On March 3 two

Menshevik factions -- moderate Zimmerwaldists and Self-defensists -- held the meeting where Potresov demanded that the Soviet Executive Committee support a policy of defense of the revolution against foreign aggression, while at the same time the moderate Zimmerwaldists (especially Ermansky) demanded that Potresov and his friends support the socialist peace slogans. Common ground was found when Potresov dropped his objections to the peace aims and the moderate Zimmerwaldists agreed to accept the policy of defense.[55] The two formally antagonistic groups found unity by adding the defense measures advocated by the moderate Zimmerwaldists. In the second week of March these views were officially accepted by the Petrograd Soviet and on March 14 they were published in Izvestiia as "An appeal to the Peoples of the World."[56]

The appeal served the ground for both peace and defense. It called on the masses of Europe to unite their effort for immediate conclusion of peace and it accused the "bourgeois" governments of Europe in rousing international hostilities. The sentiments in the Appeal were put forth in strong language: "Refuse to serve as an instrument of conquest and violence in the hands of kings, landowners, and bankers -- and by our united efforts we will stop this horrible butchery that is a stain on humanity . . . ." At the same time, however, the Appeal went beyond a simple restatement of the peace sentiments found in the Zimmerwald Manifesto. The Manifesto (accepted by most Mensheviks before 1917) spoke only of peace and of the evils of imperialism, but the Soviet Appeal of March 14 expressed a determination "to defend the Russian revolution from

foreign military force . . . ."[57] The appeal, hence, warned that the Petrograd Soviet was not led by pacifists. Rabochaia Gazeta echoed that "the revolution was a victory over tsarism, but if it is not victorious over the war -- all its forces will have fought in vain." But the same author assured readers that "the voice of the revolution will defend its freedom with arms in hand."[58]

The strong statement in favor of defending the revolution could draw fire from extreme leftists who would be quick to compare the soviet foreign policy with the right wing defensist positions occupied by Plekhanov and the German Social Democrat, Phillipp Scheidemann." In order to prevent such accusation Sukhanov wrote:

> Our policy of defense is defense of a proletarian character. It is not defense of the country, not defense of a nation. This defense is of freedom, defense of the revolution from conquest by reaction.[59]

The soviet leaders tried to emphasize the gap that separated the Petrograd Soviet from the Allied powers and from the bourgeois Provisional Government in Russia. When the Soviet leaders reached an agreement among themselves and fortified their new stand against criticism from the left, they got into confrontation with Paul Miliukov, a foreign minister of the Provisional Government. Miliukov was convinced that peace in Europe and the survival of his government depended on an Allied military victory over the Central powers. Miliukov asked his countrymen to endure the wartime conditions until the defeat of Germany.

On March 4, 1917, Miliukov wrote to the Russian diplomatic representatives abroad, giving instructions to his staff. He outlined the Provisional Government's position in foreign affiars:

> We will strictly observe the international obligations contracted by the fallen regime. We shall steadfastly strengthen the relations which bind us to the Allied nations . . . . The government of which I am a member will devote all its energy to the achievement of victory.[60]

The Menshevik leaders and their Social Revolutionary allies in the Petrograd Soviet could not agree to the position taken by Miliukov, and began a propaganda campaign against the government. Miliukov would have to bring his policy in line with Soviet thinking. Rabochaia Gazeta led the charge. "What does Miliukov really want," the editor asked rhetorically. "By saying that we must destroy the Turkish state, he really wants us to march on Constantinople and rename it Tsargrad; and by freeing the people of Austria-Hungary, he means the annexation of Galicia . . . . These desires, which are not in step with the will of the people, constitute the real goals of Miliukov . . . ."[61] Finally, the editor asked for a guarantee that Miliukov would steer Russia toward the Zimmerwald goal of a general European peace without annexations and indemnities.[62] Miliukov, in turn, attacked his critics in editorial articles that appeared in Rech, the Kadet newspaper in Petrograd, and intensified government efforts to capture the loyalty of the soldiers in the Petrograd barracks. The activity among the soldiers was especially threatening to the Soviet leaders. By the third week in March a serious confrontation between the Soviet and the government was

unavoidable, and the Soviet leaders began to consider using the garrison in a public demonstration against the Provisional Government. On March 21, Sukhanov proposed that "the Soviet begin a nationwide, systematic campaign for peace and mobilize the proletariat and the garrison under the slogans of peace." [63] Sukhanov's call for action met little resistance until the leader of the Siberian Zimmerwaldists, Iraklii Tsereteli, who had just returned from exile, rose to address a meeting of the Soviet Executive Committee in the late afternoon of March 21. The Georgian Menshevik spoke out in opposition to Sukhanov's plans. His polemic ignored Sukhanov, but questioned the manner in which the Soviet leadership was conducting its relations with the Provisional Government. Tsereteli charged the Soviet leaders with disturbing the political harmony that had to be maintained between the Soviet and the Government: "We ought to refrain from politically irresponsible opposition." Tsereteli did not try to alter the Zimmerwaldist-defense posture adopted in the March 14 Appeal to the Peoples of All the World, but he expressed fear that radical action would endanger the safety of the new "bourgeois' regime. The Mensheviks wished to achieve a socialist peace in Europe (on that point agreement could be reached), but outward hostility toward the Provisional Government would endanger political harmony. Plans to change the foreign policy of the Provisional Government had to be carried out with caution. Tsereteli wanted the Executive Committee of the Soviet to assure the survival of "that unity of progressive forces which were created for the solution of internal problems."[64] He reminded the Mensheviks of their commitment to the strategy of

socialist-liberal cooperation during the revolutionary period. Tsereteli felt that uncontrolled street demonstrations and propaganda assaults on the Provisional Government would further divide the socialists from the liberals and dim hopes for defending the refolution against internal as well as external enemies. According to Tsereteli, the action recommended by Sukhanov would weaken the stability of the Provisional Government and expose all the revolutionary forces to defeat. A week after his confrontation with Sukhanov, Tsereteli spoke at the All-Russian Conference of Soviets. He touched on a number of issues including the relationship between the Soviet and the Provisional Government:

> At the very moment, comrades, when the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies announces that it is entering into a conflict with the Provisional Government and it turns out that one part of the people is supporting the Soviets while the other part is supporting the Provisional Government, then at that moment our national cause will be lost.[65]

After the March 21 speech against Sukhanov, tsereteli managed to consolidate his power in both the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet and in the Menshevik party. The left Petrograd Mensheviks were willing to accept him, showing no sign of resistance. O.A. Ermansky and V. bazarov, for example, were avowed Zimmerwaldists who had opposed cooperation between socialists and liberals in the Russian War Industry Committees, but in March of 1917 they accepted the leadership of Tsereteli and were prepared to support his views among other Mensheviks in Petrograd.[66]

Tsereteli's leadership was also acknowledged by the Menshevik Self-defensists who promoted the views of Potresov and Gvozdev. They saw a the protection of Russian frontiers as an essential factor in the salvation of the revolution. They stood to the right of Tsereteli, however. in their skepticism about the plans to establish a socialist peace in Europe and on several occasions advised the majority in the Menshevik party to make certain that peace plans not be allowed to threaten good relations between the Soviet and the Provisional Government.[67]

The Menshviks who stood closest to Tsereteli during 1917 were identified with neither the Self-defensists nor the radical Zimmerwaldists. N.S. Chkheidze, F. Dan, and B.I. Gorev (Gol'dman) were the most important. These men represented the center of Menshevik opinion during most of 1917. Before the revolution Chkheidze led the Menshevik faction in the Russian State Duma. He was a cautious political leader who remained as far away as possible from the inter-party feuds of the pre-revolutionary period. Gorev had been numbered among the radical Zimmerwaldists before the insurrection in Petrograd. He was a professional journalist who helped Tsereteli by serving on the editorial board of Rabochaia Gazeta. Dan was much closer to Martov than to Tsereteli in his private affairs, but he worked with Tsereteli in Siberia during the early war years and became attached to the Georgian leader. After Tsereteli's downfall, Dan rejoined Martov's group. He apologized for his stand taken in 1917 and eventually became an important figure in the left wing of the Menshevik emigration.

Tsereteli's support from Social Democrats extended beyond the Menshevik party. The Bundist leader Mark Liber spoke on behalf of Tsereteli in the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet. The Jewish Bund formally entered the Menshevik party at the May conference of Mensheviks. Tsereteli also captured the loyalty of some Bolsheviks. Both V.S. Voitinsky and P.N. Sevruk (Gomel) joined the Menshevik party in March as supporters of Tsereteli.[68] Of course, the reunion of all Bolsheviks and Mensheviks that Tsereteli hoped to achieve did not come about, but in the spring of 1917 many Bolsheviks were reserved in their opposition to the Soviet leadership; it was not until after Lenin's influence over the Bolsheviks grew strong in the summer of 1917 that the Bolshevik party became a strong foe of the Petrograd Soviet.

One of Tsereteli's most impressive gains in March of 1917 was to capture the support of some important leaders in the Social Revolutionary Party. The loyalty of the soldiers to the Social Revolutionary party did not run deeply, but so long as it existed the Soviet could speak with a strong voice by gaining the support of Social Revolutionaries, Tsereteli was able to rely, at least temporarily, on the armed garrison in the capital city which gave the Menshevik leaders an authority that fat outweighed their slight numerical strength. The close friendship between Tsereteli and some important Social Revolutionary leaders, especially V. Zenzinov and A. Gots, was well known.

Conclusions about the consolidation of Tsereteli's power over the Mensheviks and over other socialist groups in Petrograd must be drawn cautiously. The Mensheviks themselves did not unite closely

around Tsereteli. They still remained tied in small groups that owed loyalty only to a tactic or to an idea and not to the new party leader or to a unified party structure. As long as these groups agreed to work together, Tsereteli could serve as party spokesman simply because his views coincided with theirs. But once the small Menshevik groups began to disagree on how to support the Provisional Government and how to conduct foreign policy, Tsereteli would find his support quickly weakening. The same unwritten agreements kept the Social Revolutionaries united and attached to the Mensheviks.

Tsereteli's victory of March 21 reduced Sukhanov's influence in the Executive Committee, but it had no effect whatever on Miliukov whose foreign policy remained unchanged. Miliukov still saw the direction of Russia's war effort as the business of the Provisional Government and the Allied chiefs of state, and he boldly continued his efforts to capture the loyalty of the troops in the Petrograd garrison. Moreover, he considered the Soviet leaders to be the representatives of a small minority of the Russian people, and hoped their political influence would wane as time passed. His foreign policy statement of March 6 followed closely the line he revealed in his March 4 memorandum. And on both March 9 and 11 he quietly accepted political recognition on behalf of the Russian Provisional Government by the various Allied powers whose support was continuing on Miliukov's readiness to continue the fighting. The Soviet leaders were not pleased with Miliukov's stand, and were expecting Tsereteli to initiate action. He began in late March by preparing a formal statement of Soviet policy. It included

statements favorable to both the defense of the revolution from foreign invaders and the establishment of an international peace. It also called upon the Provisional Government to renounce all aggressive designs and to repudiate annexations and indemnities. Supposedly written in the spirit of Zimmerwald, the program was a long way from Miliukov's position.[69] It met with a favorable reception in the Soviet on Friday, March 24 (Sukhanov voted in its favor) and was then presented to the Provisional Government by the Contact Commission, the Menshevik-dominated committee established on March 7 to serve as the liaison body between the Petrograd Soviet and the Provisional Government.

After some considerable haggling back and forth between the government and the Soviet, Miliukov made the following statement on March 27: "Defense is not the sole, but the primary aim of the war, and there will be no violent seizure of foreign territory."[70]

Tsereteli happily accepted this version of Miliukov's foreign policy as did most other socialists in the Executive Committee of the Soviet. It was considered by them to be a concession on the part of the Provisional Government, "a step away from the foreign policy of the tsarist regime, a step toward peace."[71]

The publication of the March 27 declaration on war aims is usually interpreted as a victory for the Petrograd Soviet, but it is difficult to understand why this interpretation has not been challenged. The declaration showed little resemblance to the views of the Menshevik leaders in the Soviet. By making no direct statement about extending Russia's boundary lines and avoiding use of the terms annexations and indemnities, the foreign minister was

obviously rejecting the Menshevik demands in a clever fashion. In addition, the style of the new pledge suggested that Miliukov had not refused from his desire to achieve peace through a military victory over the Central powers. He simply stated most of his former aims without using the popular jargon of the times. It was true that the Provisional Government had taken a step away from the tsarist position, a retreat the Mensheviks hoped to turn into a full scale rout, but the temporary victory hardly outweighed the serious implications that arose from the document accepted on March 27 by the Soviet Zimmerwaldists. As a matter of fact, acceptance brought about the Soviet recognition of several points in the policy that Miliukov was advocating.[72] But unforseen complications were to develop that were not anticipated by either defensists or internationalists.

CHAPTER III

THE APRIL CRISIS AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

The First Clash

The late March - early April was a relatively peaceful time which inspired optimism among all ranks of society. The truce in the factories held up. Production was increasing in many plants, and though Lenin's return to Petrograd on April 4 again gave rise to anxiety about the "danger on the left," this was calmed down by the record of workers' resolutions published in the socialist press, which seemed to indicate that few workers were ready to embrace Lenin's slogan of "All Power to the Soviets."[1] Moreover, the soldiers, who had only recently threatened the leaders of the soviet politically and even physically, now began to issue declarations of loyalty.

By mid-April, the executive committee and the soviet had become more efficient instruments, under the leadership of Tsereteli and the group of old friends who now held important positions in either the soviet or the Menshevik and SRs organizations. Every morning, this leadership group would meet in Skobelev's apartment to go through the day's agenda, to draft resolutions to be presented to the executive committee for approval, to outline its positions in negotiations with the Provisional Government, and to debate required changes in strategy.[2] Although the members of this

informal "presidium" came from different parties and factions, they were characterized by a more practical approach to the situation than that taken by other, more doctrinaire socialists. Above all, these practical politicians appreciated the importance of a strong, unified leadership, and their unity as well as their control of the soviet's two largest factions enabled them to predetermine all the major political decisions of the executive committee and the Petrograd soviet.

First in importance was Tsereteli -- by then the most popular man in the soviet, its current theoretician, and its chief negotiator with the Provisional Government. Then, in descending order of importance, were three former collaborators of Tsereteli in the Siberian Zimmerwaldist group: Dan, the chief editor of Isvestia; Voitinskii, the soviet's best troubleshooter in dealing with workers and soldiers; and Gots, the group's liaison with the SR party. Chkheidze and Skobelev, both of whom had been, like Tsereteli, Duma deputies from the Caucasus. On the periphery were four other Siberian Zimmerwaldists who were the members of the executive committee and of the Menshevik organization: N.A. Rozhkov, and three Menshevik praktiki, V.A. Anisimov, S.L.Vainshtein, and K.M. Ermolaev. Sometimes the "presidium's" meetings would be joined by Gvozdov, Bogdanov, or Liber as well as by a few Populists: V.M. Chernov, the SR leader who had returned from Europe in early April, or N.D. Avksent'ev, a right-wing SR who served as chairman of the Soviet of Peasants. Together, these men could reasonably claim to embody the unity of the three constituent groups of "democracy" (workers, soldiers, and peasants), and for this reason throughout

most of April the discipline they sought to enforce on the soviet did not cause tension between leaders and followers. The biggest success of the soviet in this time was the turn in the soldiers' loyalty to the soviet.

There were several reasons for this change in the soldiers' position. First, the soviet's public stand on defense now reassured the soldiers that they would not be betrayed by a defeatist leadership. Second, the government's seeming acceptance of the slogan of a "democratic peace" gave an aura of national acceptability to the soldiers' desire for a prompt end to the war. Third, the crisis of late March had forced the executive committee to improve its lines of communication with the soldiery through its commissars, the soldiers' committees, and daily discussions with delegations from the front. Finally, and perhaps most decisive, was the course of the confrontation between soldiers from the front and the Petrograd workers. The workers' restraint had the effect of undermining the soldiers' belief in the bourgeois press's stories about the workers' "excessive" demands, so that the numerous delegations sent from the front to report on events in the capital returned from their visits to the factories expressing sympathy for the harsh conditions in which the workers had long been forced to live and for their demands, as well as appreciation of the workers' expressed readiness to continue serving the war effort.[3]

The favorable effect of these developments seemed to be confirmed when the new leadership sent its highest-ranking members to the First Congress of the Western Front, held in Minsk from April 7 to April 16. Not only did the congress adopt the

resolutions on war and state power passed by the Conference of Soviets and demand that the Provisional Government grant financial support to the Petrograd soviet, but the soldiers also expressed unqualified support for an eight-hour workday.[4] Addressing the congress, Tsereteli assured the soldiers that "such unity among all elements of Russia" had never existed before.[5]

The soviet's contacts with the Provisional Government were successful during the first half of the month, though the war issue itself remained intractable. The soviet demanded that the government restate in clearer language than was the case in its "Declaration to the Russian People" (March 27) a renunciation of annexations and indemnities, and Miliukov agreed to this demand. However, he did not act on it immediately, even though he was under pressure to do so from within the cabinet.[6]

By mid-April soviet leaders had found a new weapon with which to pressure the government: the Freedom Loan. This loan had been proposed by the government to help meet the costs of the war and of the new social programs, but it was not popular among workers, who believed such expenses should be covered by increased taxation of the rich, especially of the infamous and much rumored "war profits."[7] Responding to the workers' opinion, most Mensheviks (especially Chkheidze) objected to Tsereteli's favorable presentation of the loan on the issuance of Miliukov's promised diplomatic note.[8] It was in this context that the three thousand deputies of the soviet were informed about Miliukov's promise and about Tsereteli's trust in its fulfillment.

On April 18, as all of Petrograd was celebrating May Day, Miliukov finally sent the promised note to the Allies, but it was hardly what Tsereteli had anticipated. It was merely an addition to the text of the former "Declaration," which, in fact, negated the latter's very essence: It promised that Russia would continue the war to a "decisive victory" and together with the other "leading democracies" establish "guarantees and sanctions" -- terms suspiciously reminiscent of the objectionable "annexations and indemnities." To make matters worse, in the soviet's view, the entire cabinet (including Nekrasov, Tereshchenko, and Kerenskii) had approved the offending document.[9]

Being distressed by the note, the executive committee spend the night of April 19 discussing it. Tsereteli declared that this act "had destroyed the compromise that had mad cooperation with the government possible."[10]

In spite of the general indignation, however, the executive committee could not agree on any course of action. The three leading Zimmerwaldists (Tsereteli, Dan, and Gots) recommended quiet negotiations with the government. But most of the old leaders such as Bogdanov, insisted on calling on the workers and soldiers to demonstrate against the government's declaration.[11] In any case, events on the streets, beyond the control of the leadership, did not allow this crisis to subside peacefully.

Having been alerted by earlier discussions in the soviet of their leaders' position on the question of the war, as well as of Miliukov's promise, and having found out in the morning papers of April 20 that the promise had in effect been violated, thousands of workers

and soldiers came out to demonstrate, not against the government as such but against its refusal to accept the demand of the soviet.[12]

By the second day of the protest, April 21, the mood of the demonstrators had changed. A sense of betrayed trust and a renewed belligerency seemed apparent, perhaps as the result of a counterdemonstration organized by the Kadet Central Committee and attended by thousands of well-to-do citizens, intelligenty, and shopkeepers, who had come out to defend "their government" and repel its attackers. The city was suddenly divided, and many workers -- such as those of the Putilov plant for example, who had previously heeded their leaders' advice to stay off the streets -- could no longer avoid taking sides in this social and political confrontation.[13]

The committee's bureau immediately resolved to appeal to the masses of the city, through the socialist press and through the committee's most popular speakers (who were dispatched to factories and military units), to avoid demonstrations that were not authorized by the soviet. The point was not that the leaders disagreed with the political goal of the demonstrators (though a conflict between a radicalized constituency and its moderate leadership did appear later). Rather, the Revolutionary Defensists were once again concerned with avoiding an unorganized, "anarchic" display of force and were quite realistically fearful that an open attack on the government would further undermine its already shaky authority and provoke violent clashes in the streets. For this reason, when, on April 21, news arrived of just such clashes and of Kornilov's order to the troops to come to the defense of the

government, the executive committee, at Skobelev's behest, issued a "proclamation" to the troops which forbade them to follow any government order without the soviet's sanction -- an open challenge to the government's authority. At the same time, however, the full soviet accepted Dan's proposal to ban all demonstrations in Petrograd for two days, and in this way the leadership indicated its right to censure its constituency.[14]

Thus the soviet leadership was likely to act as the country's self-appointed authority, fully conscious of national responsibility. This had been and continued to be the essence of its policy of restraint, as Stankevich put it very clearly in a speech to the full soviet on the evening of April 20:

> Why, comrades, do we need 'action'? At whom will we shoot? Against whom shall we employ our forces? After all, the only forces are you and the masses behind you . . . . Whatever you decide, will be . . . .Look, it is five minutes to seven; we will call them on the phone and within five minutes the government will hand over its authority. By seven o'clock (the government) will no longer exist. Fore, action, and civil war -- why do we need this?[15]

This April crisis was eventually resolved through negotiations between the executive committee and the Provisional Government in a nightlong session. Tsereteli and Nekrasov, the two men who personified the intelligentsia's mission to unite and lead Russia's "vital forces," composed a short text in which annexations were again repudiated and the offending terms "guarantees" and "sanctions" were explained as being references to international tribunals, limitations on armaments, etc.[16] Later that evening the plenum of

the soviet (where 2,000 votes were registered) almost unanimously accepted the compromise as a "great achievement for democracy."[17] Moreover, the next day the same body overwhelmingly approved the presidium's proposal to lend its support to the Freedom Loan.

The soviet's new measure of confidence and prestige did not immediately lead to a new political strategy, however. In at least three of their public pronouncements, the Revolutionary Defensists argues neither that dual power should be abandoned nor that a coalition government should be established. Tsereteli simply reasserted that the "vital forces of the nation could and must march together again."[18]

In the days following the April crisis, a striking contrast developed between the Mensheviks' reaction to it and that of the non-Menshevik circles in the soviet and the partisans of democracy outside the soviet. The events of April 20 and 21 had aroused a widespread desire for a formal expression of unity, especially among those intermediary social and political groups that hoped to prevent the polarization of society. Intelligentsia organizations, locally elected governments, soldiers' and officers' organizations, and peasant soviets all appealed to the Petrograd soviet and the Provisional Government to form a coalitions. Accordingly, the cabinet of the Provisional Government called on the soviet to add its "active and creative force" to the "responsible work" of government and hinted at the cabinet's weakness.[19]

The April crisis had demonstrated that a change in the soldiers' loyalties had deprived the Provisional Government of the single most important instrument of governmental authority. Even inside the

soviet, many who had previously been content to practice cooperation within the framework of dual power were moved by their concern for both a sound structure of governmental authority and the continuation of the war effort to the demand for coalition. The SRs had been propagating this idea with considerable success in the garrison's barracks for some time, and now they made it part of their party's official strategy.[20]

The Menshevik leadership, however, held firmly to its rejection of coalition. In a series of meeting between April 21 and 25, the party's Petrograd organization, its district committees, the organizational committee, and the editorial board of Rabochaia gazeta all agreed that the pressure for coalition had to be resisted.[21] Toward that end, Dan drafted a resolution summarizing the Menshevik view on coalition. It was the fullest Menshevik statement to date on the subject, a list of the expected detrimental effects of coalition:

1. -The soviet . . . will lose all its influence and the ability to lead the masses.
2. -The responsibility for all social conflicts inevitable in the course of the revolution will fall on the socialist members of the government . . . As members of a government facing revolutionary elements (stikhiia), they will be in objective opposition to the (masses).
3. -(Coalition) will strengthen . . . social maximalism and give credence to the illusion that extremist demands may be fulfilled (and) will increase anar chy on the left.
4. -(Coalition) will tie the soviet to the government and will destroy the role of the soviet as the organ of revolutionary democracy that exercises kontrol' over the government; it will undermine the revolutionary

> stature of the soviet and will turn it into a regular governmental department.
>
> 5. -(Coalition) will create an extremely unstable situation . . . and could cause an unavoidable collapse of the government, the result of which will lead either to a victory of the counterrevolutionary forces or to a dictatorship of the proletariat that would be doomed to defeat at this time.[22]

Indeed, over the next few months he would see his prophecies realized in almost every detail. The Menshevik leaders searched desperately for a way to both strengthen the authority of the cabinet and gain greater leverage over its work even as they rejected a formal coalition. During the meeting of April 28, Chkheidze proposed that the SRs -- as the party of the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie -- join the government. When Gots refused, Tsereteli suggested that nonparty "democratic elements" sympathetic to the soviet join the government and be assured that democracy would support them.[23]

The effort, however, was doomed from the start, for as L'vov made clear to Tsereteli that evening, what the ministers actually wanted was for the soviet to renounce the formula of conditional support and so give up its separate power, its separate authority.[24] Three days later, the government formally turned down Tsereteli's proposal. Meanwhile, the leaders of the executive committee did all they could to lend the government some of the soviet's strength. A resolution to support the Freedom Loan (April 22) was one such act. The executive committee searched also for ways of restoring discipline in the garrison..

The committee published an announcement on April 26 that not only acknowledged General Kornilov's authority but did not demand implementation of the promised plan of reorganization and hid the conflict that had surrounded Kornilov's order to mobilize the troops against the demonstrators on April 21. It was a measure of the soldier's disaffection from the government that even after the publication of this statement some units refused to obey Kornilov's orders without the authorization of the executive committee, precipitating his resignation on April 30.[25]

Aware of the futility of most of their efforts to help the government regain its hold on the situation yet unable to pursue any other course, the Revolutionary Defensists leaders turned to the constituency of the soviets and to the population at large with a series of appeals published between April 30 and May 2. There were appeals to the peasants to market their grain and not to seize land before a Constituent Assembly had had a change to discuss the problem. Another appeal, drafted by Voitinskii, was addressed to the soldiers and went beyond any earlier commitment of the soviet's leadership to the continuation of the war. It declared that there were times "when only offensive action can repel, or prevent, an attack by the enemy."[26]

The soviet leaders were afraid that the governments weakness, its inability to enlist the support of the broadest segments of population in the execution of its most essential functions, posed an imminent danger to the revolution. On April 29, Guchkov announced his resignation from the post of minister of war, citing th threat of anarchy, especially in the army, as his reason. Immediately, the

soviet was flooded with telegrams from soldiers' committees and personal appeals from officers sympathetic to democracy that it join the government to prevent the further disintegration of the army. Tsereteli remembered it as the moment when he concluded that it was "necessary to give the country a new government (and) not to delay by even one minute."[28]

Guchkov's resignation hastened two political developments: a division within the first cabinet of the Provisional Government, and the emergence of a "counterrevolution" -- that is, an organized political opposition to the soviet and to the processes of democratization. The right wing in the cabinet headed by Miliukov and Gchkov made clear their belief that the cabinet alone spoke for Russia's national interests, whereas the soviet was merely a "partisan" institution not deserving of special influence over state policy.[29] At the same time, it also became clear that there were men in the cabinet, and in Miliukov's Kadet party, who were, in Rosenberg's words, "ready and willing to work closely with a broad spectrum of political leaders."[30] These men were left Kadet Necrasov and three other cabinet ministers who shared his receptiveness to collaboration with the moderate socialists: Konovalov, an old ally from the public organizations; Kerenskii, the popular Trudovik who was fond of describing himself as "democracy's hostage' in the government; and Tereshchenko, the nonparty "repentant capitalist," as Nabokov called him.[31]

To be sure, Konovalov, Kekrasov, and Tereshchenko shared the cabinet's principal concern that the erosion of political authority might render the government powerless. But they sought to

overcome what they saw as the harmful effect of dual power not through confrontation with the soviet but through co-opting its moderate leaders into the cabinet.

The April crisis had sharpened disagreements in the cabinet. Whereas Miliukov and Shingarev had been ready to consider Guchkov's proposal to suppress the demonstrations by force and thereby break the soviet's strength -- if troops could have been found to carry this out -- Tereshchenko had announced that he would rather resign than authorize such bloodshed.[32] As the first step toward mobilizing the forces of the right against the soviet and its supporters, Guchkov had attempted to revive the Duma and its Provisional Committee.[33] Moreover, at a meeting of the members of all four dumas which the Provisional Committee convened on April 27, ostensibly to commemorate the convocation of the First Duma, Guchkov attacked the soviet in the strongest words.[34]

Yet, as Tsereteli had emphasized in his speech to the Duma's commemorative meeting, for every attacker the soviet had a bourgeois defender. If Rodzianko rejected the soviet's kontrol' of the government, Nekrasov stressed that "the goal of the Russian revolution was not to replace one autocrat with twelve"; where Shul'gin's sights were fixed on the war, Prince L'vov saw the revolution's legacy of freedom. [35]

Guchkov's resignation marked the crystallization of the antidemocratic or even counterrevolutionary forces as well as their departure from the Provisional Government. When news of the resignation reached the soviet's presidium during its morning meeting on May 1, together with an invitation to Tsereteli to discuss

the new situation with Prince L'vov, Tsereteli and his colleagues agreed to accept coalition if no other solution to the political crisis could be found.[36] Ideology had apparently finally given way to reality or at least to the reality perceived by the Revolutionary Defensist leaders through their experience in the executive committee.

Menshevik Debates on Coalition

The final vote for a coalition with the Provisional Government took place at a meeting of the executive committee in the early morning of May 2. There were forty-four voices in favor of coalition, and nineteen against it. The majority realized that Coalition was to save the soviet from the far less acceptable alternative of establishing its own "soviet" government.[37] (Prince L'vov had presented Tsereteli this alternative, obviously effectively, in the form of an ultimatum on May 1.)

Independent Internationalists and the Mensheviks within the committee had again in a political arrangement, though their reasons for doing so as well as their interpretations of it were markedly different. In the days immediately following its May 2 decision, the executive committee was faced with two conceptions of the coalition strategy. The first, proposed by Tsereteli, emphasized cooperation between democracy and the progressive bourgeoisie in fulfilling the promises of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. This conception called "minimalist," included three principles: that the socialists should constitute only a minority of the cabinet; that they should

limit their programmatic "conditions" to the issues of war and peace; and that the soviet should declare full confidence in the government.[38] The second conception was worked out by Independent Internationalists, especially Sukhanov and Bazarov, who hoped coalition would enhance the socialist' ability to pressure the bourgeoisie to begin transcending the limits of a bourgeois revolution on the road toward a socialist revolution. In practical terms, the position led to three demands: that the soviet have the majority of ministers in the cabinet; that it pursue an aggressive "peace policy" (including publication of the secret treaties) and establish full government control over production, distribution, pricing, and profits; and that the soviet's support of the coalition cabinet be made conditional on the acceptance of this program.[39]

It quickly became clear that Tsereteli's conception of coalition ensured a majority in the executive committee, made up of the Revolutionary Defensist bloc and the Populist-Defensists. Moreover, it was natural that the process of negotiations between the executive committee's delegation and the Provisional Government should result in a further dilution of the "May 2 Principles", championed by Tsereteli. It encouraged Skobelev to ask the Petrograd soviet on May 5 (a few hours after the negotiations had ended and the new cabinet had been established) to approve the program and lend the government its "full confidence" and "complete authority."[40]

There seemed to be nothing further in the way of coalition. The socialists felt reassured by Miliukov's resignation from the cabinet on May 2, which left the foreign affairs portfolio for Tereshchenko, while Kerenskii took over the Ministry of War and

Nekrasov the Ministry of Finance. With Skobelev as minister of labor, Chernov as minister of agriculture, and Tsereteli representing the soviet's general political line (his specific assignment was the Ministry of Post and Telegraph), the executive committee felt that the new cabinet would be dedicated to the social and political democratization that they perceived as both the task of the revolution and a prerequisite for the government's stability. [41]

The workers' attitudes toward the new cabinet and their expectations of it were at odds with the interpretation of the executive committee because not many workers shared Tsereteli's trust in the progressive bourgeoisie. The typical resolution at these meetings alluded only to the socialist ministers. For example, that adopted by the workers of the Russian Society of Telegraph and Telephone on May 10 declared, "As long as you, comrades, are in the government, we are convinced that all its activity is directed toward the further strengthening of the revolution's achievements."[42]

The workers' interpretation of coalition, then, was closer to the Internationalist' than to Tsereteli's. Their sense of economic injustice was beginning to grow again toward the end of April, with rising food prices and the demand that workers contribute to the Freedom Loan. Also, the press campaign in late March against democracy and the Kadet demonstrations of April 21 had reawakened the worker's suspicion of counterrevolution, as shown by their sudden organizing of "Red Guard" detachments in the factories, as the Bolsheviks had been demanding for some time (unsuccessfully up to this point).[43] Thus, while the workers had observed the restrictions of dual power,[44] they also sought to exercise greater kontrol' over the

government. It was for this reason that they viewed the prospect of socialists joining the government as something of a triumph.

The next concern of the Menshevik leaders of the soviet in early May was for the response of their own party. The first nationwide Menshevik gathering since the revolution was scheduled to meet just two days after the coalition government had been formed and approved by the soviet.

The All-Russian Conference of the RSDRP (Mensheviks) opened on May 7 with the customary series of reports and congratulatory speeches. As new ministers and "respected leaders," Tsereteli and Skobelev addressed the conference and used the opportunity to defend the decision on coalition.[45] Cautiously and systematically, Tsereteli presented coalition not as part of his strategy for uniting the "vital forces" but as the only alternative to the assumption of full power by the soviet and for this reason as a "tremendous victory for the realistic tactics" Menshevism "has always championed."[46] After strong arguments against the coalition by extreme internationalists Larin and Peletskii, the resolution, expressing strong support of coalition,was passed by a vote of fifty-one to twelve (with eight abstentions). No sooner had it been adopted than a supplementary resolution from the floor was proposed, and accepted, which stressed the need for a strong government and condemned anyone who discredited the present cabinet, especially its socialist ministers.[47]

The debate on the question of the war followed much the same pattern. Dan spoke for the organizational committee; many amendments from the floor were proposed, and the final resolution was considerably more "defensist" than were most of the

Revolutionary Defensists in Petrograd. Not only did this resolution call for the defense of the country until a universal, "democratic" peace had been secured, but it also described the goal of peace as one that was fully acceptable to the new cabinet and added a sharply worded condemnation of fraternization on the front. Again, a strong vote in favor of the resolution (fifty-three to ten) was immediately followed by an amendment offered from the floor and adopted that specifically mentioned the need to preserve the army's fighting capacity and made defense a "national task" transcending "class lines."[48] Thus, by the time the returning Internationalist leaders, Martov and akselrod (who were the strongest opponents of any war efforts and coalition) appeared before the conference, on the evening of May 9, the two most important issues had already been settled and Revolutionary Defensism had been recognized as the party's strategy.

Naturally, the conference did not avoid inner quarrels. Years of fragmentation had left the party divided, and the different ways in which the revolution was experienced by Mensheviks in the capital, the provinces, and emigration accentuated the elements that each of these groups chose from the common legacy of party ideology. The depth of these divisions became apparent during the conference's last session in a variety of ways: the newly arrived men (with the exception of Akselrod) were denied seats on the organizational committee; the Internationalists' announcement (in the name of the seventeen voting delegates) that they could not be responsible for policies they felt were "contradictory to the vital interests of the proletariat" evoked shouts of "Disgrace!" from the floor; and finally,

when Martov took the rostrum to read a note from Akselrod, he was met by the pounding of desktops and shouts of"We don't want to listen to him!" and "Down with him!"[49]

Claims of ideological purity and of responsible realism clashed and hatreds flared at the May conference, yet the party did not split apart largely because among the veterans of Menshevism there was a desire for unity on all sides: on the part of those Revolutionary Defensists who had been close to Martov and Akselrod in the past, and on the part of the two Internationalist leaders who at least wanted to win back their "lost" comrades.[50] Both factions even managed to agree on a resolution regarding the forthcoming socialist conferences on peace.[51]

The Mensheviks party had given its blessing to the decision of the executive committee of the Petrograd soviet to establish a coalition government with the bourgeois parties of Russia. The decision was a momentous one: the two opposing camps of Russian society had formally declared their intention of working together toward the survival and transformation of the country; they had agreed to join in the military defense of the country from German aggression; and the Social Democratic leaders of the soviet, by ending their abstention from formal state power, had broken with their own ideology that had failed to predict the course of the revolution, let alone prescribe an appropriate political strategy; as the month of May began, then, the question before the Menshevik leaders of the soviet concerned the extent to which they would actually use the new possibilities, and this question subsumed others: How broadly would they define the social transformation possible at that state of

the revolution? How would they respond to their followers' aspirations and demands? How ready were they to risk the collapse of this new political agreement with the bourgeoisie should it prove to constrain unduly the freedom of Social Democracy?

CHAPTER IV

IRRECONCILABLE CONTRADICTIONS OF THE COALITION

Radicalization of Petrograd Workers and Mensheviks' Response to it

During the first two months of coalition, significant shifts of attitudes occurred among the workers in Petrograd regarding their employers, the propertied classes in general, and the strategy of cooperation between democracy and the bourgeoisie. To be sure, workers did not express their attitudes clearly or consistently, and the collapse of earlier expectations during the summer months left the Petrograd working class more politically fragmented than it had been since the start of the revolution.[1] Nevertheless, the daily experience of workers, shaped by the interconnected processes of economic ruin and intensified industrial conflict, did not accord with their initial expectations of the revolution or the hopes that had animated their support for the socialists' participation in government. Increasingly, workers blamed the frustration of their material goals, even the economic crisis itself, on their employers and came to doubt the wisdom of cooperating with them at all. Moreover, the continued participation of the moderate socialists in a coalition government that had failed to meet the workers' expectations and, more specifically, the Mensheviks' opposition to measures the workers considered essential to their own survival --

workers' control' and the freedom to strike for higher wages -- created tensions between the Revolutionary Defensist leaders of the soviet and their Petrograd constituency. This estrangement led a growing number of workers to reject the moderates' advice, first on matters pertaining to factory life, then on the political shape of the revolution.

The most overt sign of this change was the willingness of certain groups of workers to embrace Lenin's slogan of "All Power to the Soviets."

An analysis of the elections in May of delegates to the district and city soviets and to the district dumas in Petrograd shows a shift in workers' support from the moderate socialist parties to the Internationalist parties in general and the Bolsheviks in particular.

The political fragmentation of the Petrograd working class, the difficulty in interpreting the political behavior of workers, and the undisputable fact of a growing radicalism among them were all demonstrated in the outcome of the elections to the twelve district dumas of Petrograd, held in the last days of May and the first week of June. In general, the vote gave the Revolutionary Defensist bloc a comfortable majority: of the 784,910 votes (nearly 75 percent of all eligible voters), the moderate Socialists received 56.0 percent; the Kadets and other nonsocialists, 21.9 percent; and the Bolsheviks, 20.4 percent. But there were sharp variations from one district to another. it was again in the Vyborg and Vasileostrov districts that the Bolsheviks scored their greatest success, with 58.2 and 34.3 percent of the vote, respectively, compared to the moderates' 34.9 and 45.2.[2] In contrast, the Mensheviks, who had always courted the

support of the more skilled, literate, and politicized workers (generally the metalworkers and printers), now found their Revolutionary Defensist bloc supported largely by the less skilled, less politicized constituency of the SRs.

Of the highly skilled groups whom the Mensheviks viewed as their natural constituency, only the printers still showed solid support for the Revolutionary Defensists and their coalition strategy. Otherwise, the Menshevik party was fast becoming a party of the radical urban intelligentsia.

How did the soviet leaders react on the election results? None of the newspaper articles reporting the elections analyzed the reasons for the relatively strong Bolshevik showing in the Vyborg, Vasileostrov, and Petrograd districts. Instead, they hailed the results as a great victory for the Revolutionary Defensist bloc and as approval of its policies.[3] Insofar as the Revolutionary Defensists admitted that there was reason to be concerned, they explained it in ways that did not call for a reconsideration of their policies. For example, Tsereteli said that, although Bolshevik influence had penetrated the sphere of "economic struggle," the Petrograd workers still wholeheartedly supported the "democratic socialism" of the moderates in regard to "general political questions."[4] Tsereteli's disregard for the changing mood of the soviet's constituency was symptomatic of how removed the cabinet men had grown from the soviet.

The situation was very different for those Revolutionary Defensists outside the government who made themselves the defenders of coalition before audiences of workers and soldiers.

Years later, Voitinskii wrote Tsereteli expressing astonishment that the same events could have appeared so differently in their respective memoirs. Voitinskii's explanation for the discrepancy centered on the two men's different activities: "You made policy, whereas I was one of those who personally confronted the waves of hostility."[5]

Yet even in retrospect, Voitinskii was confident that the Revolutionary Defensists had been right in not changing their strategy in response to the expressions of opposition from the workers, for he believed that the real problem had lain in the expectation of"miracles" with which the "raw, ignorant" masses had welcomed the revolution: "The utopian maximalism of the lower classes vs. the real achievements attained by democratic means -- this was the essence of the split between the workers and the soldiers of Petrograd and the leaders of the soviet's majority."[6] According to both Tsereteli and Voitinskii, the gap could have been closed by a better, more forceful implementation of the strategy of cooperation and moderation.

In short, the Revolutionary Defensist strategy was based on the belief that there was no contradiction between the interests of the revolution and those of the proletariat. It was in this frame of mind that the Revolutionary Defensists awaited the opening of the first congress of soviets.

The First Congress of Soviets (June 3 - 17)

The First All-Russian Congress of Soviets opened in Petrograd on June 3. In attendance were 1,090 delegates, representing some four hundred organizations with approximately twenty million members.[7] From the outset, this "congress of democracy" was firmly in the hands of the Revolutionary Defensist bloc. Not only could the Menshevik and SR factions count on 571 of the 822 voting delegates, but within the Menshevik faction the Revolutionary Defensist leadership was supported by the provincial delegates and could effectively neutralize the more radical Petrograd section of the party.

The delegates to the congress consisted of two fairly distinctive groups, each with its own reasons for accepting the leadership's political course. The first and larger group was that of the army delegates, drawn in most cases from the soldiers' committees, army soviets, and mixed soldier-worker soviets.[8] Among these delegates, the patriotic mood of March had survived intact and perhaps even had solidified as the committees had been repeatedly called on by the command to stop the disintegration of military authority and to slow down the spread of antiwar sentiment among the soldiery.[9]

The second group, more important in terms of the stable (though also largely passive) support it gave to the Revolutionary Defensists, was that of the delegates from provincial town soviets, most of whom were Mensheviks. They still felt that, along with other groups of the democratic intelligentsia, they were responsible for uniting the nation's forces. For these delegates, the congress, with the divisions that were apparent within it and with its vocal contingent of Bolsheviks, as well as the chaos of Petrograd, provided

an almost unbearable contrast to the virtual unanimity still prevalent among the intelligentsia in their provincial towns.[10]

Given these two groups of supporters, there was little doubt of the outcome of the congress's first and most crucial debate, on relationships with the Provisional Government, nor was there anything new in the speeches of either detractors or defenders. The long debate (some sixty speeches delivered over five days) included strong denunciations of coalition by the Bolsheviks and Menshevik Internationalists: Lenin demanded a transfer of all power to the workers and poor peasants, and Martov called more vaguely for an immediate end to socialist participation in coalition as well as a more energetic pursuit of the soviet's program.[11] Tsereteli and the other socialist ministers treated coalition as an irrefutable fact and ignored all opposition to it.

Coalition defenders spoke of its achievements to date and described the "objective" reasons for its short-comings. Tsereteli's only rebuke was directed at the "anarchism" in Kronstadt during April and May, and he used it to reassert the need for a "strong government" and for the unity of "all the vital forces of the nation."[12] On June 8, the congress passed the Revolutionary Defensist resolution on this question by a resounding majority (543 to 126). The resolution limited the expression of confidence to the socialist ministers alone but did extend the congress's support to the government's policy. The outcome of this debate, encouraged the Revolutionary Defensist leaders in their conviction that "revolutionary democracy" supported their strategy of coalition.

But soon it had become clear that the Bolsheviks intended to call for a massive demonstration against the coalition government on June 10th. Whether or not the demonstration had been calculated to lead to a takeover of power, the Bolshevik slogans represented an assault on the authority of the soviet's leadership.[13]

The congress united around an appeal to the workers to ignore the planned demonstrations and indeed to avoid all demonstrations for the next three days. "Let the Leninists be as alone on the streets as they are in the congress," Rabochaia gazeta pleaded.[14] The appeal was widely accepted by workers and soldiers in all but the Vyborg and Vasileostrov districts, where about half of the workers rejected it or accepted it reluctantly. At the last minute, however, the Bolshevik Central Committee itself called off the planned demonstration.[15] Thus, although this incident concerned only the soviet's authority, not its policies, it served to reinforce the majority's confidence.

Tsereteli and his supporters, perceiving a threat from both the mounting wave of anarchy and the Bolsheviks' presumed conspiracy to seize power, attempted to "expel" the Bolsheviks from revolutionary democracy.[16] Tsereteli demanded a change away from "verbal methods of struggle" against the Bolsheviks toward stronger measures, albeit still consistent with the preservation of law and order; specifically, he wanted the soviet to act on behalf of the minister of war, Kerenskii, to disarm all military units that had supported the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks, he argued, had turned against the revolution and its democratic order and should be fought without regard for one's "revolutionary emotionalism."[17]

This demand provoked the first open conflict between Tsereteli and Dan. During a meeting of the star chamber and other Revolutionary Defensist members of the congress's presidium early on the morning of June 11, Dan launched a strenuous attack against Tsereteli and his supporters (Liber, Ermolaev, and Gots), and their proposals were defeated.[18]

It concerned the permissible scope of action revolutionary democracy could take against its lapsed members. Whereas Tsereteli wanted the Bolsheviks expelled as a party and singled out for repression -- a task that would have fallen to the soviet -- Dan preferred "democracy" to maintain its unity and discipline through moral authority alone and to leave to the government the task of punishing those individuals guilty of illegal conduct.

In Tsereteli's view, cooperation of the vital forces of the nation required the elimination of Bolshevism from the ranks of the truly democratic part of "revolutionary democracy." To him, the incident of June 10 was a good opportunity for effecting this necessary break. From Dan's point of view, revolutionary democracy was supposed to implement the revolution; Bolshevik "adventurism" was abhorrent to him and his supporters because it threatened to divide the "family of revolutionary democracy," but Tsereteli's proposed measures for dealing with the Bolsheviks were equally abhorrent, for the same reason.[19]

The effect of Bolshevik challenge can be seen most clearly in Cherevanin's analysis. The Bolsheviks, he argued, knew that Russia was not ready for socialism, yet they had tried to prevent a bourgeois-democratic order from being established because their

real goal of international socialist revolution depended on a socialist revolution taking place first in Russia. Cherevanin had no doubt of the outcome of such a willful distortion of history's prescribed path; it would simply facilitate the coming of the counterrevolution.[20]

During the debate on June 11 concerning the Bolshevik demonstration, Martov warned that nay measures taken against the Bolsheviks would only further alienate the "more active part of the proletariat" and argues that the attitudes expressed by the Bolsheviks were in fact typical of a "huge mass" of workers. Dan answered with typical Revolutionary Defensist confidence that the "true will" of the laboring masses was expressed in the Congress of Soviets and not in the actions of one or another segment of the Petrograd proletariat. Then Dan boldly repeated a suggestion that had been made on June 9 by the Menshevik Petrograd organization: that the congress organize a mass political demonstration of all the soviet's parties to show support for the leadership's strategy, which the delegates had already so overwhelmingly approved.[21]

Tsereteli and Liber registered the only reservations concerning the proposed demonstration, and they did so only because Bolshevik participation in the united venture would have obscured their standing as outcasts from revolutionary democracy.[22] As it turned out, the demonstration, which took place on June 18, did not resolve the question of the political attitudes of the Petrograd workers. The Bolshevik newspaper boasted that the demonstration had revealed "the overwhelming majority" of the industrial proletariat of the capital and its troops to have been "behind the slogans of the Bolshevik party," for the greater number of banners had borne the

slogans of the Bolsheviks and not those of the soviet: "Armistice Now!" "Down with the Ten Capitalist Ministers!," and "All Power to the Soviets!"[23] This fact suggested to the Internationalists that a reconsideration of political strategy was in order. The Revolutionary Defensists, however, chose to concentrate on the demonstration's other aspect: its support for the soviet and the marchers' apparent belief that they and their leaders were united behind the same goals.

According to the Petrograd soviet's newspaper, the "divergence" exposed during the congress between "a well-known section of the Petrograd proletariat" and the rest of democracy had actually served the leadership's cause, for it had reminded those in Petrograd of the "concrete correlation of forces existing in the country."[24] It was considered to be of great significance that the congress had created a new entity, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee (VTsIK), which was invested with supreme authority over revolutionary democracy and thereby institutionalized the superiority of the provinces over Petrograd. In the VTsIK that was elected on June 17, Mensheviks held 104 of the 257 seats and SRs 100, for a total of almost 80 percent. All told, the Revolutionary Defensist emerged from the First Congress of Soviets confident of the support of the soviet's followers for their political strategy.

Meanwhile, the fundamental shift of attitudes among the soviet's followers in Petrograd, which had been in progress since late May, accelerated and reached a turning point. Several events contributed to this shift during the two weeks following the June 18 demonstration. The first of these was the government's attack on the Anarchists occupying Durnovo's dacha (on the night following the

demonstration of June 18), which strengthened the Vyborg workers' hostility toward coalition.[25] The second was Skobelev's appeal on June 28 for self-restraint, amidst economic crisis and an escalating industrial conflict. Finally, the beginning of the Russian summer offensive against the Germans on June 18, and its complete failure over the following weeks, was perhaps most decisive.

The June Military Offensive

In late June as in late April, the issues of war, peace, and defense provided a convergence for the antigovernment sentiment among the soviet's followers. These were certainly crucial issues for the soldiers not only on the front but also in the rear garrison units, which could be called to battle at any moment. And the soldiers' point of view affected that of the workers, especially in urban settings, where the interaction between factories and barracks was most direct. In addition, the workers were receptive to the Bolsheviks' identification of domestic "capitalism" and international "imperialism." By the end of June, many workers on Petrograd had come to see the Menshevik policy on war and peace as a "blow to the Russian revolution and the International."[26]

Yet the chance to influence government policy in behalf of a just peace among the warring countries had been one of the reasons for the Revolutionary Defensists' participation in the government. Indeed, they had spared no energy during their first six weeks in the coalition in pursuit of this goal.[27] In addition, through the agency of the soviet, they pressed for the convocation of an international

socialist conference that would unite all the socialist parties that were not blamed for "defeatism" in their respective countries, in an effort to force their governments to negotiate on the basis of the soviet's formula for a "democratic peace." Meanwhile, in the Provisional Government, they sought to direct Tereshchenko, the new minister of foreign affairs, to compel the French and British governments to change the Allies' declared war aims. Neither of these efforts bore fruit, but it was not because of inaction on the part of the Revolutionary Defensists.

The first problem with the proposed socialist peace conference emerged during visits of the leaders of the European socialist parties to Petrograd: They could not be made to understand how urgent peace was for revolutionary Russia.[28] Then, while the Revolutionary Defensists were nevertheless making preparations for the conference (which was to be held in Stockholm at the end of June), there cam the second blow -- the refusal of the French, Italian, and U.S. governments to grant passports to their socialist delegates.[29] The difficulties in implementing the other part of the Revolutionary Defensist peace strategy were also created by the Allied governments, not by the moderate socialists or the Provisional Government. Tereshchenko's first diplomatic initiative was an invitation to the Allies to join a conference of a review of the war aims, presumably with the goal of preparing to negotiate peace without annexations or indemnities.

But unfortunately, Russia's financial dependence on the Allies left the Provisional Government with no further resort when they refused to consider any revision of the war aims. [30]

In the light of these failures, the Revolutionary Defensists' dedication to peace appeared unconvincing. They were angered by the Allies' stubbornness, and they admitted that only an "international struggle of democracy against world imperialism" could overcome it.[31] Yet they did not call on the Russian masses to launch this struggle with demonstrations or with fraternization and a nonbelligerent stance on the front, nor could such a strategy have been expected to convince the socialist parties in the Allied nations. Instead, the Revolutionary Defensists urged workers and soldiers to show their "determination to fight," arguing, first, that such determination would give the Germans a reason to negotiate, and later, that such determination would enable the Russian revolution to claim that it had "carried the banner of the struggle for peace" and would gain the support of the Allies socialist parties for peace negotiations.[32] With these arguments, the Revolutionary Defensists sought to justify their support of the Provisional Government's decision, taken under British and French pressure, to launch the offensive against the German army. [33]

Not only was there a touch of the absurd in the launching of a military offensive in the name of peace, but also the validity of its expectations should have been doubtful from the outset. The Revolutionary Defensists, as the Bolsheviks would do after October, exaggerated the influence of the revolution beyond Russia's borders, even among the socialist parties. They also underestimated the depth of the disruption it would cause in the army. These misperceptions obscured the fact that the only practical choice was between continued war and a separate peace with Germany.[34]

Moreover, the issues of war and peace were often confused with considerations of the revolution's political arrangements. Both a separate peace and the vaguer variant of an "immediate armistice" advocated by the Menshevik Internationalists were objectionable to the Revolutionary Defensists principally because they feared that either one would destroy the "unity of the vital forces."[35] In fact, the nonsocialist ministers, especially Tershchenko and Kerenskii, had used this concern of the Revolutionary Defensists to pressure them into supporting the offensive.[36] Had they been free of these considerations, they would have seen that the balance of forces had urgently dictated an end to the war. But in the time of late May and June, Kerenskii's campaign for "prosecuting the war in order to end it" seemed more promising a policy than that of suing for peace.[37]

The offensive tested the reality of both the renewed optimism about the army's capacity to fight and the hope for diplomatic gain from the mere search for peace. An initial flush of success and the growth of patriotic feelings among certain groups of workers as well as among the middle class and the intelligentsia gave rise to some enthusiastic rhetoric among the Revolutionary Defensists.[38] The offensive, they insisted, had been only a "strategy" subordinated to the revolution's "political tasks," specifically to its "peace policy." [39] Furthermore, they repeatedly attacked Potresov and his colleagues at Den' for their unreserved delight in the offensive.[40]

Early success, however, soon turned to defeat, and whatever enthusiasm the offensive had aroused among the soviet's followers vanished. There were reports of soldiers refusing to fight, deserting their units, and even assaulting one-popular emissaries of the soviet.

N.D. Sokolov, who had drawn up Order No. 1 was one of those beaten by soldiers for his support of the offensive. In Petrograd, the antiwar antigovernment mood spread quickly from units intended for the front to the garrison at large and finally to the workers.[41] The Revolutionary Defensists' reaction to this turn in popular sentiment was not to admit their mistake but to attack the Bolsheviks.[42] Whatever the Menshevik interpretation of the causes, the offensive had clearly become the symbol of what workers and soldiers in Petrograd believed to have been the government's duplicity and the moderates' acquiescence in it. The political consequences of this mistake would be reaped during the so-called July Days.

CHAPTER V

JULY CRISIS AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

July Days

The political crisis that took place in early July disclosed the main antagonism of the Revolution and plunged Russia into the state when the previous -- peaceful -- ways of development were closed and the political leaders of both camps had to seek new radical solutions.

Two crises which started in early July independently of each other resolved through nearly the same set of developments. One crisis involved the relations between the soviet's leadership and its followers, who poured into the streets of Petrograd on July 3 and 4 to express their desire for a bold new political initiative by the soviet. The other crisis involved the relations between the representatives of the soviet in the coalition government and the nonsocialist ministers, especially those of the Kadet party.

The cabinet crisis began a day before the street demonstration, when the Kadet Central Committee decided to withdraw its four ministers from the cabinet on July 2, ostensibly to protest the agreement on limited autonomy for the Ukraine just negotiated by Tsereteli, Kerenskii, and Tereshchenko between the Provisional Government and the Ukrainian Central Rada.[1] The agreement, it

asserted, had violated two basic Kadet principles: the absolute unity of the Russian state and the equally absolute right of a future Constituent Assembly to determine Russia's political future. The refusal of the negotiating triumvirate to make any changes infuriated many other Kadets. More broadly, however, the agreement was final proof to the Kadets of the coalition's general uselessness.[2]

The Kadet's resignation allowed the Revolutionary Defensists to recognize more openly that their initial program had not been carried out. They now felt free to rededicate themselves to the implementation of this program, which in fact served as the basis of agreement among the members of the star chamber when they met on the morning of July 3 to discuss a solution to the crisis. The coalition, without the Kadets, it was decided, would co-opt "those representatives of 'bourgeois democracy' who would not be against the implementation of the radical democratic reforms promised in the (May 6) declaration."[3]

On the afternoon of July 3, a combined meeting of the bureaus of the two all-Russian executive committees (that of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and that of the Peasants' Soviet), began to discuss the crisis. But before the two bureaus could make any decisions, news came of unrest among the workers and soldiers of Petrograd, throwing the political tactics and the parliamentary manipulations of the Revolutionary Defensist leaders into disarray. The street demonstrations by workers and soldiers proved the most damaging to the Revolutionary Defensists' strategy. In retrospect, the demonstrations appear to have been the culmination of a process of embitterment and political radicalization that had been under way

for most of the two months of coalition and that had accelerated with the offensive. Demonstrations were largely spontaneous, they began on the orders of the Bolsheviks (whose Central Committee had in fact first attempted to dissuade workers from demonstrating) nor primarily concerned with the resignation of the Kadet ministers.[4]

The first call to workers and soldiers to demonstrate against the government came on July 3 from the First Machine Gun Regiment, stationed in Vyborg, after it had elected a "revolutionary committee" to plan the takeover of certain points in the capital in conjunction with the demonstrations. The regiment had a long history of contact with the Bolshevik military organization, and activists from that organization and from the Ararchist Communists were among the leaders of the insurrection. The machine-gunners' action followed two weeks of agitation and turmoil triggered by an order on June 20 that part of the regiment move to the front.[5]

In other units and factories in the Vyborg district, and later all over the city to which emissaries from the Machine Gun Regiment were sent with word of the planned demonstration, they found most workers and a large part of the soldiers eager to listen and follow. The most dramatic response came from the Putilov workers. There, news of the Kadets' resignation had arrived on July 3 and had served to give clearer political definition to the workers' anger, which had been mounting during their month-long wage dispute with the Provisional Government. Thirty thousand Putilov workers responded to the summons with an armed march on the Tauride Palace to demand that the soviet assume "full power."[6] When they reached the Tauride Palace in the small hours of the morning of July 4, they

joined the huge crowd that had already gathered in front of the gates, carrying banners of all sorts (many of them probably left over from June 18), exclaiming, among other things, "Down with All the Capitalist Ministers" and "All Power to the Soviets!"[7]

After two months of coalition, the workers no longer believed that the soviet could force the bourgeois ministers to do its will. Indeed, the issue was not really "soviet power" as such but rather the workers' desire to see realized the soviet's policies of peace, economic reconstruction, and democratization (to which the soldiers added the distribution of land) as well as their desire that their leaders acknowledge that these policies would not be realized in coalition:

> Our comrades, the socialist ministers, entered into an agreement with the capitalists. But those capitalists are our sworn enemies. We demand that the land be seized immediately, and that a struggle be initiated immediately against the hunger that threatens us.[8]

What worker's frustration, even hostility toward formerly admired leaders was forcefully demonstrated in the episode, in which a fist-waving worker shouted at Chernov, "Take power, you son of a bitch, when it's being handed to you!"[9]

The workers' new political mood did not change the leadership's strategy, though it affected their handling of the crisis in a number of important ways. First, the demonstrations had the effect of dividing society in Petrograd and isolating its working class. On July 3, and even more so on July 4, when more workers as well as twenty thousand Kronstadt sailors joined the demonstrations, armed

confrontations took place between the radicalized soviet's constituency and the supporters of the Provisional Government which resulted in some four hundred deaths and revived earlier fears of civil war.[10] Second, the workers' behavior was viewed by most Revolutionary Defensists as symptomatic of their political immaturity and strengthened the Revolutionary Defensists' determination to resist the pressure for a more radical policy.[11] Finally, the Bolsheviks' involvement in the July Days deflected the Mensheviks' attention from the change in working-class sentiment in Petrograd. After initially discouraging the demonstrations, the Bolshevik Central Committee yielded to the pressure of events and of the party's lower ranks and on July 4 issued an invitation to all workers and soldiers to exploit the cabinet crisis and press for soviet power.[12] As a result of these three factors, the street demonstrations of July 3 and 4 had the seemingly paradoxical effect of reinforcing the resolve of the Revolutionary Defensist leaders to see the coalition revived.

The soviet leaders were faced with options: to insist on the principle of coalition, perhaps modified as a result of the cabinet crisis or to create a new political arrangement based on either soviet power or something else. The choice among these options was arguably the most crucial decision of the eight months between February and October. In the atmosphere of fear of an outbreak of civil war and of anger toward the Bolsheviks and their followers, the political divisions in the soviet and within the Menshevik party became sharper.

The meeting of the executive committees ended early on the morning of July 4 with only an appeal to the workers and soldiers to end the street demonstrations, with further debate postponed until another meeting at six that evening.[13] When the committees reconvened, it was apparent that the Bolsheviks and Left SRs were no longer the only advocates of soviet power. To most Internationalists, both Menshevik and Independent, the second, and more serious, day of demonstrations and unchecked clashes was proof that a radical departure from the strategy of coalition was urgently required, both because this was the demand of the soviet's constituency and because it seemed the only way to prevent further bloodshed. Steklov, formerly an Independent SD but now affiliated with the Menshevik Internationalists, argued that a "socialist ministry" not only had been essential but also had been met with an "enthusiasm greater than that which had greeted the overthrow of the Romanov dynasty." The Menshevik Internationalists Kapelinskii and Lapinskii agreed; the latter declared that "any other solution would condemn the country to a state of chronic crisis."[14]

It was Martov who offered the most innovative solution, another alternative. He had condemned coalition and had rejected a policy of soviet power for the same doctrinal reason: socialists should not hold political power in a revolution that could not accomplish a socialist transformation in the short run. Over the last two months, however, he had seen two long-standing threats to the revolution being realized: the bourgeoisie's refusal to "complete' the democratic revolution (now irrefutably shown in the Kadets' resignations) and the bourgeoisie's distortion of the policies of their socialist coalition

partners in an effort to deprive them of the workers' support. He was now convinced that none of the traditional Menshevik arguments against the soviets' assumption of full power could outweigh the message of the demonstrators.[15]

Martov proposed, then, a 'purely democratic' government organized and dominated by the soviet (perhaps with a minority of nonsocialist democrats) and dedicated to a program of radical reforms: an immediate armistice and the democratization of the army; a struggle against counterrevolution, including a purge of all governmental agencies; the immediate preparation of agrarian reforms that would include the confiscation and redistribution of all large land holdings, subject to the approval of the Constituent Assembly; and extensive economic changes, such as new tax measures, central economic planning and regulation, and the sequestration of any plant shut down by the owners. This was a preview of the strategy of a "homogeneous socialist government" -- that is, a government drawn from among all the socialist parties represented in the soviets, which would be the principal alternative to coalition during the next few months.[16]

But Dan's and Tsereteli's speeches that night did not betray a lessening of confidence in the correctness and feasibility of their own strategy. First, they pointed out that troops "loyal to the revolution" were on their way from the front to petrograd and could physically deflect the pressure from the demonstrators. Second, they argued that the preconditions for support of the coalition by the two camps still existed. As Tsereteli said:

> The coalition does not mean a bloc with the Kadets alone, and their departure does not mean that a bloc is impossible. We form blocs not with parties but with all those who are ready to stand on our platform.[17]

In the short run, the Revolutionary Defensists' confidence proved will founded. When Dan and Tsereteli had finished their speeches, at about 1 A.M., the debate had been on for seven hours. The executive committees began to vote on resolutions. The resolution submitted by the Revolutionary Defensists won easily over that of Martov.

The second resolution recognized the reduced cabinet as the legitimate governmental authority and consigned a comprehensive discussion of political strategy to a plenary meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee scheduled to meet in Petrograd two weeks later.[18] The meeting finally adjourned at 4 A.M on July 4. The members of the star chamber were now free to dedicate their energies to repairing the damage done by the Kadets to the unity of the "vital forces" and to fulfill their promises.

The soviet leaders' confidence in their confrontation with the Petrograd demonstrators was based on the presumed support of revolutionary democracy outside the capital. By early July, however, that support was rapidly declining at the fronts and in the industrial villages and towns of the central industrial region -- a trend that was apparently underestimated by the Revolutionary Defensists in Petrograd. The workers' sense of alienation from the soviet's leadership made them more perceptible to the political alternative formulated by the Bolsheviks. The July days deepened the split

within the Menshevik party, the summoning of loyal troops and, later, the measures against the Bolsheviks and their supporters would end any hope of a timely reconciliation between the Revolutionary Defensist leadership and the Internationalist wing led by Martov who strongly opposed the application of punitive measures against workers and soldiers. He viewed their excesses as the acts of misguided revolutionaries, not of criminals.[19]

In the short run, the outcome of the July Days was a Revolutionary Defensist victory over the opponents of coalition. But it was a shaky victory, and one built entirely on the premise that a new, more democratic coalition could be formed and be rededicated to the reforms demanded by the soviet's constituency.

-The Immediate Political Results of the July Days and the Mensheviks' Response to Them

From the July Days the political arena of the revolution was dominated by two alternatives, both of them hostile to coalition, and though they developed simultaneously and fed on each other, one can view them as played out in succession. The first of these was a right-wing dictatorship, which followed directly from the repressive measures taken against the Bolsheviks and their supporters in the wake of the July Days and ended in General Kornilov's attempted coup at the end of August. The second was a left-wing dictatorship of the soviet, advocated by the Bolsheviks since April but made far more plausible after Kornilov's failed adventure. These two alternatives, and the Mensheviks' response to them, will be

examined below. Before considering the second alternative, we will examine the social aspect of industrial relations between July and October, for without this dimension the workers' ultimate support for the Bolshevik seizure of power could not be explained.

By the end of July, the Revolutionary Defensists revealed their inability to appreciate how deeply the July Days had diminished the chances of accommodation between Russia's major social groups. Between July and October, the Menshevik leaders would find their overtures repeatedly rebuffed not only by their own constituency but also by the groups whom then considered the natural allies of revolutionary democracy. Cabinet crisis, disorder and a counterrevolutionary backlash directed against the Bolsheviks, against the workers in Petrograd, and indeed against the whole of revolutionary democracy. In Petrograd, bands of armed sailors from Kronstadt, prevented by government forces from returning to their base, continued to roam the streets, while in other parts of the city Bolsheviks and workers were arrested and lynched.[20] From the front, too, there was bad news: a German breakthrough in the Russian defenses at Tarnopol along the Galician front, and demoralization and mass desertion.[21] Meanwhile, it was becoming apparent that measures introduced in the army (with the Revolutionary Defensists' consent) to combat desertion and antiwar propaganda were being used against the soldiers' democratic organizations. These measures included the reinstitution of the death penalty, military censorship, and a ban on political association.[22]

The problem, Tsereteli explained to an emergency session of the VTsIk on July 17, was how to "strike at anarchy without striking at the revolution itself" -- that is, how to ensure that the "revolutionary order" not e used by the "counterrevolution" to undermine the organizational strength of the soviet. His and the SRs' argument was that anarchy was the greatest danger -- that, infact, anarchy and counterrevolution "fed on each other" to the extent that the Provisional Government had to be given "unlimited powers" to fight anarchy"in all its manifestations.[23]

The problem of Revolutionary Defensist strategy after the July Days, however, consisted not only of the need to balance the concurrent campaigns against anarchy and counterrevolution but also of the recognition that repressive measures alone could not be expected to stem the tide of disorder. That goal required the satisfaction of at least the most pressing of the workers' and soldiers' demands. In the days following the crisis, Rabochaia gazeta repeatedly called for making the program of "radical democratic reforms" the centerpiece of negotiations in the cabinet's reconstruction.[24] Such programs, drafted by Dan, was placed by the Revolutionary Defensist leaders before the executive committee on July 7, and accepted by it and then adopted by the Menshevik Organizational Committee.[25] It admitted that the use of repressive measures contained the risk of counterrevolution, but it blamedthe need for them on the Bolsheviks' "adventurist attempt at armed action" against the Provisional Government. On the other hand, it asserted that continued "revolutionary order" made necessary a series of steps, including the elimination of all "remnants" of the old

regime; a declaration that Russia was a democratic republic; "immediate measures" in regard to the agrarian and labor questions; the development of self-government; the regulation of economic life, especially in the area of supplies; and the convocation of the Constituent Assembly without delay.[26] The program called for the most far-reaching domestic reforms that could reasonably be expected before the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, though the issue of war or peace was intentionally left vague.

Soviet leaders' commitment to radical change was tempered by a search for agreement with other elements of educated Russia. But could a broad coalition be formed around the soviet's program? Now it contained the additional demand that the Duma be immediately dissolved. Prince L'vov rejected the attempt to "dictate" to the government and announced his resignation.[27] Not only did his resignation exemplify the widening rupture between democracy and the moderate liberals but in practical terms it meant that the new prime minister would be Kerenskii, whom none of the Mensheviks trusted. In any case, the cabinet accepted the soviet's program on July 8. This apparent victory allowed the Revolutionary Defensists to grant the government with "unlimited power" for the "salvation of the revolution."[28] But this "solution" of the crisis did not work. The events of the July Days, and the subsequent general disorder, had given political shape to the sense of injury and self-righteousness that the propertied and educated groups had increasingly felt over the past two months.

The public and commercial-industrial organizations gave free rein to their attacks both on the workers' specific demands and on

the soviet as an institution. The Provisional Committee of the Duma described the soviet as a "socialist minority" seeking to subordinate the cabinet, and Riabushinskii described it as "a casual gathering of people, for the most part ignorant, nameless unenlightened, irresponsible . . ., and unprepared to participate in state and social construction."[29] The Petrograd-based Union of Trade and Industry said the coalition cabinet was comprised of one wing (the socialist) that would not yield on its "narrowly partisan goals" and another (the nonsocialist) that had no real support among the "influential circles" of the country.[30] The general opinion of industrialists seemed to be that the government should break with the soviets.

Now, most of those who wrote and spoke for the propertied groups projected an image of Russian society as irrevocably divided between men of education and responsibility and an anarchic mob whose demands -- and nay concession to them -- would destroy the country. In these circumstances, even Nekrasov and Tereshchenko, Tsereteli's strongest bourgeois supporters, began insisting that no reform be attempted by the cabinet until it could secure the support and participation of at least the more influential parties and organizations of the propertied classes.[31] Moreover, the socialist ministers were forced to give Kerenskii a free hand in negotiating the terms of such participation. When negotiations for a new coalition began on July 13 the Kadets and the commercial-industrial organizations were dictating to the soviet the limits of its influence on government policy.[32]

The rejection of the July 8 program by the Kadets and the industrialists did not prevent the star chamber from attempting to

implement it. Having secured the approval of the Petrograd executive committee and the VTsIK for a new coalition that would be prepared to carry out "radical democratic reforms," would be invested with "broad powers," and would be based on all the "vital forces of the country,"[33] they proceeded to persuade Kerenskii to initiate the formation of the kind of cabinet demanded by the soviet. The result was a decisive blow to Tsereteli's hopes.

On July 20, Kerenskii wrote to the Kadet negotiators to explain that any new government would have to be guided by the principles of all three programs adopted by previous cabinets, those of March 2, May 6, and July 8. The Kadets promptly informed Kerenskii that they would not join such a government. Kerenskii resigned and left for Finland in a huff.[34] This was followed by the resignation of all the nonsocialist ministers, and Russia found itself without a government.[35] On July 21, the Revolutionary Defensist leaders convened the VTsIK to announce their decision to enter immediately into direct negotiations with all of the "big parties" except the Bolsheviks and the Octobrists.[36]

At the meeting with the "big parties," the soviet's representatives -- Tsereteli, Dan, Chkeidze, and Liber -- encountered unanimous rejection of their attempts to dictate the government's policies.[37] After a heated discussion Dan threatened a soviet seizure of power, but in vain. Finally, the official Menshevik response invited Kerenskii to return and form a cabinet of all parties ready to work under him as prime minister.[38]

The cabinet established by Kerenskii on July 23 was the first to have come into being without a declaration of intentions, except that

the ministers were "responsible to their consciences alone.[39] Judging only from its composition, the new cabinet could not have been pronounced as dedicated to the program of social and political democratization that had been the declared goal of the three preceding cabinets in revolutionary Russia. The socialists were now a small minority, five out of fifteen ministers, and no longer included Tsereteli, the voice of Revolutionary Defensism and the soviet.[40] To the soviet's followers, the participation of socialists in this coalition must have seemed a considerable concession to the right, though this was not how the Revolutionary Defensists saw matters.

Of all the Revolutionary Defensists, Tsereteli was the most honest about the impossibility of reconciling the tasks of reform and cooperation and the need to sacrifice the former to the latter. In presenting the new government to the VTsIK on July 24, he warned that now the soviet should avoid any "interference" with the government's acts, be they social reforms or additional measures of repression. Ideologically speaking, the compromise with the nonsocialists was a "lesser evil" when compared to the alternative of a government of the soviets that was isolated from Russia's propertied and "intermediate" classes.[41]

What made other Mensheviks, hitherto unenthusiastic about the prospects of national coalition, hold on to it so desperately now was the rising specter of a counter revolutionary backlash, or, as formulated by the Internationalist Martynov (a consistent critic of coalition), the existence of only two alternatives in the aftermath of the July Days: that of a "premature attempt to realize socialism" and

that of "reaction" -- and even the former was likely to lead to the latter.[42]

August Conferences

Antisoviet and antisocialist feelings of the propertied classes of Russia found an open expression at three big conferences that met in Moscow during August: the Second Trade-Industrial Congress (August 3 - 5); the Conference of Public Activists (August 8 - 10); and the State Conference (August 12 - 14). At the Conference of Public Activists, only a few of the speakers rejected the charge that the country's troubles were solely the fault of the socialists and the lower classes,[43] most of the other speakers, however, directed bitter complaints at the soviets, the soldiers' committees the workers' and employees' committees, and even Tereshchenko and Kerenskii whose indulgence toward socialist "dilettantes" was blamed for the desperate situation in the army, the railroads, industry, finance, and food supplies.[44] Moreover, they generally agreed on the necessity of a strong, authoritative government (meaning a government without socialists), and many called for a halt to all social reforms and the establishment of a military dictatorship.[45]

What was significant in this regard was that, alongside supporters of the old regime from among the landed nobility and the clergy, the conference had attracted representatives of the Union of Engineers, the Union of Junior University Instructors, the cooperative movement, and the Peasants' Union -- that is, those groups that the Mensheviks had identified as rural and urban democracy.

Shortly afterward, the antisoviet mood of the bourgeoisie proper manifested itself at the State Conference, the largest of the revolution's gatherings. This conference, attended by 2,500 delegates representing every social, professional, national, and political group, was meant to lend an appearance of unity and support to the Kerenskii regime. Its effect, however, was to show how little authority the coalition government had among the mass following of revolutionary democracy and how mistrustful of its ability to maintain order were such elements of census society as the army commanders and the leaders of the Kadet party. Disregarding the advice of the soviet, Moscow's workers went on strike and demonstrated against the conference in numbers not seen since February, while inside the conference hall General Kornilov's call for "urgent" measures to restore order at the front and the rear (by extending the death penalty to the whole country) was greeted with applause.[46] In general, the nonsocialist speakers, though disagreeing among themselves on almost every program discussed at the conference, followed the example of the Conference of Public Activists in devoting their statements to attacks on the socialists. To these accusations Dan, Chkheidze and Tsereteli answered that the revolutionary regime needed to implement measures for both social improvement and economic recovery, but they also indicated the soviet's readiness to accommodate census Russia's concern for law and order in the army and throughout the country.[47]

Finally, and only after long negotiations, the constituent elements of nonsoviet democracy -- the cooperatives, city dumas, and zemstvos -- were persuaded to subscribe to what came to be

known later as the August 14 program. yet neither the manifestations of national responsibility nor the parliamentary success of forming a "democratic front" could overcome the belligerent determination of the bourgeoisie for a radical political solution. The State Conference was an omen of Kornilov's attack on the Provisional Government two weeks later.

It was again time for the Revolutionary Defensists to reconsider their coalition strategy, and the Unification Congress of Russian Social Democracy (in fact, of the Menshevik party), which opened in Petrograd on August 19, provided the opportunity, though in the end produced neither unity nor a clearer political direction. Instead, the debates underscored the party's splintering and the estrangement among its many factions and groups. On the extreme left was the group of former Independent Internationalists identified with the newspaper Novaia zhizn'. Together with them, forming an Internationalist faction, was Martov's group of Internationalist émigrés, who were far closer to the traditions of Menshevism but no less extreme in their denunciation of coalition.[48] Close to them in opinion, though not in practice, were the Internationalist-Unifiers, praktiki from Moscow, Tula, Odessa, and Tver, whose Internationalism and critique of coalition were tempered by emphasis on the party's unity and by the fact that they often voted with the Revolutionary Defensists. At the center of the party stood the Revolutionary Defensist leadership, which for months had been carrying both the burden and the prestige of coalition negotiations and government work. To the right of the Revolutionary Defensists were most of the provincial Mensheviks, whose "statesmanlike"

concerns, born of governing Russia's localities and of their leadership of the provincial intelligentsia, were deepened in July by the precipitous rise in Bolshevik influence among the workers. Finally, on the extreme right and largely excluded from the party's work during 1917, stood the Defensist Potresov, whose gloomy projections now closely resembled those of the provincials.

Tsereteli's boastful optimism sharply contrasted to Potresov's profound pessimism about the proletariat's failure to "rise to the challenge of the all-national tasks." Bogdanov and Liber, like Tsereteli, warned against making the Social Democratic program of domestic reform too "radical". But the Internationalists Martov, Avilov, Semkovskii, and I.S. Astrov all called on Social Democrats to leave the coalition government which exposed its counterrevolutionary nature, and make themselves the leaders of whichever elements (democratic as well as proletarian) could be won to a program of radical domestic and international policy.[49] With opinions divided so sharply it was not surprising that the outcome was essentially a stalemate. The strategy of coalition did win majority approval, with 115 votes in favor, compared to 79 for Martov's position and 9 for Potresov's. But with the exception of Tsereteli, no one professed enthusiasm for it, and the congress itself offered no solution to the difficulties the Revolutionary Defensism. Even the Internationalists appeared reluctant to advocate the solution of a "homogeneous socialist government," for which Martov had called during the July Days, in part because they had been repeatedly reminded of the dangers of isolation, defeat, and eventual counterrevolution. Indeed, the Bolsheviks' growing strength in the

soviets and the likelihood of their manipulating a purely socialist government made these dangers seem even more real.

Two weeks after the State Conference closed, General Kornilov attempted a coup against the Kerenskii government. During those two weeks, a sense of impending disaster spread among all groups, which seemed to call for the most decisive measures. The economy took a turn for the worse; there was a haunting fear of renewed disorder in the cities; and with the fall of Riga on August 19, the German army came a step closer to Petrograd. A variety of nonsocialist organizations began planning for a radical shift in the nature of the provisional regime so as to be able to use the power of the state to curb the autonomy of revolutionary democracy -- which they blamed for the disastrous conditions in the country -- and to exclude it from organized participation in Russia's political life.

The web of conspiracy, misapprehension, and incompetence that brought about the Kornilov affair has been recounted elsewhere and need not be repeated here.[50] Whatever the intentions of those involved in it -- a military coup against the Provisional Government itself or military support for a move by the government against the soviets, the soldiers' committees, and other "self-appointed organizations" -- the goal uniting them was the political exclusion of the left.[51]

The discovery of Kornilov's actions by a supposedly surprised Kerenskii on the night between August 26 and 27 produced a flurry of defensive activity by the soviet's supporters in Petrograd and on the railroads leading to the capital, and undermined the readiness of most soldiers in Kornilov's forces to carry out the ordered march on

Petrograd. The coup attempt was quickly put down, but its very occurrence changed the political choices facing the Menshevik leaders in significant ways, closing off some possibilities and seemingly opened others.

Coalition with the Kadets or the other elements of census society implicated in the Kornilov affair now became impossible. Instead, the Mensheviks decided to combine the nonsocialist democratic groups with socialist revolutionary-democratic ones into a "homogeneous democratic government." Of course, the degree of social and political fragmentation so clearly reflected in the July Days, the State Conference, and the Kornilov affair made it unlikely that the amorphous elements of democracy would break their ties to the census groups and align themselves with the socialists. Moreover, the lessons of Kornilov's assault on the soviets might lead workers and soldiers to a new surge of militancy and vindicate the Bolshevik view of Russian society and politics. The story of this final, tragic defeat of the moderates' strategy for the revolution must be viewed in the context of an unchecked economic crisis, a relentless industrial conflict, and the precipitous decline in the functioning of the state itself. It is to these aspects of the revolution's last months that we now turn.

CHAPTER VI

THE FALL OF MENSHEVISM

Collapse of the Economy, its Causes and Results

After a brief improvement in March and April, prompted by revolutionary patriotism and the dynamics of improved relations between labor and management, the production and supply of key products began declining again in May and June. Then, between July and October, a precipitous economic deterioration became evident from the growing number of closed factories and of temporary or terminal layoffs and the increase in unemployment. Although the situation in all these areas would become far worse after the Bolshevik seizure of power in October, both workers and employers felt the state of industry in the late summer and fall of 1917 was indeed one of "crisis."

The economic crisis of late summer was caused in part by the general problems. The inability of Russian industry and economic infrastructures (especially rail transport) to meet the requirements of a prolonged war; the imbalance created by the channeling of all available resources into military production and related branches of industry; and in 1917, the impact of the revolution in undermining entrepreneurial confidence, in confusing lines of administrative

oversight, and in failing to establish a more effective regulatory system. Beyond these general causes, however, several new developments exacerbated the economic difficulties and the societal antagonisms. In late summer, the railroads faced the added tasks of transporting multitudes of soldiers leaving the front and making the seasonal shift from the light summer load (when river transport was possible and heating fuel was not needed) to the usually heavy fall and winter load. According to one report, only 50 percent of the railroad's rolling stock was in operation in late July, and fuel reserves were down to a one-week supply for industry and a two-week supply for the railroads.[1]

Another new phenomenon was the disastrous state of the treasury and financial markets. In the stock exchanges of Petrograd and Moscow, a veritable orgy of buying and selling stocks was taking place, which a financial journal attributed to the unscrupulous willingness of banks and entrepreneurs to benefit from the naiveté of people wishing to invest their rapidly devaluating monetary notes in property they considered safe.[2]

Additional difficulties affected the supply of food to the industrial centers -- a matter of immense political importance in the fall of 1917, as it had been the previous fall. Besides the problems in transporting grain from the countryside to the cities, there were few industrial goods to exchange for the grain, which prompted a major banking organization to recommend the armed requisitioning of grain.[3] Moreover, the state grain monopoly disrupted the old networks of grain purchasing, but the new public and state organs were as yet poorly organized and generally unable to obtain the

necessary operating capital.[4] The banks and commercial organizations began to condition credit to these organs on certain governmental concessions, and such conditions led to the government's decision on August 27 to double bread prices and to allow private merchants to participate in grain purchasing alongside the cooperatives.[5]

Underlying the government's inability to regulate economic activity was its failure to forge an authoritative national regime. As the gap between social groups widened, the workers' and industrialists' perceptions of what was the state's appropriate role drew further and further apart. The workers demanded more state intervention and the takeover of privately owned plants and eventually of the whole economy. Meanwhile, private entrepreneurs began to view even the most circumspect regulation by the state as illegitimate intervention and to question the right of the intelligentsia in the economic ministries to exercise state power for which they were "unfit."[6]

At the State Conference, the Menshevik leaders of the soviet made a last, though cautious, effort to save both the economy and the coalition. Chkheidze presented a program of economic measures in the name of "united revolutionary democracy" that barely exceeded what had already been done and in some cases constituted a retreat: for example, in the implementation of a state monopoly on grains and other essential items he now saw a place of individual merchants.[7] But even this modes program was unacceptable to the representatives of commercial-industrial organizations, who were

hoping at the time that the country's social and economic problems might find resolution in Kornilov's "strong hand."

After Kornilov's defeat, this hope was dashed, and as the disintegration of the state apparatus became more obvious than ever before, entrepreneurial organizations seemed disoriented, and their actions were often contradictory. Some intensified their demand to be completely free of state interference. On September 5, the newly established All-Russian Union of Societies of Industrialists adopted a resolution declaring that the distribution of raw materials should be placed under its purview, because the government was too ineffective.[8]

However, other entrepreneurs, under the leadership of Konovalov, who returned to the Ministry of Trade and Industry in the coalition of September 25, seem to have concluded that a crisis might not work to their advantage and that whatever state authority still remained should be utilized to avert an impending catastrophe. But their concessions came too late, were too meager, and involved too much sacrifice on the workers' part to be credible. A declaration of intended policies published by the government on September 25 projected the continuation of state controls on certain prices, wages, and work time.

Altogether, the commercial-industrial interests emerge here as bearing the greatest share of responsibility for the regime's failure to regulate the country's economy, yet they commonly saw themselves as victims.[9]

Confrontations had by now become the declared strategy of the Moscow industrialists, both those led by Riabushinskii in the All-

Russian Trade-Industrial Union and those led by Guzhon in the Moscow Society of Industrialists (MSI). At the Second Trade-Industrial Congress, Riabushinskii had used the archaic appellation "trading men" (liudi torgovye) to rally his fellow entrepreneurs to the organizational work that would put them in a position to exploit the approaching economic "catastrophe."[10] In summing up the congress, a Menshevik newspaper had declared that the assembled merchants and industrialists had exhibited an "exclusiveness and intolerance" worthy of the Bolsheviks: they "did not grieve over the grave condition of the motherland but gloated over the mistakes of the Provisional Government."[11]

Indeed, Riabushinskii seemed to be deliberately courting catastrophe in the hope that its outcome, "the bony hand of hunger," would teach the workers and members of "committees and soviets" the lesson of submission to the "state interest" as defined by the commercial-industrial class. Meanwhile, the Moscow-based Union and the MSI were making every effort to restrain the government's regulatory efforts, to enforce on their member enterprises a strict code of resistance to worker's demands, and to undermine labor's strength by provoking lengthy strikes or locking the workers out.[12]

An even sharper shift in strategy, especially in regard to labor's demands, occurred during July and August among the industrialists of the south who demanded that troops be sent to the Donbas mines to protect property and production.[13] Some industrialists did everything they could to break the workers' organizations: mechanize production, hire foreign workers, and shift from domestic production to imports.[14] For the men entrusted with

maintaining a semblance of industrial order, the period after the July Days was one of enormous pressures. The Mensheviks in the Ministry of Labor were often called on by other government agencies to intervene in industrial conflicts.[15] Yet they found their mediation efforts snubbed or denounced by both workers and employers, as happened in the conflict in Moscow's leather industry, which had begun in mid-July and remained unresolved on October 25.[16]

Although the ministry in numerous instances supported the workers' specific demands, the economic difficulties forced it to insist -- as did other government agencies -- that employers not grant wages higher than the state recommended, because that would trigger similar demands from the workers of other factories and cause a further depletion of the treasury or new industrial conflicts.[17] It is easy to appreciate how disappointed the workers were with the ministry's attempts to hold down wages. Indeed, the work of the Mensheviks in the Ministry of Labor during the final weeks of the Provisional Government, however well intended, seems to have only further discredited them among both workers and industrialists.

The workers were of course directly affected by the economic deterioration and the industrial conflicts. Inflation, particularly the steep rise in the cost of food that followed the August 27 doubling of grain prices, considerably diminished real wages.[18] Unemployment, too, was becoming a more widespread source of anxiety, because it now affected not only the seasonal construction and wood workers, and unskilled workers, but the relatively privileged metalworkers as well.[19] The industrialists' aggressive posture after July had raised

the workers' mistrust to new heights, while the government's failure to deal with either the causes or the symptoms of economic deterioration had forced workers to rely more on themselves, turning to their usual weapons - strikes.

Though the proportion of economic strikes ending in full or partial satisfaction of the workers' demands declined precipitously between July and October,[20] strike activity only rose. The strikers' persistence, as measured in the length of strikes, increased, even though the strikes were taking place in conditions of grave economic difficulty.[21] In short, a major characteristic of the strike movement, when it revived in late July and August, was that workers often struck simply in protest and without hope of immediate success. Strikes for better conditions undertaken in the knowledge that they were hopeless reflected an alienation from the existing order and a determination to destroy it.

In August, September, and October, the incidence of workers' intervention in the economic functions of management, including the (usually temporary) takeover of enterprises, rose rapidly in Petrograd. One source estimates that, by October, some form of workers' kontrol' was operative in ninety-six enterprises in Petrograd, which together employed nearly 300,000 workers -- i.e., approximately three-quarters of the city's industrial work force, most of it employed in large metalfinishing factories.[22] This increase in intervention was chiefly the result of workers' desperate efforts to defend their jobs, though the owners may have perceived it as impermissible aggressiveness.

The Revolutionary Defensists did themselves great damage by attacking the work of the factory committees. Under pressure from the industrialists and concerned about falling productivity, Skobelev issued two circulars: one on August 22 reminding the members of factory committees that their competence did not include matters of production (disagreements with management over such matters had to be referred to the regional factory conferences), and the second on August 28 condemning the practice of conducting the committees' affairs during working time.[23] These pronouncements reinforced the workers' sense of alienation from the moderate socialists in the government, because they were issued at the very time that workers felt compelled to expand the purview of the committees. The episode gave workers another reason for disregarding the moderates' advice and following the Bolsheviks.[24]

By the second half of August, the Bolsheviks appeared to have recovered from the July debacle and to be increasing their strength among Petrograd's workers. They captured 33 percent of the vote in the elections to the city duma on August 20 (compared to 20 percent in early June); they did particularly well in the working-class districts, winning absolute majorities in Vyborg and Peterhof.[25] Most district soviets had by then declared their opposition to the moderates, as had the Interdistrict Conference of Petrograd Soviets, which had become the radical counterpart of the Petrograd soviet.[26] Similarly, among the trade unions of the capital only the printers and paperworkers remained loyal to the Mensheviks, so that the Bolsheviks now held seventeen of the twenty-four seats on the Petrograd Trade Union Council.[27] Finally, among members of the

factory committee there was nearly unanimous support for the Bolsheviks. In some, the more active, better-organized workers in Petrograd (and increasingly elsewhere) had replaced the moderates' vision of the revolution with one offered by the Bolsheviks.

The Last Chance

The failure of Kornilov's revolt drastically changed the political situation in Russia and forced the Mensheviks to reconsider again their position concerning the main questions -- the structure of power and ending the war. The new reality expressed itself in the rapid fall of the Kadets' prestige (who had discredited themselves by the ties with Kornilov), peoples' distrust of the idea of the coalition between socialists and liberals transition of the leadership in the Petrograd and Moscow soviets into the Bolsheviks' hands, withdrawal of the Mensheviks' leaders from the Petrograd soviet and concentration of their activity on the All-Russian Soviet and its executive committee -- VTsIK, a three-week governmental crisis and further loss of the control over economy as a result, and hence still further deepening of the antagonism between the workers and the bourgeoisie.

What answer did the Mensheviks give to this challenge? On August 31 the Menshevik Central Committee adopted a resolution on exclusion of the Kadets from any future government. The same decision was approved by SRs' Central Committee on the next day. Thus, Tsereteli's strategy of coalition seemed to fail.

The next task standing in front of the Mensheviks was to find and implement another alternative to the governmental power. Two old alternatives were at their disposal. The first one that had been defended by the Bolsheviks since April constituted "the government of the soviet," which would actually function as a dictatorship of the proletariat and poor peasantry. This alternative scared both Menshevik factions (Defensists and Internationalists), and SRs as well, because it would lead (according to their predictions) to the final domination of Bolsheviks.

The second old alternative that Martov had been proposing since July 3, consisted in the formation of a "homogeneous socialist government," which would include SRs, Mensheviks and Bolsheviks. But this alternative also scared most of the socialists because it could strengthen the opposition not only from the propertied classes, but also from the workers and peasants. This could be explained by the fact that the socialists, even possessing entire power still could not satisfy the urgent needs of workers and peasants.

Therefore the moderate socialists had to look for another, third alternative, which was worked out by VTsIK at the meeting of September 3, where Bogdanov was the main speaker:

> Some comrades raise the possibility at the present moment of a dictatorship of the poorest classes, i.e., the proletariat and the peasants. Those who speak of such a dictatorship . . . are following the course of the (Paris) Commune. Such a commune may be possible in Petrograd and in other cities but not in the rest of Russia. It will be crushed by the vacillating elements that will join the bourgeois bloc.
>
> But there is another course -- the dictatorship of democracy, not of the soviets (alone) but of those

> democratic organizations whose cadres are working throughout the country, such as the cooperatives, the municipal dumas, and the new zemstvos . . .
>
> (The soviet) must immediately resolve that a congress of democratic organizations, municipal dumas, zemstvos, cooperatives, and so forth, be convoked in the nearest future, and this conference must decide the question of the organization of power.[28]

Bogdanov's "dictatorship of democracy," or, as it was better known in Dan's formulation, a "homogeneous democratic government," would be a government in which the soviets would take the initiative but would still cooperate with the intermediary social groups and the democratic public and self-governing organizations, without which a soviet government would be politically isolated and administratively helpless.[29]

This strategy became the party's official course in a resolution adopted at the September 1 meeting.[30] But it remained to be seen whether "democracy" would agree to make a break with the Kadets and the organizations of census Russia.

The Mensheviks' hopes were dashed even before the Democratic Conference opened on September 14. The leading figures of nonsoviet democracy proved to be reluctant either to break with the political organizations of census Russia or to challenge these organizations by supporting the immediate implementation of the reforms called for by the August 14 program (to which the leaders had subscribed during the State Conference). At a meeting of the star chamber at Skobelev's apartment to which several of these figures had been invited -- V.V. Rudnev, the Right-SR and a member of the Central Union of Cooperatives; and the educator Dushkevich --

"the idea of an all-democratic government was buried literally in ten minutes," as Dan later wrote, when the guests declared their refusal to join such a government and argued that it would not be acceptable to the population at large because it would only lead to anarchy and civil war.[31]

A month later, speaking before an audience of Georgian Social Democrats in Tiflis, Tsereteli complained that the Russian democratic intelligentsia, "unlike that of Georgia," had proven incapable of fulfilling its role in the revolution and had left the leaders of the revolutionary democracy with the dismal choice of coalition or a soviet government.[32]

In any event, the Democratic Conference foreclosed all hope the Mensheviks may still have had of averting a Bolshevik seizure of power.[33] At every level, the conference was divided nearly equally between supporters and opponents of coalition. The Menshevik faction first voted 59 to 55 in favor of coalition, then reversed itself (73 to 65 with 4 abstentions) after hearing Martov's and Zhordania's arguments in opposition and Tsereteli's defense.[34] When the conference divided itself up on September 19 into "curias," which voted separately on the question of coalition, the results were just as confusing: the military organizations, peasants' soviets, and municipal self-governments voted by a slight majority for coalition; the cooperatives and the zemstvos favored coalition more decisively; but the workers' and soldiers' soviets and the trade unions rejected coalition solidly. The conference as a whole voted 766 to 688 (with 38 abstentions) in favor of coalition, then amended its resolution to exclude those connected with Kornilov's conspiracy (798 to 139, with

196 abstentions); amended it a second time to exclude the Kadets explicitly (595 for the exclusion, 493 against, and 72 abstaining); and in the end voted to defeat the final resolution by 813 to 183, with 80 abstentions.[35]

Hoping to break the deadlock, the Democratic Conference delegated the decision on a political solution to an enlarged presidium, but its daylong meeting on September 20 also ended in near-deadlock: fifty votes for coalition, sixty against. The presidium did agree, however, that the new government should work for the realization of the August 14 program and be accountable to a permanent Democratic Council that the Democratic Conference was to select. The possibility of continued coalition was implied in the provision calling for the addition of a bourgeois delegation to the new council, which would then become the Provisional Council of the Russian Republic, or Preparliament (Predparliament), if the new cabinet were joined by representatives of the propertied classes.[36] Yet the divided conference could not force even this modest program on Kerenskii, who saw the Kornilov affair as an opportunity to tighten his personal hold on the cabinet. In fact, exploiting the Kadet's departure, Kerenskii had already declared Russia a republic on September 1 and had thereby stolen the soviet's thunder. He also took the first step toward reconstructing the cabinet in a form opposed by the VTsIK; that is, by creating a plenipotentiary "directory" of five members.[37] The, just as the Democratic Conference was getting under way, Kerenskii began negotiating the formation oa f new coalition in which the Kadets were to be represented. When the moderate leaders of the VTsIK (Tsereteli,

Chkheidze, Gots, and Avksent'ev) joined the negotiations as representatives of the Democratic Conference, the minister-president closed ranks with the Kadets to force the socialists to give up the demand for government accountability to the Preparliament and accept the government's minimalist interpretation of the August 14 program.[38]

Whatever hopes had been raised by the unmasking of the counterrevolution in the Kornilov affair and the resulting initiative for a "homogeneous democratic government" had now been lost. But in refusing to submit to the Preparliament, Kerenskii's coalition had helped to further undermine the notion of a national revolutionary assembly -- already greatly weakened by the inconclusive results of the Democratic Conference -- through which contradictory social interests and conflicting visions of the revolution might have been at least partially reconciled and the revolution spared from a dictatorship of the right or left.

The short history of the Preparliament demonstrated the futility of the concept underlying its existence. When it opened on September 23 as the Democratic Council, revolutionary democracy, with close to 200 of the 308 seats, had a comfortable numerical edge over nonsoviet democracy. However, when the Bolsheviks walked out, and when 156 representatives of census groups were added, what then became the Provisional Council of the Russian Republic was left almost evenly divided between the bourgeoisie, revolutionary democracy, and intermediary and indecisive democracy.[39] The debate on national defense, which took up most of the Preparliament's time, did not produce a majority for any

resolution and proved all too clearly that no collaborative effort on behalf of the revolution's goals was now possible. Not surprisingly, the workers of Petrograd voted through their deputies in the Petrograd Soviet on October 9 to boycott the Preparliament.[40]

Meanwhile, the cabinet that had refused to recognize the Preparliament's authority was itself unable to check the disorder and disintegration. There were strikes on the railroads and in the Donbas mines and the Baku oil fields; factory shutdowns in Petrograd; an uprising in the fleet; mass desertions from the front; and perhaps most serious, an almost complete breakdown of grain sales in the countryside. Moreover, as memories of the Kornilov fiasco receded and the extent of Bolshevik popularity and confidence became clearer, census Russia again seemed bent on a strategy of confrontation. At the Kadets' Tenth Congress in mid-October, Miliukov's conservative wing of the party reasserted its strength against the more conciliatory leaders such as Nabokov, N.M. Kishkin, M.S. Adzhemov, and the new Kadet industrialists Smirnov and Konovalov.[41] A second Conference of Public Activists met in Moscow in mid-October with the aim of "uniting all statesmanlike and nationally thinking" people for a "reaction against the revolutionary democratic organizations."[42] Indeed, there was talk in the halls of the Preparliament among delegates from the right of plans to exploit a Bolshevik attempt to seize power in order to rally the soldiers around the Provisional Government and enable it, where Kornilov had failed, to crush the organizations of the left. Small wonder that in this atmosphere the cabinet hardened its stand. The ministers including Kerenskii and Tereshchenko, declined even unofficial

contacts with the moderate leaders of the VTsIK; Tereshchenko, the minister of foreign affairs, now accepted the Kadet view of Russia's war aims; and General A.I. Verkhovskii, the minister of war, was summarily dismissed when he recommended to the Preparliament's Defense and Foreign Affairs committees that Russia enter into immediate peace negotiations to avoid military disaster.[43]

Thus, the hopeless situation that emerged after the failure of the Democratic Conference urgently demanded from the Mensheviks to abandon their strategy of preserving democracy through class cooperation. By the end of September the last opportunity to establish "the dictatorship of democracy" had been lost, and only two options remained -- either a proletariat or a bourgeois dictatorship.

Unfortunately, the Mensheviks stubbornly rejected these options. They preferred to criticize the left and right extremes. Dan's responses to the situation were emblematic of the Revolutionary Defensist approach, who illustrated the dilemma most vividly. On the one hand, he cautioned against "any careless step" by the soviets, for he was sure that would "kill the revolution," and in such times the duty of political parties was "not to follow the masses but to explain to them how disastrous was the road they wished to follow."[44] On the other hand, although he supported Tsereteli's and Skobelev's contention that coalition was the only possible solution in the "tragic situation" created by the Democratic Conference, Dan and many praktiki also called on their party to voice its criticism of the new coalition openly.[45]

Only a week before the Bolshevik coup did the Revolutionary Defensists turn sharply to the left. In his statements to the

Preparliament and its committees, Dan consistently pressed for government action on three points he considered essential in any effort to reclaim popular support for the regime: immediate peace talks; the transfer of all gentry-owned land to the land committees; and prompt convocation of the Constituent Assembly.[46] On October 24, a resolution on these points was narrowly approved by the Preparliament.[47] Dan improvised a "delegation" composed of himself, Gots, and the reluctant Avksent'ev, who was serving as chairman of the Preparliament, in the hope of persuading the cabinet to take last-minute action in conformity with the resolution. It was a last, desperate effort to force a "break in the sentiment of the masses" and prevent their supporting the seizure of power being planned by the Bolsheviks. But the cabinet took just a few minutes to reject the appeal, and once again the Mensheviks had failed to save the revolution and their own moderate strategies from destruction at the hands of the forces tearing society apart.[48]

The Second Congress of Soviets

From mid-October the question of the Provisional Government's existence actually had been decided in the Bolshevik party and in the soviets where the Bolsheviks held a majority. For the Revolutionary Defensists, October 25 was a day of double tragedy: first, because they were removed from the leadership of the soviets through the votes of workers and soldiers all over Russia; and second, because their political strategy was dealt a final blow when sailors and workers loyal to the Bolsheviks arrested the members of the

Provisional Government -- an act which the Mensheviks strongly believed would lead to civil war. When the Second Congress of Soviets opened on October 25, the Menshevik faction was the smallest of the three major socialist factions, with about 50 seats for the Revolutionary Defensists (including the Bund) and 33 for the Internationalists, compared to over 300 Bolshevik delegates and nearly 200 SRs, of whom more than half were Left Srs. According to the official proceedings, 505 delegates had come to the congress committed to vote of "all power to the soviets"; 86 for "all power to democracy"; and only 79 for a "coalition government," 21 of them for a "democratic coalition without the Kadets."[49] The soviets' constituency had turned decisively against the Revolutionary Defensist strategy of cooperation with the other elements of Russian society, and the congress's first act was to replace the Menshevik-SR presidium with a Bolshevik-Left SR one.[50] Early on the morning of October 26, the Second Congress of Soviets declared the Provisional Government deposed and assumed full authority in the country. By the, the SRs and Mensheviks had left the hall; this historic declaration was passed by vote of the remaining delegates, with two objections and twelve abstentions.[51]

On October 25 the Mensheviks made two statements. The first, made by Dan, said that a "homogeneous democratic government" was now an absolute necessity and should be established "immediately," presumably without waiting for the consent of democracy's more moderate elements.[52] A second statement, more openly radical, was contained in Martov's address to the Second Congress, delivered shortly after it opened; he urged that the fighting stop so that a civil

war might be avoided and that the Bolsheviks negotiate with all other socialist parties the formation of a "united democratic government" acceptable to the whole of democracy. (A few minutes later, when he spoke again in favor of his proposal, Martov used the term "revolutionary democracy.")[53] This was, in other words, a revival of the idea of a"homogeneous socialist government."

Both statements suggested a remarkable departure from Revolutionary Defensist strategies during the past few months and could perhaps have affected the political outcome of the seizure of power even if the act itself could no longer be prevented.[54] Indeed, Martov's speech was received enthusiastically by the delegates, many of whom were desperate to avoid a split in the soviets at this grave moment,[55] and his proposals were even endorsed by Mstislavskii for the Left SRs and A.V. Lunacharskii for the Bolsheviks, and they were approved by the congress unanimously.[56]

This unanimity, however, was deceptive. Within minutes of the vote on Martov's proposals, a series of Menshevik speakers (Ia.Ia. Kharash and Kuchin from the army and the Muscovite Khinchuk) accused the Bolsheviks of conspiring to deprive the congress and the Constituent Assembly of their powers, threatened to mobilize the army on the front against this "adventure," and called on the congress to negotiate with the Provisional Government the formation of a cabinet to represent all elements of democracy.[57] Then, having provoked an explosion of hostility and bitterness by their attack on the Bolsheviks and their opposition to the seizure of power, the Menshevik, SR, and Bund factions left the congress amid shouts of "Deserters!," "Kornilovites!," and "Good riddance!"[58] But

the Menshevik Internationalists remained, and Martov placed before the congress a more precise and binding resolution calling on "rebel democracy" to negotiate with the rest of "democracy."[59]

It was at this juncture that Trotskii hurled his famous imprecation at the departing delegates, which would henceforth haunt the Mensheviks: "To those who have left and who tell us to do this we say: Your role is played out; go where you belong -- into the dustbin of history!"[60] But perhaps more telling of the effect the Revolutionary Defensists' conduct had on the congress was Lunacharskii's pronouncement, for he had endorsed Martov's proposal earlier: "We all accepted Martov's proposal to discuss peaceful ways of solving the crisis . .. but a systematic attack was launched at us . . . Without hearing us out,without even discussing their own proposals, they immediately tried to separate themselves from us . . . to isolate us."[61] In any case, the Internationalists further obliged Trotskii when they, too, left the congress, and Martov's resolution was defeated.[62]

If their walkout was a tragic mistake, it should be remembered that even at that hour of misfortune they were resourceful enough to offer yet another heterodox solution: a socialist government committed to the broader aims of democracy. Although the formulation of a "homogeneous socialist government" had been Martov's, the Menshevik faction's vote on the night of October 24 -25 to press for such a government immediately indicated that many Revolutionary Defensists now accepted the necessity for some radical alternative to coalition. Here again, their motives had been derived only partially from ideology. On the night of October 25 - 26, it was

the sight of the radicalized delegates, the humiliation of being deposed once more by the Bolsheviks from the leadership of the working class, the realization of all the old suspicions about a Bolshevik "conspiracy" and "adventurism" -- all that was reminiscent of the painful experiences of the past -- that stood as an obstacle to the working out of a compromise. Even Kinchuk, a frequent critic of coalition, could not leave the formation of a new government to this congress, and even Martov could not stomach the sight of Trotskii, triumphant and spiteful, on the rostrum. The Mensheviks had once again been defeated.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

What conclusions can be derived from the experience of the Russian Mensheviks? The Mensheviks were the most consistent and devoted democrats in Russia at that time. Despite their Marxist orientation (and, perhaps, thanks to it) they were neither fanatical nor dogmatic, but could flexibly adjust their program to the demands of the situation, without betraying their main principle -- the defense of working class interests. The Russian Mensheviks (or at least their central wing) were also real humanists, who consistently opposed not only wars (imperialistic or civil), but also any social or class violence, regarding both bourgeois and proletarian dictatorships.

The weakness and downfall of the Mensheviks was the manifestation of not only the situation in Russia, but also evidence of the deep crisis of all European liberalism, and socialism as well. The defeat of the Mensheviks was the tragedy of both Russia and Europe, because the Bolshevik coup and communist totalitarian dictatorship which followed became one of the main sources for the emergence of fascist and totalitarian regimes in Europe, and finally the unleashing of World War II.

In what respect can we talk about the Mensheviks' guilt? Is it just to blame them for their refusal to support dictators (no matter from the right or from the left), seeking unlimited military power?

History doesn't favor democrats or democracy in the circumstances of a civil (or any other) war. Therefore it was natural that the Mensheviks began to lose their influence on the eve of such a war, and disappeared as an independent political force in the course of it. (By the way, the same could be said about liberals and liberalism in Russia.)

What historical lesson can be learned from the Russian catastrophe? Firstly, democracy is neither the highest nor the unconditional value; secondly, democracy cannot be introduced by somebody's will (even if this will is strengthened by a state power and considerable mass support, as it was in May of 1917); thirdly, democracy, in the genuine sense of the word, is cultivated over the space of many generations and can be rooted only under the appropriate economic, political and cultural conditions. None of such conditions existed in Russia. Therefore, in fact, the so called "period of democracy in Russia" (from February to October, 1917) is a myth. One should not call an elephant's trunk "an elephant". In the same way, it is a mistake to call the freedom of strikes, demonstrations and press - "democracy". The latter is an integrated social structure which includes a developed network of institutions, providing the rule of law, the protection of personal rights and social stability.

The Mensheviks realized that socialism was impossible in the Russia of that time but they did not realize that in Russia there was no place for democracy as well. Their passionate dreams turned out

to be utopian, and any attempt to bring about a utopia leads to a catastrophe. And this is perhaps the most important lesson to be learned from the history of the Russian Social Democrats.

This lesson remains extremely important today, but is unfortunately underestimated, both in Russia and in the West. The speeches about the expanding democracy in today's Russia are nothing but self-deception or deliberate dishonesty. It is a utopian idea which in practice leads to a wrong and hence harmful orientation and program for reforms in Russia. The destruction of the Soviet state and governmental power, the collapse of economy, the disappearance of the remnants of morality, rapid social polarization and marginalization, followed by mutual hatred, the spread of organized crime and corruption, -- all this has nothing to do with democracy or with movement towards it. And all this takes place not because of the "bad leaders", but according to social laws inherent in Russian society itself. Today, as it was seventy-five years ago, the alternative is not "democracy or autocracy", but rather "prowestern dictatorship" or "Russian nationalistic dictatorship".

Such is the Russian fate. . .

NOTES

Chapter I

1. Billington, F. "Six Views of the Russian Revolution." *World Politics, XVIII*, 3 (April 1966), 452-473.
2. Chamberlin, W. H. *The Russian Revolution 1917-1921.* 2 vols. New York, 1960.
3. Schapiro, L. *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union.* New York, 1959.
   Fainsod, M. *International Socialism and the World War.* Cambridge, 1935.
4. Daniels, R. *Red October: the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.* New York, 1967.
5. Wolfe, B. *Three Who Made a Revolution.* Boston, 1948.
6. Deutscher, I. *The Prophet Armed: Trotsky, 1879-1921.* New York, 1954.
7. Carr, E. H. *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923.* New York, 1951-1953.
8. Radkey, O. H. *The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism.* New York, 1958.
9. Rosenberg, W. Y. *Liberals in the Russian Revolution: The Constitutional Democratic Party, 1917-1921.* Princeton, 1974.
   Wade, R. A. *The Russian Search for Peace, February-October 1917.* Stanford, Calif., 1969.
10. Von Laue, Th. *Why Lenin? Why Stalin? A Reappraisal of the Russian Revolution, 1900-1930.* Philadelphia, 1964.
11. Haimson, L. H. "The Problem of Social Stability in Urban Russia, 1905-1914." *Slavic Review*, 23 (December 1964):619-42; 24 (March 1965): 1-22.

12. Haimson, L. H. ed. *The Politics of Rural Russia, 1905-1914.* Bloomington, 1979.
13. Skocpol, Th. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comperative Analysis of France, Russia, and China.* Cambridge, 1979.
14. McDaniel, T. *Autocracy, Capitalism, and Revolution in Russia.* Berkeley, 1988.
15. Suny, R. F. "Toward a Social History of the October Revolution." *American Historical Review 88* (February 1983):31-52.
16. Rosenberg, W. G. "The Democratization of Russia's Railroads in 1917." *American Historical Review 88* (Decemver 1981):983-1008.

    Saul, N. E. *Sailors in Revolt: The Russian Baltic Fleet in 1917.* Lawrence, Kansas, 1978.

    Wildman, A. K. *The End of the Russian Imperial Army: The Old Army and the Soldiers' Revolt (March-April 1917).* Princeton, 1980.

    Hasegawa, T. *The February Revolution: Petrograd, 1917.* Seattle, Wash., 1981.

    Smith, S. A. *Red Petrograd: Revolution in the Factories, 1917-1918.* Cambridge, 1983.

    Mandel, D. M. *The Petrograd Workers and the Fall of the Old Regime.* New York, 1983.

    Mandel, D. M. *The Petrograd Workers and the Soviet Seizure of Power.* New York, 1984.

    Koenker, D. *Moscow Workers and the 1917 Revolution.* Princeton, 1981.

    Wade, R. A. *Red Guards and Workers' Militias in the Russian Revolution.* Stanford, Calif., 1984.
17. Mandel, D. M. *The Petrograd Workers and the Fall of the Old Regime.* New York, 1983.
18. Nikolaevskii, B. I., ed. *Potresov A. N.: Posmertnyi sbornik proizvedenii.* Paris,1937.

    Baron, S. H. *The Father of Russian Marxism.* Stanford, 1963.

    Getzler, I. *Martov: A Political Biography of a Russian Social Democrat.* London, 1967.

Ascher, A. *Pavel Axelrod and the Development of Menshevism.* Cambridge, Mass., 1972.
Roobol, W. H. *Tsereteli: A Democrat in the Russian Revolution: A Political Biography.* The Hague, 1976.

19. Haimson, L. H. ed. *The Mensheviks from the Revolution of 1917 to the Second World War.* Gertrude Vakar, trans. Chicago, 1974.
20. Bourguina, A. *Russian Social Democracy, the Menshevik Movement: a Bibliography.* Stanford, 1968.
21. Abramovitch, R. R., *The Soviet Revolution, 1917-1939.* New York, 1962.
Tsereteli, I. G. *Vospominaniia o fevral'skoi revoliutsii.* 2 vols. Paris and The Hague, 1968.
22. Basil, J. D. *The Mensheviks in the Revolution of 1917.* Columbus, Ohio, 1983.
23. Bystriansky, V. *Mensheviki i esery v russkoi revoliutsii.* Petrograd, 1921.
24. Vardin, I. *Revoliutsiia i menshevism.* Moscow-Leningrad, 1925.
25. Maisky, I. M. *Demokraticheskaia kontrevoliutsia.* Moscow, 1923.
26. Shliapnikov, A. G. *Semnadtsatyi god.* 4 vols. Moscow, 1923-1931.
27. Mints, I. I. *Mensheviki i interventy.* Moscow - Leningrad, 1931.
28. Lepeshinsky, P. *Mensheviki.* Moscow, 1931.
29. *Revoliutsionnie dvizhenie v Rossii posle sverzheniia samoderzhaviia.* Moscow, 1957.
Revoliutsionnie dvizhenie v Rossii nakanune oktiabr'skogo vooruzhennogo nosstaniia (1-24 oktiabria 1917 g.). Moscow, 1962.
Revoliutsionnie dvizhenie v Russkoi armii v 1917 g. 28 fevrelia - 24 oktiabria. Sbornik dokumentov. Moscow, 1961.
30. Spiridonov, M. V. *Politicheskii krakh menshevikov i eserov v professionalnom dvizhenii (1917-1918 gg.).* Petrozavodsk, 1965.

31. Komin, V. V. *Bankrotstvo Burzhuaznykh i Melkoburzhuaznykh partii Rossii v period podgotovki i pobedy Oktiabrskoi revoliutsii.* Moscow, 1965.
32. Ruban, N. V. *Oktiabrskaia revoliutsiia i krakh menshevisma.* Moscow, 1968.
33. Astrakhan, H. M. *Bolsheviki i ikh politicheskie protivniki v 1917 godu.* Moscow, 1973.
34. *Neproletarskie partii Rossii: Urok istorii.* Moscow, 1984.
35. *Rabochaia gazeta.* Petrograd, 1917.
36. *Izvestiia Petrogradskogo soveta rabochikh i sol datskikh deputatov.* Petrograd, 1917.
37. *Petrogradskii sovet rabochikh i solkatskikh deputatov: Protokoly zasedanii Ispolnitel'nogo komiteta i Biuro ispolnitel'nogo komiteta.* Moscow, 1925.
38. Avdeev, N.; Vladimirova, V.; Riabinskii, K.; and Liubimov, I. N., eds. *Revoliutsiia 1917 goda: Khronika sobytii.* 6 vols. Moscow and Leningrad, 1923-1930.
39. Browder, R. P., and Kerensky, A. J., eds. *The Russian Provisional Government, 1917.* 3 vols. Stanford, Calif., 1961.
40. *Vserossiiskoe soveshchanie sovetov rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov.* Moscow and Leningrad, 1925.
41. *Vtoroi vserossiiskii s'ezd sovetov rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov.* Moscow and Leningrad, 1928.
42. See note 29.
43. See note 29.
44. Voitinskii, V. S. *God pobed i porazhenii.* Berlin, 1923.
Sukhanov, N. N. *Zapiski o revoliutsii.* 7 vols. Berlin, Petrograd, and Moscow, 1922-1923.
Ermanskii, O. A. *Iz perezhitogo (1887-1921).* Moscow and Leningrad, 1927.
Dan, F. "K istorii poslednykh dnei Vremennogo Pravitel'stva." *Letopis' revoliutsii,* Berlin, 1922, no. 1:163-75.

45. Miliukov, P. N. *Istoriia vtoroi russkoi revoliutsii.* 2 vols. Sofia, 1921-1923.
Shul'gin, V. V. *Dni.* Leningrad, 1927.
Kerensky, A. F. *The Catastrophe: Kerensky's Own Story of the Russian Revolution.* New York, 1927.
Chernov, V. *The Great Russian Revolution.* New Haven, 1936.
Stankevich, V. B. *Vospominaniia 1914-1919.* Berlin, 1920.
See also note 26.

Chapter II

1. *Vserossiiskoe soveshchanie*, 112.
2. *IzvPS*, March 2, 1917 (no. 3), 1.
3. Ermanskii, *Iz perezhitogo*, 153-54.
4. Ibid., 154 (emphasis in the original).
5. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 1:87-89.
6. Ibid., 1:90.
7. *Khronika*, 1:40-41; Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 1:88.
8. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 1:121-53.
9. *IzvPS*, February 28, 1917 (no. 1), 2.
10. Ibid., 2.
11. Wildman, *Russian Imperial Army*, 1:105, 124
12. Ibid., 1:124.
13. Shul'gin, *Dni*, 164-65, 179-80, 176;
14. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 1:161-63.
15. Burdzhalov, *Vtoraia russkaia revoliutsiia*, 292.
16. Stankevich, *Vospominaniia*, 72.
17. Miller, *Soldatskie komitety*, 25-35.
18. Ibid., 35.
19. Full text is in *Petrogradskii sovet*, 290-91.
20. In the many eyewitness accounts of February 27 and 28, the soldiers are reported as cheering both Rodzianko and Chkheidze. See, for example, Ermanskii, *Iz perezhitogo*, 150.
21. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*.
22. *Vserossiiskoe soveshchanie*, 114. Sukhanov, *Zapiski* 1:271-346, provedes the most exhaustive account of these negotiations. Different points of view are presented in Miliukov, *Istoriia*, 1:46-49, and Shul'gin, *Dni*, 185-91.
23. *IzvPS*, March 2, 1917 (no. 3):1; Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 1:236.
24. *IzvPS*, March 3, 1917 (no. 4):1.
25. The ten members of the first cabinet, other than Kerenskii, came from the Kadet, Octobrist, Progresist, and Center parties; six of them had been in the leadership of the public organizations.
26. The accusation that the agreement was a capitulation to the bourgeoisie is frequently made by Soviet historians and was the

basis for the famous statement about the "paradox" of the Russian revolution in Trotsky's, *History of the Russian Revolution*, 186-92.

27. *Khronika*, 1:54-55; Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 1:240-41; Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 1: 320-21. About half of the Bolshevik deputies voted against the Bolshevik resolution.
28. *IzvPS*, March 4, 1917 (no. 5), 6.
29. *RD posle sverzheniia samoderzhaviia*, 463.
30. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 2:113.
31. Ibid., 138-39.
32. Wildman, *Russian Imperial Army*, chap. 6.
33. Steklov explained at the time that the executive committee's concern to prevent the "battleworthy revolutionary army" from turning into a "scattered mob," rather than real agreement with Guchkov, had brought about its cooperation: *Vserossiiskoe soveshchanie*, 111.
34. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 2:158. On a number of occasions during the first week of the revolution, General Alekseev, the commander of the army, demonstrated his hostility to the soviet and to the "democratization" of the army: *RD posle sverzheniia samoderzhaviia*, 619; Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 2:65-66, 33.
35. For contrasting explanations of the soldiers' revolt against thier officers, see Trotsky, *History*, 264-75 (where the revolt is treated as an extension of the peasants' revolt against the landed gentry); Wildman, *Russian Imperial Army*, chap. 6, esp. 239-40.
36. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 2:145-46.
37. *Petrogradskii sovet*, 12, 21, 28, 37-38, 53; Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 2:84-87; and Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 2:51-52, 139, 145-46.
38. *Petrogradskii sovet*, 11, 16, 296-97.
39. *Petrogradskii sovet*, 16-19; *Khronika* 1:71.
40. *Petrogradskii sovet*, 18; *Khronika* 1:71.
41. *Petrogradskii sovet*, 397-98.
42. *Khronika* 1:71.
43. *Petrogradskii sovet*, 19-20.

44. Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 2:236-37.
45. *Vserossiiskoe soveshchanie*, 116-17.
46. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 2:173; Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 2:167.
47. Wildman, *Russian Imperial Army*, chaps. 7 and 9, esp. 294-302. For assertions that in March the soldiers were thoroughly patriotic, see Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god*, 3:166; Ermanskii, *Iz perezhitogo*, 160. Desertion was not a major problem at this stage; indeed, soldiers denounced it as an act of betrayal: Wildman, *Russian Imperial Army*, 235-36.
48. *RD v russkoi armii*, 54.
49. Wildman, *Russian Imperial Army*, 236-40, 248; 486-87, 490-91; Miller, *Soldatskie Komitety*, 36-37.
50. *IzvPS*, March 17, 1917 (no. 17), 1; *RG*, March 18, 1917 (no. 11), 2.
51. *RG*, March 29, 1917 (no. 18), 3.
52. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 2:222.
53. That the soldiers' antagonism toward the workers was aroused by the press campaign is indicated by the fact that previous soldiers' demonstrations sometimes carried banners calling for an eight-hour day for the workers as well as for victory in the war: Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 2:214-15.
54. Wildman, *Russian Imperial Army*, 319-21.
55. Ermanskii, *Iz perezhitogo*, 156.
56. *IzvPS*, March 15, 1917 (no. 15), 1.
57. *RG*, March 16, 1917 (no. 9), 1.
58. Ibid., March 17, 1917 (no. 10), 1.
59. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 2:201.
60. *RPG*, 2:1042.
61. *RG*, March 14, 1917 (no. 7), 1.
62. Ibid., March 19, 1917 (no. 12), 2.
63. Sukhanov, *Zapiski*, 2:336.
64. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:46.
65. *IzvPS*, April 8, 1917 (no. 35), 1.
66. Ermanskii, *Iz perezhitogo*, 157.
67. *RG*, March 8, 1917 (no. 2), 1.
68. Ruban, *Oktiabrskaia revoliutsiia*, 85.

69. Roobol, *Tsereteli*, 36-37.
70. Miliukov, *Istoriia*, 1:71.
71. Ibid., 1:72.
72. Ibid., 1:73.

Chapter III

1. *RG*, April 6, 1917 (no. 24),1; April 9, 1917 (no. 27),2.
2. The best description of these metings and the composition of the group was left by Voitinskii, "God pobed", 58-60. Also see Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:132-39, 151-53, and 4:44-46. References can also be found throughout Tsereteli's memoirs.
3. Wildman, *Russian Imperial Army*, 311-20. See Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:62-126, for a detailed discussion of the soviet's campaign for the soldiers.
4. *IzvPS*, April 14,1917 (no. 5), and April 17, 1917 (no. 43), 3-4; *Khronika* , 2:22, 28, 32-33, 37-38, 40, 42; Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:77-83; Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:82-85. The soviet's delegation to the congress consisted of Tsereteli, Chkheidze, Skobelev, and Gvozdev.
5. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:82.
6. See Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:84-85; Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:204.
7. For examples of worders' condemnation of the Freedom Loan, see *RG*, April 4, 1917 (no. 23), 2, and April 25, 1917 (no. 39), 4.
8. *Petrogradskii sovet*, 90-91, 111, 316-17; Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:216-28.
9. *RPG* 2:1097-98; Kerensky, *Catastrophe*, 135; Miliukov, *Istoriia*, 1:92.
10. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:87.
11. Ibid, 1:88.
12. For a sample of resolutions adopted by soldiers on the same day, see *RG*, April 21, 1917 (no. 36), and April 22, 1917 (no. 37). There is general agreement that the Bolsheviks had little to do with the initial demonstrations on April 20: Rabinowitch, *Prelude to Revolution*, 44-45; Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:192-93; and Voitinskii, "God pobed", 73-76.

13. *RG*, April 22, 1917 (no. 37),2; *Khronika* , 2:54-55; and Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:29-192. On the Kadet demonstration, also see Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 108-93.
14. *Petrogradskii sovet*, 116-118; *IzvPS*, April 21,1917 (no. 46), 1.
15. Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:260-2613.
16. Details of the meeting are in *RG*, April 22, 1917 (no. 37), 2; Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:280-89; Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:98-104.
17. *RG*, April 22, 1917 (no. 37),3; *Khronika* , 2:56.
18. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:106.
19. Ibid., 1:108.
20. Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:385.
21. *RG*, April 22, 1917 (no. 37),3.
22. *RG*, April 29, 1917 (no. 43),3-4, resolution, see also *RG*, April 22, 1917 (no. 37),3.
23. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:128-29, 131.
24. Ibid., 1:133-34.
25. Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:318-22.
26. *Khronika* , 2:91-93; *IzvPS*, May 2, 1917 (no. 55), 1-3.
27. Ibid., 2:103.
28. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:135. Also see Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:228-34.
29. Miliukov, *Istoriia*, 1:84, 102.
30. Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 59-63.
31. Ibid., 63.
32. Miliukov, *Istoriia*, 1:90.
33. Ibid., 1:92.
34. Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:345.
35. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:134.
36. Ibid., 1:136.
37. *Khronika* , 2:95; *RG*, May 3, 1917 (no. 46), 3.
38. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:138-43.
39. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:138-43; Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 3:408-17.
40. The text of the government's declaration on the outcome of the negotiations, written jointly by Tsereteli and Nekrasov, was

printed in all of the newspapers on May 6; it is reprinted in *Khronika* , 2:271-73, and in *RPG* , 3:1277. The soviet's plenary meeting is reported in detail in *Khronika* , 2:110-12.

41. The other socialists in the cabinet were the moderate Populists Peshedhonov (Supplies) and P. N. Pereverzev (Justice). The nine nonsocialist ministers included the members of the first cabinet (with the exception of Guchkov and Miliukov) and the Moscow Kadet I. D. Shakhovskoi.
42. *RG*, May 13, 1917 (no. 55), 3.
43. Wade, *Red Guards*, 79-90.
44. Examples of support for dual power abounded during April. See *RG*, April 5, 1917 (no. 23),2; April 6, 1917 (no. 24), 2; April 25, 1917 (no. 39), 2; April 26, 1917 (no. 40), 2.
45. *RG*, May 9, 1917 (no. 51), 3.
46. Ibid., 3.
47. *RG*, May 10, 1917 (no. 52), 2.
48. Ibid., 3.
49. *RG*, May 12, 1917 (no. 54), 4, and May 14, 1917 (no. 56), 3.
50. Ascher, *Axelrod*, 421-24; Getzler, *Martov*, 150.
51. *RG*, May 11, 1917 (no. 53), 2, and May 12, 1917 (no. 54),3.

Chapter IV

1. For a discussion of these political divisions, see Mandel, *Petrograd Workers and the Fall of the Old Regime*, 122-48.
2. Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 162.
3. "A Victory for Revolutionary Democracy," *RG*, June 1, 1917 (no. 69), 1; "The Victory Must Be Secured," *RG*, June 2, 1917 (no. 70), 2.
4. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:431.
5. Voitinskii, "God pobed", 107-10.
6. Ibid., 106-7, 125-29.
7. *Pervyi s'ezd sovetov* , 1:xxvii.
8. Eight of the twenty million people represented at the congress were reported to have been soldiers; Five million, worders and four million, peasants. Most of the soviets represented were of

the "mixed" type, but there were delegates from forty organizations of soldiers only, twenty-four of workers, and four of peasants: see Shliapnikov, *Semnadtsatyi god* , 2:41.

9. Wildman, *Russian Imperial Army*, 377-78.
10. Voitinskii later recalled that the provincial delegates "protested hysterically" against being dragged by the Petrograd people into their "domestic quarrels"; Voitinskii, *God pobed*, 159.
11. Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 4:260-66.
12. Ibid., 4:265.
13. In a rare agreement, both Tsereteli and Sukhanov have asserted that it was the intention of the Bolshevik leaders to seize power: Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:184-87; Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 4:316-23. After studying these events closely, Rabinowitch concluded that this was the intention of elements that Trotski called the "hotheads" in the party but that Lenin opposed the move: Rabinowitch, *Prelude to Revolution*, 75, 95.
14. *RG*, June 10, 1917 (no. 77),1-2.
15. *RG*, June 11, 1917 (no. 78), 4.
16. See Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 4:302.
17. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:201-2, 243-50.
18. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:226-28. This is the only available account of the meeting.
19. The quoted words are actually Bogdanov's, spoken during a meeting of the executive committee on June 11: *Petrogradskii sovet*, 188-89.
20. N. Cherevanin, "Leninism and Counterrevolution." *RG*, June 11, 1917 (no. 78), 1-2.
21. *RG*, June 10, 1917 (no. 77),3.
22. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 3:243-49.
23. *IzvPS*, June 20, 1917 (no. 96), 2-3; Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:251-52; and Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 4:337-42.
24. *IzvPS*, June 25, 1917 (no. 101), 7.
25. Rabinowitch, *Prelude to Revolution*, 107-11; Mandel, *Petrograd Workers and the Fall of the Old Regime*, 132-33, 160-61.

26. Workers' attitudes on questions of foreign policy and the economy are described in Mandel, *Petrograd Workers and the Fall of the Old Regime*, 134-37.
27. Tsereteli, "What the New Provisional Government Wants." *IzvPS*, May 9, 1917 (no. 61), 2.
28. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 1:169-340, esp. 172-73.
29. On this episode, See Wade, *Russian Search for Peace*, 51-73.
30. The negotiations are discussed in Wade, *Russian Search for Peace*, 77-87.
31. For examples of the Mensheviks' angry reaction to the Allies' position, see "The Situation Is Becoming Tragic" and "Italy's Statement." *RG*, May 27, 1917 (no. 66),2-3.
32. "Offensive or Preparations for the Offensive?" *IzvPS*, May 17, 1917 (no. 68), 1-2; *IzvPS*, June 4, 1917 (no. 83), 2.
33. See the resolution adopted by the Menshevik and SR factions of the Congress of Soviets, in *RG*, June 14, 1917 (no. 80), 3-4.
34. Voitinskii understood the nature of the choice later; see his *God pobed*, 96-97.
35. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:53.
36. Indications of such pressure as well as the hope that support of the offensive would strengthen the soviet's position in the struggle for domestic reforms can ve seen in *IzvPS*, June 22, 1917 (no. 98), and Voitinskii, *God pobed*, 97.
37. Wade, *Russian Search for Peace*, 89.
38. *RG*, June 25, 1917 (no. 90), 4.
39. "The Offensive." *RG*, June 20, 1917 (no. 85),1.
40. Ezhov, "Propaganda as a Weapon." *RG*, June 21, 1917 (no. 86), 2; "Two Potresovs." *RG*, June 23, 1917 (no. 88), 2-3; N. Cherevanin, "Our Fight for Peace." *RG*, June 28, 1917 (no. 92), 1-2.
41. Rabinowitch, *Prelude to Revolution*, 116-20; Mandel, *Petrograd Workers*, 160-62.
42. "The Leninists' Verdict on the Offensive" and "He Who Sows the Wind, Must Reap the Whirlwing." *RG*, June 24, 1917 (no. 89), 1-2; *IzpvPS*, June 24, 1917 (no. 100), 8.

Chapter V

1. The resigning Kadets included three ministers (Shingarev, Shakhovskoi, and Manuilov) and one acting minister (Stepanov).
2. Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 171-75; Miliukov, *Istoriia*, 1:232-36.
3. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:259-62.
4. Rabinowitch, *Prelude to Revolution*, 144-53.
5. The regiment had threatened to demonstrate against the government and the offensive several tives before: Rabinowitch, *Prelude to Revolution*, 135-40.
6. *Khronika*, 3:133-35.
7. *Khronika*, 3:135.
8. *Khronika*, 3:137-38.
9. Miliukov, *Istoriia*, 1:244..
10. Rabinowitch, *Prelude to Revolution*, 181-91.
11. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:306-8; Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 4:422-26; and Trotsky, *History*, 551-53.
12. Rabinowitch, *Prelude to Revolution*, 161-66, 174-78, 180-81, 183-84, 201-5.
13. *RG*, July 5, 1917 (no. 98), 1; *Khronika*, 3:315-16.
14. For reports of this meeting, see *IzvPS*, July 5, 1917 [illegible]09), 2, and July 6, 1917 (no. 110), 3-6; *Khronika*, 3:142-46; Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:322-27.
15. *IzvPS*, July 6, 1917 (no. 110), 6, and July 7, 1917 (no. 111), 1.
16. This "homogeneous government" was advocated repeatedly not only by Martov but also by Sukhanov and other Independent Internationalists.
17. *IzvPS*, July 6, 1917 (no. 110), 5.
18. *IzvPS*, July 7, 1917 (no. 111), 3; *Khronika*, 3:319.
19. Getzler, Martov, 1573
20. Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 5:457-61, 471-77.
21. In both cases, the information came fast as the executive committee was discussing the leadership's newest proposals on July 7 and 9: Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:455-56; Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 4:496-507.
22. *RPG*, 3:1359-61.

23. *RG*, July 20, 1917 (no. 111), 2-3, and Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:395-99.
24. *RG*, July 11, 1917 (no. 103), 3-4; *RG*, July 14, 1917 (no. 106), 2-3; *RG*, July 16, 1917 (no. 108), 1.
25. For details on the executive committee's meeting, see *IzvPS*, July 8, 1917 (no. 112), 4; *Khronika*, 3:158-59; Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 4:496-507; and Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:355-56.
26. The organizational committee's resolution is in *RG*, July 14, 1917 (no. 106), 1. The attribution to Dan is made in Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 4:485-87.
27. Tsereteli gives the only account of this meeting of the cabinet and of L'vov's general opposition to reform: *Vospominaniia* , 2:263-65. 281-82, 349-53. For L'vov's reasoning in his decision, see *RPG*, 3:1388-89, and "Resignation from the Revolution." *RG*, July 9, 1917 (no. 102), 2.
28. *RG*, July 11, 1917 (no. 103), 3-4; *IzvPS*, July 12, 1917 (no. 115), 7; and *Khronika*, 3:169-70.
29. Miliukov, *Istoriia*, 1:140.
30. Ibid., 1:141.
31. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:366-67.
32. *Khronika*, 3:180; Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 5:40-41.
33. *IzvPS*, July 18, 1917 (no. 120), and *Khronika*, 3:338-39.
34. *RPG*, 3:1405-6.
35. *Khronika*, 3:203.
36. Ibid., 204, and Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 5:94-97.
37. *IzvPS*, July 22, 1917 (no. 124), 3-4, and July 23, 1917 (no. 125), 2; Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 5:101-6; Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:382-86.
38. The Menshevik resolution read by Dan is in *RG*, July 25, 1917 (no. 115), 1.
39. *IzvPS*, July 23, 1917 (no. 125), 1.
40. The socialist ministers included four members of the star chamber: a Minshevik, Skobelev, minister of labor: two SRs, Chernov, agriculture, and Avksent'ev, Interior; and one People's Socialist, Peshekhonov, food. The fifth was S. N. Prokopovich, a nonparty, nonsoviet figure with strong ties to the Moscow

intelligentsia and only vague Menshevik connections, who took over the Ministry of Trade and Industry.

41. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:385.
42. Ibid., 2:388.
43. *RG*, August 10, 1917 (no. 131), 2.
44. Ibid., 2.
45. Ibid., 2 *Khronika*, 3:231.
46. Ibid., 3:233.
47. Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 5:184-87.
48. Ibid., 5:192.
49. The minutes of the congress have never been published, but reports on it were published, *Rabochaia gazeta* : *RG*, August 20, 1917 (no. 140), 1. It was symptovatical, that any question addressed to the Revolutionary Defensist leaders on the possibility of doing something about the war or the land question was answered with an angry "Impossible!"
50. See, for example, White, "Kornilov Affair"; and Ascher, "Kornilov Affoir: A Reinterpretation." *Russian Review*, 29:3 (July 1970),286-300.
51. The Kadets shared this goal as well. For a thorough and balanced discussion of thier role in the affair, see Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 221-33.

Chapter VI

1. *RG*, August 3, 1917 (no. 123), 1.
2. Ibid., 1.
3. The recommindation was made by the Association of Joint-Stock Commercial Banks; see *IzvPS*, September 9, 1917 (no. 166), 8.
4. At the Conference of Public Activists, Rakhovich, an opponent of the state grain monopoly, reported that grain collections for April and May had been 150 million pouds instead of the projected 440 million, see *RG*, August 11, 1917 (no. 131), 2.
5. As recently as August 4, the government had promised that bread prices would not be raised, *RPG*, 2:641-42; Also see the

angry response of the "democratic organs in the Economic Council." in *IzvPS*, September 9, 1917 (no. 166), 8.

6. Volobuev, *Proltariat i burzhuaziia*, 217.
7. Ibid., 210.
8. Ibid., 230-31.
9. Ibid., 230.
10. Ibid., 231.
11. *RG*, August 6, 1917 (no. 126), 2.
12. The reports of shutdowns in the factories in *RG*, July 16, 1917 (no. 108), 3.
13. Gaponenko, *Rabochii klass Rossii v 1917 godu*, 386.
14. Ibid.,390.
15. Volobuev, *Proletariat*, 256.
16. Ibid., 257.
17. Ibid., 260.
18. Ibid., 219.
19. Ibid., 221.
20. Gaponenko, *Rabochii klass*, 386, has calculated the following proportions of successful economic strikes: June, 81.6 percent; July, 71.2 percent; August, 51.4 percent; and September, 38.5 percent.
21. Ibid., 388.
22. Ibid., 391.
23. *RG*, August 29, 1917 (no. 146), 1.
24. Volobuev, *Proletariat i burzhuaziia*, 247.
25. Mandel, *Petrograd Workers*, 220.
26. This conference was formed during the April crisis but became active only during the Kornilov Affair. Ibid., 221.
27. Ibid., 242.
28. *RPG*, 3:1662-69. The meeting was reported in *IzvPS*, September 2, 1917 (no. 160), 3-4, and September 3, 1917 (no. 161), 5-7.
29. Dan, "K istorii poslidnykh dnei Vremennogo Pravitel'stva." 164.
30. *IzvPS*, September 3, 1917 (no. 161), 5-7.
31. Dan, "*K istorii* ", 164.
32. Tsereteli, *Vospominaniia* , 2:407.

33. Denike, Liber, and others said at the VTsIK meeting on September 1 that the Kornilov episode had made a Bolshevik seizure of power unavoidable, and Tsereteli was rather unconvincing when he professed optimism. Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 5:364-66.
34. *RG*, September 16, 1917 (no. 162), and September 17, 1917 (no. 163); and Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 6:112-13.
35. *IzvPS*, September 20, 1917 (no. 176), 5-7; and *Khronika*, 4:239-41.
36. *IzvPS*, September 21, 1917 (no. 177), 2, 4; and *Khronika*, 4:245-47; and Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 6:135-44.
37. *RG*, August 29, 1917 (no. 146), and *Khronika*, 4:103-5.
38. *IzvPS*, September 24, 1917 (no. 180), 3-4; and *Khronika*, 4:250-51, 257-60, 263-64, 266-67.
39. Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 6:239-51.
40. *Khronika*, 5:52-53.
41. See, Rosenberg, *Liberals*, 246-54, for a discussion of divisions in the Kadet party during October 1917.
42. Ibid., 255.
43. Dan, "*K istorii* ", 169-70.
44. Ibid., 169.
45. *RG*, September 24, 1917 (no. 169), and September 27, 1917 (no. 171), 7.
46. *RG*, September 24, 1917 (no. 169).
47. See, Dan, "*K istorii* ", 168, 170-71.
48. *RG*, October 25, 1917 (no. 195).
49. Dan, "*K istorii* ", 172-75.
50. *Vtoroi vserossiiskii s'ezd sovetov*, 107-9. This account shows a total of 670 delegates when listing their policy mandates, but only 648 when giving their party affiliation.
51. Ibid., 32-33.
52. Ibid., 53-55.
53. Ibid., 31.
54. Ibid., 34.
55. This point is made by Rabinowitch, *Bolsheviks Come to Power*, 292-98.

56. Sukhanov, *Zapiski* , 7:199.
57. *Vtoroi vserossiiskii s'ezd sovetov*, 4, 35.
58. Ibid., 5, 35-37.
59. Ibid., 38-40.
60. Ibid., 42.
61. Ibid., 43-44.
62. Ibid., 45-47.
63. Ibid., 43-45, 47.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NEWSPAPERS

Izvestiia Petrogradskogo soveta rabochikh i sol'datskikh deputatov. Petrograd, 1917.

Rabochaia gazeta. Petrograd, 1917.

CONTEMPORARY MATERIALS

(publications, collections of documents, stenographic reports, chronologies)

Avdeev, N.; Vladimirova, V.; Riabinskii, K.; and Liubimov, I. N., eds. *Revoliutsiia 1917 goda: Khronika sobytii.* 6 vols. Moscow and Leningrad, 1923-1930.

Browder, R. P., and Kerensky, A. J., eds. *The Russian Provisional Government, 1917.* 3 vols. Stanford, Calif., 1961.

Petrogradskii sovet rabochikh i solkatskikh deputatov: Protokoly xasedanii Ispolnitel'nogo komiteta i Biuro ispolnitel'nogo komiteta. Moscow, 1925.

Revoliutsionnie dvizhenie v Rossii posle sverzheniia samoderzhaviia. Moscow, 1957.

Revoliutsionnie dvizhenie v Rossii nakanune oktiabr'skogo vooruzhennogo nosstaniia (1-24 oktiabria 1917 g.). Moscow, 1962.

Revoliutsionnie dvizhenie v Russkoi armii v 1917 g. 28 fevrelia - 24 oktiabria. Sbornik dokumentov. Moscow, 1961.

Vserossiiskoe soveshchanie sovetov rabochikh i solkatskikh deputatov. Moscow and Leningrad, 1925.

Vtoroi vserossiiskii s'ezd sovetov rabochikh i solkatskikh deputatov. Moscow and Leningrad, 1928.

WORKS BY MENSHEVIKS

Abramovitch, R. R., *The Soviet Revolution, 1917-1939.* New York, 1962.

Dan, F. "K istorii poslednykh dnei Vremennogo Pravitel'stva." *Letopis' revoliutsii,* Berlin, 1922, no. 1:163-75.

Ermanskii, O. A. *Iz perezhitogo (1887-1921).* Moscow and Leningrad, 1927.

Nikolaevskii, B. I., ed. *Potresov A. N.: Posmertnyi sbornik proizvedenii.* Paris,1937.

Sukhanov, N. N. *Zapiski o revoliutsii.* 7 vols. Berlin, Petrograd, and Moscow, 1922-1923.

Tsereteli, I. G. *Vospominaniia o fevral'skoi revoliutsii.* 2 vols. Paris and The Hague, 1968.

Voitinskii, V. S. *God pobed i porazhenii.* Berlin, 1923.

WORKS BY OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Chernov, V. *The Great Russian Revolution.* New Haven, 1936.

Kerensky, A. F. *The Catastrophe: Kerensky's Own Story of the Russian Revolution.* New York, 1927.

Miliukov, P. N. *Istoriia vtoroi russkoi revoliutsii.* 2 vols. Sofia, 1921-1923.

Shliapnikov, A. G. *Semnadtsatyi god.* 4 vols. Moscow, 1923-1931.

Shul'gin, V. V. *Dni.* Leningrad, 1927.

Stankevich, V. B. *Vospominaniia 1914-1919.* Berlin, 1920.

Trotsky, L. *The History of the Russian Revolution.* New York, 1977.

SECONDARY WORKS

Ascher, A. "The Kornilov Affair: A Reinterpretation." *Russian Review 29* (July 1970):286-300.

_____. *Pavel Axelrod and the Development of Menchevism.* Cambridge, Mass., 1972.

Astrakhan, H. M. *Bolsheviki i ikh politicheskie protivniki v 1917 godu.* Moscow, 1973.

Baron, S. H. *The Father of Russian Marxism.* Stanford, 1963.

Basil, J. D. *The Mensheviks in the Revolution of 1917.* Columbus, Ohio, 1983.

Bourguina, A. *Russian Social Democracy, the Menshevik Movement: a Bibliography.* Stanford, 1968.

Billington, F. "Six Views of the Russian Revolution." *World Politics, XVIII,* 3 (April 1966), 452-473.

Burdzhalov, E. N. *Vtoraia russkaia revoliutsiia: Vosstanie v Petrograde.* Moscow, 1967.

Bystriansky, V. *Mensheviki i esery v russkoi revo[illegible].* Petrograd, 1921.

Carr, E. H. *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923.* New York, 1951-1953.

Chamberlin, W. H. *The Russian Revolution 1917-1921.* 2 vols. New York, 1960.

Daniels, R. *Red October: the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.* New York, 1967.

Deutscher, I. *The Prophet Armed: Trotsky, 1879-1921.* New York, 1954.

Fainsod, M. *International Socialism and the World War.* Cambridge, 1935.

Gaponenko, L. S. *Rabochii klass Rossii v 1917 godu.* Moscow, 1970.

Getzler, I. *Martov: A Political Biography of a Russian Social Democrat.* London, 1967.

Haimson, L. H. ed. *The Mensheviks from the Revolution of 1917 to the Second World War.* Gertrude Vakar, trans. Chicago, 1974.

_____. *The Politics of Rural Russia, 1905-1914.* Bloomington, 1979.

_____. "The Problem of Social Stability in Urban Russia, 1905-1914." *Slavic Review.* 23 (December 1964):619-42; 24 (March 1965): 1-22.

_____. "Menchevism and the Evolution of the Russian Intelligentsea." *The Making of Three Russian Revolutionaries: Voices from the Menchevik Past.* edited by L. H. Haimson, New York, 1987.

Hasegawa, T. *The February Revolution: Petrograd, 1917.* Seattle, Wash., 1981.

Katkov, G. *Russia 1917: The Kornilov Affair.* London, 1980.

Koenker, D. *Moscow Workers and the 1917 Revolution.* Princeton, 1981.

Komin, V. V. *Bankrotstvo Burzhuaznykh i Melkoburzhuaznykh partii Rossii v period podgotovki i pobedy Oktiabrskoi revoliutsii.* Moscow, 1965.

Lepeshinsky, P. *Mensheviki.* Moscow, 1931.

Maisky, I. M. *Demokraticheskaia kontrevoliutsia.* Moscow, 1923.

Mandel, D. M. *The Petrograd Workers and the Fall of the Old Regime.* New York, 1983.

_____. *The Petrograd Workers and the Soviet Seizure of Power.* New York, 1984.

McDaniel, T. *Autocracy, Capitalism, and Revolution in Russia.* Berkeley, 1988.

Miller, V. I. *Soldatskie komitety russkoi armii v 1917 g.* Moscow, 1984.

Mints, I. I. *Mensheviki i interventy.* Moscow - Leningrad, 1931.

Neproletarskie partii Rossii: Urok istorii. Moscow, 1984.

Rabinowitch, A. *Prelude to Revolution: The Petrograd Bolsheviks and the July 1917 Uprising.* Bloomington, Ind., 1968.

_____. *The Bolsheviks Come to Power: The Revolution of 1917 in Petrograd.* New York, 1976.

Radkey, O. H. *The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism.* New York, 1958.

Roobol, W. H. *Tsereteli: A Democrat in the Russian Revolution: A Political Biography.* The Hague, 1976.

Rosenberg, W. G. "The Democratization of Russia's Railroads in 1917." *American Historical Review 88* (December 1981):983-1008.

_____. *Liberals in the Russian Revolution: The Constitutional Democratic Party, 1917-1921.* Princeton, 1974.

Ruban, N. V. *Oktiabrskaia revoliutsiia i krakh menshevisma.* Moscow, 1968.

Saul, N. E. *Sailors in Revolt: The Russian Baltic Fleet in 1917.* Lawrence, Kansas, 1978.

Schapiro, L. *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union.* New York, 1959.

Skocpol, Th. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comperative Analysis of France, Russia, and China.* Cambridge, 1979.

Smith, S. A. *Red Petrograd: Revolution in the Factories, 1917-1918.* Cambridge, 1983.

Suny, R. F. "Toward a Social History of the October Revolution." *American Historical Review 88* (February 1983):31-52.

Spiridonov, M. V. *Politicheskii krakh menshevikov i eserov v professionalnom dvizhenii (1917-1918 gg.).* Petrozavodsk, 1965.

Vardin, I. *Revoliutsiia i menshevism.* Moskva-Leningrad, 1925.

Volobuev, P. V. *Proletariat i burzhuaziia v Rossii v 1917 g.* Moscow, 1964.

Von Laue, Th. *Why Lenin? Why Stalin? A Reappraisal of the Russian Revolution, 1900-1930.* Philadelphia, 1964.

Wade, R. A. *Red Guards and Workers' Militias in the Russian Revolution.* Stanford, Calif., 1984.

_____. *The Russian Search for Peace, February-October 1917.* Stanford, Calif., 1969.

White, J. D. "The Kornilov Affair." *Soviet Studies 20* (October 1968):187-205.

Wildman, A. K. *The End of the Russian Imperial Army: The Old Army and the Soldiers' Revolt (March-April 1917).* Princeton, 1980.

Wolfe, B. *Three Who Made a Revolution.* Boston, 1948.

VITA

Oleg Khripkov

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: THE MENSHEVIKS IN 1917

Major Field: History

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Chernyahovsk, USSR, January 14, 1955. Married, one child.

Education: Graduated from Moscow State Pedagogical Institute, Moscow, USSR, in June, 1983; with Bachelor of Arts Degree in Russian Language and Literature; studied five semesters in Moscow State University majoring in history; completed requirements for the Masters of Arts degree at Oklahoma State University in July 1992.

Professional Experience: Teacher in Moscow Boarding School N25, Moscow, 1978 - 1983; Adjunct Instructor in Moscow State Pedagogical Institute, Moscow, USSR, 1981 - 1983 and 1988 - 1989.