

THE CRISIS OF THE PROTEST MOVEMENT

Boris Ikhlov¹

¹*Perm state university*

The first blow to the worker and Communist movement has caused rapidly-forced collectivization according to Trotsky's plan, that Stalin adopted, the dispossession of the middle peasants (everything against Lenin's policy), the murder of the delegates of the XVII Congress of CFS in 1934, and Moscow open processes 1935-1936 years, which the comrades of Lenin attributed ridiculous accusations, then these people were killed. What are the results?

Class and party

Here are a few quotes from Lenin's work "What to Do".

"The workers could not have a social-democratic consciousness. It could only have been brought from outside. The history of all countries shows that the working class is able to develop only a trade unionist consciousness exclusively by its own efforts... " [1]

At this point, the materialist Lenin becomes an idealist, it is not matter that develops from itself, but the idea is primary, it is brought from outside into the dark, stagnant, inert matter of the working class. However, history shows that both the Paris Commune and the Soviets were created by the workers themselves, without party spiritual pastors.

Stalin made Lenin's situational statement of workers' illiteracy a conceptual idea. Today, "bringing political consciousness to the masses", "the inability of the workers to break out of the trade union framework by themselves" - is a fundamental idea for all bourgeois parties.

"The consciousness of the working class cannot be a truly political consciousness if the workers are not trained to respond to all and every case of arbitrariness and oppression, violence and abuse, to whatever class these cases may belong; and moreover, to respond precisely from the social-democratic point of view, and not from any other point of view" (p. 69).

Pay attention to the word "accustomed". Lenin wants to teach the workers how parents teach their children? On the other hand, if the workers do not respond to the oppression by the authorities of such bourgeois as Furgal, Grudinin, or Navalny, this, on the contrary, is good, it means that the remnants of independent thinking have not yet been eradicated from the working class.

Why does Lenin put the Social Democrats as the standard of everything? And if the Social Democrats are wrong – should the working class follow their mistakes? Today, the working class is called upon to respond to the oppression of sexual minorities, the provocateurs beaten by the police, and the dictatorship of those whom the United States appoints as dictators.

If Leo Tolstoy, Gorky, and many other great people were outraged by the police suppression of senseless student demonstrations in St. Petersburg and Moscow in 1899, today demonstrations of this type, ridiculous, exalted, shocking and provocative, cause a desire to support the police.

"Who should the team of professional revolutionaries consist of? The founders of modern scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, themselves belonged, in their social position, to the bourgeois intelligentsia. In the same way, in Russia, the theoretical teaching of social-democracy emerged quite independently of the spontaneous growth of the working-class movement, and emerged as a natural and inevitable result of the development of thought among the revolutionary-socialist intelligentsia." (p. 31).

Marx, Engels, Lenin, Kollontai, and many others laid down their lives for the cause of the working class. These are unique cases, there are no such cases today. But here Lenin 1) separates the evolution of social-democracy from the working-class movement, 2) considers the development of social-democracy independent of the working-class movement, so he clearly distorts history.

“And I will defend this position, no matter how much you incite the crowd against me for my "anti-democracy". And so I say: 1) that no revolutionary movement can be strong without a stable and continuous organization of leaders; 2) that the wider the mass that is spontaneously involved in the struggle, which forms the basis of the movement and participates in it, the more urgent the need for such an organization and the stronger this organization must be (for the easier it is for all demagogues to attract the undeveloped strata of the mass); 3) that such an organization should consist mainly of people professionally engaged in revolutionary activities” (p. 121).

This is what Stalin said: the party should consist of special people, a kind of swordsmen.

Of course, no one is against the organization. But whose organization is it? Either it is an organization of the intelligentsia, or of the workers themselves. Either the workers have the intelligence and power to displace the objectionable head of the organization, or they do not.

Lenin writes about the undeveloped strata of the masses. In 1917, in Russia, workers had at best 3 classes of education, and not all of them. In the 80s, workers had 10 years of education, and some had higher education or incomplete higher education. Today, workers visit libraries, listen to the radio, watch TV, and use the Internet. Highly skilled workers have received a much deeper education over the years of complex work than the education of many party functionaries. For such workers, it is precisely the propaganda of the social-democratic professional revolutionaries that appears to be empty demagoguery.

"The only serious organizational principle for the leaders of our movement should be: the strictest secrecy, the strictest selection of members, and the training of professional revolutionaries. If these qualities are present, then something more than "democracy" is also guaranteed, namely, complete comradely trust between revolutionaries... they have no time to think about toy forms of democracy, but they feel their responsibility very vividly, knowing from experience that the organization of real revolutionaries will not stop at any means to get rid of an unfit member" (p. 142).

After Stalin had been rude on the phone to Krupskaya, after the XII Congress of the RKPb had ignored his call to remove Stalin, Lenin could see for himself that "comradely confidence" and "getting rid of an unfit member" were his illusions, and a harmful one at that.

"And our wise men, at a time when the whole crisis of Russian social-democracy is explained by the fact that the spontaneously awakened masses do not have sufficiently prepared, developed and experienced leaders, speak with the profundity of Ivanushka: "it is bad when the movement does not come from the bottom!" (p.122).

“This kind of “push from the outside” was not too much, but, on the contrary, too little, ungodly and shamelessly little, in our movement, because we were too diligently stewing in our own juice, too slavishly worshipping the elementary “economic struggle of the workers with the masters and with the government”. We, revolutionaries by profession, must and will continue to engage in this kind of" pushing " a hundred times more. But it is the fact that you choose such a vile word as the "boost side", which inevitably makes the working (at least working as undeveloped, underdeveloped as you) distrust of all who bear his political knowledge and revolutionary experience, causes an instinctive desire to resist all such people - you are a demagogue, and demagogues are the worst enemies of the working class” (P. 122-123).

First, today a revolutionary by profession is a parasite who lives on the membership fees of his organization. The workers have no confidence in such people.

Secondly, a person differs from an animal in that he thinks. If someone takes away this distinction from the workers, claims that they themselves cannot think, because they, the party pastors, have the right to bring them political knowledge from the outside, this someone will certainly arouse the distrust of the workers.

Third, today this thesis of Lenin is not just outdated, but harmful. For there have been so many nudges from bourgeois liberals, Stalinists, various pro-American anarchists, Trotskyists, loudmouths, and demagogues in recent history that these nudges are already making the workers angry.

The bourgeois "Choice of Russia" was pushing for strikes, Academician Sakharov was pushing, and the shouter Grigory Isaev was pushing. Udaltsov-Tyutyukin and Navalny are pushing. Finally, by order of the US state Department Tikhonovskaya and her accomplices in Belarus called to strikes .

However, the whole pathos of Marxism is the affirmation of the independent thinking of the worker. Lenin repeats after Marx: socialism is "the living creativity of the masses." The masses, not the parties. Socialism, according to Lenin, is "a struggle against all kinds of oppression," and this struggle is without the creativity of the parties.

It is not difficult to see that in his polemics with the anarchists, Lenin completely repeats the ideas of Bernstein-Kautsky.

It is not difficult to see that today ALL parties, both left and right, use the Bernstein scheme, which boils down to the following: the party bonzes write the program, the party gray ranks bring it to the masses, the masses follow the program, mainly vote in elections, after which the party bonzes get senior government posts.

All parties reject materialism, which claims that the class is primary and the party is secondary; all parties follow bourgeois idealism and strive to lead the working class.

Thus, the idea of Kautsky and "a government that meets the proletariat" is realized, for which Lenin called Kautsky a renegade. Practically all Trotskyist organizations follow Kautsky's thesis.

Thus, the left-wing parties turn out to be right-wing, bourgeois - in their practice.

In many of his other works, Lenin directly contradicts his own book "What to Do?"

A state official in the USSR is a party official. "Let's reduce the role of state officials to the role of simple executors of the will of the working people!" ("The order from the Council of labor and defense to the local Councils").

Socialism – when "everyone after working out their 8-hour lesson begins to engage in state activities" ("the next tasks of the Soviet government"), "every cook can not manage the state, but every cook must learn this". And these were not empty words – in the first years of Soviet power, 20 million people passed the educational program of the state service.

However.

One of the main reasons for the defeat of the revolution

Marx writes in a letter to Zasulich that if the Russian revolution does not remain alone, and the working-class movement of the West does not reconcile itself to the capitalist system, then the victory of the revolution and socialism in Russia with its peasant communal tradition will be assured. Otherwise, the Russian revolution as a communist revolution will be doomed to failure [2].

In 1882, Marx and Engels linked the question of the Russian and world revolution. If the Russian revolution serves as a signal for the proletarian revolution in the West, then both of them will complement each other [3].

Thus, Lenin and Trotsky, rejecting the idea of the victory of socialism in a single country, followed the classics. Trotsky deduced the necessity of a world revolution from the international division of labor, Lenin pointed out that backward, agrarian Russia was not ripe for a socialist revolution, capitalism had barely begun to develop in

it, it was necessary that the revolution in Russia should push revolutions in the developed countries, then the victorious proletariat of these countries would come to the aid of the Russian proletariat.

Stalin followed the Lenin-Trotsky line even after Lenin's death in 1924, but then accepted Bukharin's idea of the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single country.

Lenin, on the other hand, made no secret of the fact that the socialist revolution in Russia was defeated – even before the revolution in Germany was defeated.

In 1918, when the left-wing Marxists accused him of "building" state capitalism, Lenin replied that state capitalism was a step towards progress.

In the same year, he points out to the workers who want to expel the bourgeoisie, nationalize the factory and start managing it independently, that they cannot manage the enterprise, because they do not know either production or the market [4].

Therefore, in 1919, at the congress of agricultural communes, Lenin argued that "we cannot "introduce" socialism' now", which would be good if the "grandchildren will see socialism".

The dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin emphasizes, is not only and not so much the suppression of the bourgeoisie, but the ability of the working class to take the economy of the whole country into its own hands.

It is impossible to "introduce" socialism in Russia, writes Lenin, "for we are illiterate" [5].

Therefore, the Workers ' Opposition (Shlyapnikov, Myasnikov, etc.), which decided that the time had already come to transfer power to the workers, without receiving broad support from the masses, disappeared from the political scene.

The matter does not end with the realization of the defeat of the socialist revolution in Russia. There is another angle from which to consider the question of relation between class and party.

In the article "The Infantile disease of Leftism in Communism" of 1920, Lenin attacked the German Social Democrats, not wanting to understand their opposition to the party class.

But in 1923, when the XII Congress of the RKPb was being held, he understood this contrast from his own experience.

Plekhanov pointed out that the dictatorship of the proletariat is as different as heaven from earth from the dictatorship of a group of revolutionaries-raznochintsev. The Congress of the RKPb, without Lenin's participation, decided that the dictatorship of the proletariat was expressed in the form of the dictatorship of the party.

Lenin, on the other hand, emphasized that "the dictatorship of the proletariat is expressed in the form of Soviet power, a form found by the workers themselves" ("The State and the Revolution"), and he spoke about the same thing at the 1st Congress of the Comintern.

For more information, see [6].

It is not difficult to see that today ALL the left-wing organizations of the world stand on the positions of Bernstein-Kautsky-Stalin.

Thus, all these organizations are anti-communist.

But the anti-communism of the left does not end with following Bernstein.

Purchased lefties

What are the modern Trotskyists, socialists, Communists, and in general all the leftists doing? Are they related to the struggle of the working class in their own country? Nothing like that. They announce that a socialist revolution has begun in some country, and collect money from members of their party to go for a walk in that country. If Washington appoints someone in some oil-or gas-rich country as a dictator, the left immediately agrees and says that this "dictator" is the main obstacle to the world socialist revolution. The left is also fighting Russian imperialism. Not with American, God forbid! No leftist in the world will ever say a word about the

American world gendarme. The left also protects the rights of women, blacks, pederasts and protects nature from Russia. In short, anything but the struggle of the working class. The left declares the protection of pederasts – you will laugh - an integral part of the struggle of the working class.

After Strauss Kahn was removed from the leadership of the IMF by Washington with an idiotic accusation of sexual harassment, and no matter that the accusation turned out to be false, after the whole world saw the idiocy of accusations of sexism and so on, it became obvious that the women's rights movement, feminism, is being used by American capital for its own interests. Feminism has degraded, gone wild, and become a tool for the suppression of the proletariat.

The same thing happened much earlier with the environmental movement. Since the 80s, Greenpeace has been a tool in the hands of American corporations to suppress competitors. Even earlier-the trade union movement became completely subordinated to capital, Russia in the 80s and 90s learned from its own experience how the AFT KPP and others implement the interests of the US State Department in different countries.

I have already written how in the United States in the 60s, the introduction homosexuality into the protest movement by the secret services, along with anti-exhibitionism, the hippie movement, etc., led to the disintegration of the movement.

Today, the accusation of homophobia is used by Washington as a club for those governments that are trying to show independence from the United States.

Another club has been created exclusively for Russia – the accusation of nationalism, of great-power chauvinism, and more specifically, of anti-Semitism. Although there is no less anti-Semitism in the USA or France than in the USSR.

Even the anti-racism movement has been perverted by capital, reduced to absurdity, turned into its opposite – black racism. The anti-racism movement has discredited itself, turned out to be a means in the hands of the US Democratic Party to achieve Biden's victory.

In the same way, the anti-fascism movement was discredited, and the anti-fascists, along with the anarchists, also found themselves in the service of Biden.

The literacy and intellectual level of the leaders of left-wing organizations and the professorships of left-wing organizations is discouragingly low.

One of the Russian luminaries of reason, professor Mikhail Khazin, speaking on TV, said: "Marx argued that if the world becomes a single system of division of labor, capitalism will end."

But Marx never said that. This thesis was put forward by Rosa Luxemburg, and Lenin convincingly refuted it. The professorship in Europe and the United States is even more primitive. All of America imagines that Sanders is a socialist!

However, it is far from just a "non-systemic" protest or a sharp decline in the mental abilities of the left – since the Frankfurt School.

Previously, the special services, for example, Germany managed to emasculate left-wing organizations, impose the path of terrorism on them, and then eliminate them.

Today, Trotskyist organizations openly sided with Washington, repeating propaganda accusations of the dictatorship of Milosevic, Hussein, Gaddafi, and Assad. Trotskyist organizations, under the guise of resolutions against the bombing, objectively served the United States, they cleared the way for NATO in the mass consciousness.

It came to the point that the Trotskyists supported Hitler's Maidan in Ukraine.

Capital has tamed even the communist parties. Some of them are Stalinist, that is, they have nothing to do with Soviet power, with the power of the working class, with socialism.

Today, the authorities of all parties, systemic and non-systemic, from the ultra-right to the ultra-left, have created a protective buffer between themselves and the masses. Capital pays for the election campaigns of the Communist parties, and the more candidates from the Communist parties become deputies – the more money capital pays to the communist parties.

Once again: "socialism is the living creativity of the masses." The masses, not the parties.

Of course, every representative of one or another left-wing organization is sure and will convince others that he is a Marxist, a socialist, a communist. But the masses must understand that in reality they all are anti-communists.

In 1877, the work of Petr Alekseev in court "process of fiftieth," said: "... the Russian working people can only hope to themselves and no one from whom to expect except from one of our intelligent young people..." Today the Russian working people first need to fear is the intelligent young people and to rely only on itself.

In hydrodynamics, there is an interesting effect: heating from above dampens the convection from below. In the 1980s, the Liberal Democrats' instilling of a multi-party system with the support of the CPSU elite suppressed the growth of the labor movement. President Putin was particularly zealous in instilling a multiparty system. Multiparty heating stifles activity from below. To suppress - one needs to lead!

Consequently, the working people should not involve themselves in bourgeois parliamentary election campaigns. Workers need to avoid being used by any left-wing organizations. One can't trust their demagoguery, their slogans, their oracles. The only way out is in the self-organization of the workers, in their independent actions, independent of the various parties.

Workers, doctors, teachers, and others need to create their own security services, their own mutual aid funds, and their own mass media.

Literature

1. Lenin, (The complete collection of essays, vol. 6, p. 79.
2. Marx, K. The letter to V. I. Zasulich // Essays, 2nd ed., vol. 19. M.: State Publishing House of Polit. literature, 1961. S. 250-251.
3. Marx K., Engels F. Preface to the second Russian edition of the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" // Op. 2-e ed. Vol. 19. M.: State Publishing House of Polit. literature, 1961. p. 305.
4. Rees A. V. Journey to the revolution. Russia is in the midst of a Civil War. 1917-1918.
5. Lenin, On cooperation // 5-e ed. Vol. 45. M.: Polit. literature, 1970. p. 377.
6. Ikhlov B. L. On the dialectic of the class – party relationship.
<http://krasnoe.tv/node/19953?withThread=01>
<https://www.proza.ru/2013/11/21/1006>