

MATERIALISM AND MULTIPARTY SYSTEM

Ikhlov B. L.¹

¹Perm State University

Abstract. It is shown that the architecture of public administration and the model of social dynamics based on Bernstein's version of the relationship between the class and the party are incorrect.

Introduction

In 1903, at the 2nd RSDLP Congress, Lenin's supporters created a "new type" party, its members are required not only to support the party's program, but also pay membership fees and work in one of the party cells. The principle of democratic centralism must operate in the new party.

The party should have a two-layer structure, conspiratorial and legal: a group of permanent cadre leading party workers (professional revolutionaries) with the necessary minimum of theoretical knowledge, political experience, organizational practice and the art of fighting the tsarist police; plus a wide network of local party organizations and a large number of party members who would be supported by the masses.

Moreover, the Bolshevik Party is the spokesman for the fundamental interests of the working class. In other words, the party not only calls on to vote, that is, to participate in the creation of parliament, but organizes and leads the mass movements. The masses do not just vote for the party, but carry out its instructions.

A. Avtorkhanov, M. Voslensky and others undertook criticism of the Bolshevik party structure. Lenin is accused of the absence of internal party democracy, of the fact that the party is not a mass one (Stalin made it a mass one), that the elite of the party are professional revolutionaries, that in the party - centralism, subordination of local cells to the center. The main charge is the rejection of the multiparty system and factionalism.

However, today the elites of all parties, both right and left, are professional functionaries, in all parties there is no internal party democracy, in all parties local cells are obliged to follow the instructions of the center, all major parties have virtually ruled out factionalism.

The multi-party system, however, became one of the slogans of liberal democracy, the content of which was the dismantling of the USSR. On the other hand, in the presence of two or several parties, the coming of one or another party to power does not fundamentally change anything in the domestic and foreign policies of countries.

The Republican and Democratic parties of the United States are a well-known "swing system" to get rid of the multiparty system in the sense of the difference in ideologies, the Communist Party in the United States was virtually eliminated.

The arrival of Tony Blair, Mitterrand or Hollande did not bring anything essentially new, the Laborites were indistinguishable from the Conservatives, the Socialists from the Republicans. Behind the external differences, the Scandinavian, Spanish, Belgian, Swiss, Austrian, Australian and other multi-party systems are essentially the same, competition between parties does not lead to progress.

Thus, the typologies of the party systems of J. Duverger, J. Blondel or J. Sartori have no relation to reality. Below we will see that the criticism "What is to be done?" did not touch upon the essence of the issue.

"What is to be done?"

Trotsky tied the class-party relationship to a revolutionary situation:

"Only the leading stratum of the class has a political program, which, however, needs to be tested by events and approved by the masses. The deep political process of the revolution consists precisely in the class's awareness of the tasks arising from the social crisis and in the active orientation of the masses by the method of gradual approach ... Only on the basis of studying political processes in the masses themselves can one understand the role of parties and leaders, which we are least inclined to ignore. They form, although not an independent, but an important element of the process. Without a governing organization, the energy of the masses would have evaporated like steam not enclosed in a steam boiler." [1]

Both Lenin and Trotsky explained the need for a dedicated governing structure 1) from the need for one-man management in any social process, 2) from the heterogeneity of the working class. There are dark, unconscious elements in the working class, and there are the most conscious ones - the vanguard. But this vanguard is not yet a party.

Adam Smith wrote that the worker, due to hard work, is not even capable of patriotism. Marx notes that due to the hard work of the workers, they are not able to generalize and lead the masses, the representatives of the interests of the working class are not the workers, but people of more liberated labor, representatives of the intelligentsia, more capable of generalization, of developing a strategy, a program. Thus, the party of the working class is not part of the working class. It is the vanguard of the avant-garde.

Here are a few quotes from Lenin's "What is to be done".

"The workers could not have had a social democratic consciousness. It could only be brought from outside. The history of all countries testifies that the working class is able to develop only a trade unionist consciousness solely by its own efforts..." [2]. At this point, the materialist Lenin becomes an idealist, it is not matter that develops from itself to the Sami, but the idea is primary, it is introduced from outside into the dark, inert, inert matter of the working class. However, history testifies that both the Paris Commune and the Soviets were created by the workers themselves, without party spiritual shepherds.

In the same book, Lenin himself objects to his own statement: "The political character of the economic struggle is quite often spontaneous, that is, without the intervention of the" revolutionary bacillus - the intelligentsia, "without the intervention of conscious Social Democrats. For example, the economic struggle of the workers in England acquired a political character without any participation of the socialists" [2, p. 73]. But, he makes a reservation, we are talking only about "glimpses of political consciousness", which the party should take advantage of and direct "glimpses" into the social democratic channel. And Marx pointed out that in view of the hard, black labor of the workers, their leaders are from the intelligentsia, whose labor is freer. But Marx stressed that any economic strike is political at the same time. Lenin took the position of Arnold Ruge, who did not understand the political significance of the economic protest of the Silesian weavers. Marx criticizes his lack of understanding, he makes fun of the political reasoning of various parties, which are trying to bring this reasoning to the masses, using specific examples.

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

"The consciousness of the working class cannot be a truly political consciousness if the workers are not accustomed to respond to all and all cases of arbitrariness and oppression, violence and abuse, no matter what class these cases belong to; - and, moreover, to respond precisely from the social democratic, and not from any other point of view " [2, p. 69].

The word "accustomed": Lenin wants to teach the workers, as parents teach their children?

Undoubtedly, in this book, Lenin is right about his opponents, he is head and shoulders above them, he also criticizes Bernstein for reformism. But why does Lenin make the Social Democrats the yardstick of everything? And if the Social Democrats are wrong, should the working class follow their mistakes? Now the working class is called upon to respond to the oppression of sexual minorities, provocateurs beaten by the police, to the dictatorship of those who are appointed by the United States as dictators. If Lev Tolstoy, Gorky and many other great people were indignant at 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.

"A spontaneous labor movement by itself is capable of creating (and inevitably creates) only trade unionism, and the trade unionist policy of the working class is precisely the bourgeois policy of the working class," Lenin summarizes [2, p. 96].

Of course, the struggle for the most favorable conditions for the sale of labor power is the satisfaction of the worker with capitalism. However, the powerful spontaneous strikes in the United States against the conveyor depersonalization - isn't this a struggle to eliminate the contradiction between mental and physical labor, about this task of socialism, which was noted by Marx in his "Critique of the Gotha Program"?

The world saw how in 1968 the workers of "Sud Aviation" seized the plant, set up production themselves, locked the offices of the administration and made the "Internationale" learn over the public address system.

In the late 1960s, the world saw how hungry, embittered and armed workers from southern Italy installed Soviets in factories, took control of enterprise finances and rid the country of corruption.

"Who should be a team of professional revolutionaries? ... Marx and Engels themselves, in their social position, belonged to the bourgeois intelligentsia. In the same way, in Russia, the theoretical teaching of Social Democracy arose completely independently of the spontaneous growth of the labor movement, arose as a natural and inevitable result of the development of thought among the revolutionary socialist intelligentsia." [2, 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 none today. But Lenin here 1) separates the evolution of social democracy from the labor movement, 2) considers the development of social democracy to be independent of the labor movement, he clearly distorts history.

"Of course," Lenin stipulates, "socialism, as a doctrine, is as rooted in modern economic relations as the class struggle of the proletariat, just as this latter follows from the struggle against the poverty and misery of the masses generated by capitalism, but socialism and class the struggle arises next to one another, and not one of the other, arise under different prerequisites. Modern socialist consciousness can arise only on the basis of deep scientific knowledge" [2, p. 39].

That is: the socialist doctrine is rooted, follows - but immediately arises not from, but side by side, independently. On the other hand, where can deep scientific knowledge come from? Are their heads of academics? Or does it arise from the practice of class struggle? After the events of the Paris Commune, Marx returned to "Capital" to correct his theory and bring it into line with practice. After the events of 1991, it became obvious to everyone that other provisions of Marxism-Leninism were subject to revision. Alas, the modern left did not draw this conclusion.

"...1) that no revolutionary movement can be strong without a stable and consistent organization of leaders; 2) that the wider the mass spontaneously involved in the struggle, constituting the basis of the movement and participating in it, the more urgent is the need for such an organization and the stronger this organization must be (for the easier it is for all demagogues to drag away the undeveloped strata of the masses); 3) that such an organization should consist mainly of people professionally engaged in revolutionary activities" [2, p. 121].

Stalin said so: the party should consist of special people, a kind of sword-bearers.

That is, Stalin and Trotsky in terms of the relationship between the class and the party stood on identical positions.

There is no objection to theory, as Marx said, "there is nothing more practical than a good theory." But both Marx and Lenin as materialists in the dialectical unity of practice and theory emphasize the primacy of practice, the primacy of practice over theory. "... practice is higher than (theoretical) knowledge, because it has not only the dignity of universality, but also of immediate reality," writes Lenin [3]. Lenin here by no means expresses Hegel's opinion on speculative theories in his own words, here Lenin's direct assertion about the "dignity of universality."

Stalinists and liberals, on the other hand, argue that theory appears divorced from practice and even precedes practice, in the minds of armchair scientists. The goal is obvious: to place theorists as a special caste above society, the party above the class. The subjective party factor became objective among the Stalinists and liberals.

"... History in general," writes Lenin, "the history of revolutions in particular, is always richer in content, more diverse, versatile, livelier, "more cunning" than the best parties, the most conscious vanguards of the most advanced classes imagine..." [4].

There is no objection and no organization. But whose organization is this? Either it is an organization from the intelligentsia, or from the workers themselves. Either the workers have the intelligence and strength to remove the unwanted leader of the organization, or they do not.

Lenin writes about the undeveloped strata of the masses. In 1917, workers in Russia had at best 3 classes of education behind their backs, and not all of them. In the 1980s, workers had 10 years of education behind them, and some had a higher education or incomplete higher education. In a situation where the number of literate people in Russia was on the order of only 23%, and even later, when the working class, as Trotsky put it, was a chaotic mass, Lenin's words were partly true.

But the working class is developing, structural changes are taking place in it. The number of knowledge workers in Russia increased from 2% in 1887 (Moscow, CSA, 1922) to 17% in 1986, education increased from

229 literate per 1000 people to 80% of workers with secondary education (in Japan - 97%), moreover, about 10-15% of workers in the USSR had a higher education. Prior to 1991, studies around the world showed an upward trend in the total number of years of schooling from year to year. This happens as capitalism develops. As Marx pointed out, the level of development of capitalism is determined by how much science has become a productive force. This means not only the introduction of scientific developments into production, but also an increase in the literacy of the worker.

Now workers visit libraries, listen to the radio, watch TV, use the Internet. Over the years of difficult labor, highly skilled workers have received a much deeper education than the education of many party functionaries. For such workers, it is the propaganda of the left-wing "professional revolutionaries" that appears to be demagoguery.

"This kind of "push from the side" is not too much, but, on the contrary, too little, it was unscrupulously and shamelessly little in our movement, because we were too zealous to boil in our own juice, bowed too slavishly to the elementary "economic struggle workers with bosses and with the government." We, revolutionaries by profession, must and will do this kind of "pushing" a hundred times more. But precisely because you choose such a vile word as "pushing from the outside", which inevitably causes a worker (at least a worker who is as undeveloped as you are undeveloped) to mistrust everyone who bears him from the outside, political knowledge and revolutionary experience evokes an instinctive desire to rebuff all such people - you turn out to be a demagogue, and demagogues are the worst enemies of the working class "[2, p. 122-123].

Today this thesis of Lenin is not just outdated, but harmful. For there have been so many nudges from the bourgeois liberals, Stalinists, various pro-American anarchists, Trotskyists, and various demagogues in recent history that these nudges are already causing a sharply negative reaction from the workers. It is not difficult to see that in his polemics with economism and anarchists, Lenin completely repeats the ideas of Bernstein-Kautsky.

Genesis

Today, ALL parties, both the left and the right, use Bernstein's scheme, which boils down to the following: party bosses write a program, party gray ranks bring it to the masses, the masses follow the program, basically vote in elections, after which party bosses receive leading 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 left parties turn out to be right in their practice.

In a party of the Leninist type, a stratum of people emerges that wants to be called a representative of the working class, and this stratum begins to express the interests of the working class for the workers, instead of the workers themselves.

Further, the principle of democratic centralism ceases to operate in a party of the Leninist type. Election, reporting of higher bodies to subordinate ones becomes a formality. The turnover from top to bottom disappears, the party leader becomes permanent for the rest of his life. The same thing happens in bourgeois parties. Parties are formed from gray ranks, regularly voting for party bosses. The selection of personnel is carried out in accordance with this. Moreover, all bourgeois parties become parties of the Leninist type. Finally, all over the world the principle of democratic centralism is transferred to economic management and is formalized in the same way as in the USSR.

The same happens with other forms of workers' self-organization. Trade unions in the USSR became an appendage of the party, in factories - an appendage of the factory administration. The same bureaucracy of trade unions took place in the West.

Finally, the moment comes when the interest expressed by the party layer becomes opposite to the real interest of the workers, when the bourgeois interest of this layer of spokesmen is hidden behind the screen of the interests of the working class. Which became clear in 1991.

According to Trotsky, "Soviets are the organ of the proletarian revolution. They cannot persist in a non-revolutionary environment. ... After the conquest of power by the working class, an unexpected decline in the initiative of the working class may limit the Soviets in their function of the direct power of the proletariat or even eliminate them"[5].

Gradually, the Soviets in the USSR became exactly the same appendage of the party as the trade unions. Already in 1923, the XII Congress of the RCPb fixed that "the dictatorship of the proletariat is expressed in the form of the dictatorship of the party." Meanwhile, Plekhanov stresses the difference: "The dictatorship of the proletariat, like heaven from earth, differs from the dictatorship of a handful of heterogeneous revolutionaries" ("Socialism and Political Struggle").

Although Lenin argued that the dictatorship of the proletariat was expressed precisely in the form of Soviet power, "in the form found by the workers themselves" ("State and Revolution"), and headed the Council of People's Commissars as an organ of economic management, and not as an organ of revolution, not as an organ of suppression of the bourgeois class.

In his last letters, Lenin states that the situation in the country is determined by a narrow layer of the party elite, i.e. there is not only the dictatorship of the proletariat, but even the dictatorship of the party. It turned out exactly what Trotsky warned about in the polemic with Lenin's pamphlet "What is to be done?": The party organization replaces the party itself, the CC — the party organization, and, finally, the dictator — the CC; while "the people are silent" [6].

The logical completion of the process of forming the relationship "class - party" was expressed in terms of "scheme", "model", "project", "technology". A certain group of people puts forward ideas, theses, writes an economic program. Further, the population is invited to support the program and vote for this group in the elections. Consideration of the role of parties in history goes back to the pre-Marxian period, when history was presented in the form of the history of kings. The party appears as the demiurge of history, which in the USSR was expressed in the slogan: "The plans of the party are the plans of the people." The ideological struggle becomes not an appendage, but the main form of the class struggle. The masses, however, can "influence" the party only through requests or proposals.

That is, the Bernstein-Kautsky thesis is being realized that the masses cannot do without the upper ruling class, they cannot go beyond the economic struggle. Political consciousness in the working class brings the party, as God brings the soul into inert, dark matter. It immediately follows from this that the self-government that Marx and Lenin proclaimed is impossible. Thus, the difference in the social order consists only in the differences between the leading party groups. For modern Russian Social Democrats, and later the CPRF, they are "competent" (for the CPRF - communists), for Ortega y Gasset, they are "hearing the underground rumble of history" ("Revolt of the Masses").

Absenteeism

Less than six months after France elected representatives of the broad masses, led by Chirac, the government decided to increase the pension qualification for public sector workers, reform the health care system and revise the collective agreement of railway workers. A nationwide strike broke out. However, the question arises: why did you vote? France is an exemplary electoral country, with a turnout reaching 80%. Whereas in the USA or Great Britain the turnout already in the 80s is about 25% -40%, only the presidential elections collect more.

Both the previous elections and the elections in 1995 showed that parties are not perceived by the population. Those wishing to become deputies took this circumstance into account, nominated themselves independently and won a convincing victory over the party nominees.

In the course of the development of capitalism, all the major parties formed a buffer between the government and the disaffected masses. The "Kommersant-Daily" newspaper writes that the electoral system helps to stabilize society. But the ruling classes use the entire political spectrum, from the ultra-left to the far-right. If any political poverty is not occupied, the power fills it with itself.

The ruling classes have learned to use any opposition, environmental, anti-fascist, women's, anti-racist movements and actively use LGBT people.

The reluctance of the population to vote for any candidate, who was nominated not by the labor collective, but by an unknown organization, for a person who is not known to many, led to a massive vote against everyone. On 6.30.2006, the State Duma adopted a law excluding the "against all" column from the ballots for elections at all levels.

All parties have discredited themselves, the government pays the communist parties for participation in elections, the more the communist parties receive mandates in parliament, the more the government pays them. Absenteeism is growing all over the world, even in France, only 47% of voters came to Macron's election.

Lenin's position

In the opinion of leftist ideologists, a class cannot organize itself, because it is heterogeneous, there are many backward elements in it. The party can become the spokesman for the interests of the class - instead of the class itself. But if the class is so heterogeneous that the "irresponsible" part is the overwhelming majority, then there is no need to talk about the power of the class. The working class is simply not ready for revolution or dictatorship. If the conscious part is large, then it is not the vanguard, but the class itself [7]. Thus, the theory of the avant-garde does not stand up to scrutiny.

A man differs from an animal in that he thinks. The need of workers to think independently, but not to follow someone else's thought, even the thought of a leader, increases with the development of production. Consequently, the theory of the avant-garde and Bernstein's thesis on the introduction of political consciousness by the party into the working class are untenable.

In his 1902 paper "What is to be done", Lenin, in a polemic with the "economists", took the position of Bernstein: the working class cannot break out of the struggle for the most favorable conditions for the sale of labor. He writes: "... the 'economists' want revolutionaries to recognize the 'rightfulness of the movement in the present' (R.D. № 10, p. 25), that is, the "legitimacy" of the existence of what exists; so that the "ideologists" do not try to "divert" the movement from the path that is "determined by the interaction of material elements and the material environment" ("Letter" in "Spark", № 12); to recognize it as desirable to wage the struggle "which is only possible for the workers under the given circumstances", and to recognize as possible the struggle "which they are actually waging at a given moment" (Separate Appendix to "R. Thoughts", p. 14). On the contrary, we, the revolutionary Social Democrats, are dissatisfied with this admiration for spontaneity, that is, before what is "at the moment"; we demand a change in the tactics prevailing in recent years..." [2].

It is obvious that this provision cannot be applied to the present moment. But Lenin has something to correct Lenin: he calls to proceed from the immediate interests of the working class, to learn from the working class, to go along with the working class, to go a step forward whenever possible.

In his 1920 work, "Infantile illness of leftism in communism", Lenin refuses to understand the German Social Democrats, who oppose the party to the class, Lenin writes about the heterogeneity of the working class and the vanguard.

In 1922, Stalin was rude to Krupskaya on the phone, and Lenin realized that the arguments of the German Social Democrats were not groundless.

In 1917, Lenin placed Soviets over the party in his work "State and Revolution".

In 1918, Lenin asserted: "The present government is the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. To think otherwise is to fall into anarchism. It is a recognized 217

fact that in S.R.D. our party is in the minority. It is necessary to explain to the masses that the Soviet of Workers' Deputies is the only possible government, a government unseen in the world, except for the Commune" [8].

However, in 1921, Lenin said the opposite, in his closing speech on the report of the Central Committee of the RCP (b) at the X Congress, he stated: "After we have experienced all these disasters, that we have practically seen all this, we know how damn difficult it is to fight with them. After two and a half years of Soviet power, we appeared before the whole world and said in the Communist International that the dictatorship of the proletariat was impossible except through the Communist Party. And then we were furiously abused by the anarchists and syndicalists ... "What's the matter?"

Perhaps Lenin was influenced by the struggle against the Workers' Opposition and the Left Marxists, who called on the working class to immediately take power, that is, to immediate socialism?

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

It is impossible to "introduce" socialism in Russia, writes Lenin, "for we are illiterate" [9]. The revolution in Germany was defeated, the proletariat of the developed countries was unable to come to the aid of agrarian Russia. In 1924, the 5th Congress of the Comintern came to the conclusion that the world capitalist system was stabilized.

Already in 1918, Lenin asserted that no sane communist would ever think of identifying existing economic relations with socialist ones. But Lenin does not distort the concepts of socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, which, according to Marx, are equivalent concepts.

The fact is, the Comintern was founded on March 2, 1919, after the abolition of the Vikzhel in January (February) 1918 and the AREC operation on April 11-12 to disarm the anarchist military units ("Black Guard"), there was no talk of separate anarchists and separate syndicalists. Lenin criticized the Workers' Opposition for its *anarcho-syndicalist deviation*.

The fact is that "in the Comintern" Lenin did not say anything of the kind. The words at the X Congress were attributed to Lenin after his death in order to ex post facto justify the formulation of the XII Party Congress, which took place in Lenin's absence, about the dictatorship of the Party. In 1919, at the First Congress of the Comintern, in his theses "On Bourgeois Democracy and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," Lenin did not at all say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the party; on the contrary, he twice identified the Soviets and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin is trying with all his might to correct the position on "bringing consciousness", which he repeated in his polemics with anarchists and supporters of economism after Bernstein in "What is to be done" [10]. He completely breaks the modern, taken from Bernstein, scheme of relations "party - masses": "Let us reduce the role of state officials to the role of simple executors of the will of the working people!" ("Order from the CLD to local Soviet institutions"). We are talking about party government officials.

One of the main points in the propaganda of various Trotskyist organizations is the thesis that the revolutionaries appoint a government acting "in the interests of the proletariat"

In *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Lenin sharply objected to this idea: Lenin writes: what is needed is not "a government that goes towards the proletariat, but a government of the proletariat." I.e. subordinate to the proletariat. That is, not a worker should be subordinate to Stalin, but vice versa.

Socialism, writes Lenin in "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power", is when everyone, after completing their 8-hour lesson, begins to engage in state activities ("The immediate tasks of the Soviet power"). At the same time, modern parties provide this opportunity to citizens only at the moment the ballot is dropped into the ballot box during election campaigns.

Conclusion

So, is Hegel right, if there are laws in history that are independent of an individual (leader) or a group of party individuals, can anything at all develop without outside influence, thanks to "internal anxiety", do the laws of dialectics work? Could Homo Sapiens have emerged on Earth by itself, without the help of something external? Lenin unfolds the question in a different way: the Social Democrats, he argues, implicitly pointing to the "Manifesto of the Communist Party", have no task of organizing the party, the Social Democrats have the task of organizing *the entire proletariat into a political party*.

In the draft -st RSDLP program, Lenin sets the task of the Social Democrats "to help the working people in their self-organization." That is why Lenin repeats, following Marx, that "socialism is the living creativity of the masses." But not party theorists. This is not about the fact that competent leadership regularly degenerates, and the masses, who only ever obeyed and followed, have nothing to replace it with. The point is that even a hundred copies of Marx, as Lenin said, is not able to manage the economy. Any narrow social group, be it a socialist leadership or a capitalist system, even the capitalist system that "meets the proletariat," "acts in the interests of the people," is not able to cover all the diversity of economic ties.

Party activists are trying to achieve improvements by organizing themselves, by creating party groups making their way to power - with the complete passivity of the masses [11]. The masses are for them only the executors of their programs. Meanwhile, Lenin pointed out that in order to carry out any transformations in society, class forces are needed, it is necessary "to organize for the struggle such forces that can - and according to their social position should" go through these transformations to the end. ("Three sources, three components of Marxism"). The parties, instead of "helping childbirth" (Marx), are trying to force society to give birth when it has not yet become pregnant. More precisely - to give birth instead of a woman in labor.

References

1. L. Trotsky, "History of the Russian Revolution", V. I, P. 28-29.
2. Lenin, CW, V. 6. P.79.
3. Lenin. Synopsis of Hegel's book Science of Logic. CW, ed.5, V. 29, P. 195.
4. Lenin. Childhood disease of "leftism" in communism.– CW, V. 41, P. 80-81.
5. Mandel E., "Trotsky's theory of the relationship between the self-organization of the class and the vanguard party", M., 1991, P. 9.
6. Trotsky L., "Our political tasks", in the book. "To the history of the Russian revolution", M., 1990, P. 63
7. Ikhlov B. L., "Class and Party", "Vibir", Kiev, 1996, №1-2.
8. Lenin. From the concluding remarks on the report of the CPC 12 (25) .1.1918 at the 3rd All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. CW, V. 35.
9. Lenin, On cooperation. CW. 5th ed. V. 45. M.: Publishing house polit. lit-re, 1970. P. 377.
10. Ikhlov B.L. Dialectics of the "class - party" relationship. Proceedings of the V All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference of the Association of Marxist Associations "Modern Democracy: History, Actual Problems and Development Potentials" November 9-10, 2013, Plekhanov House, SPb. P. 38-54.
<https://www.proza.ru/2013/11/21/1006>
11. Ikhlov B. L., "Essays on the modern labor movement in the Urals", Perm, 1994;
<http://www.proza.ru/2013/02/13/2092>.

DOI 10.34660/INF.2021.49.47.023