ADDENDA

Grammatici certant et adhuc sub indice lis est.
(Scholars dispute; and the case is still before the courts.)
-- Horace

The author is obliged to the learned examiners of this thesis who considered it for a doctorate award. One of them has also suggested some revisions in order to improve the manuscript. Thanking him wholeheartedly the author takes this opportunity to incorporate all his points, one by one, and present clarifications where that is necessary. Accordingly, this Addenda is being inserted at the end of the final chapter as recommended by the examiner.

1. This study, as stated earlier, is essentially an evaluation of Democratic Centralism, the organisational theory of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In course of inquiry the second chapter "The Quest for a Revolutionary Party" has merely tried to trace out a theoretical background of the Soviet Communist Party's organisational life. The chapter carries a brief summary of the ideas of Marx and Engels on the theme of party organisation only. It did not intend at all to present their comprehensive views on the vast spectrum of the role and functioning of mass organisations, of the working class or on the role of leadership. However, while presenting Marx and Engels' views on party a still more thorough and clearer analysis could have been made. Even though making a definite conclusion as to their views on the nature and role of party organisation is indeed difficult, a few observations can be added to complete the picture.

Marx's main enterprise was to prove that capitalism was fraught with antagonistic contradictions which made the proletarian revolution historically inevitable. Having studied the position of the various classes in the capitalist system Marx and Engels concluded that only one class, the proletariat, objectively plays the leading role in production. At the same time the proletariat is deprived of all the means of production and it cannot, therefore, play the leading part in the system of social relations. This contradictory position impels the proletariat to struggle against the capitalist system, making it the main force in the destruction of this system and the creation of a new, communist society. To accomplish this historic task, the working class must organise itself, establish a revolutionary political party, take political power, and use its rule - the dictatorship of the proletariat - to overcome the resistance of all exploiters and pave the way to the first phase of communist society, socialism.
These are the cardinal ideas underlying Marx's theory of socialist revolution. It was necessary to apply these ideas both in individual countries and in the world as a whole. But, by Lenin's time, this could no longer be based solely on the pure analysis of the general laws governing social development. Now it required the precise investigation of existing balance of political forces in particular countries with all its peculiarities. It also required a study of the paths along which the desired socialist revolution could actually develop. Marx and Engels advanced a number of important ideas concerning the theory of socialist revolution but the objective conditions were not yet favourable in the 19th century, nor were the existing socio-political forces ready to undertake it and carry it through to a victorious conclusion. More significantly, limited historical experience made it impossible to analyse concretely and thoroughly the many problems arising in connection with the theory of organisation of working class party. Also, the decline of capitalism and the development of the world socialist movement turned out to be a far more complicated and contradictory process than it appeared in the 19th century.

The period thus demanded a creative all-round development of the Marxist theory of socialist revolution, and this was done by the greatest revolutionary of the 20th century, Lenin. He went beyond the point reached by Marx and Engels. He went boldly ahead, elaborating, enriching and innovating in the Marxist theory of working class emancipation. His work in the sphere of organisation showed convincingly that his devotion to Marxism was combined organically with historical creativity with the unique ability to comprehend the Russian realities of the time.

Lenin's theory of a new type of proletarian party became one of the main elements of the twentieth century Marxism. Certainly, Lenin's theory of the party was not developed overnight. It was conceived, enriched and formulated as the Party itself grew. It would be wrong, therefore, simply to associate particular aspects of his theory only with some work or other written by Lenin. He thrashed out the different questions of party organisation in the light of the various tasks of the party under specific circumstances. This should always be taken into account if one is to see the link between Lenin's theoretical writings and the practical work regarding the party. When the Party was in the process of formation, the framing of its rules and programmes was a main task. The need to determine precisely the Party's new organisational behavior, its strategy and tactics arose only when its work of directing the working class struggle increased. And the role, task and structure of the Party as a ruling party could naturally be best determined
only when it actually assumed power in Russia and headed the working classes in socialist construction.

Lenin always emphasised the creative aspect of Marxism which has been of cardinal interest at any point of time. Such creative development of Marxist theory was determined by what he said “the aggregate of historical conditions”. This also applied to the theory and practice of the party organisation. Even though Lenin’s theory of party was an integrated one, the elaboration of each aspect of it and the specific promotion or implementation of each aspect to the forefront depended heavily on the whole set of historical conditions. Hence, Lenin introduced many new elements into the theory and practice of party which may not be found in the works and activities of Marx and Engels. Some scholars called it a deviation, while for many others it was a development of Marxism. In either case one fact remains the same, i.e. there was difference between Marx’s ideas on party organisation and that of Lenin’s. Dispute has been always on the interpretation of this difference rather than on the existence of the fact.

2. Regarding the end of the First International a somewhat controversial affair concerning the expulsion of Michael Bakunin, the famous Russian revolutionary, has been mentioned on pp. 59-61 in this thesis. However, the presentation of this part could not become authentic and convincing since it depended not on the original sources but only on the findings and conclusions of Franz Mehring, Prof. E.H. Carr, Roberto Michels and Hans Gerth. Since it does not affect the main current of the study, the part which relates Bakunin’s expulsion should be taken as obliterated from the manuscript.

3. Regarding Lenin’s views on organisation it has been asserted that a pure, perfect and professional party organisation was almost an obsession for him. A fairly large number of scholars have dwelt upon this aspect, so the proposition seems incontrovertible. In this respect the quotation from Pyotr Nikitich Tkachev on p. 64 was only to indicate a continuation of Russian revolutionary thought. That does not imply any great similarity between Tkachev’s and Lenin’s concepts of organisation. While both emphasised upon the need of revolutionary organisation per se their individual thoughts on organisation and its fine details had been much different. In the thesis, on pp. 63-64, this element could not be sufficiently elaborated. Hence this small piece, too, stands taken out from the manuscript.

4. It is always difficult to ascertain someone’s views about himself until it is clearly stated by the very person. Otherwise it is always a guess or a conjecture. And if the person in question is no more then it is quite impossible
to assert that such and such person had such and such views about himself. This is valid for Lenin as well. Now it is just impossible to assert what position he wished or imagined for himself in the party organisation he created. Therefore, while discussing his famous “Opportunism in Organisational Question” the author has taken into account some lacunae in Lenin’s theorisation. Considering Lenin’s overemphasis on unequivocal centralism it appears that whenever Lenin emphasized on ‘the greatest possible centralization’ with regard to the party leadership he, being the tallest figure in the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party, took his presence in the party centre for granted. It could hardly be otherwise, for that would make no sense of Lenin’s theory of party organisation. But this is just an apparent proposition, not in any way a definitive conclusion, because by the natural limitation mentioned earlier it cannot ever be drawn.

5. It is an usual practice in academic writings to quote some statement, argument or incident in order to buttress one’s proposition. No one quotes something questioning his own thesis. Moreover if such a supporting material, say a paragraph, is too long then obliterating irrelevant parts of the quotation by substituting three dots is also not unusual. But sometimes this sort of obliteration also creates doubts and confusion. It has been pointed out by the learned examiner that on pp. 152-53 a quotation from Lenin’s speech at the opening of the Tenth Party Congress (1921) does not lead to an objective conclusion. Therefore, in order to remove such a possibility the quotation should be read, without obliteration, as follows:

Comrades, we have passed through an exceptional year, we have allowed ourselves the luxury of discussions and disputes within the Party. This was an amazing luxury for a Party shouldering unprecedented responsibilities and surrounded by mighty and powerful enemies uniting the whole capitalist world.

I do not know how you will assess that fact now. Was it fully compatible with our resources, both material and spiritual? It is up to you to appraise this. At all events, however, I must say that the slogan, task and aim which we should set ourselves at this Congress and which we must accomplish at all costs, is to emerge from the discussions and disputes stronger than before. (Applause.) You, comrades, cannot fail to be aware that all our enemies - and their name is legion - in all their innumerable press organs abroad repeat, elaborate and multiply the same wild rumour that our bourgeois and petty-bourgeois enemies spread here inside the Soviet Republic, namely: discussion means dispute; dispute means discord; discord means that the Communists have become weak; press hard, seize the opportunity, take advantage of their weakening! This has
become the slogan of the hostile world. We must not forget this for a moment. Our task now is to show that, to whatever extent we have allowed ourselves this luxury in the past, whether rightly or wrongly, we must emerge from this situation in such a way that, having properly examined the extraordinary abundance of platforms, shades, slight shades and almost slight shades of opinion, that have been formulated and discussed, we at our Party Congress could say to ourselves: at all events, whatever form the discussion has taken up to now, however much we have argued among ourselves - and we are confronted with so many enemies - the task of the dictatorship of the proletariat in a peasant country is so vast and difficult that formal cohesion is far from enough. (Your presence here at the Congress is a sign that we have that much.) Our efforts should be more united and harmonious than ever before; there should not be the slightest trace of factionalism - whatever its manifestations in the past. That we must not have on any account. That is the only condition on which we shall accomplish the immense task that confront us.

( Lenin’s speech at the opening of the Tenth Party Congress, 8 March 1921.)

6. Finally, the fifth chapter analyses the organisational practice within the Soviet Communist Party from Khrushchev to Gorbachev’s period. While discussing the last phase of the Party, its gradual weakening and ultimate dismantling have been explained by a multitude of factors. But at no place any aspect of economic policies, planning etc. have been discussed. As mentioned in the Preface and maintained from beginning to end, that is simply out of the purview of this study. The discussion has been, all through, exclusively on the organisational functioning of the party, irrespective of its various policies and their merits and demerits.

Therefore, the incident relating Gorbachev’s Report (18 July 1989) at a meeting of the CPSU Central Committee on p. 246 of this thesis does in no way reflect upon what should or should not be the functions of economists. The quotation from Grobachev’s aforesaid Report is only to illustrate Gorbachev’s waggish style of functioning. It only indicates how the whole party, the General Secretary being the symbol of it, became incapacitated not knowing what to do when confronted with the challenge of finding a viable set of reforms. The Russian term Oblomovism, named after the immortal character in the novel Oblomov (1859) written by I. A. Goncharov, carries a number of human especially Russian characteristics. Those characteristics have been discussed in detail on pp. 221-27. The term has been applied to explain the general malady in the party. Therefore, the use of this Russian concept to explain the style of party functioning during Gorbachev’s period, beginning from that of Brezhnev’s is very specific. It illustrates the general condition of the party organisation and has nothing to do with the role of economists in Gorbachev’s democratisation.
Source: G. Razumovsky, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in The Party is Accountable to the People (Moscow, APN, 1988).
2. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE CPSU: FORMAL ELECTIONS

CONGRESS OF THE CPSU

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE

- Central Auditing Commission
- Political Bureau Secretariat
- Party Control Committee at the CC CPSU
- All-Union Party Conference

CP Congress of a Union Republic

- Union Republic Communist Party CC
- Republican Party Conference

Territorial, Regional Party Conference

- Territorial, Regional Party Committee
- Area, City, District Party Conference
- Area, City, District Party Committee

Primary Party Organizations
3. ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE CPSU: ACTUAL CONTROL

In 1987 there were 14 Union Republic CCs, 6 Territorial Committees, 153 Regional Committees, 10 Area Committees, 890 City Committees, 663 Town District Committees and 2886 Rural District Committees.
4. Growth of the Party Apparatus

-- CHART I --
Organization of the Central Committee Secretariat, 1924-1930

SECRETARIAT

Organization-Assignment Otdel (Orgstr.)
Press Otdel
Otdel for Work in the Villages
Statistical Otdel
Administration of Affairs

Agitation and Propaganda Otdel (Agprop)
Otdel for Work among Women
Accounting Otdel
Information Otdel

* The Press Otdel was placed under the Agitation and Propaganda Otdel in 1928.

-- CHART II --
Reorganization of the Central Committee Secretariat, 1930

SECRETARIAT

Organization-Instruction Otdel
Agitation and Mass Campaigns Otdel
Secret Otdel

Assignment Otdel

Heavy Industry

Light Industry

Transport

Agriculture

Foreign Cadres

Finance-Planning-Trade

Soviet Administration

Accounting

-- CHART III --
Reorganization of the Central Committee Secretariat, 1934

SECRETARIAT

Agricultural Otdel
Transport Otdel
Political Administrative Otdel
Otdel of Culture and Propaganda of Leninism
Administration of Affairs

Industrial Otdel
Planning-Finance-Trade Otdel
Otdel of Leading Party Organs
Special Section
- CHART IV -
Reorganization of the Central Committee Secretariat, 1948

SECRETARIAT

Gudet of the Party, Trade-Union and Komsomol Organso
Heavy Industry Gudet
Agriculture Gudet
Planning-Trade Gudet
Foreign Gudet
Main Political Administration of the Armed Forces*

Propaganda and Agitation Gudet
Light Industry Gudet
Transport Gudet
Administration Gudet
Special Section

* Functions as Military Gudet of the Central Committee Secretariat.

- CHART V -
Organization of the Central Committee Secretariat, 1960

Bureau of the Central Committee for the RSFSR

RSFSR

Secretariat

Administrative Affairs

Union

Party Organs

Propaganda and Agitation

Administrative, Trade, and Financial Organs

Agriculture

Industry and Transport

Sciences, Schools, and Culture

Party Organs

Propaganda and Agitation

Administrative Organs

Agriculture

Transport and Communications

Heavy Industry

Light Industry

Machine Building

Construction

Higher Education and Schools

Culture and Science

Foreign Affairs

Liaison with Blue Parties

Liaison with Non-Blue Parties

Non-Political Administration of the Soviet Army and Navy

List of the CC Departments as Known in March 1973

- Administration of Affairs
- Administrative organs
- Agriculture
- Chemical Industry
- Construction
- Cultural Department
- Defence Industry
- General
- Heavy Industry
- International
- Light and Food Industry
- Machine Building
- Organisational-Party Work
- Personnel Abroad
- Planning and Financial Organs
- Propaganda
- Relations with Communists and Workers' Parties of Socialist Republics
- Science and Educational Establishments
- Trade and Public Services
- Transport and Communications
- Party Control Committee
- Chief Political Directorate of the Army and Navy