Could Karl Kautsky - the ‘pope’ turned ‘renegade’ of orthodox Marxism - have influenced Vladimir Ilyich’s ‘April theses’? Here we print a Karl Kautsky article from April 1917, translated into English for the first time by Ben Lewis. It is introduced by Lars T Lih, a historian based in Canada, who has been at the forefront of re-examining the complex relationship between these two widely misunderstood figures of the 20th century workers’ movement.

The fall of the Russian tsar in March 1917 electrified public opinion everywhere, including socialist circles. In April 1917, Karl Kautsky published an article in his monthly journal Die Neue Zeit that assessed the prospects of the Russian Revolution and its possible outcomes. In mid-May 1906 or early June, Lenin had read the article just prior to leaving Switzerland for Russia. We are here publishing a full translation of this article, for two reasons. First, the immediate reason is the newness of this publication. The most prominent Marxist of his generation cannot fail to be of great historical interest. Kautsky had always been a great supporter of revolution and made his general assessment of revolutionary strategy in Russia, and his 1917 analysis of the Russian situation overlaps with the Bolshevik one to a large extent.

The second reason is that Kautsky’s article may provide an answer to a long-standing historical mystery. In April 1917, Lenin made certain ideological innovations that seemed to come out of the blue. Historians have proposed various explanations for the sudden shift of revolutionary strategy. One explanation has been generally convincing. I believe that the key to this myth lies in the impact of Kautsky’s article on Lenin’s outlook just at the crucial point in time when he needed to come up with a consistent political programme that would orient the activities of the Bolshevik Party in the new circumstances of 1917. I will outline the case for this shared myth here, leaving the necessary full presentation to another time.

First, what exactly was new in Lenin’s famous April theses? The following points in Lenin’s 1917 platform are not new: all power to the workers and soldiers’ committees, the overthrow of the imperialist war, and the necessity of a second stage of the revolution, in which the proletarian would take state power. These themes can all be found earlier - in particular, in theses published in October 1915. What is new is Lenin’s insistence on taking ‘steps toward socialism’ in Russia, prior to and independent of socialist revolution in western Europe. This theme occurs for the first time in remarks jotted down in April 1917 - immediately after reading Kautsky’s article. Of course, we cannot simply argue post hoc, ergo propter hoc (‘with this, therefore because of this’). Nevertheless, this coincidence in time opens up a possibility that should be seriously examined.

A couple of preliminary remarks. The theme of ‘steps toward socialism’ is not equivalent to ‘socialism in one country’, as this slogan was understood in the mid-20s. Lenin is not making any assertion about the possibility of building full socialism in the absence of an international revolution. The metaphor of ‘steps toward socialism’ was meant to be modest: Russia can begin the long journey toward socialism, and Lenin undoubtedly still counted on European socialist revolution as the only way out of the global crisis of imperialist war.

Some readers might feel that the idea of Kautsky’s ‘steps toward socialism’, which was especially popular after 1914, is inherently implausible - even paradoxical. The standard story about Lenin and Kautsky goes something like this: Lenin did indeed regard Kautsky as a Marxist authority prior to 1914, although this was probably due to a misunderstanding. But Kautsky’s actions and articles after the outbreak of the war made the scales fall from Lenin’s eyes, and he renounced Kautsky and ‘Kautskianstvo’.

This standard story is wrong on one essential point: Lenin never renounced “Kautsky, when he was a Marxist” - the phrase used constantly by Lenin after the outbreak of war to refer to the pre-war Kautsky. On the contrary, Lenin continued to energetically affirm the Marxist credentials and insights of Kautsky’s writings, especially up to and including 1909. Lenin fiercely attacked what he called Kautskianstvo, a term that he coined to sum up Kautsky’s behaviour after 1914. But Kautskianstvo most explicitly did not mean ‘the system of views set forth by Kautsky in his pre-war writings’ - in fact, the most glaring feature of Kautskianstvo was precisely Kautsky’s failure to live up to those views.

I have documented this point elsewhere. Here I will just assert that there is nothing paradoxical about Lenin being influenced by Kautsky, even in 1917, on issues other than this wartime controversies as the nature of imperialism and the need for a purified third international.

Let us now turn to Lenin’s ideological scenarios prior to April 1917. Up to this point, Lenin had one revolutionary scenario for Russia and another for Europe: democratic revolution in Russia and socialist revolution in Europe. These two scenarios could be linked externally: democratic revolution in Russia might spark off socialist revolution in Europe, which in turn might open up socialist possibilities even in backward Russia. This kind of linkage can be seen in the theses of October 1915: “The task of the proletariat in Russia is to carry out the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia to the end, in order to ignite the socialist revolution in Europe” (Lenin’s emphasis).

But, as the theses of October 1915 show, Lenin did not envision the possibility of socialist revolution in independent of socialist revolution in Europe. True, a democratic revolution in Russia required proletarian state power - nevertheless, this proletarian state power would set itself only democratic tasks. Why? The reasons can be found in an article Kautsky wrote in 1906 that had a title similar to that of his 1917 article: Prospects and driving forces of the Russian Revolution (1906), as compared to Prospects of the Russian Revolution (1917).

Kautsky’s 1906 article was greatly valued by Lenin as an authoritative endorsement of basic Bolshevik strategy. Kautsky argued that the Russian bourgeoisie was incapable of leading a thorough-going democratic revolution because it was too fearful of the inevitable result: namely, the growing power of the socialist proletariat. The workers were therefore the only class capable of leading a democratic revolution to the end - precisely because their ultimate goal was not democracy, but socialism. But in order to carry out this gigantic task of overthrowing the tsar the workers needed to win the loyalty of the revolutionary peasants away from the bourgeoisie.

Therefore, concluded Kautsky, the upcoming Russian Revolution had moved beyond the model of the bourgeois revolution in one important aspect: namely, the bourgeoisie itself would not - could not - lead the working class. But in another sense the Russian Revolution was still bourgeois: it would usher in an essentially bourgeois system, albeit a democratic one, because Russia was not ready for socialism. Kautsky proved this last point by applying two Marxist axioms to Russia in 1906. The first axiom was that socialism was impossible without an appropriate level of productive forces: “Socialism can only be built on the basis of large-scale enterprises, and it stands too much in contradiction to the conditions of small-scale enterprises for it to arise and maintain itself in a country with a overwhelming peasant majority.”

The second axiom might be called the axiom of the class ally: “It will be impossible for social democracy to achieve victory solely based on the proletariat, without the support of another class, and therefore, as a victorious party, it cannot carry out its programme further than permitted by the interests of the class that supports the proletariat.” This supportive class ally was the peasantry and, since the peasants were not ready to support socialism and since, furthermore, the workers could not achieve a全社会 democratic system, then it followed that socialism was not on the agenda in Russia in Lenin’s view.

Nevertheless, this coincidence in time opens up a possibility that should be seriously examined.

In his 1917 article, Kautsky took the two most prominent axioms (class alliance) and applied them to Russia in 1917 - and came up with this time with much more open-ended answers. Kautsky does not make definite predictions, but he warns against any automatic pessimism, against setting too high limits to socialist development, given the new empirical realities of Russia in 1917. He thus opened the gateway for Lenin to come up with his own, more assertively optimistic applications of the same axioms. In a word, he gave Lenin permission to consider the possibilities of socialism in Russia.

We are now ready to turn to Kautsky’s article and note the passages that Lenin might have found to be significant. On two levels, Kautsky affirms the key propositions of what might be called the outlook of old Bolshevikism. On the international level, he hints strongly that the Russian Revolution could lead to socialist revolution in Europe. His language is somewhat guarded and anachronistic in order to pass the censor, but the meaning is clear. He writes that “the international interdependence of state life for the purposes of the proletariat has already made too much progress for such a tremendous event as the transformation of the tsarist empire into a democratic republic to occur without repercussions for the other states.” Among these repercussions is “a tremendous upswing in the political power of the working classes in the entire capitalist realm”. This is coded language for “social revolution”. Kautsky also brings out the responsibility of the German Social Democrats to stop German militarists from crushing the new revolution.

Kautsky then reaffirms the key propositions of the longstanding Kautskyite perspective of the domestic Russian situation. The Russian bourgeoisie would like to see tsarism removed, but it is so paralysed by fear of revolution that “tsarism had to first bring Russia to the brink of the abyss before the bourgeoisie could
oppose it more energetically - obeying necessarily, not their own inner drive.

Thus the Russian Revolution was to be a proletarian one from the very beginning, and catch and catch all the more, the reason why the Russian workers could play this leadership role: the advanced class-consciousness of the Russian workers, the "20th century knowledge" of their leaders, the preponderant social weight of the cities and the "decisive role" that the proletariat already enjoyed within them. Furthermore, the peasants were the natural allies of the social revolution since only the workers were prepared to satisfy the peasant demand for land. Once the peasants received the land, they will "oppose any counterrevolution that threatens them with the loss of their newly won soil." Furthermore, the peasants were much more likely than previously to support democratic political reform. To answer this question, Kautsky's 1917 article thus contains a concise précis of old Bolshevism.

But Kautsky goes on to open up new perspectives. How far can the Russian Revolution go in a socialist direction, even prior to and independent of any European revolution? To answer this question, Kautsky applies the same logic that he used in 1906, but comes up with different results.

The first axiom states that socialist transformation is possible with the appropriate objective productive forces. Applying this to Russia in 1917, Kautsky admits that "Russian capitalism [still] offers very little in terms of starting points [Joseph Stalin's "window of opportunity"]. Nevertheless, there is much that can be done, including nationalisation of large farms, railroads, and economic regulation to protect workers; progressive taxation to raise the share of wages and help the peasant classes in Russia in parallel with the development of modern capitalism in western Europe."

Kautsky's remarks do not consist in his list of possible reforms, but rather the opened-up logic of his scenario, as set forth in the following crucial passage:

"One might call this a bourgeois programme of aims and means: a workers' programme of revolution. Whether it is one or the other depends on quantity. Here too, when quantity is increased accordingly, it must transform into a new quality. It is in the nature of things that the proletariat will strive to use its revolutionary power in the direction which I have outlined here as soon as it feels solid ground under its feet, and that in so doing it will meet the resistance of the capitalists and the large landowners. How much it will achieve depends on its relative power."

The other axiom states that the proletariat cannot go further toward socialism than its "main class ally" - in this case, the peasantry. The question becomes: will the peasantry support the socialist proletariat, not only when it is carrying out democratic tasks, but when it moves on to socialist tasks? There is no definite answer to this question (continues Kautsky).

In 1906, this possibility was the only realistic one. But, as with socialist economic measures, Kautsky insists perspicaciously now avoid taking a too narrow and pessimistic view of the peasantry. Already in the midst of war, Kautsky wrote eloquently of the transformation of the Russian peasant "from a good-natured, sleepy, and grateful creature to another, more restless and untrusting fighter who strives toward social revolution - and better." In his 1917 article, Kautsky insists that the intervening decade has seen such sweeping changes in the Russian peasant. His material circumstances and historical traditions are quite unique, and at the same time have been in the process of colossal change for three decades. The peasant is the "unknown variable," in the equation of the Russian Revolution. We are still unable to insert a figure for it. And yet we know that this figure is the crucial one, the decisive one. For this reason, the Russian Revolution can and will spring tremendous surges of force in working with the peasantry.

Thus, for both fundamental questions, Kautsky refuses to set limits and tells us to be prepared for tremendous surprises. Over the course of 1917, Lenin proceeded to ask the same two questions and gradually came up with his own definite answers. But just for illustrative purposes, we will limit ourselves here to some striking verbal echoes that indicate the direct impact of Kautsky's article.

Both come from Can the Bolsheviks retain state power?, written in early October 1917.

"For Lenin in 1917, the main Assumptions, or starting point, for socialist development for Russia was the "economic apparatus" of the banks and trusts. "This apparatus must not, and should not, be smashed."

In another part of the same pamphlet, Lenin responds to the charge that the workers are "merely" to the petty bourgeoisie, in the words, that they will not have mass support if they move against the bourgeoisie. He points explicitly to the peasantry and the peasants, and in the words, that "it is difficult to imagine that in a capitalist country the proletariat should be so little isolated from the petty bourgeoisie - and, mark you, in a revolution against the bourgeoisie - as the proletariat now is in Russia."

In other words: Kautsky, we now have the answer to your question. The peasants will support the workers in a revolution against the bourgeoisie. Full speed ahead!

Naturally, the first question that arose at the outbreak of the revolution in Russia was how it would affect the arrival of peace. We already dealt with this in an earlier article ('The ice palace' in No26 of the previous volume). But, just as the violence of the current war far goes beyond that of the Russo-Japanese war, the current revolution in Russia has already reached much more progress for such a tremendous event as the transformation of the tsarist empire into a democratic republic to occur without repercussions for the other states.

If democracy holds its ground in Russia, then both the Austrian and the Polish problems immediately acquire new facets. The success of the Polish Revolution and the preservation of Austria amongst the peoples living there drew their strength from the hatred and the fear instilled by the despotism of neighbouring Russia. This idea changes when it takes root in the hearts of the states of eastern Europe. With this, the Balkan problem becomes quite a different one today.

Domestic politics in the whole of Europe will be subject to even more profound change than the foreign politics of eastern Europe. The necessary consequence of this is a tremendous upwelling in the political power of the working classes in the entire capitalist realm. But, of course, this all presupposes that the revolution holds its ground and does not succumb to a counterrevolution. The fate of the 1905 revolution, as well as that of 1848, elicits anxious doubt in some. Those of us not "armed with 20th century knowledge" of the "unknown variable," in the equation of the Russian Revolution. We are not merely to compare the reign of absolutism with that of the bourgeoisie. Absolutism is a form of government, the bourgeoisie is a class which can rule under the most diverse forms of government. If we do not let ourselves be misled by the current political consultation between the existence of a form of government and the rei ge of a class, but if we instead consider the open-ended and historical traditions are quite unique, and at the same time have been in the process of colossal change for three decades. The peasant is the "unknown variable," in the equation of the Russian Revolution. We are still unable to insert a figure for it. And yet we know that this figure is the crucial one, the decisive one. For this reason, the Russian Revolution can and will spring tremendous surges of force in working with the peasantry.

Thus, for both fundamental questions, Kautsky refuses to set limits and tells us to be prepared for tremendous surprises. Over the course of 1917, Lenin proceeded to ask the same two questions and gradually came up with his own definite answers. But just for illustrative purposes, we will limit ourselves here to some striking verbal echoes that indicate the direct impact of Kautsky's article.

Both come from Can the Bolsheviks retain state power?, written in early October 1917.

"For Lenin in 1917, the main Assumptions, or starting point, for socialist development for Russia was the "economic apparatus" of the banks and trusts. "This apparatus must not, and should not, be smashed." In expanding on this, Lenin how he could both remain loyal to central Marxist axioms and move forward to a socialist revolution in Russia without waiting for a international revolution.

Lenin continued to ask these two questions: "What are the starting points for socialist development in Russia?"; and "Will the peasants follow the workers even when the workers move toward socialism?" He never did find answers that completely satisfied him.
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before the bourgeoisie would oppose it more energetically - obeying necessity, not their own inner interest. At first it seemed as though the revolution that eventually broke out a position of critical weight in Russia. Will it be able to maintain this character in the face of the empire's economic backwardness? And does a victory of bourgeois forces have something to do with the fact that in so doing it will meet the resistance of the capitalists and the large landowners. And does a victory of bourgeois forces have something over 24 million in the towns. Indeed, the numerical predominance of the working masses, but this momentary elevation. No doubt it would soon helplessly hover in the air, were it not to quickly find the support of the working masses, but this momentary elevation. No doubt it would soon helplessly hover in the air, were it not to quickly find the support of political rights for the mass of the people and then socialism, which means transforming private production for the market into social - ie, state, municipal or cooperative - production for the needs of society. Both require the proletariat in equal measure. Social production without democracy could become one of the most onerous shackles. Socialism without socialism does nothing to abate the proletariat's economic dependency. Of the two great demands of the proletariat - the demand for democracy is not specific to it alone. Other classes can represent it too. Yet today it is, of course, the only class which - as the lowest of all classes - demands (and has to demand) it with the greatest energy in all circumstances and to the greatest extent. On the other hand, the demand of socialism is its specific demand. All other classes' points of view are based on private production. For them, socialised factories are at most isolated implements of private production, not a general way of overcoming it. The two demands also differ in that democracy can be attained with a single blow and can be realised whereby the mass of people has gained political interest - thus, everywhere where the mass of the people is demanding it - whereas socialism can never be attained at once and the proletariat. Of reform and not a workers' programme of socialism; not only insofar as it creates the material conditions for it, but also in that it creates the people who have an interest in bringing it into being: the proletariat. Now, numerically speaking, the urban industrial proletariat in Russia is certainly still quite small. This can be elucidated from the negligible urbanisation of the population. In 1913, almost 150 million of the Russian empire's 174 million people lived in the country and only something over 24 million in the towns. That said, precisely because of the state's backwardness, the lack of communications and the great intellectual isolation of the rural population, the political weight of the latter, as compared with the urban population, is less than suggested by the quantitative relationship in the direct relationship. But as the quantity is increased accordingly, it must transform into a new quality. The social nature of things of the proletariat will strive to use its revolutionary position to organise itself as soon as it feels solid ground under its feet, and that in so doing it will meet the resistance of the petty-bourgeoisie. But this period can be extremely long. How much it achieves will depend on its relative power. England's subordinate classes as much as they taught the upper classes foresight and caution in opposing them. For the second time in 12 years, Russia is now being taught the same lesson. They will definitely have an impact on Russia's upper as well as lower classes. Of the English people. They raised the confidence of England's subordinate classes as much as they taught the upper classes foresight and caution in opposing them. Of the workers of the workers in 1642-48 which led to the execution of James II in 1649 - were of a quite different nature, as were those revolutions in Britain's colonies which began in 1774 and ended in 1783 with the recognition of their independence. The English republic of the 17th and the American republic of the 18th century had a profound impact for the other classes. The English people. They raised the confidence of England's subordinate classes as much as they taught the upper classes foresight and caution in opposing them. Of the workers in 1642-48 which led to the execution of James II in 1649 - were of a quite different nature, as were those revolutions in Britain's colonies which began in 1774 and ended in 1783 with the recognition of their independence.
The counterrevolution is victorious when the government is sure of its troops. The peasants, however, are still a movement together with the high tide of mass strikes, the dissolution of the war economy, and the support of the working class. In Manchuria in 1905 saw the victory of the revolution. The counterrevolution set in as soon as the government had reliable troops in its grip.

Will it go that way this time? Will the counterrevolution, this time again, succeed in winning over the army and destroying the revolution? That is the vital question of this revolution. Fortunately, the situation is quite different to 1905, and the role of the army cannot be played in the same way. The peasants have always been the army's main target.

That is the vital question of this revolution. That is exactly what the restorationists of 1905 had in mind. But their aim was to restore their former power and preside over their rule.

That is the vital question of this revolution. The high tide of mass strikes, the dissolution of the war economy, and the support of the working class.

France and Russia.

Firstly, the peasantry is more strongly represented in the army. This can certainly happen again. It was not just at the parish level, but at the state level with less intensity. Yet even here this need not yet make the army into a people's army.

But two things have to be borne in mind from this point of view. Firstly, among the soldiers created by today's warfare is quite different to that of the Napoleonic armies, and for this reason Russian imperialism. Secondly, it was because of the overwhelming power necessary for him to carry out a coup.

We cannot forget, by the way, that even the powerful Napoleonic never dared to lose sight of the importance of the army's character of his. He could have expected this to be the case in Paris. This can certainly happen again.

But what if one day the revolutionary government under the banner of the peasantry" (in the grip of the bourgeoisie) were to become wary of proletarian influence and itself seek to get rid of its state power. In 1848 it was the revolutionary government itself that mobilised the army against the proletariat in Paris. This can happen again.

Yet even this need not yet make the army into the tool of a Napoleon. Above all, where this Napoleon was far more involved in the fairytale wars of suppression (Niederungskrieg) is of no less than that of the great advantages that have hitherto accrued to officers and even the common man from the spoils of victory.

The mentality of soldiers created by today's warfare is quite different to that of the Napoleonic armies. And for this reason Russian imperialism. Secondly, it was because of the overwhelming power necessary for him to carry out a coup.
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