

FRUNZE: THE SOVIET CLAUSEWITZ
(1885 - 1925)

FRUNZE:
THE SOVIET CLAUSEWITZ
1885-1925

by

WALTER DARNELL JACOBS

University of Maryland



MARTINUS NIJHOFF / THE HAGUE / 1969

© *Copyright 1969 by Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, Netherlands*
Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 1969
All rights reserved, including the right to translate or to
reproduce this book or parts thereof in any form

ISBN 978-94-011-8403-8 ISBN 978-94-011-9112-8 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-94-011-9112-8

To the Memory of my Father

P R E F A C E

Alongside the names of such giants of Soviet history as Brezhnev, Khrushchev, Kirov, Kosygin, Lenin, Stalin, and Trotsky, the name of Mikhail Vasil'evich Frunze may seem to be out of place. In spite of a most impressive flowering of Western scholarship on various aspects of the Soviet Union, the figure of Frunze remains relatively undeveloped. It is, in fact, quite possible to produce a history of the Soviet Union in which he is not mentioned. It has been done several times.¹

The Western neglect of Frunze is not duplicated in works produced in the Soviet Union. There, Frunze is almost invariably treated as a major figure and is popularly regarded as one of the great strategists of the early days of the Soviet republic. He holds, as well, a high place in the ranks of the "Old Bolsheviks."

How are these contrasts between the Western and the Soviet scholarly positions to be explained?

Several factors account for the high position occupied by Frunze in Soviet historiography. He was a military hero. He had a long record of revolutionary activity. He died at an early age and did not become involved in the purges and other excesses of Stalin's later career. In short, Frunze's short, active life and his contributions to the revolution suited him almost ideally to the role of historical hero.

Western scholars have neglected him, probably, for a number of reasons. First, he appears to have been primarily a military figure and Western scholarship is only now overcoming a strong predilection against military figures (except, of course, the "Great Captains"). The role of the military figure in political affairs has been poorly appreciated until most recently.

¹ Those Western histories which do mention him generally relegate him to a position of minor attention. One of our most respected historians, writing a multi-volume history of the USSR, refers to him as "M. P. Frunze" in the earlier volumes. See Edward Hallett Carr, *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923* (New York: Macmillan, 1951-1953), I, p. 304.

Second, Frunze does not seem to be a very exciting or original person. Western scholars have tended to view him only in the shadow of Stalin or Trotsky and have not turned the light fully on Frunze. Third, he did pass from the scene in 1925, that is, after the seizure of power and the Civil War and before the intensification of the Stalin-Trotsky struggle and the purges. Fourth, as a military man he has been overshadowed in Western writings by Trotsky, Tukhachevskii, Voroshilov, and even Budennyi, and as a political figure by Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky, and many others.

This study attempts to describe Frunze's activities and theoretical writings in order to make possible an evaluation of his true historical and political significance. He certainly deserves more attention than he has been given in past Western scholarship. He deserves it, if for no other reason, because of the frequency with which his name and activities are cited in current Soviet literature. He exerts an influence on the Soviet Union today and the extent of that influence is little appreciated or understood in the West. Obviously, that influence is not so great as the influence of Lenin, for instance, but it exists and deserves some attention.

In attempting to determine Frunze's significance, this study first describes his life and activities. Then a description of Frunze's debates and writings on the unified military doctrine and other doctrinal matters follows. A recounting of some of the more important Civil War campaigns in which he participated is included. The appendix contains translations of some of his more important writings which are not elsewhere available in English.

The plan of the study is culminated with an evaluation of Frunze as a theoretician. Where there are direct indications of his influence on Soviet military doctrine or on Soviet action, such indications are pointed out. No attempt has been made to give credit to Frunze for influence which can not be clearly demonstrated, even though there may be a suspicion that such influences exist in some instances.

In no case is this study conceived as a brief for Frunze. In attempting to rescue him from a relative obscurity, this study does not desire to transform him into some sort of towering giant of Soviet and world history. It is hoped that Frunze's contributions, his originality, his influence, and his significance will become clear in the pages to follow without gilding or embroidering.

A word about the arrangement of the study itself may be appropriate at this point. It is concerned chiefly with military doctrine. Military doctrine, even that produced by the greatest names in the field, abounds in truisms, trite phrases, obvious statements, platitudes, and tautologies. (Both Suvorov and Mao Tse-tung, for instance, have advised against losing

battles.) The military doctrine considered here is no exception, even when it flows from the mouth of a brilliant Trotsky – and especially when it comes from Frunze. Nevertheless, it has been necessary to follow several lines of thought. This course sometimes becomes tedious and, it is feared, boring. The reader is asked to bear along compassionately in these instances in the hope that, at the end, a clear and nearly complete understanding of the essential points (and interpretations) will finally emerge.

A minute examination of Frunze's doctrine is particularly important because his thought developed and was refined in a frictional contact with the emery of Trotsky's counterarguments.

This study, then, has a three-fold purpose.

First, it is designed to provide information on Frunze's activities and writings in order to fill a lacuna now existing in Western scholarship.

Second, it hopes to examine Frunze's activities and writings in order to attempt to place him properly in history and political science.

Third, it modestly present itself as an attempt to contribute to and encourage the study of military thought in general.

These three purposes find their justification, it is submitted, within the broad field of political science. Past separations of politics and military affairs may have had some meaning, but a continuing compartmentalization is daily becoming more and more meaningless.

It is not accidental that the great outpouring of Western scholarship on the Soviet Union has been accompanied, in recent years, by an increasing number of works on military affairs (e. g., Garthoff, Erickson, Whiting, Wolfe, Fedotoff White, Dinerstein, Clemens, and others). The Western interest in military affairs can hardly be separated from Western interest in the progress of communism. Whether the development is welcome or unwelcome to the scholarly community, it is now a fact that a study of military affairs is coming more and more within the scope of political science. It is hoped that this effort will stimulate others to inquire more competently and more thoroughly into the relationships between military and political affairs.

Anyone who has done research on the Soviet Union knows of the dangers of reliance on Soviet sources. The Soviet habit of rewriting history is too well known to need further comment here. It is necessary, however, to remark that most of the work on this study was done, *volens volens*, in Soviet sources. This is especially true in the case of biographical and military details because of the paucity of such information in Western sources. This forced reliance on Soviet (including Stalinist) materials makes necessary a continuing vigilance against distortions. An attempt has been made to

maintain such vigilance and, in some of the more violent cases of obvious distortion, attention is called to the fact in the body of this study.

It is also appropriate to note that the nature of this work has compelled the writer to utilize Marxist and Soviet terminology in several cases. Such terms as "imperialist," "bourgeois," "class," and "proletarian" are frequently used. Their utilization should not imply their acceptance as reliable and accurate terms. They are employed here in an attempt to remain faithful to the letter and flavor of the historical setting in which they were used by Frunze and others with whom this study is concerned.

I could scarcely let pass the opportunity to express my appreciation to many persons who have helped me with my work.

My gratitude to Henry L. Roberts, formerly of the Russian Institute of Columbia University and now at Dartmouth College, is profound and sincere not only for his advice and counsel but also for his warm and sympathetic understanding. Professor Roberts maintains the highest standards of scholarship and is able, at the same time, only poorly to conceal his lively sense of humor.

I am also most grateful to Alexander Dallin who has encouraged me in this project and who has given me the advantage of his experience and judgment in commenting on earlier drafts.

My debt to several other persons is also considerable. I should mention, as a minimum, Colonel Rodger R. Bankson, USA; Daniel Bell; Pavel Bogachev, Director of the Lenin State Library in Moscow; Zbigniew Brzezinski; Walter C. Clemens, Jr.; Michael Dankewych; William T. R. Fox; Baymirza Hayit; John N. Hazard; my brother, John Clayton Jacobs, the last of the Renaissance men; Colonel Kenneth E. Lay, USA; Garé LeCompte; Elmer Plischke; Serge Shewchuk; and Lawrence Ziring.

None of these persons, of course, bears any responsibility for errors of fact and interpretation which remain in this work.

In the course of my studies, I have received financial assistance from the Ford Foundation, the Russian Institute of Columbia University, and Mrs. Frederick Lewis Allen. This help is deeply appreciated.

I know of my debt, as well, to many persons whose names do not appear here. I hope that they will not be offended if I let this impersonal expression of gratitude serve where a more detailed notice would have been more proper.

W. D. J.

College Park, Maryland

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	VII
<i>A Note on Transliteration</i>	XII
PART I. The Man	
FOREWORD. Death of a Hero	1
CHAPTER I. The Path selected	5
PART II. The Debate	17
PROLOGUE TO A DEBATE	19
CHAPTER 2. Genesis of the Unified Military Doctrine	24
CHAPTER 3. A Battle of Articles	35
CHAPTER 4. A Blossom in the Hotbed	52
CHAPTER 5. The Debate at the Eleventh Party Congress	66
PART III. The Doctrine	89
THE END TO A DEBATE	91
CHAPTER 6. Wars of the Future	100
CHAPTER 7. Arms, Technology, and the Masses	117
CHAPTER 8. The Regular Army and Militia	128
CHAPTER 9. Inside the Academy and Out	137
PART IV. Some Conclusions	145
RITUALISM AND REALITY	147
CHAPTER 10. Frunze Today and in 1984	150
CHAPTER 11. Frunze's Testament	159
EPILOGUE: Who won?	163
APPENDICES	165
APPENDIX 1. "Front and Rear in War of the Future"	167
APPENDIX 2. "Our Military Construction and the Tasks of the Military-Scientific Societies"	179
APPENDIX 3. A Note on Frunze's Campaigns	195
<i>Bibliographical note</i>	227
<i>Index</i>	230

A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

Any given system of transliteration, it has been remarked, is satisfactory only to its creator. With some optimism, the present system of transliteration is designed to be satisfactory to all those who have worked with Russian language sources in libraries in the United States.

In an attempt to obtain a maximum of clarity and a minimum of apparatus, a variation of the Library of Congress transliteration system has been used here.

The variations include:

Ligature marks are omitted.

Single Russian letters which are transliterated into English by more than one letter are given initial capitalization only.

Both the soft sign and the hard sign are transliterated as '.

Some proper names which are now well-established in an English transliteration are used in the common English version rather than in a strict transliteration. Thus, Trotsky is used rather than Trotskii, but Tukhachevskii and not Tukhachevsky.

PART I
THE MAN

FOREWORD

DEATH OF A HERO

Amid honors, varying from a tribute by Josef Stalin¹ to memorial wreaths made of machine parts rather than flowers,² Mikhail Vasil'evich Frunze was laid to rest in Moscow's Red Square on November 3, 1925.

The legend of Frunze, born largely on that cold November day, has grown and been nurtured to our own time. At the present in the Soviet Union, Frunze is regarded as being among the front rank in at least three categories. These categories are military hero, military theorist, and Old Bolshevik.

Even today, after a major world war, the Soviet Union has no military hero to rank with Frunze.³

¹ Stalin's funeral speech for Frunze is reprinted in his *Works* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1954), VII, p. 256.

² R. Eideman, "Vozhd'-polkovodets," *Sputnik politrabotnika*, No. 27-28 (November 15, 1925), pp. 9-13.

³ Some of the indications of Frunze's rank as a Soviet military hero may be cited here without any attempt at flippancy.

Frunze is buried behind the Lenin mausoleum and in front of the Kremlin wall. His grave is marked by a marble bust. The only other graves with a similar position are those of Dzerzhinskii, Kalinin, Stalin, Sverdlov, and Zhdanov. This special honor would seem to rank Frunze among the six greatest Soviet Communist heroes, after Lenin. He is the only military figure among the six (if Stalin is considered to be chiefly a political figure).

The libraries of the Soviet Union also recognize Frunze as an outstanding military hero. Their catalogs list the following as "Leaders and Heroes of the Civil War" – Budennyi, Voroshilov, Kikvidze, Kirov, Kotovskii, Kuibyshev, Lazo, Ordzhonikidze, Parkhomenko, Fabritsius, Frunze, Furmanov, Chapaev, and Shchors. (The listing is followed by the note, in parentheses, "See also Lenin and Stalin.") In recent days, some other figures, such as Bluikher and Tukhachevskii, have been rehabilitated and added to the list. However, Frunze is the only figure honored by a special grave marker and by a listing among the leaders and heroes of the Civil War.

His place of prominence as a Soviet hero is also indicated by the large number of institutions, including the staff college of the Soviet Army, which are named in his honor.

Nor has the Soviet Union a single writer to compare with Frunze as a military theorist. The Soviet leadership pays honor to this side of Frunze through frequent reprintings of his writings (not only in the Soviet Union but also in the satellites),⁴ and through repeated, adulatory studies of his writings.⁵

The Soviet Union is still comparatively rich in Old Bolsheviks (and sons of Old Bolsheviks) even though the purges and the rewritings of history

He also has the usual number of streets named after him. A bust of Frunze was erected in front of the staff college in Moscow in May 1960. The capital of the Kirgiz republic is named for him. Many similar honors are paid him.

⁴ For a listing, see bibliographical note. It may be noted here, however, that his collected works were published in three volumes in 1926-1929. His selected works were published in one volume editions in 1934, 1940, 1950, 1951, and 1965, and in a two volume edition in 1957.

⁵ Among the principal critical works are V. Antonov-Ovseenko, "Stroitel'stvo Krasnoi armii i revoliutsiia," *Za 5 let* (Moscow: Krasnaia nov', 1922), pp. 145-189; I. Bakanov, "Frunze i oborona SSSR," *Bol'shevik*, No. 19-20 (October, 1940), pp. 59-71; G. Baranov, "M. V. Frunze o edinonachalii," *Propagandist i agitator RKKKA*, No. 17, 1940, pp. 10-15; Andrei Sergeevich Bubnov, *O Krasnoi Armii* (Moscow: Voennoe izdatel'stvo, 1958); Marshal Semen Mikhailovich Budennyi, "Vydaiushchiisia polkovodets i gosudarstvennyi deiatel' (K 25-letiiu so dnia smerti M. V. Frunze)," *Znania*, No. 10, 1950, pp. 129-136; R. Estreikher-Egorov, "M. V. Frunze o revoliutsionnoi voine," *Voina i revoliutsiia*, No. 10-11 (October-November, 1927), pp. 215-231; F. Girs, "M. V. Frunze i voprosy sovremennoi oborony SSSR," *Narodnyi uchitel'*, No. 2, 1927, pp. 5-10; A. Golubev, *M. V. Frunze o kharaktere budushchei voiny* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe voennoe izdatel'stvo, 1931); N. Gretskii, "M. V. Frunze o voennoi ditsipline," *Propagandist i agitator RKKKA*, No. 14, 1929, pp. 11-17; Sergei Ivanovich Gusev, *Grazhdanskaia voina i Krasnaia armii* (Moscow: Voennoe izdatel'stvo, 1958); F. D. Khurstov, *Frunze o voinskom vospitanii* (Moscow: Voennoe izdatel'stvo, 1946); A. A. Kosiukov, *Voenna-pedagogicheskie vzgliady M. V. Frunze* (Moscow: Voennoe izdatel'stvo, 1960); O. V. Levitskii, *M. V. Frunze - kommanduiushchii vsemi vooruzhennymi silami Urkainy i Kryma* (Moscow: Voenna-politicheskaiia akademiia imeni V. I. Lenina, 1951, an unpublished dissertation); I. S. Lezman, *Voennaia i partii'vo-politicheskaiia deiatel'nost' M. V. Frunze na Ukraine v period perekhoda ot grazhdanskoi voiny k mirnomu sotsialisticheskomu stroitel'stvu (noiabr' 1920 g. - mart 1924 g.)* (Khar'kov: Krar'kovskii gosudarstvennyi universitet imeni A. M. Gor'kogo, 1955, an unpublished dissertation); F. N. Petrov, ed., *M. V. Frunze: Zhizn' i deiatel'nost'* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1962); S. S. Shiskin, "Voennye vzgliady Frunze i sovremennaia voina," *Pod znamenem Marksizma*, No. 1, 1944, pp. 49-65; L. Trotskii, "Voennaia nauka ili mnimo-voennoe doktrinerstvo?" *Voennaia nauka i revoliutsiia*, No. 2, 1921, pp. 204-234; Major E. N. Tsvetaev, "Voenna-teoreticheskaiia rabota M. V. Frunze," *Izvestiia Akademii nauk SSSR, Serii istorii i filosofii*, No. 6 (November-December, 1950), pp. 501-513; I. G. Viktorov, *M. V. Frunze i voprosy sovetskoj voennoi ideologii* (Leningrad: Leningradskii gosudarstvennyi universitet imeni A. A. Zhdanova, 1951, an unpublished dissertation); A. Vol'pe, *Oborona strany i M. V. Frunze* (Moscow and Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1928); and I. M. Zhernosek, *Mikhail Vasil'evich Frunze o role i zadachakh tyia i snabzheniia v voine (po materialam boevoi deiatel'nosti i voennoe-teoreticheskim trudam)* (Kalinin: Voennaia akademiia tyia i snabzheniia imeni V. M. Molotova, 1952, an unpublished dissertation).

have eliminated quite a few who might otherwise be on hand. It is perhaps as much the fact of Frunze's early death as his record of service to the party that makes it possible for him to continue to be included in the ranks of the Old Bolsheviks. (Trotsky has suggested⁶ that Frunze's strict party discipline was responsible, in part, for his early death. According to Trotsky, Frunze submitted to an operation ordered by Stalin and the Politburo. Frunze died as a result of the operation.)

Frunze was all these things. He was a military hero, a troop leader, and a campaigner. He was a prolific and imaginative writer on military matters, as well as a capable administrator and reformer. He was also an early member of the Bolshevik Party and is properly included among the Old Bolsheviks. In addition to being all these things, Frunze died in 1925 – before the absolute consolidation of power by Stalin and before the blood purges which destroyed so many reputations and so many lives.

In his role as a troop leader and campaigner, Frunze commanded Soviet troops during several critical campaigns of the Civil War. His campaign at Ufa was a brilliant operational maneuver which contributed to the ultimate defeat of the Kolchak forces. His actions in Central Asia helped to break the Basmachi movement and to add Turkestan to the Soviet empire. His operations against Wrangel and Makhno in the Ukraine and the Crimea brought the military phase of the Civil War to an end. There is no name in Soviet military history that is connected with so many successful Civil War actions as that of Frunze.

As an administrator, Frunze oversaw the post-war organization of the military areas of the Ukraine and the Crimea. He later supervised the transformation of the Red Army from an irregular, loosely organized band of varied units into a tightly drawn, regular army. Frunze's work as an administrator is not dealt with in detail here as it has been ably and thoroughly described by Fedotoff White in his *Growth of the Red Army*. The military reforms, described by Fedotoff White, are also the subject of the 1958 work of Il'ia Borisovich Berkhin, *Voennaia reforma v SSSR (1924-1925)*. Both the Fedotoff White and the Berkhin books draw heavily on Frunze's collected work for the period of the reforms.

Frunze's other roles, those of military theorist and of Old Bolshevik, took up a large part of his vital energy. The two roles are virtually inextricable one from the other. While they can not be examined separately, the two roles may be somewhat arbitrarily developed, for the purposes of

⁶ See his *Stalin: An Appraisal of the Man and His Influence* (New York: Harper, 1942), p. 418. There is, apparently, no way to check today the accuracy of Trotsky's theory.

this study, with the Old Bolshevik role developing from a review of Frunze's life and the military theorist role developing from an examination of his writings.

The eminent position of Frunze in the Soviet Union, as well, would seem to indicate the value of a detailed examination of the body of his doctrinal and theoretical writings. An attempt, thus, will be made to determine the worth and reliability of his doctrinal views.

This attempt will be aided by the cursory look at his life which will also attempt to measure him as an Old Bolshevik. It will then weigh his qualifications to pose as an expounder of military doctrine. The weighing will be done by describing his campaigns and military background. An examination will then be made of his debates with Trotsky on the question of the unified military doctrine. Finally, a consideration of his theoretical works will be made in some detail, both historically and thematically. The views of his supporters and opponents will be examined to the extent that they contribute to a fuller understanding of Frunze's military ideology.

While this will be primarily a military study, the political views of Frunze will also be considered. This is necessary, if for no other reason, because Marxists refuse to draw a distinct line between political and military affairs.

CHAPTER I

THE PATH SELECTED

In 1904, while still a student at the Saint Petersburg Polytechnical Institute, Mikhail Vasil'evich Frunze joined the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party (RSDRP).¹

Less than a year later, Saint Petersburg witnessed the events of "Bloody Sunday."² Shortly after this dramatic occurrence, Frunze sent an excited letter to his widowed mother in Vernyi (now Alma-Ata). He wrote:

You have your son Kostia³ and your daughters. I hope that they will not leave you but will look after you in difficult times and that you will give me up for a

¹ Sergei Arkad'evich Sirotinskii, *Put' Arseniia: Biograficheskii ocherk o M. V. Frunze* (Moscow: Voennoe izdatel'stvo, 1956), p. 29. Sirotinskii adds that Frunze "consistently followed the Bolshevik line."

² A line has developed in modern Soviet writings to the effect that Frunze was a participant in the "Bloody Sunday" demonstrations.

His presence, there or in the capital city, on January 9, 1905, is, however, not established. While a student at the Polytechnical Institute, he frequently left the city and was, indeed, twice expelled from the school.

Two popular Soviet biographies state that he was there and was even in the front line of demonstrators when the first shots were fired by imperial forces. These works are Sirotinskii, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-30, and Viacheslav Alekseevich Lebedev and Konstantin Vasil'evich Anan'ev, *M. V. Frunze, 1885-1925* (Moscow: Molodaia Gvardiia, 1957), pp. 46-50. The latter biography goes so far as to state that Frunze was wounded in the arm by a rifle shot.

Some doubt is cast on these assertions because the presence of Frunze at the Winter Palace is not mentioned in earlier sources. See, for instance, "Desiat' let so dnia smerti M. V. Frunze," *Krasnyi Arkhiv*, No. 5 (72), 1935, pp. 44-50, and *Mikhail Vasil'evich Frunze: Polkovodcheskaia deiatel'nost': Sbornik statei* (Moscow: Voennoe izdatel'stvo, 1951), both of which have rather lengthy biographical material on Frunze.

Frunze himself did not claim to have been present at the "Bloody Sunday" events. See his "autobiography" in M. V. Frunze, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* (Moscow: Voennoe izdatel'stvo, 1957), I, pp. 69-71.

³ Frunze did not know that his brother Konstantin (Kostia) had been reported killed in the Russo-Japanese War. The report, received by his mother, later proved to be false. Sirotinskii, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

bad job. The torrents of blood which were spilled on the ninth of January must be atoned for. The die is cast, the Rubicon crossed, the path selected. I give myself wholly to the revolution. Do not be surprised at any news about me. The path which I have selected is not a smooth one.⁴

The path which Mikhail Frunze had thus rather melodramatically selected for himself was to take him far from his origins, both physically and spiritually.

He was born in the Central Asian city of Pishpek (now the capital of the Kirgiz SSR and renamed Frunze in his honor) on January 21 (or February 2, new style), 1885.

His father, Vasiliï, was a Moldavian who had served in the imperial army as a surgeon's assistant (*fel'dsher*). Vasiliï had come to Pishpek with a cavalry regiment and had been released from the service and pensioned while there. He decided to settle permanently in the area. In Pishpek, Vasiliï met and married Mavra Bochkareva. She was pure Russian, the daughter of a migratory peasant of the Voronezh district.

Of five children born to Mavra and Vasiliï Frunze, Mikhail was the second. He had an elder brother and three younger sisters.

When Mikhail was twelve years old, his father died.⁵ Konstantin Vasil'evich, three years older than Mikhail, took over the position as head of the family.

Like his elder brother Konstantin, Mikhail was an above average student. He is reported, in what may be after-the-fact iconizing, to have displayed an early fondness for military games. According to these reports, whenever the young Mikhail was asked what he wanted to be when he grew up, he invariably replied, "A general."⁶ Of all the generals of history, Mikhail chose Timur (Tamerlane) as his favorite.⁷

Mavra Frunze enrolled Mikhail in the academy in Vernyi. In 1904, he was graduated with the "gold medal."⁸ Frunze later stated that it was at the

⁴ Lebedev and Anan'ev, *op. cit.*, p. 49, and Sirotinskii, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-31. The letter is reproduced in numerous biographies of Frunze. These works do not cite the source of the letter but there is little reason to doubt its authenticity whether or not Frunze actually participated in the events of January 9, 1905, in Saint Petersburg.

⁵ Sirotinskii, *op. cit.*, p. 11. Early deaths seem almost to have been the rule among the male members of the Frunze family. Vasiliï died at 45, Mikhail at 40, and Timur, Mikhail's son, at 19.

⁶ See, for instance, S. Borisov, *Frunze* (Moscow: Molodaia Gvardiia, 1940) p. 15.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16. One of his teachers is reported to have said to Frunze, "I predict, Misha, that you will be a Suvorov." Mikhail precociously replied, "Or, perhaps, a Timur." See also, Sirotinskii, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14, for some hints about the influence of Timur (and Alexander of Macedonia) on Frunze's early education.

⁸ G. A. Timchenko, ed., *Novye materialy k biografii M. V. Frunze* (Alma-Ata: Tsentral'noe arkhivnoe upravlenie Kazakskoi SSR, 1933), p. 4, gives a detailed listing

Vernyi Academy that he first became acquainted with "revolutionary ideas."⁹

His good academic record at Vernyi enabled Frunze to enter the Saint Petersburg Polytechnical Institute in September, 1904. His interest in "revolutionary ideas" was cultivated while at the Institute. In November, he took part in a student demonstration near the Kazan Cathedral in the center of the city. He was arrested and reacted in a "revolutionary" manner by giving a false name and address to the police. His first alias was "Boris Tachaiskii" and his false address was Petrovsk.

In accordance with police practice then in effect, Frunze was transported to Petrovsk when released from confinement. When he arrived in that city, not far from the Volga, he took out formal membership in the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party (RSDRP).¹⁰

During the months of November and December, Frunze was engaged in party work, serving as a propagandist-agitator in Petrovsk, Livny (a town about 360 kilometers to the south of Moscow), and Moscow. "From the first," he later wrote, "I sided with the bolshevik . . . tendency."¹¹ There is nothing in his early activity to gainsay this rather sweeping assertion.

Frunze's academic work at the Polytechnical Institute in Saint Petersburg was suffering as a result of his absences from the capital. He returned to the city in January, 1905, and apparently was there at the time of "Bloody Sunday." In April, however, he again departed for the provinces to do further party work.

He went first to Ivanovo-Voznesensk, a textile center which has been called the "Manchester of Russia."¹² He also worked at party agitation in Shuia.¹³ Under the cover name of "Trifonych" he participated in the planning and execution of a general strike in the Ivanovo-Voznesensk area in the summer of 1905.¹⁴

of the grades which Mikhail Frunze received at Vernyi. His marks in "application, attention, and conduct" were all "5's" (the highest mark). He also got all "5's" in religion. He was awarded a mixture of "4's" and "5's" in Russian, Slavonic, Arithmetic, Geometry, History, and Natural Science. He obtained a "3" along with some "4's" and "5's" in Geography. In his last year, he had all "5's" in Logic, Physics, Latin, Greek, German, and French.

⁹ Frunze, *op. cit.*, I, p. 69.

¹⁰ Lebedev and Anan'ev, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-46.

¹¹ Frunze, *op. cit.*, I, p. 69.

¹² On Ivanovo-Voznesensk, generally, as well as Frunze's activities there, see Pavel Mikhailovich Ekzempliarskii, *Istoriia Goroda Ivanova* (Ivanovo: Ivanovskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1958), Part I.

¹³ Frunze, *Sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1926-1928), I, p. 669.

¹⁴ V. Galkin, *Vseobshchaia stachka Ivanovo-Voznesenskikh rabochkikh letom 1905 goda* (Ivanovo: Oblastnoe izdatel'stvo, 1940), *passim*.

A period of rather intense agitational activity followed. When Tsar Nicholas II issued a constitutional manifesto on October 17, 1905, Frunze retaliated by issuing a manifesto of his own which closed with the words, "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"¹⁵ He organized mass meetings of workers in the fields near the river Talka. His shouts of "Down with the autocracy!" did not go unnoticed by the authorities. He was arrested once again and sent to Kazan, a city which he had falsely listed as his home.

Frunze was shortly released from confinement upon giving a written understanding that he would not leave the environs of Kazan.¹⁶ He returned at once to Shuia.

Meanwhile, back at the Saint Petersburg Polytechnical Institute, the school authorities were examining their records. They decided to expel Mikhail Frunze because of "absence from classes."¹⁷

In the country at about this time, discontent was erupting into revolution. Soon there were barricades in the streets.

Frunze got his first taste of armed insurrection when he led a group of workers from Shuia into Moscow. His detachment fought in the Triumphal Square (now Maiakovskii Square), in Bronnaia Street, and in Pressnia. In one engagement, Frunze and two companions captured a machine gun from regular troops of the imperial army.

The insurrectionists, however, were not able to match the regulars in sustained combat. The uprising was put down within nine days after the arrival of the Shuia detachment at the Nicholas (now Leningrad) Station in Moscow. When it became apparent that the revolt had no chance of success, Frunze left the city and returned to Shuia.¹⁸

There he again busied himself with agitational work. The Ivanovo-Voznesensk party apparatus gave recognition to his prominent position by selecting him as its representative to the Fourth Congress of the RSDRP in Stockholm.¹⁹ Among the other delegates to this Congress were Krupskaja, Lenin, Litvinov, Stalin, Trotsky, Voroshilov, and Zinoviev. At this meeting, Frunze struck up a friendship with Voroshilov that was later to be of some value to him. (At that time, Frunze was using the alias "Arsenii" and Voroshilov called himself "Volodia." The two did not learn each other's true identity until they met again during the Civil War.) Frunze also had a lengthy talk with Lenin about the military shortcomings of the 1905 revolutionary actions in Moscow.

¹⁵ Levedev and Anan'ev, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-61.

¹⁶ "Desiat' let so dnia smerti M. V. Frunze," *op. cit.*, p. 48.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Sirovinskii, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-49.

¹⁹ Frunze, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia, op. cit.*, I, p. 69.

Lenin is reported to have listened attentively while the twenty-one year old quondam student of economics expounded on the military aspects of the Moscow uprising.

"The Bolsheviks," said Frunze, "must know military affairs and must have their own officers who are superior to the servitors of the Tsar in military matters." Lenin, so the story goes, nodded affirmatively and asked Frunze if he had read *Anti-Dühring*. When Frunze replied that indeed he had, Lenin pointed out the lesson to the youngster. "There, in Engels," is a direct indication of the necessity for revolutionists to master military skills. The revolution needs its officers."²⁰

This conversation, whether true or fictional, indicates the line of thought being followed by the conspirators around Lenin as early as 1906. They never lost sight of the necessity for military training and skills and attempted to develop them at every opportunity. Frunze was later, in his debates with Trotsky, to make eristic use of this lesson in citations from the masters.

When he returned to Shuia after the Congress, Frunze received the news that his application for readmission to the Polytechnical Institute had been approved. He re-enrolled in June.²¹

His revolutionary interests were again overriding. His school work was once again neglected. In March, 1907, he was selected as a delegate to the Fifth Congress of the party, but he was unable to attend. Another arrest intervened.

During the night of March 24, Frunze heard a knocking at the door. He rushed, with a revolver in each of his hands, to greet the visitors. He declined the opportunity to use his armament, however, and was arrested by the police.²²

At the hearing, where he was charged with membership in the RSDRP, Frunze gave his name, again, as "Boris Konstantinovich Tachaiskii."²³ The authorities were not fooled this time. They recognized their prisoner as Trifonych-Arsenii-Frunze. He was convicted and sentenced to four years of penal servitude.²⁴ A demonstration of workers demanding his release was unavailing and Frunze was sent off to prison in Vladimir.

Back in Saint Petersburg, shortly after Frunze's arrest, the keepers of the

²⁰ Quoted in Colonel Danil Maksimovich Grinishin, *Voennaiia deiatel'nost' V. I. Lenina* (Moscow: Voennoe izdatel'stvo, 1957), p. 56.

²¹ "Desiat' let so dnia smerti M. V. Frunze," *op. cit.*, p. 48.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 49. Sirotinskii, *op. cit.*, p. 67, mistakenly states that Frunze gave the name "Tachapskii." Lebedev and Anan'ev, *op. cit.*, p. 86, support the "Tachaiskii" version.

²⁴ Frunze, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia*, *op. cit.*, I, p. 70.